



## Utah Farm Bureau Policies 2024

Approved at the 107<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the  
Utah Farm Bureau Federation

Provo, Utah  
November 17, 2023

*Inspire*  
all Utah families to  
connect, succeed, and grow  
through the *Miracle* of  
**Agriculture**

## **UTAH FARM BUREAU FEDERATION**

*9865 South State Street*

*Sandy, UT 84070*

*(801) 233-3000 • UtahFarmBureau.org*

### **OFFICERS**

#### **ValJay Rigby, President**

P.O. Box 81  
Newton, UT 84327  
(435) 757-4236

#### **Wade Eliason, Vice President**

P.O. Box 815  
Moroni, UT 84646  
(435) 469-0322

#### **Spencer Gibbons, CEO**

9865 S. State St.  
Sandy, UT 84070  
(435) 770-4590

### **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

#### **District 1**

Chris Chambers  
98 W. 400 S.  
Smithfield, UT 84335  
(435) 770-0541

#### **District 2**

Logan Wilde  
2250 N. 7000 E.  
Croydon, UT 84018  
(801) 940-2995

#### **District 3**

Tyson Roberts  
891 W. Weaver Ln.  
Layton, UT 84041  
(801) 915-6960

#### **District 4**

Russ Kohler  
970 River Rd.  
Midway, UT 84648  
(435) 671-0896

#### **District 5**

Steve Hanberg  
HC 69 P.O. Box 129  
Randlett, UT 84063  
(435) 823-5829

#### **District 6**

Trevor Barnson  
375 N. Main St. P.O. Box 71  
Junction, UT 84740  
(435) 616-2078

#### **District 7**

Jared Buhler  
489 W. Main St.  
Delta, UT 84624  
(435) 864-7000

#### **Women's Leadership Chair**

Dot Jensen  
6985 N. 6800 W.  
Tremonton, UT 84337  
(435) 279-0370

#### **P&E Chair**

Sherrie Tate  
2020 S. Franklin Dr.  
Washington, UT 84780  
(435) 229-5239

#### **YF&R Chair**

Brady Spackman  
80 S. 200 W.  
Lewiston, UT 84320  
(435) 890-2606

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>MISSION STATEMENT</b>	3	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</b>	16
<b>VISION STATEMENT</b>	3	Air Quality—Odor	16
<b>FOREWORD</b>	3	Pollutants	16
<b>PURPOSE OF FARM BUREAU</b>	3	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, AND</b>	
<b>FARM BUREAU BELIEFS</b>	3	<b>GOVERNANCE INVESTING</b>	16
<b>AGRICULTURE DEFINITION</b>	4	<b>EQUINE</b>	16
<b>AGRITOURISM</b>	5	<b>FARM SAFETY</b>	17
<b>ANIMAL HEALTH</b>	5	<b>FARM SERVICE AGENCY</b>	17
Brucellosis Vaccination	5	<b>FENCING</b>	17
Chronic Wasting Disease	6	<b>FOOD QUALITY, SAFETY, REGULATORY</b>	
Epididymitis Disease	6	<b>ASSURANCE, AND INSURANCE</b>	18
Johne’s Disease	6	<b>FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS</b>	19
Scrapie	6	<b>FRUITS AND VEGETABLES</b>	19
Swine Health Regulations	6	<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	19
Trichomoniasis	6	Capitalism Private Enterprise	19
<b>ANIMAL HUSBANDRY</b>	6	Constitution	20
<b>AQUACULTURE</b>	7	Elections	20
Commercial Fee Fishing	7	Federal Government	20
Disease Testing	7	Government by Initiative	20
Whirling Disease	7	Executive Branch	20
Federal Assistance	7	Legislative Branch	20
Fish Stocking	7	Judiciary	21
Funding	8	Socialism and Communism	21
Institutional Aquaculture	8	States’ Rights	21
<b>BEEKEEPING</b>	8	<b>GUN CONTROL</b>	22
<b>BRAND INSPECTION</b>	8	<b>HEALTH CARE</b>	22
<b>CENTURY FARMS</b>	9	<b>HEMP</b>	22
<b>DAIRY</b>	9	<b>LABELING</b>	22
Checkoff Promotion	9	Animal Identification	22
Federal Dairy Deregulation	9	Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO)	22
Federal Milk Marketing Order	9	<b>LABOR</b>	23
Marketing	9	Homeland Security	23
National Fluid Milk Standard	9	<b>LAW ENFORCEMENT</b>	23
Raw Milk	10	<b>LIVESTOCK THEFT &amp; DESTRUCTION</b>	23
<b>EDUCATION</b>	10	<b>LIVESTOCK TRAIL RIGHTS</b>	24
Higher Education	10	<b>OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION</b>	24
Public Education	11	Agriculture Protection Areas (APA)	24
Agriculture in the Classroom	11	Coordinated Resource Management	24
<b>EMINENT DOMAIN AND IMMEDIATE</b>		Funding Sources	24
<b>OCCUPANCY</b>	11	Incentive-Based Solutions	24
<b>ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT</b>	12	Liability	25
Species of Concern	13	Purchase of Development Rights or	
<b>ENERGY</b>	14	Conservation Easements	25
Renewable Energy	14	<b>PEST CONTROL</b>	25
Climate Change	15	<b>PLANNING COMMISSIONS</b>	25
Surface and Mineral Rights	15	Land Use Plans	26

<b>PORK</b>	26	<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	40
Marketing	26	Class D Roads	40
Pork Check-off	26	Traffic Related Laws	41
<b>PREDATOR CONTROL</b>	26	Vehicle Inspections	41
<b>PRIVATE FOREST PRACTICES</b>	27	<b>TRESPASS</b>	41
<b>PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS</b>	28	<b>TURFGRASS</b>	42
Environmental Impact Statements	28	<b>UTAH STATE FAIR</b>	42
Preserving Private Property Rights through Market-Oriented Solutions	28	<b>WATER</b>	42
Recreational Access	29	Beneficial Use	43
<b>PUBLIC LANDS</b>	29	Agricultural Water Optimization	43
Base Property	29	Federal Water Policy	44
Multiple Use	29	Flood Plain Management	44
Antiquities Act	29	Groundwater Management	45
New National and State Monuments and Parks	30	Dam Safety	45
Existing National and State Monuments and Parks	30	Interstate Compact Water	45
USDA Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative	30	Irrigation Infrastructure	46
Public Ownership of Land	30	Water Rights Forfeiture	46
Rangeland Management	31	State Water Rights	47
Recreation	32	Instream Flows	47
Recreational Areas	32	Water Companies	47
Roads	33	Water Reuse	48
Forest Management	33	Water Development	48
Wetlands-Army Corps of Engineers	33	Great Salt Lake	49
Wild Horses and Burros	34	Bear Lake/River	49
Wilderness Areas	34	Central Utah Project	49
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES</b>	35	Colorado River	50
<b>RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT</b>	35	Water Quality	50
<b>RIGHT TO FARM</b>	36	<b>WEEDS</b>	50
<b>SCHOOL AND INSTITUTIONAL</b>		<b>WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION AND</b>	
<b>TRUSTLANDS ADMINISTRATION</b>	36	<b>AGRICULTURE BURNING</b>	50
Development	36	<b>WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT</b>	51
Funding	37	Damage Control	51
Grazing Permits	37	Managing Wildlife	52
<b>SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICTS</b>	38	Landowner Associations	53
<b>TAX</b>	38	Transplants and Reintroductions	53
Farmland Assessment Act-Greenbelt	39	Wildlife Board	53
<b>TRADE AND COMPETITION</b>	39	<b>WORKERS COMPENSATION</b>	54
		<b>ZONING ORDINANCES</b>	54
		Land Divisions	54
		<b>SCOTT DALTON</b>	54

## **MISSION STATEMENT**

Inspire all Utah families to connect, succeed, and grow through the miracle of agriculture.

## **VISION STATEMENT**

We bring value to every citizen and community through love of God, family, country, and the land. We work for those who work to feed and clothe the world.

## **FOREWORD**

The Utah Farm Bureau is a federation of 28 county Farm Bureaus. Farm Bureau is the largest general farm organization in Utah and the United States.

Numerous legislative, educational, and service-to-member programs are provided for the benefit of Farm Bureau members.

The policies presented herein have been developed through the democratic processes of discussion and debate in local, county, and state Farm Bureau meetings.

Activities of the Utah Farm Bureau Federation in 2024 will be based on the policies outlined in these resolutions adopted by the official voting delegates, except as they may be modified or supplanted by later resolutions.

Leaders and members are asked to support these policies in a united effort to improve the social and economic condition of farmers and ranchers.

*Adopted by the UFBF Voting Delegates  
November 17, 2023*

## **PURPOSE OF FARM BUREAU**

Farm Bureau is an independent, nongovernmental, non-partisan, non-sectarian, non-secret, and voluntary organization of farm and ranch families and agribusinesses united for the purpose of addressing their problems and formulating action to achieve educational improvement, economic opportunity, and social advancement and, thereby, to promote the national well-being. Farm Bureau is local, county, state, national, and international in its scope and influence. Farm Bureau is the voice of agricultural producers at all levels.

## **FARM BUREAU BELIEFS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Government affairs should not be secretive except as actually essential to national security.

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

We believe in being good stewards of the land. We reaffirm our position to do our part to be good neighbors and to protect and enhance the image of the agricultural industry. We recognize the need to extend ourselves in the communities in which we live and assisting our neighbors and the general public in comprehending the benefits and positive impacts agriculture has on society and understand our responsibilities therein.

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

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

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

Congress, the President, government agencies and their employees should be subject to the same laws and regulations as the other people of the United States.

We believe the words "In God We Trust" should be displayed in a prominent position on all U.S. currency. We also believe the words "One Nation Under God" should remain in the Pledge of Allegiance.

We support the right to public prayer and discussion of religious themes in public forums, including schools, and support a modification of the Utah Constitution, if necessary, to guarantee this right.

We support the traditional American ideals of standing, saluting, and reciting the Pledge of Allegiance and National Anthem regularly and teaching and practicing flag etiquette.

We believe political parties should be open, inclusive, and allow any qualified voter to participate in any political party's candidate selection process.

### **AGRICULTURE DEFINITION**

Agricultural businesses which meet the criteria for regulation under one specific set of rules should not automatically fall under jurisdiction of others. We recognize the importance and inherent value of small farms and ranches' involvement in the agricultural industry.

We support:

- 1) Standardizing the definition of agriculture as it is used within state code.
- 2) Efforts to define a farm. The definition should be developed with strong producer input and should be consistent for all agencies.

## **AGRITOURISM**

We support:

- 1) Limiting liability for agritourism.
- 2) The following definition of agritourism: "Agritourism activity" means any activity which allows members of the general public, for recreational, entertainment, or educational purposes, to view or enjoy agricultural related activities, including, but not limited to, farming activities, ranching activities, or historic, cultural, or natural attractions. An activity may be an agritourism activity whether or not the participant pays to participate in the activity. An activity is not an agritourism activity if the participant is paid to participate in the activity.
- 3) Incentives and removing barriers for agritourism.
- 4) Recommending items to be listed on signs identifying hazards and risks at the entrance to any farm or ranch where agritourism occurs.
- 5) A voluntary process by which agritourism operators may register their operation(s) on a public database.
- 6) Listing agritourism in Utah's "Right to Farm" statute.
- 7) Agritourism within agricultural protection areas.
- 8) Holding buildings and structures used for agritourism to agriculture building codes instead of commercial building codes.

## **ANIMAL HEALTH**

We support:

- 1) Maximum enforcement of animal health laws and regulations, including restrictions on importation of foreign livestock into the U.S.
- 2) State or federal assistance in the form of low interest loans, grants, or other disaster relief if losses or health hazards attributed to serious animal diseases confront livestock operators in Utah.
- 3) Livestock, poultry, and aquaculture producers following reasonable and prudent measures in preventing the spread of infectious diseases.
- 4) Testing for diseases transmittable to livestock and humans on all transplantable big game.
- 5) The continued use of antibiotics and sulfonamides in agriculture.
- 6) Scientific and economic studies before removing any antibiotics from use in agriculture.
- 7) Expanding state law to allow any person to teach or perform nonsurgical bovine, ovine, and/or porcine artificial insemination and pregnancy diagnosis.
- 8) Maintaining a veterinary diagnostic laboratory in southern Utah.
- 9) The certification of the Utah Veterinarian and Diagnostic Laboratories.
- 10) Recruitment and retention of food animal veterinarians, particularly in rural areas.

## **Brucellosis Vaccination**

We support:

- 1) Utah's brucellosis vaccination program be administered by rule through Utah's State Veterinarian and Utah's Department of Agriculture and Food (UDAF).
- 2) Mandatory calfhooed vaccination for all females entering the beef and dairy breeding herds.
- 3) Evidence of tattoos or blood tests as the necessary requirements for breeding animals entering the State of Utah.
- 4) Revaccination of calfhooed vaccinates if science supports it.

### **Chronic Wasting Disease**

We support:

- 1) The use of government funds to research Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD), its cause, transmissibility, and prevention in cervids.
- 2) Funding to the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) to do extensive testing of wildlife to determine if CWD exists in cervids.

### **Epididymitis Disease**

We support:

- 1) Adequate funding and research to help eradicate epididymitis disease.

### **Johne's Disease**

We support:

- 1) Efforts of the Utah Johne's Disease Advisory Committee, along with state funding, to develop improved methods for detecting and controlling Johne's disease.
- 2) Building a nationally legislated fund to slaughter Johne's positive cows by using the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) market loss funds.

### **Scrapie**

We support:

- 1) Continued priority funding for scrapie research until the disease is controlled through the ongoing testing regimen.

### **Swine Health Regulations**

We support:

- 1) Strict enforcement of applicable blood testing requirements on all hogs shipped across state lines.
- 2) A mandatory blood test for all hogs not going to harvest from stock shows.

### **Trichomoniasis**

We support:

- 1) State regulations for bulls testing positive for trichomoniasis fetus.
- 2) Allowing a Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) test to differentiate between venereal and intestinal forms of trichomoniasis. Bulls carrying intestinal forms of trichomoniasis should not be sent to terminal markets or otherwise restricted.
- 3) Penalties for livestock owners who fail to test for trichomoniasis.
- 4) A continued research program that leads to a more reliable trichomoniasis test.
- 5) The State of Utah using a better-quality ear tag.
- 6) The testing of all dairy and rodeo bulls for trichomoniasis.

### **ANIMAL HUSBANDRY**

We support:

- 1) The right of farmers to raise and transport livestock in accordance with commonly accepted agricultural practices.
- 2) Adequate agriculture representation on any local, regional, or state boards or organizations that deal with livestock husbandry.
- 3) The development of a livestock husbandry board under the authority of UDAF.
- 4) Efforts of industry representatives to negotiate animal welfare legislation that meets the needs of producers, processors, and retailers.
- 5) The producer's, or animal owner's, right to engage in acts of animal husbandry such as, but not limited to, dehorning, branding, tagging or notching ears, teeth floating and dental maintenance, farriery and hoof trimming, castrating, deworming, vaccinating,



injecting, and artificial insemination of farm animals; or the acts or conduct of a person advising with respect to nutrition, feeds, or feeding.

We oppose:

- 1) Efforts to classify animals of husbandry as companion animals and elevating the well-being of animals to a similar status as the rights of people.

## **AQUACULTURE**

### **Commercial Fee Fishing**

We support:

- 1) Commercial fee fishing operations on privately stocked natural streams and lakes which are on private lands; and
- 2) Exempting private ponds that do not naturally enter public water from regulation and inspection by DWR or UDAF.

### **Disease Testing**

We support:

- 1) A state funded aquaculture indemnification program at 75% of market value for private aquaculturalists required to eradicate diseased fish.
- 2) National "minor use for minor species" legislation to make drugs more readily available to treat diseased fish.
- 3) A legislative appropriation to establish a fish section at the Utah Veterinary Diagnostic Lab.
- 4) DWR being required to conduct fish disease testing through outside certified labs similar to the private sector.
- 5) Scientific studies that would evaluate the financial and economic impacts to both the public and private aquaculture industries.
- 6) Legislative action that would level the playing field allowing for private fisheries to market and sell fish to urban fisheries under the Trout Enhancement Program.

We oppose:

- 1) Use of new, more sensitive tests for fish diseases that are above the standards set in the American Fisheries Society (AFS) Blue Book.

### **Whirling Disease**

We support:

- 1) Fish suspected of carrying any pathogen or aquatic invasive species only being stocked in waters known to already be infected.
- 2) A testing system using independent private labs to confirm the presence of Whirling disease or other aquatic pathogens, testing should be completed within six months.
- 3) Consistent efforts for both private and public fisheries to control whirling disease.

### **Federal Assistance**

We support:

- 1) State or federal assistance in the form of low interest loans or other disaster relief for fish farmers who must remodel or go out of business due to whirling disease or any other prohibited pathogen or aquatic invasive species.

### **Fish Stocking**

We support:

- 1) Purchase of fish for public fisheries by the DWR from certified private sources on a bid

- basis in lieu of expanding the state-owned hatchery system.
- 2) Bid invitations being issued at least 12 months in advance of purchases.
  - 3) Stocking of fish not smaller than ten fish per pound in any waters where whirling disease has been found.

### **Funding**

We support:

- 1) A legislative appropriation that would meet expenses incurred by the Utah Fish Health Policy Board.

### **Institutional Aquaculture**

We support:

- 1) Limiting production of fish at institutional production facilities to 2,000 lbs. annually and marketing such fish on the same basis as private aquaculture.
- 2) Limiting live fish transplants from closed institutional aquaculture systems to permitted ponds only under the authority of the original fish supplier's certificate of health.

### **BEEKEEPING**

We support:

- 1) The classification of bees as livestock.
- 2) Hive inspections by UDAF.
- 3) The requirement for hives to have removable frames.
- 4) The registration of hives, and their location with UDAF. This information is not intended to be accessible by the public.
- 5) Limited liability to landowners and pesticide applicators should have locations not be disclosed and or properly registered.

### **BRAND INSPECTION**

We support:

- 1) A fiscally responsible brand inspection/registration department which is funded through a combination of the user fees and department budgets, with any increase in user fees being approved only through the direction of the State Brand Board, Legislature, and Governor.
- 2) Reciprocal brand inspection agreements with neighboring states, especially to avoid duplicate brand inspections when livestock are sent to auction.
- 3) A fee waiver for brand inspections of livestock that routinely move between pastures within neighboring states.
- 4) Brand inspectors who are familiar with livestock producers they serve.
- 5) Training of local and state law enforcement personnel on brand inspection laws and procedures in order to curtail illegal hauling of livestock.
- 6) The option of Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification within the Brand Department.
- 7) Training brand inspectors on how best to read earmarks in sheep.
- 8) Utah Farm Bureau Federation becoming a recommending organization for a position on the Utah Brand Board.
- 9) Requiring brand inspection at point of sale, harvest (including on farm harvest), or any time an animal crosses the state line.
- 10) Brand inspectors having authority given by the Brand Department necessary to perform their duties.

We oppose:

- 1) Self-inspection of animals, by the owner of the animals.

## **CENTURY FARMS**

We support:

- 1) Any farm or ranch in the State of Utah that has been owned by one single family (as defined as one set of parents and their posterity for one hundred years or more) being recognized as a Century Farm or Ranch. As such, they are the beneficiaries to all legislative benefits and protection designated for Century Farms and Ranches in the State of Utah.

## **DAIRY**

### **Check-Off Promotion**

We support:

- 1) Check-off requirements on domestic products. This should be applicable to all agricultural imports.

### **Federal Dairy Deregulation**

We support:

- 1) A phase-in period of five years for any deregulation of the dairy industry.

### **Federal Milk Marketing Order**

We support:

- 1) Modifications in the Federal Milk Marketing Order that will enhance the price of milk received by producers. These modifications would include, but not be limited to:
  - a) Removing the make allowance on class III milk, and
  - b) The opportunity for producers to vote on amendments to the FMMO rather than just an up or down on the whole order.
- 2) Regulatory reform efforts to strengthen the price correlation between physical commodity trade and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange contracts meant to represent those commodities.

## **Marketing**

We support:

- 1) A supply management program administered by the dairy producers.
- 2) Continued emphasis by UDAF to develop markets for dairy product exports.
- 3) Funding for research and development of dairy ingredients.
- 4) Increased funding for the U.S. Dairy Export Council.
- 5) A state milk marketing order and other revenue enhancing programs.
- 6) Generic promotion of dairy products and displaying the "real" seal on products produced and processed in the USA.
- 7) Institution of regional dairy marketing opportunities such as compacts and marketing agencies.
- 8) A voluntary statewide dairy producer 1 cent/cwt dairy check-off program directed to the Dairy Producers of Utah.
- 9) Serving milk; including flavored milk, in school lunch programs.

We oppose:

- 1) The FDA memorandum calling for the USA to give "grade A" status to foreign milk.

### **National Fluid Milk Standard**

We support:

- 1) A national fluid milk standard consistent with the California standard.

## **Raw Milk**

Food safety, in both perception and reality, is important to producers and consumers. Because of the risk inherent in the consumption of raw milk we propose the following:

We support the production, transportation and sale of raw milk and raw milk products packaged for retail sale so long as the producer follows the following requirements:

- 1) Retain ownership of the raw milk and raw milk products until final sale to the consumer.
- 2) Have a current Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA).
- 3) Increase frequency of raw milk testing:
  - a) Producer/processor handler required to bear the expense of additional testing.
  - b) Maintain current UDAF Bacteria and Pathogen Tests including antibiotic residue testing.
- 4) Meet labeling requirements such as, but not limited to:
  - a) Use buy/sell by date (maximum of 9 days from production to final sale).
  - b) Health risk label informing raw milk and raw milk products consumer of health risks associated with consumption of raw milk and raw milk products.
  - c) Raw milk and raw milk products handling label that educates consumers on how to handle raw milk at home to maintain and preserve quality and to avoid contamination/spoilage leading to health risks associated with unpasteurized milk.
- 5) Milk processing facilities should meet the same health and sanitation requirements and standards required for restaurants including:
  - a) Certifiable, reviewable, milk testing lab and technician.
- 6) Have and follow strict retail quality control protocols and standards:
  - a) Mandatory 3<sup>rd</sup> party raw milk and raw milk products testing of every batch bottled and prepared for retail (raw milk and raw milk products will be held off store shelves until batch tests come back and are clean).
  - b) All raw milk and raw milk products sold must be handled and maintained at a specific temperature requirement and are subject to regular and random milk cooler checks.
  - c) Maintain a database of all raw milk and raw milk product sales.
- 7) Raw milk sold at the dairy farmer's owned off premise retail location.
- 8) The sale of raw and pasteurized milk at the same retail location provided the raw milk and raw milk products are sold at the farmer's owned, on-farm, retail location; is displayed and sold from separate coolers than pasteurized milk and there are distinctly different labels for the raw and pasteurized milk, including raw milk products.
- 9) UDAF increasing enforcement and penalties for the illegal sales and distribution of raw milk and raw milk products up to \$2,000 for a first offense, \$5,000 for a second offense, and up to \$10,000 for a third offense.

We oppose:

- 1) The sale of raw dairy products, with the exception of cheese, at Farmers Markets.
- 2) A cow share program in any form.

## **EDUCATION**

### **Higher Education**

We support:

- 1) The Land Grant University system, specifically the Utah State University (USU) research, teaching, and Extension mission, and USU should:
  - a) Expand its distance learning programs.

- b) Teach both lower and upper division courses on Extension campuses.
  - c) Assure gubernatorial appointment of at least two bona-fide agriculture industry representatives to both the Utah Board of Regents and the USU Board of Trustees.
  - d) Allow out-of-state students residency status after one year of continuous Utah residency.
  - e) Be adaptable and responsive to the changing needs of agriculture, including, but not limited to, air, environmental, and water issues.
- 2) Require an agricultural appreciation and awareness course for all undergraduate degrees.
  - 3) Expand farm business management education and benchmarking.

### **Public Education**

We support:

- 1) Curriculum revision of high school agriculture science classes to ensure they qualify as science credits for graduation and at universities.
- 2) Increased oversight of approved school instructional materials to ensure they accurately portray agriculture.
- 3) Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs in public schools and specific state funding to ensure these programs continue. This funding should not be redirected to fund Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM) or general educational programs.
- 4) Utilizing local producers to provide agricultural commodities to local schools for school lunch programs.
- 5) Educational opportunities for elementary, middle, junior high, and high school students to participate in growing commodities suitable for use in school lunches.
- 6) The use of the “Farm to Fork” website that promotes the Farm to School lunch programs.

We oppose:

- 1) Any legislative action to move current CTE state funding from the Utah State Board of Education, which is a secondary education board, to the Utah College of Applied Technology (UCAT) Board, which is a post-secondary education board.

### **Agriculture in the Classroom**

We support:

- 1) Permanent funding for agriculture in the classroom programs in all public schools to improve student understanding of agriculture’s importance in our economy and as the source of our food and fiber. This funding should not be redirected to fund general education programs.

### **EMINENT DOMAIN AND IMMEDIATE OCCUPANCY**

Agencies and utilities, with condemnation powers, should be required to:

- 1) Only use eminent domain as narrowly as possible.
- 2) Cross federal and state-owned lands before going across private property.
- 3) Attempt to purchase property for just compensation before announcing plans to condemn it.
- 4) Inform property owners about the Private Property Ombudsman prior to condemnation or threatening condemnation when land sales are being negotiated.
- 5) Notify citizens potentially affected by projects in which eminent domain will be utilized to allow for feedback and input.
- 6) Give certified written notice and obtain permission from the property owner before

entering the property to survey.

- 7) Provide appraisal upon request to the property owners within ten days. When choosing to request an appraisal from the state Property Rights Ombudsman, the private property owner shall be involved in the selection of the appraiser. The state Property Rights Ombudsman may provide an appraisal at the owner's request.
- 8) Oral presentations made by any agency representative in the negotiation phase should be reduced to written form and considered binding.
- 9) Return property to the condemnee within a reasonable length of time when the property was not utilized for the purpose for which it was condemned.
- 10) Strictly adhere to the principle of due process and just compensation for the taking of any land or property rights.

We support:

- 1) Private companies acting as public utilities being required to meet the same guidelines for crossing privately owned land as those required to cross federal and state-owned lands.
- 2) Private utility companies being required to perform environmental assessments and environmental impact statements, etc., before crossing private land.
- 3) Requiring a court order for surveyors to enter private property if the landowner refuses entry.
- 4) Legislation that would restrict the use of eminent domain in the taking of mineral rights beneath needed surface rights unless there is a clear public need for those oil, gas, and mineral rights and fair compensation is paid for those rights in addition to the surface compensation.
- 5) Legislation that would restrict any public entity from acquiring oil, gas, and mineral rights without the public entity demonstrating a clear public purpose for those mineral rights and without fair compensation for those oil, gas, and mineral rights.

We oppose:

- 1) Counties, cities, political subdivisions, and other governmental entities condemning agricultural water rights through eminent domain inside or outside their jurisdiction.
- 2) The use of eminent domain for recreational purposes, private economic development, or to expand the land holdings of wildlife agencies.
- 3) Granting the power of eminent domain to the Utah Lake Commission.
- 4) The use of state, federal, local, or county taxes to fund any organization and its developmental programs and projects which are specifically intended for private development and condemnation purposes.

## **ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT**

We support the elimination of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and propose that a new ESA be enacted that allows for meaningful participation from all affected people, agencies, and affected groups with standing to decide if a given species warrants listing for protection under a new ESA. However, until the act is repealed, we support the following:

- 1) Transferring to the general public any costs incurred by landowners attributed to the ESA.
- 2) Incentive based conservation and management of candidate, threatened and endangered species by the private sector.
- 3) Policies and laws that protect landowners engaged in voluntary conservation actions to conserve and manage sensitive, candidate, threatened and endangered species.
- 4) All local, county, state, and federal officials promptly notifying landowners and public land users of the potential of listing any species.
- 5) Mandatory public meeting(s), town hall meeting(s), and other meetings of a similar

nature with applicable local, county, state, and federal representation within local geographical areas regarding the status and potential of listing any species to hear input and concerns of local residents regarding potential listings and critical habitat designations.

- 6) The creation of an Endangered Species Council with credible individuals of standing representing local landowners, county state and federal officials to recommend actions or the lack thereof to federal officials regarding the potential listing or designation of critical habitat for any species of concern.
- 7) Listings based on current endangerment instead of any rarity, using sound, peer reviewed science and reliable confirmation of the genetics that is readily available to landowners and their representatives and which considers all populations of a species, including those in other countries of the world.
- 8) The prompt delisting of any species that have reached their original target population goals, unless there are mutually agreed upon reasons (decided by all affected people, agencies and affected groups with standing) why the species should not be listed. The delisting of any species should not be determined solely on the basis of total population numbers.
- 9) An amendment to ESA, allowing for locally affected individuals of standing and local and state agencies, a majority control in the listing and delisting of species.
- 10) Biological opinions being made available for public comment.
- 11) Withdrawal of lands designated as critical habitat if the species has not been sighted in two years in that same area.
- 12) The right of any state to reject any proposed or existing critical habitat designation, recovery plan or introduction/reintroduction of any species.
- 13) The recognition of species that are considered sensitive versus candidate versus threatened versus endangered to be a factor in determining the feasibility of development projects both public and private.
- 14) The efforts to initiate programs for the restriction and monitoring of species of concern and their habitat based on sound scientific data.
- 15) The Utah partners annually report population and habitat benefits of species conservation and management actions to the appropriate Federal agencies and the public.

We oppose:

- 1) Listing any additional species for protection by any federal or state entity or the designation of additional critical habitat until ESA is rewritten and authorized by Congress.
- 2) Fines and penalties as a method of establishing and/or maintaining control of private landowners and public land users in developing core conservation areas for restoring currently protected species associated with the ESA.  
Endangered, threatened, candidate and sensitive species taking priority over previously established private property rights, water rights, and grazing rights on public and private lands.
- 3) The use and interpretation of ESA to guide and manage land-use practices and policies.
- 4) Using the ESA as a means to implement policy that restricts lawful chemical/pesticide use on farms and ranches.
- 5) Using the ESA as a means to implement climate change policy and law.

### **Species of Concern**

We support:

- 1) Prompt notification of impacted agricultural producers, operators, and owners that may be directly affected or have the potential to be affected by a species of concern (SOC)

- designation on public and/or private land.
- 2) Producers, operators, and owners that have the potential of an impact on operations and management of their enterprise shall have the legal right to interject comments, documentation and be active in the SOC process.
  - 3) Any relevant findings, documentation and other applicable information by private entities, public agencies, or other non-government organizations (NGOs) shall be made publicly available and be used to mitigate any decision(s) in performance of the SOC analysis.

## **ENERGY**

We support:

- 1) Policies and practices that promote reliable and affordable electricity supply.
- 2) Reprocessing nuclear waste as a way to generate additional energy.
- 3) Exempting electrical cooperatives from mandatory purchases of renewable energy.
- 4) The development of all sources of energy in the state including within all National Monuments.
- 5) The immediate expansion of natural gas as a fuel source for vehicles including the necessary infrastructure.
- 6) Careful planning for energy development that utilizes scarce water resources in the most beneficial way, as to not harm rural communities nor agricultural water right holders.
- 7) Temporary or permanent low-level radioactive waste storage.
- 8) Offshore drilling, drilling on federal lands and in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR).
- 9) The Keystone Pipeline Project.
- 10) Building additional refineries in the United States.
- 11) A careful, in-depth cost benefit analysis, by an independent source, resulting in the possible impacts of Utah joining the California Independent System Operator (ISO), including cost impacts, grid reliability and governance that will impact all Utah rate payers.

We oppose:

- 1) Federal subsidies for corn ethanol.
- 2) Mandatory use of renewable energy sources.

## **Renewable Energy**

We support:

- 1) The responsible development and use of cost-effective renewable energy resources, including careful evaluation of any subsidies.
- 2) Retail net metering policies that are inclusive to all electric customers.
- 3) Free-market principles determining renewable resource integration.
- 4) Limiting government subsidies, credits, and programs that create winners and losers.
- 5) Renewable energy sources, accessing the transmission grid, pay their fair and equitable share of maintenance to the Utility provider.
- 6) Market driven policies for the development of ethanol and biofuels.
- 7) The development of agricultural commodities for fuel sources.
- 8) The construction of hydropower electric generating plants on existing dams and water ways as a form of renewable alternative energy.

We oppose:

- 1) Government mandates that limit or dictate energy choices.
- 2) Renewable energy policies that rely on uncertain, future technological advancements.
- 3) The loss of animal unit months (AUMS) to wind, solar, and geothermal projects on state and federal lands.



## **Climate Change**

We disagree with manmade climate change as a tool for regulation. Until proven otherwise, we support:

- 1) Alternative energy sources being developed and/or utilized based on market driven needs.
- 2) Market based solutions rather than federal or state emission limits.
- 3) The inclusion of the agriculture community as a full partner in the development of legislative policy.
- 4) Incentivizing farmers and ranchers for their role in carbon management and any program that emerges must be a net benefit.
- 5) Efforts to combat climate change through innovative solutions rather than through taxes.

We oppose:

- 1) Climate change regulation that establishes mandatory cap and trade provisions.
- 2) Climate change policy that is not fair, affordable, or achievable.
- 3) Climate policies that adversely impact the viability of Utah farmers and ranchers.

## **Surface and Mineral Rights**

We support:

- 1) The State Private Property Ombudsman provide education to landowners on their rights in negotiating leases. The Utah Private Property Ombudsman office should expand their focus to include education and assistance for surface and mineral rights issues.
- 2) Legislative efforts to define the surface estate rights in balancing development of the sub-surface estate.
- 3) Exploration and extraction on all eligible private, state, and federal lands.
- 4) A simplified method for removal of property encumbrances from past and void leases.
- 5) Private property owners seeking professional assistance when negotiating contracts with development companies.
- 6) Cities, towns, and counties addressing challenges associated with split estates by amending General Use Plans and passing ordinances.
- 7) Establishing surface owner protections when a split estate exists.
- 8) Surface owners having equivalent negotiating authority as mineral right holders.
- 9) Fair and competitive pricing of petroleum products.
- 10) The State of Utah providing information regarding water which is gathered when oil and gas wells are drilled or requiring oil and gas companies to provide the information to the state.
- 11) Compensation to grazers when AUMs are lost due to oil and gas exploration and development.
- 12) Consideration of surface owners and users in allowing input into the planning, exploration, and development of mineral rights to minimize the impact on agricultural operations. Just and fair compensation should be rendered to landowners when there is an adverse impact to the surface owner or user.
- 13) Technology that allows for directional drilling being adopted to minimize impacts to surface users.

We oppose:

- 1) Oil and gas companies placing wells on productive agriculture lands.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

### **Air Quality – Odor**

We support:

- 1) Development of state voluntary and incentive-based guidelines to assist local officials in establishing air quality ordinances and regulations with input from agriculture.
- 2) Development of technologies that reduce negative environmental impacts to air as well as water.
- 3) Agriculture being exempted from CERCLA and EPCRA reporting requirements.
- 4) Additional studies that evaluate measurement methods when making air quality determinations.
- 5) Action, legal, if necessary, by the State of Utah to reverse EPA's decision to designate Box Elder County and other Wasatch Front neighboring counties as a 2.5 PM non-attainment area.
- 6) The exemption of ammonia from agriculture emissions standards.

We oppose:

- 1) Government regulations mandating animal and odor control unless:
  - a) Justified by sound scientific research,
  - b) Technology exists to accurately quantify odor emissions, and
  - c) The regulation requires consideration of economic feasibility.
- 2) Overemphasis on agriculture's relative contribution to regional, state, and local air quality.
- 3) Government regulations mandating air quality control over dust and emissions from farm machinery and equipment, including all-terrain vehicles.
- 4) An overreaching and unaccountable Environmental Protection Agency.

### **Pollutants**

We support:

- 1) Agriculture being regulated based on sound science and technical characterizations that best represent the process and emissions from the particular operation/entity.

We oppose:

- 1) By-products or constituent elements thereof, produced through natural biological processes of agricultural businesses being defined as pollutants or agricultural waste.
- 2) Government classification of properly used nitrogen fertilizers as pollutants, and any attempt to limit proper use of nitrogen, in any form, especially for fertilizers.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, AND GOVERNANCE INVESTING**

We oppose:

- 1) Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Investing.

### **EQUINE**

We support:

- 1) The Utah horse industry and resources that are necessary for its protection and endorsement and recognize the economic contributions of the horse industry in the State of Utah.
- 2) Voluntary horse ID for the purpose of tracking ownership.
- 3) The USU Extension ADVS and Equine programs as the premier and leading equine education tool in the state of Utah.
- 4) The state statute defining horses/equine as livestock/animals of husbandry.
- 5) Resuming harvesting of horses in the U.S. through federally inspected plants.
- 6) Continuation of intra/interstate transportation and exportation of horses for harvest.

- 7) Efforts to keep open the Canadian and Mexican borders for the export of U.S. horses.
- 8) The Federal Government providing a means for horses to be harvested to solve the ever-increasing problem of the public abandoning horses onto private and public properties.
- 9) A resolution from the legislature to the governor outlining the problem with abandoned horses and calling for a resumption of harvesting of horses.

## **FARM SAFETY**

We support:

- 1) Funding for an active farm safety program.

## **FARM SERVICE AGENCY**

We support:

- 1) Protecting the quality of the Colorado River water by implementing the approved Colorado River Salinity Control Environmental Impact Study (EIS) as soon as possible.
- 2) Designating the salinity areas in the Colorado River Salinity Control EIS as priority areas for Environmental Quality Improvement Program (EQIP) funding.
- 3) The continuation of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control program in its original form and purpose. Control should remain with the local working committees.
- 4) Irrigated farms assigned dry land yields in the 1985 Farm Bill being updated to irrigated yields for direct Commodity Credit Corporation payments.
- 5) USDA soliciting and considering agricultural input on proposed regulations and procedures early in the rule drafting process.
- 6) Using the previous year's AUMs, a difference in average weights, or other loss figures to document permittees actual losses for qualification for disaster relief.
- 7) Efforts to streamline USDA-FSA as long as such efforts consider:
  - a) Achieving savings through eliminating administrative inefficiencies at the Federal, State, and local levels.
  - b) Providing high quality, professional services to producers within a reasonable distance.
  - c) Simplifying crop insurance purchasing requirements to enable farm program eligibility.
  - d) Adjusting acreage yield estimates to reflect recent productivity data on a county-by-county basis.
  - e) Giving the FSA state committee the flexibility to establish area specific crop insurance purchase requirements.
- 8) Prioritizing direct and guaranteed loan program funds to applicants that are young, beginning, or applicants that are temporarily financially distressed due to adverse ecological/industry factors.

We oppose:

- 1) Requiring three (3) years of farm managerial experience to qualify for a direct farm ownership loan, if the applicant is a young or beginning farmer.

## **FENCING**

We support:

- 1) Current Utah law that grants authority to county legislative bodies to declare and enforce general policies on fencing within their own jurisdictions. We favor a fence out policy on traditional open range areas of all counties.
- 2) Prompt notification to landowners of damage to property caused by accidents or other incidents. This notification should come from local law enforcement agencies in an effort

to mitigate further damage.

- 3) County, municipal and city ordinances that would require an individual and/or developer who changes the use of agricultural land(s) to adequately fence the property that is adjacent to irrigation facilities and land currently in Greenbelt or agricultural production.
- 4) Fences (on public lands) destroyed by fire (prescribed or natural ignited / let burn) should be rebuilt (materials and labor) by the appropriate land management agency.
- 5) Just compensation and restitution to landowners when damages are incurred to a fence and/or property.
- 6) Public and School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) lands in historic open range that are sold to private entities (who no longer want to continue open range use) being fenced or include a fencing requirement as a condition of the sale.
- 7) UDOT being responsible for all fence construction and maintenance, including materials and labor, along state highway rights-of-ways.
- 8) Fencing open ranges, adjacent to public roadways, under the following conditions, terms and requirements:
  - a) Upgraded, widened, or paved roads that lead to increased traffic and speeds.
  - b) The public entity responsible for the road shall take responsibility for securing funding from appropriate public sources and overseeing the construction and maintenance of the fence.
  - c) Fences shall be constructed to appropriate specifications to prevent livestock from entering the roadway.
  - d) Liability to the livestock owner remains the same as open range.
  - e) Proper signage alerting motorists of the possibility of livestock on roadways even though there are fences.
  - f) State law that clearly places liability on the motorist on open range.
- 9) Enforcement of the current Railroad right-of-way fence law, by the state of Utah (UDOT), and by local county officials.
- 10) Maintenance of all Railroad fences by the Railroad.
- 11) Local jurisdiction of proper and timely maintenance of cattle guards on county and state roads and rights-of-way.

## **FOOD QUALITY, SAFETY, REGULATORY ASSURANCE, AND INSURANCE**

We support:

- 1) All participants in the food chain, from producers to consumers, working towards safe food, including but not limited to education, research and programs designed to ensure food safety.
- 2) Producer vertical integration, direct to consumer sales, processing and product value-adding that secures the sustainability, market stability and safety of the entire food chain, with consideration to risk.
- 3) Food handler permits.
- 4) Sufficient time for producers to adjust to cancellation of traditional management tools.
- 5) Access to critical pesticides used for crop and livestock production, along with increased funding for research on alternative crop and livestock protection tools.
- 6) Practical, feasible, and economical use of pesticides and livestock treatments in accordance with label directions, along with reasonable, economical, and feasible record keeping of such uses.
- 7) Delaying the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) restrictions on juice processors regarding hazard analysis and critical control point ruling until the restrictions can be scientifically justified.
- 8) Irradiation of meat, poultry, fruit, and vegetables.

- 9) Promoting the livestock and dairy quality assurance programs, including the beef injection site recommendations.
- 10) Annual calibration, inspection, and certification of wholesaler single component feed calibration equipment (i.e., moisture testing, protein percentage) by UDAF compliance officers.
- 11) Proper insurance coverage for grain crops and straw considering the increased value of such commodities.
- 12) Certified-testing labs offering the California Hay Test (TDN) as well as relative feed value test.
- 13) General health and safety requirements for custom cutting meat (i.e., beef, lamb, swine, poultry, wild game, domestic elk, fish, etc.) for private individuals and/or entities being identical for all species processed. These requirements shall be administered by county and state agencies as required by statute. These requirements shall not be for meats (as identified above) for retail sale.
- 14) Regulations that encourage and promote the development and growth of small-scale processing plants.
- 15) Restoring a lamb insurance program through the USDA Farm Bill.

We oppose:

- 1) Removing regulations that ensure the safety of food: For example, the Food Freedom Act.

## **FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS**

We support:

- 1) A requirement for parties whose claims are denied and found to be frivolous to pay court costs and damages.
- 2) Efforts to eliminate frivolous lawsuits designed to block grazing on public lands.
- 3) State appropriations to defend agricultural interests from environmental lawsuits.

We oppose:

- 1) The American taxpayer paying for frivolous lawsuits. We call on Congress to report on the payments made through the Equal Access to Justice Act.

## **FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

We support:

- 1) A national fruit promotion program.
- 2) Adoption of a USDA marketing order for fruit and vegetable growers.
- 3) Removing restrictions on fruit, specifically apples and all vegetable sales to Mexico.
- 4) Timely implementation of laws and regulations regarding control of fruit tree and vegetable diseases and pests.
- 5) Efforts to protect the continued use of crop protection tools and pesticides.
- 6) Full funding for the pest diagnostic lab at USU.

## **GOVERNMENT**

### **Capitalism – Private Competitive Enterprise**

We support:

- 1) Efficiency and high per capita production as primary elements in achieving high standards of living.
- 2) The American capitalistic, private, competitive enterprise system.
- 3) Funding government programs by the general public when the service or product benefits the general economy or public health and safety.

We oppose:

- 1) Government operation of commercial business in competition with private enterprise.

## **Constitution**

We support:

- 1) The Constitution of the United States.
- 2) Individual liberty by a division of authority among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches and the diffusion of government powers through retention by the states and the people of those powers not specifically delegated to the federal government.
- 3) Changes in long-established interpretations being made only through constitutional amendments.
- 4) Convention of the States.

We oppose:

- 1) Calling a Constitutional Convention.

## **Elections**

We support:

- 1) Clear, transparent, honest, and timely elections.

## **Federal Government**

We support:

- 1) Federal legislation being made available to the public at least 72 business hours prior to the time it is proposed for vote on the House or Senate floors.

We oppose:

- 1) Federal programs being used as vehicles to force state and local governments to conform to federal authority.

## **Government by Initiative**

We support:

- 1) The republic, representative form of government. We support the initiative process only when the following guidelines are in place:
  - a) Those soliciting signatures must disclose whether they are being paid to collect signatures and who is paying for the signatures.
  - b) The main points of the effort must be disclosed when each signature is collected.
  - c) Anyone signing petitions must be allowed three business days after the county clerk filing to request that their signature be removed, with a no requirement of notary public acknowledgement.
  - d) Those soliciting signatures cannot register voters at the same time as collecting petition signatures.

We oppose:

- 1) The use of the initiative process to establish new taxes or tax increases.

## **Executive Branch**

We support:

- 1) Exercising restraint in seeking broad, discretionary powers from the legislative branch.

We oppose:

- 1) Interpreting laws beyond the scope specifically spelled out by the legislative branch.

## **Legislative Branch**

We support:

- 1) Congress and the State Legislature safeguarding their legislative prerogatives by:

- a) Insisting that federal and state expenditures be legislatively approved annually.
  - b) Avoiding delegation of broad, discretionary powers to the executive branch, including the appointment of czars.
  - c) Enacting corrective or conforming legislation when a court or agency has invaded the legislative arena.
  - d) Government regulation should be subject to scrutiny and review through the legislative process.
- 2) Legislative bodies adopting a code of ethics which clearly delineates the conduct and activities that govern their members.
  - 3) A Utah legislature that is:
    - a) Part-time,
    - b) Convenes annually for 45 consecutive days
    - c) Begins as early in the calendar year as possible.
  - 4) An amendment to the state Constitution to guarantee the fundamental right to determine apportionment of one house of the legislature on some basis other than population.

### **Judiciary**

We support:

- 1) An independent judiciary
- 2) Impartial administration of law without special privilege
- 3) Government by law wisely administered according to constitutional principles.

We oppose:

- 1) Federal or state courts performing functions reserved for the legislative branch.
- 2) Courts overlook the rights of crime victims in an over-zealous effort to protect the civil rights of the accused and the convicted.

### **Socialism and Communism**

We oppose:

- 1) All socialistic and communistic economic systems and encourage the cooperation of other nations in this endeavor.

### **States' Rights**

We support:

- 1) All powers not specifically delegated to the federal government by the Constitution being reserved to the states or to the people.
- 2) States having the right to nullify any rules passed and administered by Federal Agencies until Congress ratifies the rule(s).
- 3) The maintenance of strong, independent, and responsible state and local government is imperative to the preservation of self-government and individual freedoms.
- 4) Public functions being performed by the qualified unit of government closest to the people, without coercion by legislatures and administrative agencies of higher units of governments.
- 5) Retention of the Electoral College for presidential elections, electors should be required to vote for the candidates on the ballots to which they were pledged.
- 6) A caucus system that allows local representation to elect candidates to the primary ballot.
- 7) Special bond elections only be held in conjunction with primary or general elections.

## **GUN CONTROL**

We support:

- 1) The constitutional right to own and to bear arms.

## **HEALTH CARE**

We support:

- 1) Funding for rural and mental health programs in the agricultural community.

We oppose:

- 1) Any Federal or State mandated COVID vaccination program.

## **HEMP**

We support:

- 1) Following state guidelines on hemp production.

## **LABELING**

We support:

- 1) Legislation that makes it illegal to put commodities in improperly labeled containers (i.e., packaging low quality fruit in a box labeled for high quality fruit).
- 2) Reuse of containers when the label accurately reflects the contents.
- 3) Country of origin labeling of imported food products identifiable to the consumer at the point of sales.
- 4) Voluntary country of origin labeling for sheep, poultry, pork, and beef produced in the U.S.A.
- 5) USDA approved market-based certification programs which identify production practices used to produce such food.
- 6) Food labeling and nutrition definitions, taking the entirety of nutritional information into account, and not changing definitions or singling out specific ingredients.

We oppose:

- 1) False, misleading, or deceptive marketing and promotion and/or label claims, including the use of absence claims on food labels, when compared to other products not bearing such claims, unless sufficient scientific evidence exists to substantiate the claim.
- 2) Any product that is not animal-based protein being labeled as meat.

## **Animal Identification**

We support the establishment and implementation of a coordinated state and national animal identification system that incorporates the following principles:

- 1) Is capable of providing support for animal disease control and eradication, as well as enhancing food safety.
- 2) Is voluntary and is economically motivated and driven.
- 3) Gives the producer flexibility to use electronic devices and includes current permanent forms of identification such as brands and tattoos.

## **Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) Labeling**

We support:

- 1) All voluntary food or agriculture labels should be approved by UDAF, USDA, and/or the FDA ensuring scientific accuracy and truthfulness in labeling.

We oppose:

- 1) Products that are produced using approved biotechnology being required to designate individual inputs or specific technologies on their label.



## **LABOR**

We support:

- 1) An economical and effective federal guest worker program. In the absence of a federal guest worker program, a statewide guest worker program that will allow foreign workers with appropriate identification to work in the U.S.
- 2) Adoption of the H-2A labor reform program to:
  - a) Reconfigure wage rates based on prevailing local averages,
  - b) Streamline the application process,
  - c) Allow for a one-time adjustment of status for current immigrant laborers,
  - d) Not monetarily penalize the producer if a laborer did not fulfill contract agreements, and
  - e) Relocate and/or deport laborers who fail to fulfill their contract.
- 3) Standardizing the H-2A program by allowing all non-seasonal H-2A workers the ability to stay in the United States for a minimum of 3 years.
- 4) Amending child labor laws to allow family-owned farm corporations and partnerships the same requirements and privileges as accorded to sole proprietorships.
- 5) Children and family members, under the age of 18, lawfully working on farms and ranches.
- 6) Agriculture employers being required to submit a New Hire Registry Reporting Form for each employee to the Department of Workforce Services only after the employee has worked for at least three months for the employer.

We oppose:

- 2) Enforcement of E-Verify until a functional guest worker program is implemented.

## **Homeland Security**

We support:

- 1) Proactive measures against any form of agricultural terrorism. Perpetrators of such terrorist activities should be subject to felony conviction and maximum penalties including loss of their tax-exempt status if applicable.
- 2) A secure United States border.

We oppose:

- 1) Driver's licenses for illegal aliens.
- 2) Allowing illegal aliens to vote, and access to government programs.

## **LAW ENFORCEMENT**

We support:

- 1) Public lands agencies contracting with the local county for law enforcement services on federal lands rather than organizing their own law enforcement.
- 2) The authority of the County Sheriff as the primary law enforcement in a county.
- 3) A reasonable distance for which individuals may discharge firearms from agricultural structures, farm equipment, wells, and engines. We further support expanding the definition of such a structure to include structures used to hold, feed, and work livestock.

## **LIVESTOCK THEFT AND DESTRUCTION**

We support:

- 1) Maximum penalties for livestock theft and destruction and imposition of felony convictions.
- 2) Imposing similar penalties for illegal killing of livestock, as for the poaching of big game, which may include the loss of hunting rights.
- 3) Penalties of treble damages and costs of investigation against those convicted of theft

- and livestock destruction.
- 4) Payment of treble damage fines and maximum punishment for those convicted of unauthorized release of farm and research animals or sabotage at farms, product processing or research facilities.
  - 5) Funding for additional livestock theft investigators.
  - 6) UDAF and DWR assisting local law enforcement and local inspectors in cases of livestock theft and destruction.

## **LIVESTOCK TRAIL RIGHTS**

We support historic livestock trail rights-of-way remaining open through developed areas and on federal and state lands.

## **OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION**

### **Agriculture Protection Areas**

We support:

- 1) Full statutory protection of agricultural land within an "Agriculture Protection Area" (APA) until it is voluntarily withdrawn by the landowner.
- 2) Additional incentives to farmers for placing lands in agricultural protection areas for the full 20-year term.
- 3) Projected roadways and easements through APAs be designed to minimize the impact to agricultural production.
- 4) Preference and partiality should be given to road routes and easements that utilize the edges of farm and ranch land and minimize disruption to agricultural businesses.
- 5) The use of data and information collected through the Annual Report developed and provided through USU in conjunction with the Utah State Tax Commission Farmland Assessment Advisory Committee to determine the value of agricultural lands.

We oppose:

- 1) Amending the APA statute in any way that would erode current protections granted to landowners, including the requirement of a governmental entity to obtain approval from a local APA advisory board before the governmental entity can acquire protected land by eminent domain.

## **Coordinated Resource Management**

We support:

- 1) Coordinated resource management plans and inclusion of locally elected Conservation Districts in the local planning process.

## **Funding Sources**

Agricultural land preservation projects funded by the government should not disrupt private, competitive market forces.

## **Incentive-Based Solutions**

We support:

- 1) Assessed valuation in line with productive capacity of farmland.
- 2) Investment by private entities and local government in agricultural enterprise profitability.
- 3) Marketable tax credits from donated development rights.
- 4) Tax credits against state inheritance and federal estate tax.
- 5) Density bonuses to encourage greater density in specific areas.
- 6) Counties and municipalities using the criteria "the protection and preservation of properties used for agricultural purposes" when creating and amending planning and zoning processes.

- 7) Voluntary incentive-based programs that keep farms and ranches in production.
- 8) Efforts of the Quality Growth Commission – LeRay McCallister Fund to focus on the preservation of agricultural lands in the state. Education related to conservation easements is needed to assist those who have an interest in this method of preservation.
- 9) The concepts associated with urban farming based on county options. However, qualifying lands must have special tax status separate from the Farmland Assessment Act (Greenbelt) and must be managed as a profitable agricultural business.

### **Liability**

We support:

- 1) Protecting landowners from any liability created by governmental efforts to preserve open space where such efforts include the landowner's property.

### **Purchase of Development Rights or Conservation Easements**

We support:

- 1) Purchase of development rights or conservation easements on a willing seller, willing buyer basis with emphasis on acquisition by the private sector.
- 2) No expansion of condemnation powers of government to preserve agricultural lands or open space.
- 3) Permanent or specified term conservation easements.
- 4) Transferable development rights.
- 5) Legislation which provides for special districts to assess taxes to purchase conservation easements or development rights for agricultural land or open spaces.
- 6) Not counting the sale of government lands that are encumbered by conservation easements or other management restrictions as "no net loss" transactions.

### **PEST CONTROL**

We support:

- 1) Increased funding for each infested county, by state and federal governments, to combat infestation of crickets, Japanese beetle, grasshoppers, meadow voles, pocket gophers, crows, ravens, and other pests.
- 2) Control measures on state and federal lands adjacent to private property.
- 3) Early monitoring to determine location of insect, and/or rodent infestation and maximization of resource allocation.
- 4) The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) leaving pesticides available until an equal and more effective product becomes available.
- 5) Requiring government agencies that administer wildlife refuges or wetland areas to participate in the control of mosquito populations.
- 6) An aggressive program to prevent the spread of the West Nile virus and urge the use of whatever methods necessary to control mosquitoes which are vectors on private and public lands.
- 7) State and federal programs for controlling sparrows and starlings.
- 8) The control of prairie dogs on public and private lands year-round.

### **PLANNING COMMISSIONS**

We support:

- 1) Appointment of agricultural representatives on planning and zoning commissions.
- 2) Protection of private property rights, especially regarding subdivision ordinances, as a priority for planning commissions. Landowners should not be encumbered by any governmental entity in exercising their right to buy or sell property. Furthermore, there

- should be no net loss of private lands within counties/cities.
- 3) Property owners only being required to install improvements proportionate to the impact of development. We oppose property owners bearing the disproportionate cost of creating amenities for the public interest.
  - 4) Including government agencies, school districts and charter schools in local planning and zoning or permit requirements for construction projects, with the exception of Military Installation Defense Authority (MIDA) zones.

### **Land Use Plans**

We support:

- 1) Local development of county/city by county/city land-use plans.
- 2) County, state, and federal governments adhering to county/city plans without government interference.
- 3) The creation of a state land use plan so long as it is made up only as a compilation of the county/city land use plans, including updates of county/city plans, and not as a separate plan.
- 4) Continued funding and technical assistance to aid counties/cities in developing, adopting, and updating county/city plans.
- 5) County governments be given authority to amend Congressional approved county land-use plans subject to a local, public review process.
- 6) The development and mapping of livestock driveways and waterways as part of a county's/city's transportation plan revision.
- 7) That development plans be required to consider and manage drains that are necessary for irrigation tail water, storm water, etc. as development occurs.

We oppose:

- 1) Land being designated as "sensitive land" for its agricultural, ecological, or archeological value.

### **PORK Marketing**

We support:

- 1) The development of local, regional, and global markets.

### **Pork Check-off**

We support:

- 1) A vote to continue the check-off, provided there is a full annual accounting of how the money is used.
- 2) Applying the pork check-off collection to U.S. and imported slaughter hogs.
- 3) The exemption of feeder pigs and breeding animals from the check-off.

### **PREDATOR CONTROL**

We support:

- 1) All current predator control methods and practices, including the judicious use of approved pesticides by qualified persons.
- 2) Funding for additional predator control research coupled with information dissemination to appropriate parties including farmers and ranchers.
- 3) Implementation of approved and effective predator control measures by authorized agencies, trappers, farmers, and ranchers without interference from animal advocacy groups or others.
- 4) Federal agencies controlling depredation from threatened or endangered species and

disposing of predators which drift into Utah or are illegally introduced to protect private property rights associated with livestock grazing rights, crops, or other private property damage.

- 5) Increased efforts to control ravens, crows, skunks, and raccoons.
- 6) Removing wolves from the endangered species list. Supervision and control of the wolves should be at the state level.
- 7) Improved and increased predator control for wildlife on public lands to prevent depredation that occurs when predators drive wildlife onto private lands.
- 8) The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) issuing timely harassment and relocation permits for eagles in critical livestock grazing areas particularly in advance of calving and lambing seasons.
- 9) FWS issuing eagle take permits to USDA Wildlife Services (WS) and licensed eagle falconers, when necessary, based on excessive populations of adolescent eagles.
- 10) Bobcat permits being available throughout the trapping season wherever trapping licenses are sold.
- 11) Greater input to the state predator control program.
- 12) An active and functioning Animal Damage Control Board with more livestock producers as board members. This Board should meet at least quarterly, solicit information from livestock producers, and report to county commissions and councils.
- 13) Performance-based compensation above a base salary for WS Trappers.
- 14) Return of predator control assessments to the area collected when WS cannot provide adequate predator control.
- 15) UDAF establishing an enforceable policy for collecting animal damage control assessments from livestock producers.
- 16) Dedicating a portion of the cost of every big game hunting license to predator control and be directed to the predator control program.
- 17) Elimination of the bear relocation program and replacing it with euthanasia.
- 18) State and county officials supporting predator control programs and fully funding a program that meets the needs of local agricultural producers.
- 19) Predator damage compensation programs to include all endangered or protected species and providing 100% compensation for livestock using a multiplier on confirmed losses to reflect actual probable losses.
- 20) Private parties using aircraft to hunt coyotes on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands.
- 21) All predator control efforts, including aerial control, during big game hunting seasons.

## **PRIVATE FOREST PRACTICES**

We support:

- 1) The training of private forest landowners in sound forest management practices, including proper logging, by USU Extension Service and the Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands in cooperation with the Utah Farm Bureau Federation.
- 2) Requiring commercial logging contractors to notify the Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands of any logging plans on private forest lands.
- 3) A voluntary program wherein a private forest landowner may contact the Division of Forestry, Fire and State lands prior to a timber sale for assistance in protecting his resources.
- 4) Reforestation as qualified projects for Agricultural Resource Development Loan (ARDL) moneys.
- 5) Tax incentives to preserve private forest lands.
- 6) The formation of a statewide forestry association.

## **PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS**

We support:

- 1) The sanctity and protection of private property rights without government interference.
- 2) State and county leaders resolving Tribal jurisdiction issues and protecting the rights of non-tribal citizens who live on or own real estate assets such as land, water, and mineral rights within reservation boundaries.
- 3) Efforts to strengthen surface owner rights in a split estate.
- 4) Stronger recognition of the right to compensation for regulatory takings by government.
- 5) Changes in the state code that would prevent a public right-of-way by dedication when private land is being accessed or utilized by the public.
- 6) Private property owners' rights to close their land to public access.
- 7) DWR being subject to the same laws governing access to private lands as the public and law enforcement agencies.
- 8) Reducing the requirements of private landowners to post and fence private property to prevent public access and prescriptive easements.
- 9) The practice of conservation pools, parking areas and campground facilities associated with privately constructed reservoirs on publicly owned lands as long as they be financed and maintained by the agency managing the lands.
- 10) Giving the office of the Private Property Ombudsman authority and budgetary resources to provide information that assists private interests and local governments in protecting private property rights.
- 11) The responsible and safe use of Small Unmanned Aerial Systems (SUAS) (Drones) for agricultural operations as a tool to manage and enhance an agricultural enterprise with modern technologies.

We oppose:

- 1) Government zoning of private property without the consent of the landowner.
- 2) The practice of government agencies requiring a rental fee on lands inundated by reservoirs.
- 3) The use of SUAS (Drones) for activities that would endanger personal and public safety, violate private property, and personal privacy rights, including but not limited to equipment, livestock, crops, etc. and interfere with public safety operations.
- 4) Extending public trust doctrine to any private property rights established prior to statehood.
- 5) Any restriction on landowners regarding cameras or any other surveillance equipment placed on their own private property.
- 6) Governmental entities suspending private property rights.

## **Environmental Impact Statements**

We support:

- 1) Preparing environmental impact statements (EISs) in harmony with long-established scientific and economic principles, with social and local customs being considered, and with the ultimate goal of improving the resource rather than restricting multiple use.
- 2) Permittees having greater input in the EIS preparation.
- 3) Continuing normal range improvements during the EIS process.
- 4) Timely completion of EISs.

## **Preserving Private Property Rights through Market-Oriented Solutions**

We support:

- 1) Market-oriented solutions to transfer land or other property rights.
- 2) The marketplace as the best determinant of the value society places on land and water

resources.

### **Recreational Access**

We support:

- 1) Defining workable recreational water access on private property while recreational access is being litigated.
- 2) The allowance of portage structures at the discretion of the adjoining private landowner and within the boundary of the public easement. Furthermore, landowners should not be responsible for any damages or injury while the public is utilizing the water and not responsible for the portage structure installation, maintenance, cost and/or liability.
- 3) Private properties that border stream beds should be indemnified and protected from lawsuits originating from public users of state waters.
- 4) A penalty of permanently revoking a fishing and hunting license for those who have been convicted of destroying or damaging private property while utilizing a recreational easement.

### **PUBLIC LANDS**

#### **Base Property**

We support:

- 1) Preserving base property requirements.
- 2) Transferring grazing permits without transfer of base property or livestock if the new permittee has base property and livestock to service the permit.
- 3) Leases of base property, grazing permits, and livestock handling facilities with lease terms at least equal to the term of the grazing permit.
- 4) Requiring grazing allotments to be actively grazed and abide by the terms of the Taylor Grazing Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA).

#### **Multiple Use**

We support:

- 1) Promotion of multiple use in management of natural resources on public lands by local, state, and federal management agencies.
- 2) Government agencies working in a coordinated effort to promote and enhance livestock grazing as an integral part of multiple use and management of natural resources, as outlined in county and state resource management plans, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA), and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA).
- 3) Meaningful coordination between federal agencies and state and local governments in support of FLPMA and NFMA planning processes.
- 4) The creation of a council (on an as needed basis) which consists of all individuals, agencies, or other non-governmental organizations (NGO) with standing to discuss concerns, ideas, and possible solutions to wildlife and wild horse conflict with domestic livestock on public land. The council shall include landowners and/or grazing permit holders in impacted areas, as well as agency and/or NGO personnel.

We oppose:

- 1) The relinquishment and retirement of federal grazing permits or allotments in favor of conservation, wildlife, feral horses and burros, or other uses.
- 2) Conservation being considered a use on par with other uses under FLPMA's multiple use sustained yield framework.

#### **Antiquities Act**

We support rewriting the Antiquities Act to revoke the executive branch's ability to designate national monuments. Congress, in coordination with the executive branch, and with the approval of state and local

governments, should be the body to designate national monuments. We support the original intent of the Antiquities Act, that national monuments “be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.” Objects to be protected should be discrete and specified.

### **New National and State Monuments and Parks**

We oppose:

- 1) The creation or expansion of national and state monuments and parks unless the affected county Farm Bureau is supportive.

### **Existing National and State Monuments and Parks**

We support:

- 1) Congressional review and evaluation to determine the necessity of all national monument and park designations using the NEPA process.
- 2) Multiple use in national monuments and parks, including livestock grazing, hunting, fishing, trapping, timber harvesting, watershed management, recreation, and mining.
- 3) Removal of land or change of boundaries of the monument to facilitate extraction and utilization of natural resources, including oil, gas, and coal.
- 4) The timely completion of grazing management plans in all national monuments and parks that protect current and historic grazing. Grazing management plans should allow vegetative treatments for purposes of reducing pinon juniper and other regrowth.
- 5) Providing sanitary restroom facilities in national parks and monuments.
- 6) State and/or county governments supporting continued operation of national parks immediately after any federal government shut down.
- 7) The control of vector borne diseases and noxious weeds by allowing the spraying of mosquitoes and noxious weeds within restricted areas such as national monuments, parks, and other public lands
- 8) Requiring the National Park Service (NPS) to pay the full cost of emergency services and equipment provided by local government to national park areas.
- 9) The construction of more roads, parking areas, and public trails within national parks and national monuments to improve public access.

We oppose:

- 1) The concept of view sheds as land use restrictions.
- 2) Buffer zones outside of state parks, national parks, and national monuments.
- 3) Enlarging the boundaries of national parks and monuments.
- 4) Restricting public access to national parks and national monuments.
- 5) The National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS).
- 6) The encroachment of wilderness designation impacts to adjoining counties.

### **USDA Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative**

We support:

- 1) The USDA Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative.

### **Public Ownership of Land**

We support:

- 1) No net loss of privately-owned property in Utah.
- 2) Federal land management agencies being located or headquartered closer to the lands they manage.
- 3) The transfer of public lands from federal management to state and local governments, including some privatization. Lands transferred to state and local control should be administered under multiple-use management.



- 4) Simplification and streamlining of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements and process to reduce delays in necessary land management practices.
- 5) Federal land management agencies strict conformance with the legislation in question when drafting regulations.
- 6) Increased federal payments in-lieu of taxes on public lands and increased sharing of rent and royalty revenues, with in-lieu payments that reflect current values paid by other taxpayers.

We oppose:

- 1) Utah's DWR purchasing private agriculture or range ground and/or grazing permits resulting in a tax base decrease.
- 2) DWR acquiring or leasing public or private land, range land or grazing permits.

### **Rangeland Management**

We support:

- 1) The cultural, historical, and social importance of livestock production including federal lands grazing as a traditional cultural practice.
- 2) Use of a portion of BLM and SITLA grazing fees for rangeland improvement.
- 3) A public accounting of income and disbursement of grazing fees.
- 4) Active vegetative management for watershed and grazing enhancement on public lands.
- 5) Restricting use of grazing fee funds used for fire rehabilitation projects to those lands that have been and will continue to be used to graze domestic livestock.
- 6) Investment in the UDAF Grazing Improvement Program, the DNR Watershed Restoration Initiative, and the LeRay McCallister Working Farm and Ranch Fund.
- 7) Treble damages to permittees whose improvements are altered or removed by any government agency.
- 8) Permittee ownership of any improvements financed and/or built wholly or in part by the permittee.
- 9) Open access to permitted lands for permittees consistent with the intent of their permit, including but not restricted to maintenance of reservoirs, water conveyances, fence structures and/or other handling facilities.
- 10) Open access across public land by private inholders to their property.
- 11) Elimination of any trail permit fee.
- 12) Mediation or arbitration, as opposed to court action, to determine the cost to the permittee of easements or rights of way across public lands.
- 13) Sub-leasing of AUMs on a short-term basis, especially during droughts.
- 14) The reallocation of retired or unused grazing allotments to permittees by agencies that appear to be circumventing the law, including the "chiefly valuable for grazing" mandate of the Taylor Grazing Act.
- 15) Compensation at fair market value in the event that the federal government retires a grazing permit
- 16) Long-term range monitoring that includes range trends, utilization data, actual use, and climatic patterns.
- 17) Establishment of federally funded programs to compensate financial losses to public land permittees when they are required to forfeit or reduce grazing due to drought, wildlife conflict, fire damage, endangered species, or other causes. Where feasible, the federal agency should offer an allotment in another area to the affected permittee.
- 18) Permittee notification of and an invitation to participate in range tours and surveys which may affect range use.
- 19) Legislation that removes court decreed restrictions on grazing.

- 20) Permit renewals being negotiated solely between the permittee and the corresponding federal agency. "Affected party" filers should be restricted from intervening in these renewals.
- 19) The Utah Grazing Improvement Program Advisory Board.
- 20) Strict adherence to the Taylor Grazing Act, FLPMA, NFMA, and the Public Rangeland Improvement Act, by appropriate government agencies.
- 21) The Range Specialist position at Southern Utah University funded by Southern Utah University and USU.
- 22) Continued use of fire, grazing, and logging as a management tool on public and private lands.
- 23) Chaining and other forage enhancement activities.
- 24) Incentives for permittees whose grazing practices help prevent fires.
- 25) Continued livestock grazing and other surface uses, and permit transfers on military installations.
- 26) Programs to maintain and improve rangeland to maximize carrying capacity.

We oppose:

- 1) Any government agency removing or destroying improvements financed wholly or in part by permittees.
- 2) Permittees who make improvements on public lands being responsible for the cost of environmental studies.
- 3) Designating allotments or partial allotments for wildlife only.
- 4) Designating large tracts of land as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). ACECs should be small in size and allow continued grazing and should be consistent with the county and state resource management plans.
- 5) Any retirement of grazing permits.
- 6) The designation of any new Wild and Scenic Rivers, including intermittent streams and dry washes.
- 7) Any changes in federal range management until range data demonstrates there is a cause to change management practices.
- 8) Reduction in grazing until monitoring clearly demonstrates a downward trend in range carrying capacity.

## **Recreation**

We support:

- 1) Recreation, including but not limited to, off-road and recreational vehicle use and rest area facilities on public lands.
- 2) Designated off-road and recreational vehicle areas and recommend that private property owners cooperate with organized recreational associations in leasing land for such use.
- 3) Strict enforcement of laws to prevent damage to public and private lands used for off-road and recreational use.
- 4) Public land agencies implementing educational programs for ATV users to help protect the land resources from degradation.
- 5) User and access fees to cover costs of all off-road and recreational activities (e.g., hunting, camping, hiking, biking, fishing, ATV training, etc.).

## **Recreational Areas**

We support:

- 1) Livestock grazing in national parks and recreation areas with the local BLM field office responsible for developing and implementing grazing management plans with input from affected private landowners and livestock operators.

## **Roads**

We support:

- 1) The option of cost sharing of maintenance and improvement by all agencies for roads they use.
- 2) USFS and BLM reviewing their road closure criteria to allow access for removal of dead fall and other multiple use activities. Irrigation companies should also be allowed access to maintain their respective canals and storage structures.
- 3) Advertisement and public comment on any road closure proposal on federal or state lands.
- 4) Roads and trails on federal or state lands remaining open for administrative or multiple use.
- 5) Local government involvement in the road inventory on public lands along with support from the Utah Association of Counties.
- 6) Maintaining roaded areas on USFS and BLM land from being designated as roadless or receiving a backcountry designation.
- 7) Increased signage and designation for open range.
- 8) The picking up of dead wildlife (e.g., deer, antelope, and elk) carcasses along state roadways in a timely manner.

We oppose:

- 1) Right-of-way purchase requirements by state or federal land management agencies for local governments to establish or improve access.
- 2) New trails and roads on federal and state lands that interfere with permitted grazing practices consistent with R.S. 2477.

## **Forest Management**

We support:

- 1) Logging on government managed lands and encourage USFS to be more aggressive in defending sound silvicultural activities.
- 2) Responsible harvesting of timber on federal, state, and private lands including roads for access.
- 3) Prescribed burns contained within USFS forest plans to include standards that allow for the harvesting of marketable timber before such burns are initiated.
- 4) Allowing harvest of wood in areas where tree mortality has occurred.

## **Wetlands – Army Corps of Engineers**

We support:

- 1) Wetlands as a vital resource for the environment.
- 2) An acre for acre exchange rate in purchases of private land by public entities for wetland mitigation.
- 3) Allowing winter grazing on private property wetland mitigation sites.
- 4) State and local governments having jurisdiction over non-navigable waterways and their tributaries.

We oppose the Corps of Engineers' authority to regulate:

- 1) Non-navigable waterways and their tributaries
- 2) River channels that it does not maintain or on which it does not have authority to compensate landowners for flood damage.
- 3) Canals, ditches, and other man-made conveyances, including man-made still water reservoirs, holding ponds and their seepages used for irrigation.
- 4) Farmland, including land that has been irrigated, by any man-made facility.
- 5) Use of adjudicated water rights it does not own to create or maintain wetlands.

- 6) Inclusion of private property owners and local governments in wetland issues and decisions.

### **Wild Horses and Burros**

We support the repeal of the Wild Free Roaming Horses and Burros Act. Until the act is repealed, we support:

- 1) Acknowledging that wild horses and burros are feral animals.
- 2) Managing wild horses and burro populations in compliance with county, state, and agency resource management plans and maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance on the range for all multiple uses.
- 3) Effective and efficient fertility control including sterilizations to minimize population growth and reduce the cost of gathers.
- 4) Utilizing any ethical method of removing excess wild horses and burros from the range including, but not limited to, the use of helicopters, bait and traps and lethal control.
- 5) Transferring title of wild horses immediately upon adoption.
- 6) Wild horses and burros that have been held in government captivity for more than six months and are deemed unsuitable for adoption be ethically euthanized or marketed.
- 7) Wild horses and burros be treated as a commodity, and a system be developed to take advantage of economic opportunities.
- 8) Testing for diseases.
- 9) Proportional reduction in wild horses and burro numbers in the event livestock numbers have to be reduced for any reason.

We oppose:

- 1) Reduction or elimination of livestock grazing rights due to misuse of federal lands by wild horses or burros.
- 2) Any new or expanded wild horse and burro territories being established on public land or imposed on private land.
- 3) Using taxpayer funds for marketing campaigns.
- 4) Designating wild and/or feral horse or burro herds as treasured or other special classifications.

### **Wilderness Areas**

We support:

- 1) The elimination of Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).  
However, until WSAs are eliminated we support the following:
  - a) State and county approval for wilderness designation in states with greater than 25 percent public land ownership. Any wilderness designation should take into consideration local economies, property rights and water rights.
  - b) Disqualifying any area from wilderness designation that has R.S. 2477 roads or other access roads or established rights-of-way.
  - c) Managing WSAs according to multiple use, sustained yield principles.
  - d) Release of WSAs not designated wilderness after five years.
  - e) Hunting and horse use in wilderness and primitive areas.
  - f) Use of motorized or mechanical equipment to repair water or structural range improvements on the allotment.
  - g) Control of noxious weeds by motorized or mechanical means.
  - h) Use of helicopters for search and rescue operations in WSAs and wilderness areas.
  - i) Continued grazing in WSAs and wilderness areas under the same terms and conditions as prior to its designation.

- j) Continued predator control in WSAs and wilderness areas.
- k) Hard release language in any wilderness law.
- l) Lapsing of all pending WSAs.

We oppose:

- 1) Buffer zones around WSAs or wilderness areas or withdrawal of multiple use on any federal or state land as de facto buffer zones.
- 2) Use of cherry-stemming as a means for qualifying an area for wilderness designation when roads and other access already exists.
- 3) Designation of new wilderness areas

## **PUBLIC UTILITIES**

We support:

- 1) Exempting non-profit utilities from annual public utility right-of-way fees imposed by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT).
- 2) Informing all entities desiring an easement within a right-of-way that they must obtain an easement from the property owner as well as the right-of-way owner.
- 3) Incentives, for both private and public developers, installing utility infrastructure in underserved or unserved areas.
- 4) Low-interest government loans available for developing utility infrastructure.
- 5) Regulating utility companies so competitive bidding can occur for both new and expanding utility infrastructure.
- 6) The independent advocacy role of the Committee of Consumer Services in the regulation of Utah's public utilities.
- 7) The utility company, proponent, or other designee, being responsible for immediate repair and/or for suitable compensation for damage to existing and/or future infrastructure, including, but not limited to irrigation canals, ditches, irrigation systems, crops, buildings, homes and businesses through the construction or usage of the new or future utility.

## **RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

We support:

- 1) The state legislature appropriating funds to USU for further research, education, and extension services. This threefold mission should emphasize:
  - a) Farm efficiency
  - b) Profitability
  - c) Innovative marketing techniques
  - d) New uses for products
  - e) Alternative crops suitable to Utah
  - f) Beneficial and economical uses of crop residue
  - g) Biotechnology, including a consumer education program.
  - h) Agriculture experiment station
- 2) Changing the funding paths and legislative oversight of USU Extension and Agriculture Experiment Station from the legislature's Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee to the Natural Resource Appropriations Subcommittee.
- 3) Utah Agriculture Experiment Station pursuing federal funding for fur industry research.
- 4) An annual review by agricultural commodity interests to help establish research, extension, and education priorities at USU.
- 5) State marketing orders designed to provide for orderly marketing and an even flow of high-quality products to consumers.

- 6) State marketing orders, by industry vote, for purposes of promotion, education, research, and orderly marketing. State marketing orders should be administered by the Agriculture and Food, Marketing and Development Rule found within UDAF's rules.
- 7) The beef check-off, as administered by the 1985 Act.
- 8) Expediting the approval process of biotechnology products by government agencies.
- 9) USU providing Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) testing in the State of Utah.
- 10) The continued use of animals in medical research in order to ensure medical advances that lead to enriched quality of life in humans as well as animals.
- 11) Continued legislative appropriations for the fruit research farm in Utah County.
- 12) The continued improvement, development and approval of crop and livestock technologies.

We oppose:

- 1) Cuts in budgets that would reduce or eliminate beneficial programs in Extension.

## **RIGHT TO FARM**

We support:

- 1) Responsible actions designed to allow and protect the rights of farmers and ranchers to produce without undue or unreasonable restrictions, regulations, or harassment from government entities and /or public or private sectors.
- 2) Actions to ensure that farmers be protected from undue liability and nuisance suits and harassment when carrying out normal production practices.
- 3) Basic right to farm, right to harvest, right to access roads and highway policies designed to secure legislation defending 100 percent of the owner's interest in agricultural development of rural land.
- 4) Further steps to educate law enforcement on agricultural laws and practices.
- 5) Protecting irrigated agriculture land from the abuse associated with oil and gas development.
- 6) Agricultural operations that are consistent with sound agricultural practices are presumed to be reasonable and do not constitute a public nuisance.
- 7) Limited restrictions upon the rights of farmers and ranchers to develop agriculture livestock production facilities.
- 8) Legislative efforts by local and state government to develop consistent zoning and land-use policies to govern agricultural businesses.
- 9) The rights of farmers and ranchers to use agricultural zones properly for the purposes of agricultural businesses.
- 10) The use of by-products as fertilizer and soil amendments including, but not limited to, manure, compost, bio solids, etc.
- 11) The use of a matrix that could assist in giving guidelines to local government in making these decisions.
- 12) The development and passage of a Utah Constitutional amendment preserving the rights of Utah Farmers and Ranchers to practice legal and commonly accepted agricultural practices.

## **SCHOOL AND INSTITUTIONAL TRUST LANDS ADMINISTRATION**

### **Development**

We support:

- 1) Cooperation between state agencies in the development of SITLA lands and adjacent private lands.
- 2) Fewer restrictions on development of SITLA lands, especially those imposed by archaeological clearances.

- 3) Use of public funds rather than private or SITLA revenues to cover costs associated with archeological clearance surveys conducted on SITLA properties that are sold for development.
- 4) Timely reclamation of disturbed SITLA sites from oil, gas, mining, or other extractive industry activities.
- 5) Sale at market value of SITLA lands planned for residential development rather than lease of these lands.
- 6) Multiple-use, sustained-yield management of SITLA lands.
- 7) The exchange of SITLA land in WSAs to acquire BLM land.
- 8) Converting SITLA lands under grazing permits to cultivated cropland or other higher use only when the following conditions are met:
  - a) The conversion will not increase soil erosion.
  - b) The current lessee is allowed the right of first refusal.
  - c) The current lessee is protected from adverse financial impact by conversion.
- 9) Archaeological assessments required for development of state lands be financed by a government agency. The NRCS should be authorized to perform such assessments.
- 10) That during the exchange of federal and state or state agency to state agency land swaps there needs to be a county commissioner and also a Farm Bureau County president or substitute from the counties affected in attendance at the exchange meetings.
- 11) That when the sale of SITLA lands occurs, as a condition of the sale, a legal surveyed access right-of-way be established for ingress and egress if no other route is possible into unsold SITLA lands adjacent to the sold lands.
- 12) That when the sale of SITLA lands occurs where traditional water sources for livestock have been sold that a legal surveyed easement be granted as a condition of the sale, for livestock watering in the traditional site(s) within the sold SITLA lands.

We oppose:

- 1) Seed collection leases on SITLA managed land where the same SITLA land is already under a grazing lease.
- 2) The issuance of solar/renewable energy leases on SITLA managed land where the same SITLA land is already under a grazing lease, until the current grazing lease expires.

## **Funding**

We support:

- 1) Removing the cap on interest money from the SITLA fund that goes to the schools of the state.

## **Grazing Permits**

We support:

- 1) A preference renewal system similar to that of USFS or BLM for leasing SITLA property.
- 2) Extending the SITLA grazing rental up to a minimum of 30 years.
- 3) Extending the SITLA grazing permit cancellation notice requirement from 30 days to 365 days.
- 4) Grazing fees that are based on forage productivity and/or services.
- 5) A grazing fee formula for Utah Trust Lands that reflects indexed changes in future private, non-irrigated pasture grazing lease rates as reported annually by USDA Ag Statistics.
- 6) SITLA considering the impacts on permittees, the local public, and private economies if

lands are sold.

- 7) SITLA compensating permittees, after the change of the grazing permit, or the sale, or the commercial lease of the property, for improvements the permittee made to the land and the fair-market value of the affected grazing permit.
- 8) A Grazing Protection Act that protects grazing on SITLA, state, and federal lands.
- 9) SITLA in conjunction with permittees developing a long-range master biological (wildlife) management plan that is mutually beneficial.
- 10) Studying and evaluating the social impacts as well as the economic impacts on current permittees by selling the Tabby Mountain block.
- 11) Under competitive bidding practices consideration of the economic impacts on current permittees and the local economy, as well as the past performance record of the current permittee before awarding a permit to the highest bidder.
- 12) Under competitive bidding requiring a new permittee, who does not hold an adjacent BLM or USFS grazing permit or causes an unauthorized trespass problem, to fence the boundary of the SITLA permit.

We oppose:

- 1) Competitive bidding to establish grazing permits.
- 2) Attempts by SITLA to acquire or reclaim lands for mineral right exploration that have been legally sold and/or transferred.

### **SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICTS**

We support:

- 1) The process of appointing board members to local, regional, and statewide special service districts by elected officials provided that any proposed tax increase be subject to the approval of the appointing elected official.

We oppose:

- 1) Special service districts collecting fees when no services are rendered.

### **TAX**

We support:

- 1) A balanced tax policy for Utah that includes property tax, income tax, sales tax, and user fees.
- 2) A simplified tax code.
- 3) Exempting private stock water companies from property tax.
- 4) Exempting farming operations from impact fees/assessments as a result of irrigation water coming off farms and into storm drain systems or drainage detention basins.
- 5) Motor fuel taxes expressly for construction and maintenance of Utah's highways and a system that will minimize interest costs.
- 6) Income tax reform with consideration to converting the federal income tax to a retail sales tax.
- 7) Reinstating income averaging in all tax years.
- 8) The repeal of state and federal estate taxes.
- 9) Retaining all sales tax exemptions available to Utah agriculture.
- 10) Fuel tax credits for agricultural vehicles and implements of husbandry used for off highway use and only incidentally on the highway, regardless of whether the vehicle is required to be registered with the state.
- 11) All farm products and other related products used for transporting, selling, producing, and or installing should remain with a tax-exempt status and be protected against all sales tax and/or personal property tax.
- 12) The term farm product is defined as any products requiring one or more of the following processes:



- a) Breeding
  - b) Planting
  - c) Fertilizer
  - d) Watering
  - e) Cultivating, or
  - f) Harvesting.
- 13) Property valuations for agricultural lands that reflect current agricultural productivity values. Taxable value, however, should not exceed market value.
  - 14) All licensed vehicles pay state and federal road taxes.
  - 15) Elimination of state and federal taxes on capital gains.
  - 16) Bonding to finance government capital facilities under some circumstances. Bonding to finance non-capital items should be minimized.
  - 17) Equalizing the food tax to the state sales and use tax rate.

We oppose:

- 1) A tax on ticket sales when entering county fairs, rodeos, etc.
- 2) A value added tax.
- 3) A county or municipality-imposed fuel tax.
- 4) A tax on agriculture water and water rights.
- 5) A state levied property tax.

### **Farmland Assessment Act (Greenbelt)**

We support:

- 1) The Intent of Greenbelt to protect agricultural producers.
- 2) County Assessors enforcing Greenbelt qualification requirements to prevent abuses.
- 3) The Farmland Assessment Act (FAA)
- 4) The rollback provision of the FAA as reasonable and necessary to preserve fairness and integrity of the law.
- 5) Counties ensuring the Constitutional mandate for statewide uniformity in property assessment is met.
- 6) Fallowing during drought or times of limited water supply or as part of a prudent farm management practice.

We oppose:

- 1) The removal of agricultural lands from Greenbelt designation due to oil and gas development.
- 2) Expanding its strict focus on agriculture to include private lands that are managed specifically for public wildlife purposes.
- 3) Assessing agritourism or related agricultural activities as anything other than agriculture.

### **TRADE AND COMPETITION**

We support:

- 1) Competitive livestock markets to assure fair market prices.
- 2) Lifting tariffs from agricultural products entering Turkey and the European Union.
- 3) Allowing packer buyers to purchase cattle for other feeders in addition to their employer.
- 4) Continued appropriations for UDAF's Market Reporting Service and information gathering techniques that ensure accurately reported data.
- 5) Independent producers forming alliances and other strategic business arrangements that will help them survive the changing structure of agriculture.
- 6) Increasing the upper limit of bonding requirements for agricultural dealers and processors.

- 7) Increased authority and flexibility for the Commissioner of Agriculture to require audits and financial reports from dealers to help determine proper bond levels.
- 8) Sellers of agricultural products being protected by product lien laws.
- 9) Utah producers should not be required to implement production practices not consistent with best practices and industry standards of care.

We oppose:

- 1) Unfair subsidies to group farming projects such as the Navajo Ag Product Industry in New Mexico and the Ute Farms in Colorado.
- 2) European Union attempts at inward processing to increase exports in excess of WTO rules.
- 3) Proposals to limit packer ownership of livestock to 14 days.
- 4) The opening of the Canadian Border to cattle over the age of 30 months.
- 5) Bonding provisions governing the sale of commodities from farmer to farmer.

## **TRANSPORTATION**

We support:

- 1) Funding of transportation needs in rural Utah.
- 2) Funding for non-contractual noxious weed control along Utah's Department of Transportation rights-of-way.
- 3) UDOT planning for highway construction that will preserve viable farming operations.
- 4) County residents and landowners to be given access to a fee waiver when accessing roads and highways through national and state parks.
- 5) Local government's statutory authority to issue and enforce permits to groups that use state highways or local roads for organized events, provided that these events will not interfere with community or agricultural transportation needs.
- 6) A local option by individual counties to take over maintenance of selected state roads.
- 7) Sufficient road shoulders that may serve as an emergency lane on state highways as traffic loads increase.
- 8) The extension of I-70 West.
- 9) The construction, expansion and maintenance of Utah highways and roads through Utah's counties with an emphasis on minimizing the loss of productive cropland.
- 10) A four-lane roadway from the intersection of Interstate 15 to the intersection of Interstate 70 (Highway 6).
- 11) Uncontroverted evidence of an interruption or closure of a road, even for a short period of time, is adequate and sufficient for the ten-year public right-of-way period to recommence.
- 12) All-terrain vehicles (ATVs), with implement of husbandry stickers, being allowed to operate on public lands with permitted approval where OHVs are not allowed.

We oppose:

- 1) Interstate 15, as well as other Interstate systems, being designated as "Toll Roads."
- 2) Public access to adjacent private lands when road easements across private lands are granted to oil companies or other non-public entities. Public access on these roads should be by written permission of the affected landowners.

## **Class D Roads**

We support:

- 1) Limiting county's ability to claim jurisdiction over and designate privately constructed roads on private land as Class D roads unless a public right has been obtained by:
  - a) Gift
  - b) Prescriptive easement

- c) Eminent domain proceedings
- d) Purchase, or
- e) Prior written permission from landowner
- 2) Counties abandoning public interest in all class D roads on private property not obtained utilizing one or more of the above five conditions.
- 3) Counties vacating class D roads on private property if there has been 10 years of continuous non-use if requested by the landowner.

**Traffic Related Laws**

We support:

- 2) Amending Utah law to align with surrounding states’ laws which allow for increasing tandem weight limits as long as such increases do not exceed the allowable gross weight limit of a vehicle.
- 3) Consistency in interstate trucking weight limits.
- 4) Adoption by Utah Motor Carrier Division of exempting hauling of agricultural supplies or commodities from the 70-hour work week limitation during the planting and harvest season.
- 5) Exempting drivers licensing requirements for OHV use on implements of husbandry on private and public lands.
- 6) Vehicles of husbandry operating on public highways.
- 7) The current statute exempting agriculture from “Track Out” regulations on public and private thoroughfares.
- 8) An agricultural exemption related to the parking of implements of husbandry within city and county limits.
- 9) Exempting intrastate, in-field loaded weight overages when transporting raw agricultural products.
- 10) The use of valid foreign drivers’ licenses for migrant workers.
- 11) Making the driver’s license test available in multiple languages for migrant workers in the state of Utah.

We oppose:

- 1) Mandatory electronic onboard recording devices on commercial vehicles.
- 2) Federal and state regulations requiring all drivers of articulated agricultural vehicles with 10,001 or more GVW ratings to have a medical card.
- 3) The requirement that all vehicles hauling livestock stop at ports of entry.

**Vehicle Inspections**

We support:

- 1) On farm (on site) vehicle safety and I/M inspection, when required by the state.
- 2) Safety inspections being made valid for one year from the date of inspection regardless of change in ownership.

**TRESPASS**

We support:

- 1) Strengthening the criminal trespass code and its enforcement by:
  - a) Considering private property closed unless one has permission to enter.
  - b) Aggressive ticketing and mandatory fines of individuals on private property without permission or discharging a firearm or other device into private property from adjacent property without permission.
  - c) Prohibiting “hot pursuit” of injured wildlife as a waiver of the trespass law.
  - d) Exempting landowners from liability for injuries or deaths that occur to trespassers as a result of their trespassing actions.

- e) Property owners receiving full compensation for damage caused by trespassers.
- f) Having DWR amend their trespass rules to follow state statute.
- 2) Requiring government employees to obtain permission from the landowner prior to entering private property.
- 3) Restricting hunting and fishing privileges for those hunters and anglers who are convicted of trespassing on private lands.

## **TURFGRASS**

We support:

- 1) Research, education, development, and marketing of drought and heat tolerant varieties of turfgrass and other ornamental plants, in order to better manage Utah's scarce water resources.
- 2) The definitions of "xeriscape", "water conserving landscape", and "water efficient landscape" as a landscape that includes but is not limited to the water conserving principles of planning and design, soil improvements, appropriate plant selection, practical turf areas, efficient water distribution and scheduling, mulching, and appropriate maintenance.
- 3) The use of turfgrass in public and private spaces.
- 4) That the benefits of turfgrass and ornamental plants in the environment outweigh costs associated with water conservation.

We oppose:

- 1) Any provisions or ordinances limiting the use of turfgrass or other ornamental plants in public or private spaces.
- 2) The removal of turfgrass or other ornamental plants either by incentive or mandate as a means to improve water conservation efforts.

## **UTAH STATE FAIR**

We support:

- 1) The expansion and upgrading of the Utah State Fair Park through state appropriations, provided that increased emphasis is given to agriculture education and interactive displays in the exhibits and facilities during the State Fair. The Utah State Fair should be a showcase for agriculture and refocus on that mission.

We oppose:

- 1) Moving the state Fair Park to another location.

## **WATER**

Our society and national security depend on abundant and reliable agricultural production and agriculture requires abundant and reliable water supplies, wisely used, to produce food, fiber, and energy. We support the engagement of agricultural producers in all efforts to secure water supplies and protect water quality.

We support:

- 1) The Prior Appropriation Doctrine of water allocation - "first in time, first in right."
- 2) Use of water in agricultural production as a recognized beneficial use of water.
- 3) Maintaining and strengthening legal doctrines recognizing water rights as constitutionally protected property rights; such rights should enjoy the full spectrum of due process safeguards.
- 4) Education of the public, including school students, on the hydrologic cycle, water resource management, water quality, and beneficial use of water by agriculture, including agricultural water uses that enhance natural ecosystems.

- 5) Farm Bureau and county Farm Bureau organizations working cooperatively with other water stakeholders who support wise agricultural water use as beneficial to society.
- 6) Ongoing research and innovation directed to optimizing water use in farming, especially improved irrigation technology, and other farming practices.
- 7) Broad stakeholder engagement, including agriculture, in development of informed, wise public policy regarding water.
- 8) Cost-effective and affordable agricultural water supplies.
- 9) Cooperative watershed management with broad private and public participation.
- 10) Water policy makers at all levels of government engaging knowledgeable and reputable experts, including agricultural producers, so that water policy, laws, and regulations are based on sound science, economics, community needs, and watershed hydrology.

### **Beneficial Use**

We support the existing legal doctrine that beneficial use shall be the basis, limit, and measure of a water right. Beneficial use for irrigated agriculture should include consumptive use, plus reasonable and necessary losses to deliver water, and any other wise water use that supports production of food and other agricultural products.

We support:

- 1) Water rights forfeiture upon lack of beneficial use, so long as protections to agricultural water users are not reduced.
- 2) Amending Utah water statutes to extend further protections to agricultural water users similar to those enjoyed by public water suppliers.
- 3) Beneficial use allowing for the variety of agricultural products supported by Utah climate, soils, and markets; opportunities to improve water use practices; and local circumstances such as salinity control, conveyance infrastructure, and water storage practices.
- 4) Recognizing storage of water in an aquifer, whether by injection, infiltration, or reduced groundwater diversion by fallowing, as a beneficial use.
- 5) Rights to store water in reservoirs and natural lakes for beneficial use.

### **Agricultural Water Optimization**

We support:

- 1) Creation of the Agricultural Water Optimization Task Force and the responsibilities delegated to it, so long as agricultural producers hold the majority of votes on the task force.
- 2) Continued efforts to identify, develop, and apply sound science and relevant research to optimizing agricultural water use.
- 3) Measuring water optimization gains, including farm economics, at the farm, community, and watershed levels.
- 4) Encouraging agricultural markets to reward water optimization.
- 5) Protection of water rights when a water user implements water optimization practices. For instance, use of optimization practices must not cause a farmer's water rights to be reduced, restricted, or suffer reduced marketability.
- 6) Meaningful benefits for farmers to optimize water use and protect water quality.
- 7) Development of precise water rights administration tools, including funding for the Utah Department of Natural Resources and its divisions to develop such tools.
- 8) Participation by agricultural and other stakeholders in any changes to water rights administration laws, rules, or practices and adoption of statutes or rules carefully defining any such changes.

- 9) The Agricultural Water Optimization Task Force developing economic models to demonstrate the viability of implementing water optimization practices and that such practices will assure greater drought resiliency and maintain or increase current production.
- 10) Soil health practices being classified as a water optimization tool.
- 11) Equal consideration is given to all applications regardless of basin, system, or water company when funding grants and cash allocations. Water optimization benefits the entire state and we do not want geographic location to be weighted in grant consideration.

## **Federal Water Policy**

We support:

- 1) The McCarran Amendment (43 USC §666) and other statutes, regulations, and policies that acknowledge that administration of water resources and water rights is reserved to the states and has not been delegated to the federal government unless specifically delegated by interstate compacts or other specific delegations.
- 2) Administration of water law and allocation of water under the laws of the respective states, including allocation and administration under interstate compacts.
- 3) State laws providing that water rights acquired by beneficial use of water on federal lands belong to the water user and not to the federal government.
- 4) State legislation directing that the federal government cannot claim ownership of water developed on federal land by federal permit holders, or ownership of or the right to manage water solely because it originates on federal lands.
- 5) Managing water storage projects to maximize agricultural use of water.
- 6) The federal agencies allowing infrastructure destroyed or damaged by natural disasters, vandalism, or other causes to be repaired or rebuilt.
- 7) Legislation to amend Section 404 of the Clean Water Act to restrict U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction to waterways used for transporting interstate and foreign commerce, or which can be made navigable for these purposes with reasonable effort, and to clarify and restrict the Corps responsibilities to those which it exercised prior to 1972.
- 8) Granting requests to transfer title of Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) facilities and water rights to local project sponsors when repayment obligations have been satisfied.

We oppose:

- 1) Federal claims for 1861 storage rights, including those in the Uintah Basin.
- 2) Any doctrine or law that would establish additional reserved water rights on federal lands managed by USFS, BLM, or NPS.
- 3) Decommissioning Glen Canyon Dam or any other BOR facilities used to supply irrigation water unless replacement facilities have been completed by Reclamation or other suitable parties and in operation.
- 4) Claims of federal reserved water rights such as those proposed in the rangeland reform.
- 5) Requiring water treatment or an NPDES permit as a condition for inter-basin water transfers.
- 6) Requiring relinquishment of existing water rights as a condition of access to federal land for maintenance and repair of water infrastructure.

## **Flood Plain Management**

We support proper management and control of flood plains and necessary emergency actions that may supersede current governmental regulations. Public agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, should allow repairs and cleaning in a timely manner before emergencies exist.

## **Groundwater Management**

We Support:

- 1) A legislatively funded in-depth study of state ground water basin management policy, including impacts on agriculture and related industries prior to any legislative action to change state water management policy.
- 2) The consideration and development of private voluntary basin wide groundwater management plans in coordination with the state's safe yield policy.
- 3) State buyout of water rights at fair market value in over-appropriated basins as a means to attain safe yield as determined by a groundwater management plan.
- 4) Participation by local water users in development of groundwater management plans.
- 5) Protection by the State of Utah against taking of water from Utah groundwater basins for use in other states.
- 6) Legislation to change how underground water over-use penalties are accessed.
- 7) Natural stream flows and catch basins for surface water to provide recharge for underground aquifers.
- 8) The state management of ground water supplies to ensure the greatest benefit to agriculture both in the short-term and in the long-term.

We oppose:

- 1) Efforts to move groundwater from Utah to other states unless up-to-date empirical studies clearly show that water can be withdrawn and exported without adverse effects to Utah water users.
- 2) Transferring water from one aquifer to another aquifer, water basin, or surface water for municipal use or recharge.
- 3) Transfer of surface water to groundwater if the change increases depletion from an over-appropriated groundwater basin.

## **Dam Safety**

We Support:

- 1) The Utah Division of Water Resources assuming 95% rather than 80% of the costs of repairing irrigation dams to meet state standards under reasonable engineering.
- 2) Allowing access for repairs and maintenance to water infrastructure located within restricted travel areas. If access is denied, reservoir owners or water right holders should not be liable for damages from water infrastructure failure.

## **Interstate Compact Water**

Water allocated to Utah under interstate compacts should be developed for use in Utah.

We support:

- 1) The continued development of Utah's share of the Colorado River.
- 2) The current law prescribing the appointment of two members to the Bear River Compact Commission who have these qualifications:
  - a) A landowner and irrigator actually residing on and operating a farm within the upper division, as defined by the compact, and
  - b) A landowner and irrigator actually residing on and operating a farm within the lower division, as defined by the compact.

We oppose:

- 1) Leasing and selling water outside of Utah.

## **Irrigation Infrastructure**

We support:

- 1) Protecting private ditch and canal owners and irrigation companies when other entities use their delivery systems for uses other than what they were originally intended. Municipalities, industrial entities, developers, and private individuals should assume responsibility for disposing of drainage from their property.
- 2) Legislation to significantly limit irrigation canal and ditch company liability.
- 3) Local governments with land use regulation authority over new land developments modifications to existing land developments establishing and enforcing protections against damage to or any increased risk of liability to existing water facilities such as canals, ditches, and pipelines.
- 4) The state paying for complying with any new regulations imposed by state statute or rule on irrigation canals, ditches, or other irrigation facilities, and the responsible local government paying such costs for compliance with any local regulations it imposes.
- 5) The recognition of prescriptive easements for conveyance of water as well as other agricultural uses to or from agricultural lands and the right for maintenance of the same.
- 6) That before disturbances along a ditch, canal, or pipeline can occur, the entity's board of directors must give written permission.
- 7) Prohibiting the public from accessing canals, ditches, and pipeline rights-of-way for recreational purposes without written permission from the canal owner or operator.
- 8) Requiring that changes to pipelines, ditches, canals, or other water conveyance infrastructure can be made only with written permission from the water conveyance system owner or operator and engineered at or above capacity.
- 9) Encroachments on water conveyance system easements or rights-of-way should be regarded as trespassing.
- 10) Providing a method in which water companies can voluntarily abandon a canal easement.
- 11) Exemption of ditches and canals from designation as a jurisdictional stream for which stream alteration permits are required.
- 12) Allowing-agriculture producers to use herbicides according to label instructions for moss and plant control in canals and ditches without having to obtain a permit, other than a pesticide applicator's license.
- 13) Legislation to protect canal companies from damages caused by an act of God such as floods and earthquakes or unauthorized water entering the canal.
- 14) Agriculture water conveyance systems not being considered a utility.
- 15) Public and private entities which cause damage to agriculture infrastructure systems shall be held accountable for full repair or replacement.

## **Water Rights Forfeiture**

We support:

- 1) Water users being given notice to protect their water rights within the principles of beneficial use and any other legal limitations of their water rights.
- 2) Such a declaration not being made retroactive.
- 3) Expansion of the definition for reasonable causes for agricultural non-use under the Utah water rights forfeiture statute.
- 4) Allowing a shareholder to file a non-use application on his proportionate share of the company water right if the shareholder:
  - a) Notifies the company,
  - b) Bears all costs, including the cost of the proof of resumption of use, and
  - c) Continues to pay all assessments on the shares.



- 5) Changing the priority date on a water right revived under the “Lazarus Clause” from its original priority date to the date on which water use was resumed.

### **State Water Rights**

We support:

- 1) Normal filing and adjudication processes for any expansion of original irrigated acreage.
- 2) Careful planning by municipalities, public water suppliers, and governmental agencies when acquiring water rights or water stock and when developing new water sources and systems in order to reduce adverse impacts on agricultural and other water users.
- 3) Granting the State Engineer authority to enforce Utah water law, including consideration of historic water use and/or approving or rejecting change applications.
- 4) Adaptation of programs, regulations, funding, and statutory law to the needs and hydrology of specific watersheds

We oppose:

- 1) Issuing of new appropriations by the state engineer in areas of full appropriation
- 2) Encroachment by government agencies on private water rights.
- 3) BLM and USFS practices of filing diligence claims on water used by other parties and allowing any recognition of these claims by the Utah Division of Water Rights.
- 4) Allowing change applications that would transfer company water rights outside the basin or sub-basin where the water is currently used.
- 5) Regulatory schemes, laws, and mandates that do not allow adaptation to local needs when reasonable basis exists to address local needs differently.

### **Instream Flows**

We support:

- 1) The leasing of water for instream flows so long as:
  - a) Other water rights will not and could not be adversely affected.
  - b) Utah does not lose water to other states.
  - c) All assessments are retained on the respective rights.
  - d) Instream flow rights are not acquired through use of eminent domain powers.
  - e) Instream flow rights are not acquired based on diligence claims unless those claims have been previously recognized by court decree.
  - f) The cost of administering the instream flow change is borne entirely by the instream flow holder.

We oppose:

- 1) Creation of instream flow rights in artificial water bodies such as reservoirs, canals, and ditches except by arm’s length agreements with the owners and users of such facilities.
- 2) The purchase of or permanent change applications regarding water rights for instream flows.
- 3) Granting automatic access to individuals who attempt to utilize bodies of water solely on the basis of a granted instream flow through private surface. In these cases, trespass laws apply.
- 4) Using instream water rights to turn seasonably dry riverbeds into a continuously flowing stream.
- 5) The inclusion of the Sevier River water basin in any expansion of instream flow rights.

### **Water Companies**

Water companies own and manage substantial water rights and water distribution systems critical to Utah’s agriculture. Agricultural production is best sustained by maintaining title to underlying water rights by the water companies.

We support:

- 1) Authorizing cities to contract with water companies to provide water delivery and storm water conveyance systems, including:
  - a) Recognition that existing easements may include storm water conveyance, and
  - b) Expenditure of municipal revenues for payments to water companies under such contracts.
- 2) Allowing simple reinstatement or reorganization of water companies for which the corporate charter has lapsed or for which there has been an administrative dissolution for failure to file annual reports.
- 3) Protecting the interests of water company shareholders who continue use of irrigation water for agricultural use as water interests of the company are purchased and converted for municipal and industrial use.
- 4) Protecting viability of water companies in the current economic and legal environment.
- 5) A defined procedure that guarantees notification and delivery of water right change applications to a water company.
- 6) Protecting the purpose, viability, and interests of water companies, particularly in those instances when the water company may choose to not respond to a shareholder change application request within the legal response time. If the water company knowingly or unknowingly does not respond within the legal response time, then the shareholder change application is denied. In this event, we support:
  - a) mandatory mediation, before and/or after judicial review, unless both parties decline, and
  - b) the costs of mediation should be paid by the non-prevailing party if actual notice is received. If the water company does respond after actual notice is received and within the legal response time, the shareholder seeking the change application pays full mediation costs.
- 7) Notifying the public of pending changes, the holding of hearings and the issuance of first-line decisions by the State Engineer.
- 8) Legislation to assure that security interests in a mutual irrigation company stock shall be perfected under the Utah Commercial Code.
- 9) The principle of voting based on shares within a water company, subject to the right of shareholders to provide in their articles of incorporation for other voting arrangements suited to local conditions.
- 10) Allowing local water company bylaws to provide that board members be elected by the shareholders in their district.
- 11) Water companies having the right to protest any change of water rights to instream flows.
- 12) Water companies be given written notice to any instream flow that may affect their water rights.

### **Water Reuse**

We support reuse of municipal and industrial water when doing so does not impair other water rights, does not exceed the historic depletion under the relevant water rights, and does not interfere with flows to Great Salt Lake or any of its tributaries.

### **Water Development**

We support:

- 1) Changes involving agricultural water being transferred to municipal and industrial

- use should be among willing sellers and buyers.
- 2) Dedicating up to 1/4 cent of the sales tax towards water development and dam safety.
  - 3) Agricultural input in the development of public recreational plans at reservoirs.
  - 4) Projects that facilitate the use of Utah's share of Colorado River water.
  - 5) Being able to capture precipitation for beneficial use for livestock watering without a water right.
  - 6) Funding water infrastructure for agricultural purposes.
  - 7) The aggressive reclamation of our watersheds through logging, grazing, fire, and treatment of invasive species including, but not limited to, pinyon–juniper, tamarisks, Russian olive, etc. to enhance the flow of water and maximize the usable water.
  - 8) Continued efforts toward the eradication of invasive aquatic species (such as quagga mussel) that could be extremely detrimental to irrigation and water systems throughout the state.

### **Great Salt Lake**

We support:

- 1) Agriculture being an active participant in optimizing its performance to enhance flows to Great Salt Lake.
- 2) A Declaration of full allocation of all tributary basins to Great Salt Lake both surface and subsurface.
- 3) Legislation which encourages water savings in Industrial and municipal uses particularly in the mineral extraction industry.
- 4) If regulatory water reductions are required to address Great Salt Lake, they should be by priority.

We oppose:

- 1) Solutions to Great Salt Lake which completely rely on agriculture.
- 2) State and/or federal agricultural optimization programs created to address Great Salt Lake levels which require non-voluntary sales of water rights by participants.
- 3) The allocation of consumptive water rights from the Great Salt Lake Basin.

### **Bear Lake/River**

We support:

- 1) The State Engineer requiring Rocky Mountain Power and the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District to maintain the flow of the Bear River and Weber River as a constant level during the irrigation season to ensure that irrigators have easy access to their water rights.
- 2) Maintaining Bear Lake to ensure that established water rights may be fully utilized.

### **Central Utah Project**

We support:

- 1) Central Utah Project (CUP) allocation of at least 30,000-acre feet to be delivered for beneficial use in southern Utah County and the original allocation of water to Juab County.
- 2) Replacement of the CUP's proposed dam on the Uintah River with a project that would include the West Side Combined Canal and Green River pumping projects.
- 3) Completion of the original CUP while protecting agricultural water rights, water quality and all existing water sources.
- 4) All commitments made on completed sections of the project being kept before any further transfer of water occurs.
- 5) The trans-mountain diversion not exceeding the original agreement amount.

- 6) Reverting back to the original CUP plan of bringing water from the Green River to the Uintah Basin. Additional available water should be left in the Uintah Basin.
- 7) The CUP agreement being amended when projects are deleted to prevent taxation without benefit.
- 8) The Central Utah Water Conservancy District, the BOR, Duchesne County, and the Ute Indian Tribe to cooperate in completing the Uintah Basin water projects.

### **Colorado River**

We support:

- 1) The Colorado River Authority of Utah preserving Utah water rights.
- 2) The formation of an Agricultural Advisory Council to the Colorado River Authority of Utah.

### **Water Quality**

We support:

- 1) Voluntary, incentive-based solutions at the state and local level for point and non-point source pollution programs, livestock manure management, and water quality enhancement and being pro-active in supporting at the state and local levels assessments of impaired state waters.
- 2) Farmers and ranchers who are in the process of implementing approved water management plans should not be required to alter such plans while they are in progress without just compensation for such changes.
- 3) Livestock and dairy producers should not be held responsible for pollution derived from animal nutrients after ownership of the manure has been transferred to another party and removed from the producer's control.
- 4) Collaborative efforts between USU and others to educate forest landowners on the importance of minimizing water pollution associated with silvicultural activities.

We oppose:

- 1) Requirements to comply with non-point source clean water standards more quickly than other entities such as industries, municipalities, or other governmental entities.
- 2) County Ground Water Source Protection laws being stricter than state Ground Water Source Protection laws.
- 3) Mandatory bonding or other financial assurance for waste management facilities associated with Animal Feeding Operations (AFOs) or Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs).
- 4) The administrative exemption for silviculture from the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process.
- 5) Unfunded mandates relating to water quality regulations imposed by changes in rule and law.

### **WEEDS**

We support:

- 1) Aggressive efforts by county weed control boards to control noxious weeds and jointed goat grass.
- 2) The State of Utah controlling weeds on state rights-of-way.
- 3) Certified hay and straw required for use on USFS lands be certified as weed seed free, rather than weed free.

### **WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION AND AGRICULTURE BURNING**

We support:

- 1) Cooperation between federal agencies responsible for fire suppression and local fire districts in the suppression of wildfires on non-federal lands.

- 2) Where local fire or trained personnel are prohibited from suppressing the fires on federal or tribal lands, those prohibiting entities should be responsible when the fire gets out of control, for reseedling, reestablishing the streambed and restocking fisheries.
- 3) Increased state funding to counties for suppression of wildfires on non-federal lands.
- 4) Livestock grazing as a viable fire suppression tool to reduce burnable fuels on private, county, state, and federal lands.
- 5) Agriculture burning as an accepted management practice.
- 6) Modifying the state fire suppression code to protect rural communities from unreasonable regulations and ordinances.

## **WILDLIFE**

### **Damage Control**

We support:

- 1) Monitoring of public range conditions to determine which species are responsible for use and damage to ranges.
- 2) Expanding the Utah big game damage payment program to include all wildlife species. Any unused annually appropriated funds for this purpose should be applied specifically for damage or prevention payments in future years.
- 3) Compensation to private landowners within all hunting units and all hunting species for wildlife damages.
- 4) Wildlife damage payments on the basis of forage loss, damages, and/or historical land yields for both irrigated and range ground.
- 5) Full reimbursement by the DWR without maximum limit to private property owners whose crops, personal property, fences, or real estate have been damaged by any form of wildlife.
- 6) Holding landowners harmless when wildlife inadvertently consumes potentially harmful substances on private property.
- 7) Improving the process that confirms livestock depredations to ensure that it is timely, includes training and allowing DWR personnel to verify kills, and maximizes the technology for both livestock producers and government agencies.
- 8) Harvest objective hunting for bears.
- 9) Valuing livestock based on current market or replacement value.
- 10) Valuing young livestock at weaning weights.
- 11) Big game damage assessments funded by DWR, administered by a neutral third party, and subsequent damages promptly paid from the depredation fund.
- 12) DWR offering wild turkey permits that may be used for resale as compensation for providing habitat and feed to wild turkeys.
- 13) The mission of the Berryman Institute in addressing human/wildlife conflicts through teaching, research, and Extension.
- 14) The right of agricultural producers to take any wildlife that is destroying crops or livestock or creating a hazard to livestock including disease transmission. The long-established 72-hour notice requirement must be preserved.
- 15) Allowing private landowners to sell landowner and appreciation tags.
- 16) Allowing landowners or landowner lessees all the permits necessary to mitigate against depredation. Issuance of mitigation or depredation permits should encompass the following concepts:
  - a) The granting of antlered big game permits to landowners or lessees should not be based strictly on qualifying acreages but should also include consideration of actual damages.
  - b) Landowners should also have first priority for permits to hunt in the area in which they live.

- c) Depredation and mitigation hunts should not be limited to antlerless permits.
  - d) DWR should implement a formula that will provide more weight to big game depredation of-cropland.
  - e) Landowners should be able to distribute qualifying permits at their discretion.
  - f) Hunters receiving mitigation permit vouchers should not be charged an additional permit fee.
  - g) The issuance of mitigation permit vouchers should not absolve DWR from paying for crop damages.
- 17) Legislative funding to defray damages to agricultural enterprises by geese, Sandhill Cranes, and all federally protected birds.

We oppose:

- 1) Tying compensation for wildlife damage to a property owner being compelled to allow public access. If a property owner is interested in allowing public access, there should be an agreement between the parties requiring full disclosure and signatures.
- 2) Forfeiting preference points for landowner and depredation/mitigation tags.
- 3) Governmental agencies disclosing private and personal information to the public regarding wildlife damage control activities.

### **Managing Wildlife**

We support:

- 1) Wildlife management plans complying with the original intent of the Taylor Grazing Act.
- 2) A pro-active, sustained public education and involvement effort including agriculture, sportsmen, government agencies, and other interested parties.
- 3) Promoting consistency and the application of multiple use and sustained yield principles in managing and maintaining Utah's wildlife ecosystem.
- 4) Cooperative agreements between landowners, permittees, DWR, federal, state, and local agencies and sportsmen to establish and maintain population objective numbers of wildlife consistent with public and private land habitat constraints.
- 5) All efforts to harvest more wildlife until they are reduced to population objective.
- 6) The ability to manage wildlife populations within Utah's national parks and monuments.
- 7) Staying within the provisions of the Bison Herd Unit Management Plan that are specific to the protection of livestock including brucellosis testing and herd size objectives.
- 8) The same public review process used to establish original unit numbers when changes in wildlife unit numbers are proposed.
- 9) Cooperative Wildlife Management Units (CWMUs) for big game, along with the agreed private/public permit ratios for antlered animals established by administrative rule.
- 10) DWR contacting private landowners and obtaining their permission prior to setting a special hunt on private lands.
- 11) The issuance of maps by DWR, which indicate hunting unit boundaries and identify private property to those purchasing hunting licenses.
- 12) Issuing big game conservation permits to farmers, ranchers, and agriculture to further enhance habitat improvements.
- 13) Euthanizing, not relocating, problematic wildlife.
- 14) A statewide sage grouse management plan that protects private property rights.
- 15) Bear hunts in the state of Utah.
- 16) An annual Sandhill Crane hunt in Utah.
- 17) Immediate action to remove Tribal bison that have migrated off tribal land onto private, state, and federal lands.

- 18) Authority for livestock owners/managers or any individual entrusted to manage or care for livestock on public or private lands to shoot or kill on sight cougars, bears, wolves, or any predatory species observed threatening privately owned livestock.
- 19) Increased control of beavers throughout the state.
- 20) Enforcement of State of Utah regulations for bison production in Utah.
- 21) The percentage of tags issued to landowners should be correlated to the percentage of private land in a general season unit.

We oppose:

- 1) Any increase in big game numbers, unless there is a corresponding increase in livestock AUMs.
- 2) Any increases in big game numbers where Appropriate Management Levels (AMLs) have already been exceeded.
- 3) Acquisition of private land by using wildlife habitat funds.

### **Landowner Associations**

We support:

- 1) The formation of Landowner Associations (LOAs) within the State of Utah for the purpose of Wildlife Management.
- 2) LOAs being included in all wildlife meetings where private lands or access to private lands may be affected.
- 3) Allowing flexibility to manage LOAs in accordance with local conditions.

We oppose:

- 1) Any rules, laws for regulations that would require government mandated public access to private property.
- 2) The use of forage and crops as a public resource or by a government agency without just compensation.

### **Transplants and Reintroductions**

We oppose:

- 1) Transplanting wildlife species into areas where an historical presence cannot be shown.
- 2) Reintroduction, relocation, or transplant of predators and wildlife into areas that may adversely impact livestock or other private property.
- 3) Reintroduction or transplanting of wildlife unless an agreement is reached with private landowners and/or permittees.
- 4) Wolves in Utah, including the Mexican and gray wolf; and any established packs that migrate to the State of Utah.
- 5) Listing wolves as an endangered species in Utah.
- 6) Reintroduction of the black-footed ferret.
- 7) The introduction of wild turkeys into areas where commercial turkey operations are located and urge DWR to aggressively control the commingling of wild fowl with domestic turkeys.
- 8) Any illegal transplanting of wildlife.

### **Wildlife Board**

We support:

- 1) Modifying and restructuring of the DWR State Wildlife Board to statutorily include the agricultural industry.

### **WORKERS COMPENSATION**

We support:

- 1) Maintaining an insurer of last resort.
- 2) Taking proactive steps to reduce premium cost to high-risk books of business.
- 3) All licensed insurance agents having access to writing coverage to the Workers Compensation Fund.

## **ZONING ORDINANCES**

We support:

- 1) Notice by mail to affected landowners of proposed new zoning maps or adjustments to current maps.
- 2) The opportunity for affected landowners to meet with county/city planners prior to public hearings.
- 3) The Private Property Ombudsman having authority to intervene on behalf of property owners in cases involving both takings and land-use questions.
- 4) Local ordinances that allow for the discharging of a firearm within city limits for the disposal of unprotected animals (varmints), such as skunks, raccoons, etc. that have been trapped or for the slaughter of animals for personal consumption.

## **Land Divisions**

We support continued flexibility and ease in dividing agricultural lands. Any changes to subdivisions procedures should:

- 1) Consider tiering regulatory requirements for subdivision approval and basing the tiers upon the size and impact of the proposed subdivision with minimal subdivision requirements and no exactions for smaller agricultural lands.
- 2) Maintaining the current agricultural division process using metes and bounds for large acreages of land and not requiring surveys and plats.

We oppose:

- 1) The use of zoning as a mechanism to preserve open space at the expense of the landowner.
- 2) Assessments by Special Improvement Districts (SIDs) on agricultural lands where landowners do not utilize the improvements.

## **SCOTT DALTON**

We oppose:

- 1) Building more houses than we can feed.