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MISSION STATEMENT

Farm Bureau is a voluntary, grassroots advocacy organization representing the social and economic interests of farm and ranch families at the local, state, and national levels. By providing leadership and organizational skills, Farm Bureau seeks to gain public support on the issues affecting farm and ranch families.

THE WASHINGTON FARM BUREAU CREED

We Believe ...

- In the American competitive enterprise system.
- That man's search for progress should be encouraged by maintenance of opportunity, not hindered by illusions of security.
- That a person should be rewarded in accordance with his or her productive contribution to society.
- That every person is entitled to own property, earn money honestly, save, invest and spend as he or she chooses.
- That property rights cannot be taken away without infringing on rights guaranteed by the Constitution.
- That the Constitution is the basic law of the land.
- That government should operate impartially in the interest of all.

That government’s regulatory functions should be based on law.
That government should provide only minimum controls and aids.
That government should stimulate, not discourage, individual initiative.
That propagandizing by government is dangerous to the maintenance of self-government.
That monopoly, whether by government, industry, labor or agriculture, is dangerous.
That voluntary cooperation is part of the American system.
That all candidates for public office should state their beliefs with respect to communism, socialism, or capitalism.

All these under girded by our Religious Faith.
THE GRASSROOTS OF WASHINGTON FARM BUREAU

In 1920, farmers and ranchers across Washington joined together to form Washington Farm Bureau (WFB) to raise a united voice on issues that affected their future. Truly grassroots in nature, WFB has grown to include 25 county Farm Bureaus and more than 44,000 member families, representing all agricultural commodities in Washington state. Farm Bureau is recognized for the unique way in which policy is established. These policies guide the organization in its efforts to influence public policy.

The policies contained in this book are the result of a grassroots, member-driven process where individual members surface issues and work through their county Farm Bureau policy development committee or a state advisory committee to draft and debate resolution language. Approved resolutions are submitted to the state Policy Development Committee for review. Policy resolutions approved by the committee are forwarded for consideration by the voting delegates at the WFB Annual Meeting in November. Adopted resolutions become organizational policy for the following year. National policy resolutions adopted by the voting delegates are submitted to the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) for review and consideration at its annual meeting.

Farm Bureau continues to work for solutions to the challenges that face the agricultural community. Agriculture is a major component of the state’s economy, and WFB is the united voice on state issues that affect family farmers and ranchers. With more than 6 million member families, AFBF is the nation’s largest and most influential voluntary organization of active farmers and ranchers. AFBF represents the agricultural community on national issues.

MEMBERS OF THE 2018 POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
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SECTION 1 – FARM BUREAU ESSENTIALS

1.1 – Definitions
We define “agriculture” as:

1) The science, art, or business involved in:
   a) The preparation of soil for crop production.
   b) The cultivation and propagation of crops.
   c) The production and culture of plant and animal products and fiber for human consumption, feed, or sale as articles of trade or commerce.

2) Activities related to the production of agricultural products.

3) The broad scope of decisions and activities in which farmers may engage, beginning with the analysis and decision of what to grow or produce and continuing through the end stages of processing, packaging, wholesaling, delivery, the retail sales of finished products, and agricultural promotion and tourism.

4) The agribusinesses that provide support to farming activities. These activities include, but are not limited to, equipment and material supply and service, advisors, applicators, processors, storage, delivery, marketers, and shippers.

We define “farmer” to mean any person (individual or business entity) engaged in the business of growing, raising, producing, or harvesting any agricultural product for sale. Included in the definition of “farmer” are people who perform farm management services on farms and people who provide custom farming services for others. For purposes of Washington Farm Bureau policy, terms such as “grower,” “rancher,” and “producer” have the same meaning as “farmer.”

We define “agricultural product” to mean any product of plant cultivation or animal husbandry including but not limited to horticulture, grain cultivation, vermiculture, composting, viticulture, forestry, aquaculture, apiculture, nursery stock, greenhouse stock, plantation Christmas trees, turf, or any animal. Animals include, but are not limited to, private-sector aquatic products as defined in state law, birds, insects, or the substance obtained from such animals.

We support efforts to incorporate our broad definitions of “agriculture,” “farmer,” and “agricultural product” into state law. (1994, Amended 2013)

1.2 – Farm Bureau Family Values
We believe that the strength of every civilized society is the family. We support and encourage the promotion of the fundamental principles and family values on which our nation was founded.

We believe that marriage is defined to be between one man and one woman.

We believe parents:

1) Are responsible for the care of their children: to provide food, clothing, and shelter until the age of majority, 18 years.

2) Should be held responsible for property damage and vandalism as long as the minor child is residing in the home. We approve of restitution being made by the child in the form of community services.

3) Should accept financial responsibility or a portion of the responsibility for state-funded care or services their children receive.

4) Have the right to discipline their children in accordance with state law. (Amended 2014)

1.3 – Farm Bureau Beliefs
The central issue in all societies is freedom of the individual versus concentration of power, which destroys freedom. Economic progress, cultural advancement, and ethical and religious principles flourish best where citizens are free, responsible individuals. America’s unparalleled progress is based on freedom and dignity of the individual, sustained by basic moral and religious concepts.

We believe:

1) In our constitutional form of government and its division of powers as intended by the nation’s founders, the competitive free enterprise system, and the protection of God-given inalienable rights of the individual.

2) The United States should be returned to a true republic (rule by law), with the federal Constitution as the supreme law. We support a strict, literal interpretation of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

3) In freedom of press, speech, peaceful assembly, and religion. We pledge ourselves to the preservation of these inalienable rights and the thwarting of socialistic tendencies whenever and however small in nature the tendency may appear.

4) That the economic law of supply and demand, private ownership management, and the profit and loss system ultimately determine true market prices.
5) Personal property rights, including water rights, are fundamental. By protecting property rights, we preserve our economic stability, the health and welfare of our citizens, the public good of this state, and the sovereignty of our nation. We oppose any erosion of these rights.

6) That the centralization of power and authority is a threat to our very existence, life, and liberties. We advocate local control in as many areas as possible.

7) That a monopoly wherever found (labor, industry, government, or agriculture), jeopardizes freedom and self-government.

8) That government should stimulate, not discourage, individual initiative.

9) In the vital role education plays in helping students understand and appreciate the basic principles of our system of government and the competitive enterprise system.

10) That we have the right and responsibility of speaking through a voluntary organization without government intervention. To safeguard and restore our inalienable rights, we need to actively engage in public discourse at all levels of government through proactive participation in policy development, community action, or any other necessary public process.

We will not advocate for growers of crops that are deemed illegal by the federal government. (1994, Amended 2014)

1.4 – Farm Bureau Purpose
Farm Bureau is a free, independent, nongovernmental, voluntary organization of farm and ranch families united for the purpose of analyzing their problems and formulating action to achieve educational improvement, economic opportunity, and social advancement and, thereby, to promote the national well-being.

Farm Bureau is local, statewide, national, and international in its scope and influence. Also it is non-secret, nonsectarian, and non-discriminating as to race, color, sex, or political affiliation.
SECTION 2 – ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

2.1 – Animal Identification
We support an expanded animal identification system for those who wish to become part of a national or state identification system. We strongly oppose any state or national animal identification program that is mandatory. (2006)

2.2 – Animal Medication and Health
We recognize the need for and wish to assure the availability of animal health products and feed additives in livestock, farmed fish, and poultry feeds.

We support:
1) The use of a standard symbol for all drugs and withdrawal time.
2) Legislation that would continue the policy of allowing veterinarians to prescribe drugs needed for proper animal health on an extra-label use basis.
3) The United States Food and Drug Administration using research data of foreign countries as a basis for clearing animal health medications for use in the United States.
4) The United States Food and Drug Administration designating sheep, goats, and farmed fish as minor use species so that research data utilized to clear animal health products in other farmed animals can be applied to them.
5) Faster drug approval from the United States Food and Drug Administration on medications for the poultry industry.

We oppose the banning of animal medications without adequate proof of danger to humans or animals. (1996, Amended 2012)

2.3 – Animal Research and Welfare
We support:
1) Animal welfare and will at every opportunity make the public aware of our commitment to the health and well-being of animals we raise.
2) Correcting misleading information that falsely accuses farmers and ranchers of mistreating or abusing farm animals.
3) The continued use of animals for research.

We oppose:
1) Any legislative or regulatory actions that would tend to prohibit good animal husbandry practices and increase the cost of food to consumers.
2) Efforts to restrict common animal husbandry and livestock handling practices based on declarations that create an artificial distinction between livestock and companion animals. (1994, Amended 2007)

2.4 – Biosecurity
We support the enforcement of biosecurity standards on farms designated as biosecure. Such standards are designed to prevent the spread of disease. These standards:
1) Require all visitors to biosecure properties to stop their vehicles where posted.
2) May require protective clothing and disinfectant measures for visitors who access the property on foot.
3) Require all visits to be pre-arranged with a representative of the farm. This could require such visits be made by escort only.
4) Should apply to all local, state and federal regulatory personnel, unless entry is required to protect imminent threat to human safety or the environment.

We believe that the Washington State Veterinarian’s office at the Washington State Department of Agriculture should develop a training program designed to teach individuals and organizations that might reasonably be expected to visit livestock operations how to avoid spreading disease organisms. This program should be actively offered to all local, state, federal, and independent agencies and organizations that regularly make farm visits in the course of their normal activities. (1999, Amended 2014)

2.5 – Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
We support holding all countries with confirmed cases of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) to uniform health and OIE (Office International des Epizooties, also known as the World Organization for Animal Health) standards with regards to the importation and exportation of animal and animal products.

We believe there should be no announcement of BSE test results until they are confirmed due to the adverse effects on the market.

We reaffirm the policy to restrict cattle imports from Canada to those less than 30 months of age. (2003, Amended 2007)
2.6 – Brand Law
We support a more effective brand law by favoring brand inspection at all cattle and horse sales and by giving law enforcement officers the responsibility to inspect any vehicle suspected of transporting stolen livestock.

We support an application for an annual permit from your local brand inspector for an exemption on brand inspection for cattle moving less than 50 miles from pasture to pasture across state lines without change of ownership.

Private party intrastate sales of livestock reported electronically through the WSDA electronic database should not require an in-person brand inspector. Each seller of livestock should have the option of having a brand inspection, reporting the sale electronically, or both as long as the method chosen meets current requirements for federal animal disease traceability. The Washington State Department of Agriculture should have a compliance verification program to ensure that sales are promptly reported electronically. (1994, Amended 2013)

2.7 – Brucellosis
We support:
1) Tightened regulations on brucellosis.
2) Extending financial aid to farmers and ranchers. Brucellosis indemnity should be paid on the basis of up to 80 percent of the market value for dairy milk cows and 80 percent of the market value for beef cattle affected by this disease.
3) Granting the Washington State Department of Agriculture Director authority to use adult bovine vaccinations and change the milk law, if necessary, to assist in eradicating the disease.
4) Approving the use of adult bovine vaccinations on herds, which have been detected to have a problem with brucellosis.
5) Lifting quarantine when the last reactor has been removed from a herd. However, if one of the three required blood tests is positive, but the subsequent tissue test is negative, we feel that test should be declared negative.
6) The development of a joint emergency response plan between the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to respond to a brucellosis outbreak in the wild elk herds. The WSDA/WDFW response plan must include action to protect cattle herds and compensate cattle owners for damages accrued from such an outbreak.
7) Containment, quarantine, and, if necessary, eradication of the infected elk herd needs to occur should an outbreak occur. (1994, Amended 2004)

2.8 – Domestic “Animal Rights” Terrorism
We urge the state legislature to provide protection for operations using animals for agricultural research, educational, entertainment, or any other legal purpose. This protection should cover all crimes against persons or property including, but not limited to: animal release, graffiti, threats, arson, and trespass.

We support the Animal Enterprise Act of 2006 and encourage strong enforcement of its provisions.

We urge the United States Congress to take the following steps to address the problem of domestic “animal rights” terrorism:
1) Amend the federal tax code to allow for suspension or revocation of tax-exempt status for federally recognized charities linked to domestic terrorist groups in the event that such relationships are confirmed by federal investigation.
2) Direct the United States Office of Personnel Management to allow for permanent removal of such charity from the Combined Federal Campaign list of eligible charities in the event that such relationships are confirmed by federal investigation and that such organizations be required to return all funds they have received as a result of being on the Combined Federal Campaign list.
3) Initiate legal proceedings to revoke the nonprofit status of any group responsible for animal rights terrorism, as described above. (1999, Amended 2011)

2.9 – Hoof and Mouth Disease
We support banning imports of hoofed animals (ungulates) from countries with active cases of Hoof and Mouth Disease. All people, vehicles, merchandise, etc., that travel to or through countries with Hoof and Mouth Disease should be decontaminated before entering the United States. (2003)

2.10 – Livestock Protection/Guardian Dogs
The keeping of recognized breeds of livestock protection/guardian dogs used specifically for livestock protection is an acceptable farm practice. Livestock protection/guardian dogs should be included in statute as farm animals. (2011)

2.11 – Transporting Dogs
We oppose the law requiring that dogs be tethered when transported in open vehicles, as it constitutes a hazard to dogs. (1999)
SECTION 3 – COMMODITIES AND GENERAL AGRICULTURE

3.1 – Aerial Application of Agriculture Crop Protection Products
We support the continued use of aerial application of agricultural crop protection products because it is a viable method of applying these products when done in accordance with the product labels. (1993, Amended 2001)

3.2 – Agricultural Chemical Containers
Disposal programs are beneficial to the environment and demonstrate agriculture’s commitment to being good stewards of the land.

We support:
1) Allowing agricultural input material to be sold in any quantity to reduce the disposal problems associated with single use containers.
2) Voluntary efforts associated with the recycling of plastic pesticide containers.
3) Implementation of an easy and inexpensive method of legally disposing of empty agricultural containers such as the Washington Pest Consultant Association’s statewide container recycling program.
4) Continued funding for the Washington State Department of Agriculture’s waste pesticide disposal program that accepts unusable and outdated products. (1994, Amended 2001)

3.3 – Agricultural Fair Practice Legislation
We support:
1) Measures that ensure farmers are paid in a timely manner for the commodities they sell. These measures include, but are not limited to, the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, Packers and Stockyard Act, and the Commission Merchants Act. We will work to maintain, reform, and strengthen such acts.
2) Agricultural fair practices legislation for fresh fruits and vegetables. (Amended 2013)

3.4 – Agricultural Protection/Enhancement Products
Jurisdiction over products used in agriculture should be limited to one federal and one state agency, the United States Department of Agriculture and the Washington State Department of Agriculture.

We support:
1) Expediting the issuance of temporary use permits, the re-registration of existing products, and registration of new products proven to have negligible risk to applicators, the public and the environment.
2) Industry-wide labeling of all products that would include the following:
   a) Clearly marked safe storage temperature.
   b) Date of manufacture.
   c) Shelf life before and after being opened.
3) Research to determine the effects of pesticide exposure on farmers and their employees.
4) Effective ways of correcting erroneous and misleading allegations associated with the legal and proper use of crop protection materials.

We oppose:
1) Any effort that calls for reimbursement of costs associated with ills attributed to products and/or odors from agricultural operations.
2) The removal by the United States Environmental Protection Agency of minor crop protection products until viable economic alternatives are fully developed.
3) The United States Department of Labor’s efforts to take over the responsibility of the registration of pesticides relating to farm workers. (1999, Amended 2001)

3.5 – Aquaculture
We support:
1) The advancement of aquaculture in the state of Washington and recognize it as environmentally enhancing, as well as a non-consumptive water use farming practice.
2) Aquaculture as a form of agriculture and cultivated aquatic animals, plants, microorganisms, and their products produced by private persons and moving in standard commodity channels as agricultural livestock, crops, and commodities.
3) The reauthorization of the National Aquaculture Act and enhance funding for the Washington State University Aquaculture Diagnostic and Certification Center.
4) State legislation that would retain aquaculture and place aquaculture health regulations under the Washington State Department of Agriculture.

5) A non-food classification of farmed fish during certain life cycles to include brood stock fish and their eggs. (1994, Amended 2012)

3.6 – Bees
Bees are an essential part of agriculture in the state of Washington.

We support the research and the creation of a certified laboratory testing facility at Washington State University to help solve and/or help address bee health issues. (2007)

3.7 – Biotechnology
Farm Bureau should facilitate and sponsor education regarding genetic engineering, both pro and con, to its members and the public.

We support:
1) The continued research and development of biotechnology and genetically modified organisms (GMO) while protecting the markets we currently have for non-GMO products. We condemn any act that would destroy the above by any individual or group.
2) Extending to farmers the legal immunity from civil liability for nonconsensual or unintentional cross-pollination between GMO and non-GMO products. (Amended 2013)

3.8 – Central Filing System
We oppose a Central Filing System (CFS) as proposed by the Washington Bankers Association. CFS does nothing for farmers, but it gives the banks another party to go after in case of default: the buyer. The CFS proposal is especially harmful to dairymen and other livestock operators who buy large quantities of farm products from other farmers.

3.9 – Chemical Applicator Insurance
We recommend that insurance companies be encouraged to provide insurance at a reasonable cost to chemical applicators. (1994, Amended 1999)

3.10 – Commission Merchants Act
We support a complete revision of the Washington State Commission Merchants Act to:
1) Provide protection regardless of marketing arrangements (co-signed product to handler, etc.). This protection is to provide for reporting, accounting, and security of product and funds held for the producer.
2) Change the bonding requirements to raise the minimum bonding level. This rate should be variable to ensure the producer of any farm product ample protection for their product being sold.
3) Provide a provision that when requested by a consignor, a commission shall within three business days render to the consignor all records of the ongoing sales of the consignor’s agricultural products showing the amount sold, the selling price, any adjustments, and all other information required by the act.
4) Levy fines against unbonded or fraudulent individuals for at least the same amount as the value of the product that is or has been in their possession. Minimum fines should be held as high as possible. (1994, Amended 2002)

3.11 – Commodity Dealer Bankruptcies
Any farm commodity is the property of the farmer who produced it, and the farmer should continue to be the owner until they are paid in full for said commodity.

If commodities are assigned to an elevator, warehouse, or processor and said receiver declares bankruptcy, the farmer must be “first in line” to receive money for their products. (1997, Amended 1999)

3.12 – Dairy Inspections
We support the ongoing role of the Washington State Department of Agriculture in inspecting Grade A dairy facilities.

We demand the right of Fair Hearing and Administrative Review in order to guarantee “due process” and to protect the right of dairy farmers to fair treatment and justice. (1999, Amended 2011)
3.13 – Dairy Products and Raw Milk
We support:
1) The operational growth of all types of dairies and increased opportunities for the marketing of diverse types of dairy products.
2) The right of states to make their own decisions about the sale and distribution of raw milk.
3) State regulations allowing farmers to produce, bottle, and sell raw and pasteurized fluid Grade A milk and milk products for human consumption in conformity with mandatory Washington State Department of Agriculture inspections, labeling stipulations, and other requirements to reasonably ensure customer safety.
4) Measures to protect farmers from liability if their customers choose to transport their own milk or milk products illegally across state lines. (2013)

3.14 – Federal Grade A Pasteurized Milk Ordinance
We recommend that Federal Law, Section 3 – PERMIT be changed to allow a producer to request a different inspector and review before a degrade can be made for barn sheet violations. A producer should not be subject to a degrade or the threat of degrade if personality problems, unjust, unqualified inspectors are the problem.

Federal Law, Section 6 - EXAMINATION OF MILK allows for specific antibiotic or substance sampling of milk; we request that this section be added to state law. Washington state law does not require specific testing but allows the state and the Dairy Associations to test for antibiotics that are not inclusive disc tests. Those individuals who may not be the farmer are now protected because of the lack of specific antibiotic testing.

We request that a minimum tolerance for dairy products be set to decrease the allowable residues of substances and antibiotics in milk.

We request that candidates for certification to the Washington State Department of Agriculture, the regulatory agency, should be required to:
1) Hold a Bachelor of Science Degree in Dairy Manufacturing or Dairy Production.
2) Have substantial training courses in geology in order to properly evaluate contamination threats to wells, springs and ground supplies.
3) Have specific training in electrical and plumbing evaluations.

We fully support the Washington State Department of Agriculture and the United States Department of Agriculture in banning the sale of filled milk in the United States.

We recommend that a state antibiotic test for milk be the same test for all processors. (1999, Amended 2003)

3.15 – Fruit Quarantine Rules
Established quarantine boundaries must accurately reflect the actual location of apple maggot catches or other quarantinable insects and plant viruses in each county. (2004, Amended 2008)

3.16 – Horse Slaughter
We support:
1) The slaughter of horses in USDA-inspected plants.
2) Allowing the transportation of horses to horse slaughter plants.

3.17 – Industrial Hemp
We support the development of a viable industrial hemp industry in Washington state that complies with state and federal law. (2014)

3.18 – Machinery Identification
We favor a voluntary Farm Bureau program on equipment (farm machinery) identification.

3.19 – Mobile Packing and Processing
We support mobile and permanent packing and processing facilities to meet the demands of the agricultural community. (2015)
3.20 – Open Range Land
We support:
1) The role of the county legislative authority in maintaining range areas authorized in RCW 16.24.010 to apply equally to both private and public lands, including those owned or managed by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife.
2) Requiring real estate developers to erect and maintain all fencing surrounding development properties sold in open range areas.
3) Requiring proponents or developers of rails-to-trails facilities or similar systems to erect and maintain adequate fencing.
We oppose adoption by county government of stock restricted zones in open range areas for real estate developments. (1997, Amended 2014)

3.21 – Paid Diversion - Haying and Grazing
We oppose allowing haying or grazing of any acreage under federal programs for which a grower has received compensation not to grow a crop, except for research purposes. (Amended 2006)

3.22 – Pasteurization of Cider
We oppose the United States Food and Drug Administration forcing all American cider makers to pasteurize their product, without proven scientific evidence, such as could be provided by the National Academy of Science.
Pasteurization changes the unique product, cider, into common apple juice. Implementation of pasteurization will destroy an entire industry, while at the same time still allowing juice from foreign countries to enter the United States without any checks or regulations on health standards. (1998, Amended 1999)

3.23 – Processor and Preparer Liens
We believe:
1) A statutory processor or preparer lien should remain in effect until the amount due is paid or for at least 45 days after the agricultural product is delivered, without the need to file notice of a lien.
2) Hay farmers should have the right to place a lien on the business and personal assets of hay buyers up to 120 days after the hay buyer has taken possession of the crop.
3) Farmers should have the right to file an interstate agricultural lien. (2004, Amended 2013)

3.24 – Rabbit
We ask that rabbit be removed from the poultry classification and be classified as “rabbit.”

3.25 – State Fencing Law
We oppose any fencing regulation that would be detrimental to crops or livestock. (Amended 2011)

3.26 – Sudden Oak Death
We support the scheduled expiration of the state and federal regulations regarding Sudden Oak Death (SOD). Until such time as the regulations expire or are removed, we support plant owners, in terms of SOD reimbursement for plant removal, being not only covered for the value of the plants destroyed, but the plant owners should also be reimbursed for any costs related to the removal of the plant material because of SOD regulations.
The Washington State Department of Agriculture should work in concert with the United States Department of Agriculture as it pertains to the development, implementation, and enforcement of federal regulations impacting the nursery and greenhouse industry, in accordance with the regulatory goals of Section 120 – Regulatory Accountability. (2005)

3.27 – Wineries
We support:
1) Laws amiable to the “wine country” atmosphere.
2) State research in viticulture and enology, and oppose any reduction in research funds, particularly those funds from taxes on the industry specifically imposed for that purpose.
We oppose:
1) Any reduction in research funds, particularly those funds from taxes on the industry specifically imposed for that purpose.
2) The Washington wine tax per gallon. It should be sharply reduced or eliminated. (1994, Amended 2003)
SECTION 4 – EDUCATION

4.1 – Agricultural Education
We support:

1) Providing modern, adequate facilities and equipment using state and local funding when local schools have vocational, technical, and agricultural training courses.

2) A revision to the Revised Code of Washington that would set minimum standards for the employment of teachers of Agricultural Education in secondary schools:
   a) Teachers assigned to vocational, technical, and agricultural training courses should meet preparatory requirements of certification for their assignments.
   b) Any teacher employed in a state-approved Vocational Agriculture and Renewable Natural Resource program must have an extended contract that would provide support for the program outside of the classroom. At a minimum, a full time teacher should have at least 20 days extension to their standard teaching contract to be used for weekend and summer supervision of extended learning programs and student/parent contact, contents and leadership activities. No program should receive vocational funding in excess of normal state funding if this requirement is not met.

3) Local administrators actively working with advisory committees made up of instructors, parents, and students in agriculture curriculum development and program planning.

4) “Agriculture in the Classroom.” It is aimed at developing an understanding of where food and fiber come from and how life-sustaining systems function. It is an educational teaching tool that should be made available to all schools at all levels.

County Farm Bureau members’ participation, cooperation, and funding are encouraged.

5) The distribution of factual, scientifically-based materials about agriculture and agricultural practices for use by teachers in their classroom studies.

6) The continuation of the positions of State Director of Vocational Agricultural Education and State FFA Advisor within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

7) The reinstatement of a two-year agricultural science degree at community colleges and encourage the legislature to fund this needed and important program. (1998, Amended 2015)

4.2 – Agricultural Research/Washington State University
We request that the Washington State University administration maintain the land grant principles upon which the university was founded by continued support of agricultural research and extension.

We support:

1) Providing additional funds for WSU Agricultural Research through the Washington State Department of Agriculture.

2) Making the best use of the available resources by assessment of spending priorities.

3) Recognition by the legislature of the critical role played by the land grant system in maintaining the health, productivity and competitiveness of this state’s largest industry.

4) Adequately funding research and extension programs through the state budget. Agricultural research should be supported at a level consistent with the agricultural industry’s contribution, or potential contribution, to the state’s economy.

5) A WSU Agricultural Research Facility for the Okanogan Highlands. (1994, Amended 2014)

4.3 – Consumer Education
Our goal is to educate people that agriculture is an honorable and productive occupation, and we encourage and promote more participation in agriculture. Those working in agriculture, both employer and employee, should be praised for their positive efforts toward our society.

We support:

1) A statewide agricultural education program aimed at consumers that will help place agriculture in a more favorable light.

2) Individual member involvement in civic and/or political matters compatible with Farm Bureau.

3) Cooperation with all groups and coalitions in their efforts that is compatible with our policy positions. We especially encourage cooperation with other farmer organizations where our interests coincide.

We believe there is a need to improve the farm image and educate the consumer, who is uninformed as to costs of production, standards of quality of products, farm chemical regulations and employment liability, health regulations, and the nature of the family farm. (1995, Amended 2000)

4.4 – Consumer Pesticide Education
We support an education program that informs the American consumer to the advantages of the judicious, reasonable and safe use of pesticides and crop protection materials associated with the production of food products.
We request that the Washington State Department of Agriculture be responsible for establishing and distributing to all licensed pesticide applicators such guidelines and rules as are necessary for the purpose of informing and protecting agriculture employees concerning the use and presence of these materials. (1997, Amended 2001)

4.5 – Educational Philosophy
We support:
1) The right to say the Pledge of Allegiance, as written, at all levels of the Washington state educational system.
2) The responsibility of parents to encourage children to pursue academic achievement and learn moral responsibility.
3) Giving local district school boards authority to set policies, programs, and curricula of local public schools.
4) The current system of elected school boards.
5) Careful scrutiny of the educational system for fiscal responsibility and accountability.
6) A broad basic educational program, which includes academic and vocational training programs that will enable students to continue to advanced levels, thus becoming good citizens, gainfully employed, and leaders in the agricultural community.
7) The rights of parents to choose their children’s education. Home schooling, vouchers for private schools, and charter schools should all be viable options.
8) Weighting the state public school funding formula to aid small school districts in the more sparsely-settled areas of Washington.
9) School boards setting standards for student safety, discipline, and accountability.
10) Discipline in the classroom and the support of parental authority, first and foremost, for the benefit of the student.

We oppose:
1) Transporting students from one area within a school district to another area for ethnic, sociological, or financial reasons.
2) Legislation converting school boards from elected to appointed positions. (1998, Amended 2007)

4.6 – Educational Standards
We support:
1) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in establishing recommended standards of educational level achievements acceptable to local school boards.
2) Including agricultural literacy as an essential academic learning requirements (EALR), especially in the areas of science and social studies, at all grade levels.
3) Use of the English language and recognize that students whose native language is other than English may need assistance for transition to English.
4) A strong commitment to agricultural higher education, including research, extension, and career agricultural opportunities. (1998, Amended 2003)

4.7 – Tourism
We support efforts to promote ag-tourism and ag-education so the public will be aware of the value of agriculture to their lives.

We encourage local and state groups (including government) to support efforts to facilitate and promote on-farm ag-tourism in conjunction with an ongoing farm. (2005)
SECTION 5 – ENERGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

5.1 – Biofuels
We support:
1) The development of alternative energy resources, including agricultural products used for biofuels.
2) Policies that encourage the growth of in-state oilseeds and other feedstocks and that promote in-state processing of biodiesel and other similar biofuels.
3) Maintaining the state renewable fuel requirement that diesel contain at least 2 percent biodiesel as a short-term method for growing the regional biodiesel industry until it is established as a viable, self-sustaining industry.
4) The use of more precise standards for measuring the amount of biofuels distributed in the state.
5) Only biofuels that meet or exceed ASTM fuel standards.
6) Incentive-based approaches that will achieve a greater usage of biofuels in Washington and that will increase the agricultural productivity and profitability of the industry.
7) The lease or sale of all state and federal lands that could be used for the production of oilseed crops.
8) Ongoing research and field trials that will aid in more efficient biofuels and co-products.
9) The marketing and sale of co-products of biofuels that add value to the raw commodity, including safe products for livestock feed.

We oppose:
1) Policies or regulations that interfere with the development of biofuels.
2) Mandating the blending of biofuels that reduce the performance characteristics of petroleum-based fuels. (2011, Amended 2013)

5.2 – Biogas and Anaerobic Digesters
We support:
1) Voluntary efforts to create energy from livestock nutrients.
2) The development of market-based revenue streams derived from livestock nutrients.
3) Simplification of the permitting process that combines livestock nutrients and municipal biosolids.
4) The application of livestock nutrients to the land before and after biogas and/or anaerobic digestion capture the energy. (2011)

5.3 – Biomass
We support:
1) Considering biomass as a renewable form of energy.
2) Efforts to convert biomass to usable sources of energy. (2011)

5.4 – Bonneville Power Administration
We support:
1) Continued ownership of the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) by the federal government.
2) Purchase of BPA by the Pacific Northwest states in the event that the federal government decides to sell BPA.
3) Actions by BPA to make electrical energy available to Washington irrigators at a rate not in excess of that given to out-of-state utilities and industrial consumers during excess water power periods. (1999, Amended 2015)

5.5 – Comprehensive Energy Policy
We support:
1) The use of electricity and other natural resources to promote a better standard of living.
2) A comprehensive federal and state energy policy that promotes reliable, expanded, and inexpensive energy sources, including those that are renewable. All potential energy sources must be economically viable.
3) The development of alternative sources of energy capable of providing an increase to the overall base energy capacity to meet our increasing demands, provided they do not negatively impact existing power generation.
4) Incentives for the production of, and infrastructure associated with, alternative sources of energy.
5) Simplification of any permit or regulatory process associated with production and distribution of energy sources.

We oppose:
1) Connecting energy policy to climate mandates.
2) The use of direct load control programs or devices to regulate or curtail the power use and/or quality delivered to customers. (Amended 2015)
5.6 – Hanford Nuclear Facility
We support responsible, ongoing cleanup efforts at the Hanford Nuclear Facility that will protect surrounding agricultural lands. (1997, Amended 2014)

5.7 – Hydropower
We support:
1) The inclusion of power from existing and future hydropower facilities as a renewable energy source under state law.
2) The use of our inland waterways for efficient and economical power production.

5.8 – Electric Power Infrastructure
We support:
1) The establishment of new utility corridors when doing so is on balance determined to be technically appropriate and cost-effective by electric power professionals.
2) The construction of new transmission lines, power lines, and substations by local public utility districts, electric cooperatives, private power companies, and the Bonneville Power Administration that are required to provide reliable power to rural communities.
   a) Transmission lines should follow existing utility corridors when that is the least expensive and most reliable option.
   b) All new power lines should only use existing rights of way, where possible, by updating and/or sharing rights of way and ownership of transmission facilities between power companies (private or public). County comprehensive land use plans should be followed when private lands are used for power line routing.
   c) Where new or expanded rights of way are necessary, the priorities in order of importance to be followed are:
      1. Use of non-agricultural land.
      2. Use of public lands.
      3. Use of least productive land, if nonagricultural land is unavailable.
      4. Landowner input.

We oppose the use and abuse of environmental laws and regulations to unnecessarily delay and increase the cost of needed electric power infrastructure improvements or to eliminate existing power facilities. (2008, Amended 2009, 2015)

5.9 – Northwest Power and Conservation Council
We support:
1) Agricultural involvement in the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to provide input into its planning process for future power use and fish recovery efforts.
2) More congressional oversight into the activities of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) and specifically to their sub-basin planning efforts.
3) Using NPCC mitigation project funds to develop additional off-stream multi-use storage sites and other facility upgrades throughout the Columbia Basin/Snake River Basins, including but not limited to the Yakima, Walla Walla, Wenatchee, Entiat, Okanogan, and Methow River Basins.
4) An emphasis on local input and control over mitigation projects. (2003, Amended 2011, 2015)

5.10 – Nuclear Power
We support:
1) The use and expansion of nuclear power as a reliable, safe, and renewable energy source.
2) An expanded education program on the benefits of nuclear power.
3) A change in existing legislation to allow spent nuclear fuel used from power generation to be reprocessed.

5.11 – Oil and Natural Gas
We support legislation that encourages exploration and development of oil and natural gas resources within the state. The legislation must also protect the rights of both the owner and operators of the land, as well as the mineral right owners. (1997, Amended 2011)

5.12 – Power Costs
We support:
1) Continuous efforts to raise public awareness of the rapidly rising costs of public power.
2) An intensified effort within the public utility districts to create greater cost efficiency.
3) Full disclosure and transparency of the direct and indirect cost of power for compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

We oppose deregulation of retail electrical services that does not assure agricultural producers and rural consumers the same benefits of lower prices and reliable services that are assured for urban and industrial consumers. (1994, Amended 2011)

5.13 – Telecommunications
We support efforts by the public and private sectors to enhance, promote, and expand technological innovation for agriculture, farmers, and rural residents. This innovation includes infrastructure for telecommunications and high-speed internet access.

If local governments, including public utility districts, opt to install telecommunication infrastructure, such as fiber optic cable, those governments must use separate fund accounting so that electrical ratepayers do not subsidize the telecommunications services. (2004, Amended 2013)

5.14 – Wind and Solar Energy
We support:
1) Wind and solar power as a positive component to augment our overall energy supply.
2) Research and development to achieve ways to make wind and solar power dispatchable and available on demand, since these sources are currently not able to replace baseload facilities
3) The inclusion of wind and solar farms within agricultural or natural resource designations when those facilities are approved to be located on those designated lands. (2004, Amended 2013, 2015)
SECTION 6 – ENVIRONMENT

6.1 – Agricultural Burning
We support:
1) The use of agricultural burning, when needed as a management tool for the production of agricultural crops.
2) Continued research to develop new equipment and practices designed to offer producers practical and economically-viable options to field burning.
3) Burning where no economically viable or practical alternative exists or where soil conservation and water quality could be compromised.
4) Air quality regulations that address particulate reduction rather than acreage reduction.
5) Setting particulate standards based on scientific measurements.
6) Collection of air quality samples before and during agricultural burning to establish background levels of emissions.
   Furthermore, scientific measurement should be used to assess both risk and benefits of given agricultural practices, and the results drawn on to provide valid risk assessment.
7) Continued maintenance of an air monitoring network to ensure science based metering of permitted agricultural burning.
8) Continuation of open burning on private property.
9) Research on the effect of natural carbon from burning on water quality.

We oppose discriminatory enforcement of regulations by the Department of Ecology against any crop or segment of the agricultural industry. (1996, Amended 2013)

6.2 – Climate Change
We believe that climate change is a natural occurrence. Focusing on greenhouse gas emissions, especially carbon, does not address the impacts of natural climate variability, nor does it recognize the fact that carbon dioxide is a key component of agricultural productivity and efforts to provide sufficient food to feed the world and reduce world hunger.

We support:
1) Recognizing agricultural practices as a benefit to the environment.
2) Requiring an economic impact and cost-benefit analysis of all regulations related to climate change prior to adoption or implementation, including but not limited to greenhouse gases and reduced vehicle miles traveled. Such analysis should be conducted by an independent third party.
3) The use of performance audits related to existing climate change programs. Such audits shall include a cost-benefit analysis.

We oppose:
1) The addition of a climate change element to any local planning activity, including but not limited to, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), the Growth Management Act, the Shoreline Management Act, or fish and wildlife management plans.
2) Requiring local governments, either city or county, to consider and mitigate for climate change under SEPA. We oppose any rulemaking by the Washington State Department of Ecology concerning climate change under SEPA.
3) Any efforts to force watershed planning units to address the potential impacts of climate variability.
4) The Kyoto protocol and any future international agreements binding the United States to control greenhouse gases.
5) Participation in the “Western Climate Initiative” or any other climate program.
6) Any “cap and trade” program or carbon tax. (2007, Amended 2013)

6.3 – Climate Change Education
We support efforts to educate the public and influence public policy on issues related to climate change. This effort should challenge the view that human activity that produces “greenhouse gases” affects climate variability to a significant degree. (2008)

6.4 – Conservation Compensation
We believe that agricultural producers or landowners who receive federal government compensation for any conservation practices should not be required to submit to any additional federal restrictions not explicitly stated in the contract of the program in which they have enrolled. (2006)

6.5 – Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
We support expanding the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program to include minor crops such as tree fruit, vine crops, hops, hay, mint, asparagus, potatoes, and vegetables. (2002, Amended 2013)
**6.6 – Conservation Reserve Program**

We support:

1. The original concept of a Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) to improve soil and water resources and, secondarily, to provide wildlife habitat.
2. Negotiated CRP land management plans between the landowner and the local Farm Service Agency (FSA) that include management plans for fire protection and prevention.
3. Voluntary research/pilot programs designed to enhance and promote the environmental stability of CRP lands. Such research could include livestock grazing or prescribed burning. These activities should be performed with the approval of local FSA committees.
4. Changes to the current CRP to ensure it competes fairly with local land rental rates. Compensation should be according to conservation benefits only on the portion of the land that is environmentally sensitive. (2005, Amended 2013)

**6.7 – Endangered Species Act**

We believe:

1. The human need for food, fiber, shelter, and energy must have priority over the protection of species listed as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA).
2. Landowners must be allowed to employ voluntary, incentive-based solutions to species protection in place of land use and regulatory restrictions.
3. The ESA must be amended to require the needs of individuals, especially landowners and their constitutionally protected property rights, to receive the same level of protection as a candidate or listed species under the ESA.

We support making the following changes to the ESA:

1. Clarify listing procedures and requirements.
   a) Decisions to list species must be based on sound, peer-reviewed, scientific research.
   b) To be listed, “species” must actually be threatened or endangered and must not be “sub-species,” “distinct populations,” or “evolutionarily significant units.” The statutory definition of “species” in the ESA should be changed to a taxonomic species definition recognized by the scientific community.
   c) Specific protections for species that are listed as threatened should be less onerous than for species listed as endangered, as Congress originally intended.
   d) Base listings on the actual threat of extinction, not on the loss of historical habitat.
   e) Provide a landowner who operates in compliance with agreements such as a Habitat Conservation Plan, Candidate Conservation Agreement, or Safe Harbor Agreement who otherwise provides habitat for threatened or endangered species with an incidental take permit or other legal protection that provides the landowner with absolute assurance that he or she will not be found in violation of the ESA or other federal environmental laws.
   f) The burden of proof for listing species as endangered should be on the petitioner or the U.S. Department of the Interior.
   g) Any agency, organization, or person proposing an animal or plant be listed under the ESA should be required to post a bond for damages incurred if the species are subsequently found not to be threatened or endangered.
   h) Any agency, organization, or person proposing the listing of any species or requesting a critical habitat designation should:
      1. Provide and fund an environmental impact study of the proposed action.
      2. Provide and fund an economic impact study of all actions taken under the ESA that must include locally relevant data, current conditions, and projected trends with meaningful participation of local government.
      3. Conduct DNA analysis on the proposed species to be listed to ensure it is qualified as a unique, genetically pure species.
   i) Scientific data supporting the listing of a species shall receive wide dissemination to landowners and private organizations representing the rights of their landowners.
   j) The secretaries of the U.S. departments of the Interior and Commerce must not list species or subspecies on a geographical basis if they are abundant in other areas.

2. Minimize impacts to agriculture.
   a) The ESA must not encroach on economic agricultural or silvicultural practices.
   b) The federal government should be strictly liable for any and all injuries or damages to persons or property caused by or in any way arising out of the relocation or reestablishment of listed species, especially carnivores, such as wolves and bears.
   c) A landowner must be allowed to kill or remove a listed species if the species is causing damage to his or her private property and if payment of full market value compensation by the federal government is not allowed.
   d) Full market value compensation must be provided for financial losses and for taking of private property or private property rights if those losses are substantiated due to critical habitat designations.
e) Implementation of the ESA should be done in a manner that is consistent with state water rights systems allocating water within states. Therefore, we oppose any reallocating of water from agriculture under the ESA. If water rights or contractual rights to use water are taken by federal or non-federal projects as part of a recovery plan for a listed species, then full market value compensation must be made promptly by the appropriate government entity.

3) Establish clear recovery goals and monitoring requirements.
   a) Federal agencies must set realistic goals for recovery that are based on sound, peer-reviewed science. Recovery reviews should be completed on a timely basis, and species must be delisted once the goals are met.
   b) A monitoring program with a specific set of measurable criteria for each listed species must be developed and implemented.
      1. All requests for funding on a habitat project must have a monitoring component, monitoring cost element, and the length of time the monitoring is to occur. The monitoring criteria should be set by an oversight board made up of an equal number of individuals from the public and private sectors. Public positions may be made up of agency or university personnel. The private sector positions must include at least one person in production agriculture, family forestry, and private property owner at large.
      2. All monitoring must be done by a third party that is not the entity that has implemented the recovery plan, has received funding to implement a specific portion of the recovery plan, or has implemented a habitat project related to the recovery plan or project.
      3. Harvest of potentially threatened or endangered species, including subsistence and ceremonial uses, must be monitored using verifiable techniques.
   c) A designated critical habitat area must be officially undesignated when the listed species the designation was designed to protect has not been sighted for five years.
   d) Ongoing, independent audits should be conducted to measure the success of recovery programs for listed species.

We support:
1) The right of landowners to protect themselves, their families, livestock, and properties from all predators listed in the ESA.
2) Requiring efforts to restore listed species, including habitat restoration, to be implemented first on publicly-owned lands before mandated on private land.
4) Equally applying land-use restrictions and regulations in both urban and rural Washington for the protection of salmon or any other listed species.
5) Consistently applying uniform penalties for actions that endanger listed species.
6) The captive propagation of federal and state listed species by farmers to support a healthy ecosystem, mitigate the impacts that these species present to our natural resources industry, and provide an environmentally beneficial agricultural product. We encourage the development of viable rules for the safe propagation and reintroduction of these species.
   (1993, Amended 2013)

6.8 – Endangered Species Act Implementation

We support:
1) The federal delisting of the following species based on the evidence that they have made a significant recovery since originally being listed:
   a) Steelhead in the Columbia River system and its tributaries. A petition for review of the steelhead listing for the Columbia River has been accepted by NOAA Fisheries.
   b) Grizzly bear.
   c) Gray wolf.
2) A federal audit of the caribou recovery program in the Selkirk Mountains.

We oppose:
1) Relocating Caspian Terns to any county when such relocation may cause a decline in endangered or threatened species populations.
2) Listing the Dusky Goose because its habitat in Alaska was damaged not by man but by natural forces in the 1964 earthquake.
3) Imposing label restrictions on essential agricultural pesticides for the protection of listed species when such restrictions will jeopardize agricultural production.
4) Providing federal agency staff with the discretion to:
   a) Dictate who will comply with ESA requirements and who will not.
   b) Treat public and private holdings differently. (2013)
6.9 – Environmental Enforcement Action
When a state agency or local government claims a threat to the environment, it should concentrate its financial resources on additional research to help solve the alleged problem rather than enforcing sanctions against the accused. (2004, Amended 2007)

6.10 – Environmental Projects
We oppose:
1) Funding the implementation of the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project.
2) Including private farmland in any planning efforts without notifying the landowners that their land is being considered for inclusion in the project. (2014, Amended 2015)

6.11 – Fish Recovery
We support:
1) A local approach to achieving sustainable fish stocks in Washington and the Pacific Northwest.
2) A plan of action that, in order to be effectively implemented, is socially, scientifically, and economically verifiable and is based on appropriate, peer-reviewed science.
3) A plan that is intended to protect fish habitat and is sensitive to management practices initiated by irrigated agriculture.
4) Consideration given to the effects of proposed rules and policies on stakeholders and human populations in the affected area.
5) Cost-effective plan implementation, which is essential to obtaining long-term positive results.
6) Participation at the local level planning process.
7) The inclusion of genetically equal species, including hatchery-reared fish, for the purpose of recovery counts.
8) The option of a moratorium on commercial, sport, and tribal fishing for a scientifically determined period.
9) Adequate monitoring and evaluation to ensure that measurable fish benefits are verified.
10) A plan that takes into account fish predation and addresses it effectively.
11) Consideration of changing inland climate and ocean conditions, as well as direct habitat measures taken to improve fish runs, when making assessments of returning adult fish.
12) The equitable distribution of incidental-take allowance among all affected parties, including, but not limited to, tribal treaty interests, commercial and sport fishing interests, water users, landowners, and federal agencies. This stipulation should apply whether or not a listed species is subject to commercial, sport, or tribal harvest.
13) Requiring the state to pay all maintenance and operation costs of a fish screen when a holder of water right or claim is required by the state to install a fish screen for a diversion. The state shall be required to provide all water necessary to operate these facilities.

We oppose:
1) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries no-net-loss water policy and flow targets (National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion) as a flawed water resource management program, which illegitimately challenges state water law, lacks technical merit, and creates unnecessary economic costs to the region.
2) Classification of seasonal and/or intermittent streams and irrigation and drainage systems as fish-bearing streams. (2000, Amended 2013)

6.12 – Invasive Species
We support:
1) A policy that ensures that agricultural crops are not nominated or declared “invasive” unless:
   a) The plant has been declared a noxious weed by a local county noxious weed board in accordance with established rules.
   b) The plant has been declared a noxious weed by the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board in an open and public rulemaking process with the full consideration of its economic impact on agricultural operators.
2) The implementation of county programs to remove non-native plants only from affected areas within those jurisdictions. (2004, Amended 2005)

6.13 – Littering
We support stronger enforcement of anti-littering laws to prevent contamination of agricultural property. (2003)

6.14 – Noxious and Aquatic Weed Control
We support:
1) Legislation that will provide for a long-term, well-funded noxious and aquatic weed control program, public educational programs regarding noxious and aquatic weeds, and a biological weed control program.
2) Policies that ensure that agricultural crops cannot be declared “noxious weeds” just because they are non-native or because their population has not been managed effectively.

3) Measures to ensure that managers of public and private lands control noxious and aquatic weeds and pests in the same manner expected of farmers.

4) Legislation that will prohibit any agency, board, or commission from acquiring title to property whether by purchase, condemnation, or gifting, without first having in place a comprehensive noxious and/or aquatic weed control program that specifically complies with both state and county noxious weed board regulations.

5) Changes to the weed control law to give credence to economic feasibility and accessibility when considering the enforcement of the law on non-cultivated land.

6) Amending RCW 17.10 to give county commissioners the option to appoint qualified at-large members to county noxious weed control boards if there are not sufficient qualified persons in the respective districts. These appointments should not exceed two board members from a single district. (Amended 1994)

6.15 – Nutrient Management
We believe nutrient management regulations should incorporate:

1) Technical assistance.
2) Producers registration options.
3) Inspection options.
4) An enforcement strategy that promotes cooperative correction of minor, unintended incidents.
5) Penalties for repeat violations.
6) Practices that are equally applied to all nutrient sources in the area being regulated.
7) Scientific justification identifying all sources of DNA and how much each source contributes. The costs of sampling and testing should be borne by the regulatory body requiring the management practices.
8) A method of first addressing nutrient volumes from wildlife and other sources.
9) The requirement that wildlife feeding operations meet the same standards as private individuals and producers.

We oppose the issuance of fines based on nutrient management regulations that do not incorporate the preceding standards. (Amended 2012)

6.16 – Pollution
Agriculture should be fairly represented on any pollution control activity. (1997, Amended 1999)

6.17 – Septic Inspections
We oppose government mandates on the maintenance of private septic tanks, specifically yearly inspections and tri-yearly gravity flow tank inspections, when tanks are new and/or operating properly. (2007)

6.18 – Soil Conservation and Highly Erodible Land
We believe:

1) Soil management is far more effective than residue management.
2) Locally developed conservation practices are the best tools available to successfully protect our soil and water.

We support:

1) Federal conservation programs with technical advisers and services being offered by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and Farm Service Agency.
2) The use of economical local conservation practices to develop conservation plans
3) Congressional consideration of farmer input in its reevaluation of the rules for designating land as Highly Erodible Land.
4) Giving local conservation districts more flexibility in determining the specific practices that will be most effective in controlling erosion.
5) Additional authority for local conservation district boards to resolve issues locally rather than at a state or national level.
6) Acknowledgment in NRCS assisted conservation plans that a well-established fall seeded crop is our most effective means of controlling soil erosion.
7) NRCS recognizing plant growth on slopes as a supporting practice in treatment for concentrated flow areas.
8) Requiring weather conditions for the previous two years to be considered in setting guidelines for residue requirements.
9) Reclassification of land as Non-Highly Erodible Land when an acceptable economical farm conservation plan is developed and implemented.
10) Using local conservation practices as a monitoring criterion when conducting spot checks by NRCS to check or enforce compliance of a farmer’s conservation contract.
11) Cost-sharing with landowners for drainage, river control, and other soil conservation measures should be handled by and through NRCS and the Farm Service Agency.

12) Basing county and state requirements for conservation practices primarily on the improvements to a particular parcel of ground rather than upon arbitrary standards or results for any or all parcels of ground to which a certain conservation practice might be applied.

13) NRCS remaining an agency to provide technical assistance and education and not acting as an enforcement agency. However, policies developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service must be binding on all appropriate enforcement agencies.

14) State and federal governments eliminating their requirement for archaeological surveys in order to qualify landowners for cost-sharing on conservation programs.

15) Transferring jurisdiction over stream bank management programs in agricultural areas to the conservation districts rather than the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. (1995, Amended 2015)

6.19 – Solid Waste
We support:

1) Treating imported solid waste to eliminate the potential threat caused by the introduction of new insects and diseases or by creating an incubation environment for existing pests.

2) Legislation redefining solid waste and associated rules to protect human health and the environment while encouraging the beneficial recovery of valuable resources.

3) The application of biosolids on agricultural lands provided that the application follows acceptable rates to meet but not exceed the nutrient requirements of the crop.

We oppose classifying agricultural residue as solid waste and it should not be regulated as such. Agricultural crop residues are considered organic material, and many best management practices promote their use as desirable soil conditioners and amendments. (1997, Amended 2013)

6.20 – Total Maximum Daily Load
We recommend that Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) responsibility begin with the Washington State Department of Ecology based upon the water quality minimum guidelines developed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. TMDLs must be based on credible data, and implementation actions should follow the guidelines in Washington Farm Bureau policy entitled, “Regulatory Accountability.”

Water quality may be significantly impacted by the presence of wildlife, and such impacts must be included in all TMDLs and other water quality processes and plans. Failure to include wildlife impacts in such processes and plans will unfairly penalize agricultural, forestry, and other rural landowners. (Amended 2010)

6.21 – Water Quality
We support:

1) The development and implementation of reasonable water quality standards.

2) The right of states to develop and to maintain Section 208 plans of the Clean Water Act that are voluntary with relation to individual farmer participation.

3) Financial aid for agricultural pollution control equal to municipal pollution control.

4) Availability of long-term, low-interest loans.

5) We favor a program where the Extension Service provides educational information, the Conservation District and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) provides technical assistance, and government cost-share assistance is administered by the Farm Service Agency or conservation district office in each county.

6) Federal funding to aid and encourage farmers to implement local conservation practices to be made available through the Farm Service Agency on a cost-share basis between the landowner and the federal government, with the government’s share being 75 percent or more.

7) An exemption for agriculture from non-point water quality regulations because of the impossibility of determining non-point source pollution from land cultivation and utilization practices.

8) Changes in regulations for all aquaculture activities that would prohibit closures based solely on increasing water coliform counts without correlation in counts in harvested meats.

9) A comprehensive educational program that would include public meetings, printed information, news releases, etc., dealing with the causes of non-point pollution, the resulting problems for aquaculture, and possible alternatives for controlling the problem.
We oppose:
1) Standards that cannot be met under natural or background conditions.
2) Damages being attributed to a landowner who has applied all crop production inputs by recognized or labeled methods.
3) Considering off-stream livestock watering a point source pollutant or nutrient.
4) The removal of the word “navigable” from the Clean Water Act.
5) The establishment of another bureaucracy with mandatory requirements to carry out the Water Quality Goals of Section 208.
6) Any standard or guideline whereby non-point source pollution is held to a higher standard, or regulated and held accountable to a higher standard, than point source pollution. (1997, Amended 2015)

6.22 – Water Typing
We support revision of the state water typing system to consider site-specific validation and historic experience.

We oppose:
1) Labeling or classifying streams as fish-bearing or potentially fish-bearing by model-based water typing or well-meaning “expertise” alone.
2) Classifying a fish-bearing stream as habitat for a species of fish if that species has not inhabited it in the past.
3) Designating critical habitat for anadromous fish at the endangerment of native fresh-water fish, mussels, or salamanders.
4) Any restrictive rules targeted for “Desired Future Conditions” that are biologically excessive, practically unattainable, or financially unacceptable. (2005, Amended 2011)

6.23 – Wetlands
We believe:
1) Prior converted wetlands should be exempt from being regulated as jurisdictional wetlands.
2) The use of privately owned wetlands and their designated buffers should not be restricted by law or regulation without just compensation based on fair market value paid to the landowner.
3) Any agency of government that proposes to impose a land use restriction upon a landowner should be required to provide the landowner with a Takings Implications Assessment.
4) The delineation manual should be subjected to public review and comments.
5) Wetlands should be defined as a naturally-occurring area of predominantly hydric soils that presently support a preponderance of hydrophytic vegetation. Supporting definitions should be:
   a) “Hydric soils” are soils that are consistently in time wet enough to maintain an anaerobic condition that supports primarily hydrophytic vegetation.
   b) “Hydrophytic vegetation” means plants that grow in water or in soils made deficient in oxygen due to excessive water content.
6) Wetlands should be classified as to their relative value to the environment. The classification system must reflect regional differences and values. Mitigation for wetland use, as well as penalties for wetland destruction, should bear some reasonable relationship to the environmental value of the wetland. Wetlands banking, wetlands enhancement, and compensatory mitigation should be given equal consideration in developing a mitigation program.
7) Compatible economic uses of wetlands, such as timber harvesting and production of native crops, should be encouraged rather than impeded.
8) Any easements on wetlands offered by the federal or state government through a Wetland Reserve Program or other program should be limited to a maximum of 10 years. Placements of easements on foreclosed Farmers Home Administration/Farm Service Agency properties or other property that temporarily passes through government hands should be eliminated.
9) Wetland determinations by any agency of government that are challenged by the landowner should automatically be reviewed by a committee of local citizens, similar to the Farm Service Agency county committee.
10) Agricultural wetland protection should be addressed only through the Conservation Title of the Food Security Act, enforced by the USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service/Farm Service Agency.
11) Non-agricultural wetland protection should be enforced by a single agency of the federal government that is required to coordinate its permitting process with state and local government.
12) Wet areas that are man-induced, such as farm ponds, irrigation induced wet spots, irrigation facilities, aquaculture, etc., should not be considered or classified wetlands. Also, beaver ponds and areas flooded due to naturally-caused logjams or man-made obstructions should not be considered jurisdictional wetlands.
13) The United States Fish and Wildlife Service should be prohibited from purchasing drained farmland.
14) Legislation should be enacted to force all federal and state agencies to cooperatively develop and use the wetlands map to enable consistent management.
15) Regional control to develop standards on elements such as rating systems, buffer zones, and mitigation requirements, within an overall wetlands program, should be allowed.

16) If wetlands are purchased by federal/state/private agencies, it will be the responsibility of the agencies to manage the land in an appropriate manner such that noxious weeds and wildlife do not cause damage to agricultural lands in the surrounding area. (1993, Amended 1999)
SECTION 7 – FISCAL POLICY

7.1 – Business and Occupation Tax
We oppose:
1) The Business and Occupation (B&O) tax.
2) Applying the B&O tax to any agriculture-related business transactions other than the final sale of a product.

We support:
1) Repealing the B&O tax.
2) Maintaining all existing agriculture-related tax exemptions until the B&O tax is repealed. (1992, Amended 2015)

7.2 – College of Agriculture Budget
We believe that proceeds from the sales of property given to and/or developed for a department within the College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences or the College of Veterinary Medicine, such as the department of Animal Sciences, should be deposited in the Capital Endowment Fund and be used only by those departments.

We oppose budget cuts to Washington State University’s College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences that affects the Extension Service and the 4-H program. (1997, Amended 2004)

7.3 – Death Taxes
We oppose any form of taxation that strikes due to the death of the individual. These taxes include, but are not limited to:
1) The federal estate tax.
2) State inheritance and estate taxes.
3) Any federal income tax that may occur due to the individual’s death.
4) Any excise tax that may be assessed due to the occurrence of death.

We support:
1) The continuation of “step-up in basis” of assets for income tax purposes.
2) Tying the Washington Estate and Transfer Tax exemption equivalent to the federal estate tax exemption equivalent until death taxes are repealed in full. (2001, Amended 2002)

7.4 – Dedicated Funds
We oppose the transfer of dedicated funds and interest to the state general fund or the transfer of dedicated funds and interest to departmental administrative functions. (1995)

7.5 – Farm Building Taxation
We support taxing farm-related buildings and improvements at current use value, rather than replacement value. (1994, Amended 2001)

7.6 – Federal Funding
The federal government should not withhold funds or threaten reprisals in an effort to force state governments to take legislative or administrative actions not acceptable to the states. (1997, Amended 2011)

7.7 – Capital Gains Tax
We support a federal capital gains tax exemption on the sale of existing farm or ranch land to another farmer or rancher. The exemption would be 100 percent if the sale is to a first-time farmer or rancher. The exemption would be 75 percent if the sale is to an existing producer. A first-time farmer is an individual who may have experience in farming or ranching but who has not purchased or inherited more than 10 percent of the county average farm or ranch size. An existing producer is an individual whose primary income is derived from agricultural production.

We oppose a state capital gains tax. (2015)

7.8 – Funding of Fairs
We believe the legislature should provide permanent funding for community, county, regional, and youth fairs. (1999, Amended 2000)
7.9 – “Open” Open Space
We believe that the continued removal of taxable properties from a county’s taxable land base by nature conservancies, conservation and enhancement groups, and tribes has a detrimental effect on the fiscal solvency of a county. Removal of these lands from taxation shifts the burden to remaining taxable lands.

We support:
1) Subjecting notice of an application for “open” open space classification to the same notification processes required by all Growth Management Act land use applications.
2) Acting on applications for “open” open space classification only once a year in conjunction with the annual comprehensive plan update.
3) Requiring applicants to enter into a legal agreement with the county noting how they will refrain from using county services on these lands.
4) Requiring counties to develop and implement a specific plan indicating how it will offset the removal of property from the taxable land base without impacting the remaining tax base.
5) Allowing no deferment for interest, penalties, and back taxes when the classification is removed. (2006)

7.10 – Open Space Taxation
We support:
1) Uniform statewide administration of the Open Space Taxation Act by Washington State Department of Revenue and county assessors.
2) Automatic inclusion in the program when an applicant meets the eligibility requirements.
3) The broadest use of the definition of agriculture in determining the eligibility for open space taxation including, but not limited to, such activities as feeding or boarding livestock, including horses and the growing of containerized nursery stock.
4) The ability to withdraw land from the program without a two-year notification period, provided the 10-year initial term has been satisfied, without a penalty being added to the back taxes and interest.
5) Extending the current law applying to participants entering the program prior to 1991 to all participants regardless of when the land was entered into the program or how long the land has been in the program. This law states that “no additional tax, interest or penalty shall be imposed if the removal of classification resulted from the sale or transfer of land within two years after the death of an owner of at least fifty percent interest in the land.”
6) Including the evaluation procedures used in setting the open space tax rate whenever that rate is appealed to the Board of Equalization.

We oppose:
1) Any attempt to dilute the current use provision of present law.
2) The use of a single income requirement for all lands in the state, regardless of the productive capacity of the land. Instead, income requirements should be tied to the determination of the current use value as established by the county advisory committee.
3) Special improvement assessments that create burdensome assessments contrary to the agricultural and timber classifications.
4) The practice of assessors setting the house and homestead outside of the open space contracts as the home site is an integral part of that production unit and should be valued at the same rate.
5) Being required to pay back taxes, interest, or penalties when an assessor determines land in the program that no longer qualifies due to size. (1995, Amended 2017)

7.11 – Property Tax
Because of the rapid rise in property tax valuations in the state of Washington, we support:
1) A fair market property tax valuation base in each county to be frozen for all existing real property.
2) Real property assessed values should be allowed to increase or decline (to reflect a decline in value) a maximum of 1 percent annually, plus a fair market value for improvements that may have been added.
3) The levy limit should be no more than 100 percent.
4) Permit revaluation on change of ownership of property.
5) Agricultural land be assessed and valued for agriculture, not for potential development.
6) Assessing land on which energy-producing wind machines are located at the same rate as surrounding land, as if no wind machines were present.
7) The ability of any county to exempt farm machinery and equipment from any personal property tax that the county is due to receive. (1997, Amended 2013)
7.12 – Personal Property Tax
We support:
1) Repeal of the personal property tax for all farmers, ranchers, and agricultural-related business. Until such repeal:
   a) Personal property tax should be removed from supplies, tools, and off-highway fuels.
   b) The Washington State Department of Revenue should change the personal property valuation indicator to a more realistic percentage, reflecting the depreciated value and useful life of equipment.
   c) Wind machines should be assessed as personal property, which, in agricultural use, may qualify for a farm machinery exemption.
2) Legislation to prevent the Washington State Department of Revenue from circumventing the appeals process.
We oppose taxation of exempt production units of food and fiber. (1995, Amended 2013)

7.13 – Real Estate Excise Tax
We support:
1) A Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) exemption on agricultural lands sold to active agricultural producers.
2) The exemption from the REET of an exchange of Washington “open space” real property for replacement Washington “open space” real property, to the extent gain is deferred under IRC 1031.
3) The exemption from the REET of transfers of ownership, including transfers of controlling interests in entities, to descendants and ancestors. (2008)

7.14 – Sales and Use Tax on Agricultural Supplies
We support the exemption from state sales and use tax on farm and agricultural supplies, off-highway fuels, and equipment that are used in agricultural production. This includes farmer-to-farmer sales. The continued qualification for exemption from the use tax of equipment and other assets acquired under a sales and use tax exemption statute must be tested as if the repealed or expired statute continued to be in existence. (1995, Amended 2006)

7.15 – Sales Tax on Custom Meat Processing
We oppose the collection of sales tax on the custom processing of meat.

7.16 – State Spending
We believe competition encourages efficiency. Wherever possible, tasks should be performed by private industry through competitive bidding rather than by government.

We support moderation in government spending combined with fiscal responsibility in limiting government spending to available revenues, without tax and fee increases.

We oppose government spending justified as a means of providing “economic stimulus.” (2007, Amended 2008)

7.17 – Storm Water Fees
We oppose the act of governments, including state and county, assessing storm water fees on agricultural land, including grazing lands. We oppose any tax and/or utility charge for surface water or impervious surface water on agricultural farmlands.
(Amended 2007)

7.18 – Tax Reform
We support:
1) Limiting the state sales tax to 5 percent and all other taxes and user fees to current levels.
2) Limiting the budget and our tax rates and bases as follows:
   a) Limit the budget to 98 percent of projected revenues as defined by the November projections of the Economic Forecast Council in even calendar years, as determined under existing tax law, or to that percentage of the average growth of gross personal income over the past three biennia, whichever is lower.
   b) Further surpluses should go toward reducing the next biennial taxes.
   c) Any emergency exceptions must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote of both Houses.
3) The original intent of Initiative 601 as a valuable tool to limit the growth of government.
4) The reinstatement of the supermajority necessary to pass school bonds and levies.
5) Evaluation of state user fees and regulations before implementation to assess their effect on the agricultural industry and consumers. The state’s tax law and regulatory structure should not place Washington agriculture at a competitive disadvantage.
6) Inclusion of a clause in all spending legislation stating that if a section of a bill with money attached is vetoed or not used for the intended purpose, the money will automatically return to the Treasury or General Fund.
We oppose:

1) A state income tax.
2) Any proposed tax system that results in a net gain of taxes collected and places a disproportionate burden on agriculture.
3) Any tax system that penalizes taxpayers whose income fluctuates greatly from one year to the next. Provisions for loss carry-backs and carry-overs must be available.
4) The state withholding funds to force adoption or development of certain laws or regulations against the will of a local government.
5) The deduction from the state apportionment allocation by the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of federal forest fund contributions to help finance schools.
6) The creation of any new or increased fees or taxes to fund Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife or Washington Department of Natural Resources. (1995, Amended 2013)

7.19 — Taxation of Irrigation Water
We strongly oppose the taxation of irrigation water that is appurtenant to the land and is already being taxed as part of the value of the land. (1997)

7.20 — Taxation of Raw Product Income
We oppose any tax on raw products such as oil, gas, mineral potential, crops, farm and forest products, except the forest severance tax. (1995, Amended 1996)

7.21 — Taxing Districts
We support the state constitutional limit of local tax to 10 mils except for special levies, for a specific purpose, for a specific amount, and for a specific time. We believe that counties, as required by law, must use the yearly limit increase in taxes as a lid, instead of a base, and should cease crowding junior taxing districts out of the 10-mil base. (1995, Amended 1997)

7.22 — Toxic Chemical Mitigation Fees
We oppose the Washington State Department of Ecology's ability to charge toxic chemical mitigation fees based on an agricultural or forestry producer's potential to pollute. (2013)

7.23 — Tribal Taxation
We support tribal governments paying tax on tribal lands outside reservation boundaries.

We oppose taxation by tribal governments of non-enrolled people or businesses within reservation boundaries. (1997, Amended 2008)
SECTION 8 – FORESTRY AND PUBLIC LANDS

8.1 – Agenda 21
We oppose the United Nations Agenda 21 and the ratification or implementation of any or all of its components, such as the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives and sustainable development. (2012, Amended 2013)

8.2 – Convention on Biological Diversity
We oppose:
1) Ratification by the United States Senate of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Treaty DOC 103-20), which says the United States “... shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures ...” to facilitate the transfer of technology to the governments and private sector of “developing” countries, without knowing what technology is to be transferred or how the owners are to be compensated.
2) Any action by the Senate committing the United States to provide “... new and additional financial resources ...” to developing countries as required by Article 21, without knowing how much, how often, and to which countries.
3) Executive Order 12852, which creates the President’s Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) and which represents an extremist view that overlays all other environmental planning.
4) The PCSD and all further work by the PCSD.

We support a congressional hearing on the PCSD and ultimate repeal of Executive Order 12852. (1996, Amended 2011)

8.3 – Cross-Jurisdictional Governance and Ecosystem Initiatives
We oppose the creation and funding of cross-jurisdictional organizations or governments created for ecosystem management, such as:
1) The Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP).
2) The Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative (Y2Y).
3) The Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act.
4) Metropolitan park districts or similar vehicles used to create ecosystem management areas such as the North Cascades Corridor Project.
5) The transfer by deed or lease of any United States land for controlled use as a park (e.g. United Nations Park, International Peace Park, Biosphere Reserves) by any foreign government or the United Nations. (Amended 2015)

8.4 – Federal and Regional Control of Rivers
We oppose:
1) Any federal control of local and regional planning within the Columbia River Gorge because it poses serious impacts to both the economy of the Gorge communities and to our regional economy, as a whole. We believe it is a federal preemption of local and regional initiative, which is as yet unwarranted.
2) Any legislative effort that will expand the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act or the Washington State Scenic Rivers Act.
3) The American Heritage Rivers Initiative because it gives the federal government additional control over our rivers and the waters that feed these river systems, further diminishing the private property and water rights of Washington residents. (1997, Amended 2013)

8.5 – Fire Advisory Committee
We support the creation of a committee appointed by the legislature to review and advise state agencies involved in firefighting to ensure a secure and effective fire suppression response for the state. The committee should include landowners and managers, as well as representatives of state and local agencies with fire control responsibilities. (2005, Amended 2008)

8.6 – Fire Suppression on Wildlands
We believe it is critical that when the state engages in wildland fire suppression efforts, local representation be included in all unified commands to ensure that local knowledge and expertise is woven into the command strategy. (2008)

8.7 – Forest Health
We support:
1) A full range of management tools to address unprecedented fuel loads and widespread disease and insect infestation in order to avoid forest health issues that lead to catastrophic fires, unhealthy forests, impacts from spreading to private forest land, and threats to homes and lives.
2) Voluntary, incentive-based programs as a tool for private forest landowners.
3) Open roads throughout our national and state forests to provide access for maintenance and emergency response to
ensure the health of forests and to protect the health and welfare of the people.
4) Timber harvest and thinning to reduce fuel loads and address disease and insect infestation.
5) Prescribed fires limited to those areas where no other tool is appropriate and there is low-risk. Prescribed fires should not replace other tools such as harvest, thinning, and biological management of ladder fuels.
6) Prioritized forest management on federal and state lands where the majority of forest health issues exist.

We oppose:
1) Forest health enforcement against private forest landowners.
2) Continuation of forest practices on state and federal lands that create unhealthy forest conditions. (2006, Amended 2012, 2015)

8.8 – Implementing Fire Control Practices
We support giving owners and operators of agricultural lands regulatory flexibility to implement wildfire prevention and suppression practices that include, but are not limited to, the use of prescribed burning, logging, thinning, and grazing. Implementing these practices helps to maintain healthy forests and grasslands and to minimize forest fires. (2012)

8.9 – Private Ownership of Land
We support and promote private ownership of the land of the United States. To maintain a no-net-gain policy of government lands, we support:
1) Local, state, federal, or ratepayer lands being sold into private ownership within Washington state. Such sales should be available to adjacent private property owner’s requests or homestead situations.
2) Tax foreclosures on surplus lands being sold to private ownership or held until it can be sold to private ownership.
3) Legislation that will compensate affected counties for lost economic productivity as a result of government acquisition of private property. We believe an in lieu fee equivalent to the standard tax base should be paid on the acquired land. These in lieu dollars should be distributed proportionally to all taxing districts.

We oppose:
1) Any legislation or grants that increase the total acreage of land under permanent government control, ownership, or conservation easement using federal, state, local government, or ratepayer funds with the exception of school structures or emergency services.
2) The appropriation of funds by the legislature for the purchase of more land by state agencies. Lease programs with specific durations are not considered to be permanent control. (1999, Amended 2013)

8.10 – Road Closures
We oppose any effort by the federal, state, or county government to intentionally restrict access to forestlands by selectively closing access roads. We believe public roads constructed with taxpayer funds should not be closed. If there is a shortage of funds to maintain these roads, the roads should be allowed to naturalize without intervention. (2003)

8.11 – Small and Non-Industrial Forest Landowners
We support all opportunities to lessen the regulatory burden on small and non-industrial forest landowners. Those opportunities may include, but are not limited to:
1) Reduction of Forest Practice regulations, particularly stream typing.
2) Reduction of stream buffers.
3) Exemption from Forest and Fish legislation.
4) Exemption from the Forest Practices Act.

8.12 – Wilderness Areas
We support:
1) Keeping wilderness areas to a minimum.
2) Approval by local and state governments as necessary for wilderness designation.
3) Managing all wilderness classified areas in the same manner as all United States Forest Service land regarding fire control.

We oppose:
1) Sacrificing productive agriculture and forestry lands to wilderness encroachment.
2) Efforts such as Wild Olympics because they are designed to expand wild areas by taking private lands and such efforts will necessarily preclude private activities and public access. (Amended 201, 2015)
8.13 – Wildfire Suppression
We support the rights of private landowners to use fire suppression methods on adjacent public lands when necessary to defend their private lands. (2014)

8.14 – Wildlife Refuges
We support:
1) The management of wildlife refuges and similar public lands for multiple uses. Grazing, horseback riding, snowmobiling, camping, berry picking, and timber harvesting can be compatible to good wildlife management in wildlife refuges.
2) The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service continuing to honor multiple use in wildlife refuges.
3) The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service following all applicable federal laws and presidential orders that support local government and local citizen involvement in management planning and/or the execution of management plans. (2001, Amended 2005)
SECTION 9 – GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

9.1 – Artificial Intelligence
We oppose the implementation of any artificial intelligence that impacts or compromises constitutionally protected individual rights and liberties or those that compromise national or industrial security and their autonomy. (2017)

9.2 – Best Available Science
We believe public policy must be informed by sound science that relies on the traditional scientific method and is based on data, hypotheses, and observations that are verifiable, reproducible, and subject to independent peer review.

We oppose:
1) The use of science that claims to be “Best Available Science” when it is in fact biased, arbitrary, wishful, or imaginary in nature.
2) The use of public resources for the development or enforcement of any legislation, policy, or rule that is not supported by sound science. (2005, Amended 2015)

9.3 – Bill Riders
We favor enactment of federal legislation that will prohibit attachment of a “rider” to a bill unless it deals directly with the original subject. (1997, Amended 2000)

9.4 – Campaign Contributions
We recommend that the law that prohibits campaign contributions or limits such contributions by corporations and other non-union entities be also extended to labor unions in both the private and public sectors.

We believe that labor unions should be governed by the same principles as non-union entities. This should prohibit mandatory dues from being used for partisan activity. (1996)

9.5 – Census and Survey Data Collection
We believe:
1) Government agencies have the right to collect fundamental data on population counts for its census purposes. This data would include:
   a) The names of individuals residing at the residence.
   b) The number of people residing at the residence.
   c) The year of birth of people residing at the residence.
2) Any information requested in addition to this data must be voluntarily given by the individuals.

We oppose:
1) The American Community Survey from the United States Department of Commerce because it aggressively and unnecessarily invades individual privacy with its data collection efforts.
2) The use of fines to coerce citizens to submit to intrusive, mandatory personal data collection efforts by the federal government. (2013)

9.6 – Civil Service Accountability
Every government agency and/or its employees must be accountable to the public. Every civil service position should be subject to a reasonable procedure for recall.

We urge legislative support for the following:
1) Governmental agency personnel testifying at public hearings should identify their testimony as a government position or personal testimony.
2) Require that each agency must develop and implement policy which determines how agency personnel are authorized to represent the agency when working with local governments or staff to formulate policy or regulations.
3) Require that agency personnel who are designated as representatives of an agency to have the agency regional director’s letter of authorization on all proposed changes and or edits to local government’s proposed policies or regulations.
4) Unless specifically authorized by legislation, any such actions by agencies or any agency personnel shall be invalid. (1997, Amended 2008)

9.7 – Complaints
We believe that a person should have to post a bond to cover investigation and court costs if the person has previously filed a complaint against an agricultural operation.
If the complaint results in a criminal or civil penalty against the person charged, then the deposit would be refunded to the complainant.

If there were no conviction, then there would be no refund.

Individuals and/or organizations that bring third-party lawsuits should be held accountable for disruption to business, devaluation of land, etc., caused by their legal action against individuals and entities in the natural resource industries. (1999, Amended 2004)

9.8 – Conservation District Elections
We oppose changing the election procedure to have Conservation District supervisors elected under the general election procedures of the state.

We believe that Conservation District supervisors should be elected by district landowners and that they must have agricultural or natural resource experience. (2002)

9.9 – Constitutional Convention
We oppose any attempt to call a constitutional convention. (1997, Amended 1999)

9.10 – County Pest Control Boards
We believe the legislature should provide permanent state funding for county pest control boards.

9.11 – Disclosure
We oppose the disclosure of personal information by an agency about an individual and/or their farming operations. The release of any information shall only be allowed by specific written authorization of the individual or private business entity. Any personal information provided in, but not limited to, farm plans, dairy plans, animal identification programs, and AFO/CAFO plans to any government agency should be required to stay within that agency. Any agency responding to a request for public records shall be required to comply with current laws and, in addition, not release personal, private or confidential business information without the consent of the person who submitted the information. (2005)

9.12 – Drones
We support:
1) The use of drones, also known as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) or unmanned aircraft systems (UAS), for agricultural purposes.
2) Allowing landlords and tenants to fly over their fields for any reason without it being considered commercial activity.
3) Requiring the drone operator to gain the written consent of the landowner and/or farm operator if the drone will be surveying or gathering private property data.
4) A system through which ownership of the drone can be easily established.

9.13 – Electoral College
We support:
1) The retention of the Electoral College for presidential elections.
2) Electors being required to vote for the candidates to which they were pledged.

We oppose proposals to make the popular vote the sole determinant of presidential elections. (2009)

9.14 – Emergency Clause
The emergency clause should only be used in cases of true emergency, as intended by the Washington State Constitution. (2012, Amended 2016)

9.15 – Empowering County Legislative Authority
We ask that the county legislative authorities from each county formally formulate and adopt a County Coordination Plan that requires the sustaining of the local customs, culture, and economic stability of the citizens of the county by doing the following:
1) Coordinate in writing any plan, designation, or proposed course of action that would affect the economy, customs, and culture of their county.
2) Closely follow and adhere to any adopted County Coordination Plan in promulgating any laws, statutes, USCs, WACs, and/or RCWs.
3) Require that all employees and administrators of any federal, state, tribal, or subdivisions thereof adhere to the Coordination Plan. All communications and coordination will be performed in writing and with the approval of the county legislative authorities. (Amended 2010)

9.16 – English as Official Language
We support legislation to make English the official language of the State of Washington and the United States.
We believe preferences for any visa should be given to individuals with English language skills. (Amended 2008)

9.17 – Farm Service Agency Loans
We believe that any funds provided by the Farm Service Agency to purchase farmland should only be loaned to citizens of the United States. (1998, Amended 1999)

9.18 – Federal Planning Efforts
We seek representation at all negotiations to protect agriculture. (1995, Amended 2012)

9.19 – Financial Disclosure by Public Officials
We believe that the Washington State Public Disclosure Commission should not require any public official to file the mandatory F-1 form and any other form of disclosure statement unless that public office holder is salaried and that salary is greater than $5,000 a year. (2003, Amended 2012)

9.20 – First-Time Farmer Loan Programs
We support a revised First-Time Farmer Loan program that would set the loan cap at $1 million and the interest rate at prime. A first-time farmer is an individual who may have experience in farming or ranching but who has not purchased or inherited more than 10 percent of the county average farm or ranch size. (2003, Amended 2012)

9.21 – Game Farms
We believe that regulation of private game farms should be the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and/or the Washington State Department of Agriculture rather than the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. We support promotion and marketing assistance of game farm products, thereby adding to Washington state’s economic development. (1996, Amended 2011)

9.22 – Gun Ownership
As addressed in our state Constitution, we support the right of the individual citizen to bear arms, in defense of himself, others, or the state – a right which shall not be impaired.

We oppose:
1) Legislation to require the registration or licensing of firearms, ammunition, reloading equipment, and supplies.
2) Legislation that would impose taxes or fees on the ownership of firearms, reloading equipment, and supplies.
3) Additional taxes or fees on firearms or fees, reloading equipment, and supplies.
4) Mandatory background checks for private firearm transactions between law-abiding residents of the United States.
5) Restricting lawful firearm use and hunting through the enactment of no-shooting zones, land use restrictions, and other regulations without a clear, factual, and undeniable public safety concern. (1997, Amended 2013)

9.23 – Gubernatorial Appointments
We believe that all gubernatorial appointees must be confirmed by the state Senate within six months of the appointment or not be allowed to continue to serve. (2002)

9.24 – Homeland Security
America and Washington state must continue to be able to produce safe and secure food, protecting us from becoming hostage to our food needs.

While we support the safety of our nation, we oppose any regulatory action under the Homeland Security Act that will result in undue restrictions impacting a farmer’s ability to grow, harvest, or ship agricultural commodities to market or that would jeopardize our constitutional rights and policies supported by Farm Bureau. (2002, Amended 2005)

9.25 – Immigration Enforcement Trespass
We protest the actions of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in trespassing on private farmland. We insist that ICE recognize personal property rights of farmers to include the requirement for search warrants to allow service personnel to enter farmland.

9.26 – Impact Statements
Environmental impact statements have become burdensome and costly and should be balanced by consideration of economic impact.

We support:
1) Mandating that all environmental and economic impact statements be filed with the appropriate standing committees of the legislature for all proposed rule amendments that are issued by the Washington State Department of Ecology, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, and the Washington State Department of Agriculture, when such rules reduce or restrict agricultural practices or management.
2) Requiring all environmental and economic impact statements filed with a standing committee of the legislature to receive at least two public hearings. If the committee does not approve the content of the environmental and economic impact statements, the agency shall not adopt the proposed rule change. (1994, Amended 2012)

9.27 – Initiatives and Referenda
We support requiring a fiscal impact statement for every ballot initiative before it is placed on the ballot.

We oppose the use of the emergency clause by lawmakers to negate the initiative and referendum processes and will of the people. (2002, Amended 2012)

9.28 – Judicial Activism
We oppose the Boldt decision, Boldt Phase II decision, and Quackenbush decision because of their extreme adverse effect on irrigated agriculture.

We oppose Washington State Supreme Court decisions that seize legislative powers. (1993, Amended 1999, 2016)

9.29 – Jurisdiction of Tribal Police
We oppose any legislation that would allow tribal police to arrest, detain, cite, or otherwise regulate non-tribal members either on open reservation or off reservation areas, unless the tribal officer is deputized by the appropriate county sheriff or city/town and has the equivalent training and certifications of the officers in the jurisdiction granting the commissions.

Hearings resulting from such arrests, detentions, or citations by tribal police shall take place in Washington state courts. (2007)

9.30 – Lake Roosevelt/National Park Service
We demand the National Park Service (NPS) administer the lands within the Lake Roosevelt Recreation Area according to the provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act and the Reclamation Act.

We demand the NPS use only scientific studies that are site specific to Lake Roosevelt to determine if livestock and/or agriculture have a significant adverse environmental impact on the water quality of Lake Roosevelt.

We believe grazing and agricultural use permits must be continued, since agriculture and the permanent settlement of farm families are stated purposes of the Columbia Basin Project. In addition, grazing and agriculture are historic uses of the land and are a part of the custom and culture and must be preserved under the National Environmental Policy Act.

We defend our riparian water rights under the laws of the State of Washington for the reasonable use of the water for our livestock.

We support a process where local governments fully participate in a process in which the United States Environmental Protection Agency provides complete, independent human health and ecological studies of Lake Roosevelt and the upper Columbia River prior to designation of a superfund site.

We support the rights of communities and organizations along Lake Roosevelt to maintain community docks and the right to access the waters for boating and fishing from within their communities.

By law, citizens have a right for access to navigable water; therefore, we oppose the erecting of any physical barrier to such access. (1999, Amended 2003)

9.31 – Law and Justice
We support the following concepts:
1) Justice should be administered in strict accordance with the laws of our state, counties, cities and the Constitution of the United States.
2) Every criminal jury should be instructed by the court of its right to interpret the law and the facts of the case.
3) Punishment is a deterrent to crime.
4) Perpetrators of nonviolent crimes should be given stiff penalties in the form of payment, either by work or fines, so as to provide more positive rehabilitation and relieve the overcrowding of jail facilities.
5) All government law enforcement agents must identify themselves as law officers of the specific agency in order to perform law enforcement duties.
6) Laws that impose high standards of education and training in law and law enforcement for all government law enforcement agents who carry firearms in conjunction with their law enforcement duties.
7) All law enforcement should be under authority of the chief elected law enforcement officer of the county.
8) No government agency should coerce any person or business to surrender any constitutional rights by requiring permits or licenses to operate any business that, by obtaining them, certain rights are waived.
9) That all government agents enforcing laws and regulations at the local, state or federal level, be required to swear their allegiance to the U.S. Constitution and to upholding the laws of their jurisdictions, in the form of an Oath of Office same as is required from any law-enforcement officer.

We oppose any effort to suppress or restrict the full implementation and application of the United States Constitution and its protections on any section of United States soil or any area governed by the United States. (1994, Amended 2017)

9.32 – Legal Fees
We believe:
1) The prevailing party in a civil court action should be awarded all attorney fees and associated costs.
2) State agencies should be liable for court costs and attorney’s fees where a private party shows the court that the state agency has knowingly violated state law.
3) If a legal services corporation loses a case in a year in which it accepts public funds or Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts (IOLTA) funds, it must pay all court costs and attorney fees.
4) Prisoners should be required to pay for legal expenses for frivolous lawsuits initiated by them and pay for a portion of the cost of their college and vocational education.
5) When a governmental agency takes an action against a person or business based on an unfounded allegation, or obstructs or hinders a permitting process, or engages in a harassment campaign, the person or business is entitled to recover from the agency any legal fees, costs, and damages incurred by their action or inaction. (Amended 2015)

9.33 – Legal Services Corporation
We believe that indigent people deserve access to our legal justice system. However, the legal services corporations in Washington are using state funds to pursue court actions that persecute family farmers and ranchers and promote a political agenda.

Any entity that uses interest on the lawyer’s trust account (IOLTA) fund must be subject to the same state and federal restrictions on the use of legal service funds.

Legal services corporations shall be prohibited from:
1) Offering services to illegal aliens. It shall be the responsibility of the legal service corporation to establish the status and document the status prior to service being offered.
2) Appearing at any legislative or agency hearing or meeting.
3) Providing input to agencies when they are contemplating policy or rules.
4) Lobbying while receiving state funding since they are not stakeholders.

To prevent the pursuit of frivolous claims by legal services corporations, clients of legal services should be forced to pay a sliding scale, and at least minimum wage, for legal representation. A judge could waive the fee in cases involving domestic violence, family law, elder abuse, Medicaid, and Social Security.

State funds for legal services should be removed unless the legal services corporations enter into an alternative dispute or mediation agreement with farmers. Under the agreement, legal services corporations would be required to give notice to farmers before filing a suit. Once notified, the farmer could bring the dispute to the appropriate agency or the governor. If the agency found for the farmer, the attorney general’s office would defend the farmer and the agency decision in further court action. If not, the farmer could abide by the agency decision or ask that the matter be brought to court at his own expense. (2003, Amended 2006)
9.34 – Legislative Agriculture Committee Appointments
We insist that the state legislative leadership seek out and appoint only legislators to both the Senate and House Agriculture Committees who are knowledgeable and interested in agricultural production and enhancement, as well as finding solutions to its problems. (1994, Amended 2012)

9.35 – Limiting Grower Liability of Various Food Safety Programs
We support voluntary, reasonable, science-based food safety programs that, if implemented, would provide legal assurance for the grower that the burden of proof for any food quality issue be borne by the accusing party. (2012)

9.36 – Local Control of Hanford Land
We Support:
1) The transfer of United States Department of Energy lands within and adjacent to the Hanford Reach, which are deemed to be decontaminated, back to their respective counties.
2) A local counties cooperative oversight management plan that allows for primary local control of these transferred lands with applicable state and federal agencies assistance in compliance with the local management oversight plan.

9.37 – Marijuana
We support:
1) More stringent security requirements for facilities growing, processing, or selling marijuana in proximity to populations at risk, such as schools and daycare facilities.
2) We support the reclassification of marijuana from a Schedule I drug to a Schedule III drug under the Controlled Substances Act. (2014, Amended 2016)

9.38 – Membership on Boards and Commissions
We believe that where producers pay full cost of the commodity group, only producers should sit on the board on the basis of one vote per group regardless of size.

We oppose:
1) Any effort to name consumer representatives to boards, commissions or marketing order committees where they have no direct interest.
2) Any requirement for a person who is appointed to sit on a board or commission, who serves in a voluntary or cost reimbursement capacity, to have to disclose any personal financial information to the legislature or the public. (1994, Amended 2005, 2016)

9.39 – Multiple Use of Federally or State-Managed Lands
We support:
1) The multiple use of our federally or state-managed lands with full consideration given to the benefits that the land receives from this multiple use because it:
   a. Encourages biological diversity in rangeland and forest ecosystems.
   b. Provides a consistent, affordable supply of basic commodities that fuels our economy.
   c. Benefits the long-term stability of both the economic and ecological conditions of federally or state-managed lands and the communities in which these lands exist.
   d. Includes the multiple-use of management tools and practices necessary in the continuance of good stewardship.
2) The Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) continuing to manage DNR lands to produce income from active uses, such as grazing, timber, and crops. If an agricultural lease is removed without cause, the lessee must be compensated for all lessee improvements.
3) The timber harvest plan that maximizes timber harvest on Washington State School Trust Lands.
4) Rehabilitation through reforestation on state and federal forest lands following wildfire damage or natural disaster. (1996, Amended 2010, 2016)

9.40 – Native American Indians
We believe that tribal members from both federally and non-federally recognized Indian Tribes should be recognized as full United States citizens with all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
We encourage county boards and state agencies to develop mutual programs with those on Indian Reservations to provide equal and just benefits to all citizens of the state. These programs will be most appropriate when action must be taken by a board to correct deficiencies within Reservation boundaries.

We support:
1) Legislation requiring that all tribal members residing within the boundaries of a state be governed by existing laws of their respective states.
2) Legislation to establish the principle that all citizens have equal rights under the Constitution with commensurate responsibility to obey the laws of the nation as established by local, county, state and national governments.
3) Termination of treaty rights between the United States and Northwest Indian Tribes by purchase or negotiation for fair compensation and an end to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We point to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 as a model that might be followed to end special treatment of Native American Indians and bring them to full equality under the law.
4) The rights of tribal members to hunt and fish using their traditional methods and restricting their catches to their traditional uses.
5) Allowing all owners of deeded land within a reservation to have the same right to hunt on such lands as Native American Indians.

We oppose:
1) Open reservation tribal governments regulating or taxing non-tribal members, unless a non-tribal member receives benefits or privileges.
2) Native American tribes governing or regulating, in any way, lands owned in whole or part by non-tribal members within reservation boundaries.

9.41 – Non-profit Reporting Requirements
We oppose the Washington State Secretary of State’s requirement that volunteer-run, non-profit corporations such as a county Farm Bureau must provide a physical address for the corporation. (2017).

9.42 – Oversight of Regulatory Agency Powers
We believe emergency orders issued by state government department directors must be reviewed by a panel of legislators.

We urge the state to tighten the process when Environmental Reviews are submitted from Department of Ecology personnel, to Washington State Department of Ecology for review, for a determination of non-significance from the Washington State Department of Ecology. No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required after a determination of non-significance. (1997, Amended 1998)

9.43 – Permit Action
We support:
1) Legislation that would require state and county agencies to act on permit applications within 60 days.
2) County governments exempting county building permits on specialty agricultural structures or capping permit fees at no more than $75. (Amended 2008, 2016)

9.44 – Personal Liberties
We support the right of all individuals to be self-sufficient and self-reliant.

We oppose (on unincorporated lands):
1) Any law, regulation or policy, which would limit a person’s freedom to exercise their right to be self-sufficient and self-reliant, including the ability to grow their own food according to sound agricultural practices or generate their own power.
2) Requirements to connect to utilities or to any other infrastructure, before being able to obtain a building or occupancy permit on structures built to reasonable standards. (2017)

We oppose the efforts by certain citizen activist groups that work to eliminate or transfer property rights from individual persons to government entities, non-elected boards, non-profit institutions, or business corporations. (2015)

9.45 – Protecting Ownership Rights
We support:
1) Strengthening institutions that work to protect private property rights and increase community awareness that local food security depends on a foundation of laws and policies designed to secure private property rights.
2) Legislation requiring total financial and procedural transparency of government or privately funded non-profits that impact the value of property rights.

We oppose the efforts by certain citizen activist groups that work to eliminate or transfer property rights from individual persons to government entities, non-elected boards, non-profit institutions, or business corporations. (2015)

9.46 – Public Records Act and Open Public Meetings Act
The state Auditor’s and/or the Attorney General’s office should enforce the Open Meetings Act and Public Records Act. When public entities create barriers to access of public information, the Auditor should have authority to investigate compliance of these acts and to levy fines for violations.

We reject the Supreme Court’s judicial expansion of the exemptions listed in the Public Records Act to include “overbroad requests” and “any and all attorney-client privileged information” regarding a public agency.

We believe that government agencies should be required to provide documents in a timely manner in response to a general or specific request. A per-day penalty should be assessed against an agency for each document that is not produced by the required deadline. (2004)

9.47 – Regionalism
We oppose the establishment of an interstate regional government in any form. (1994, Amended 2000)

9.48 – Regulatory Accountability
We believe unrealistic regulation is economically and environmentally irresponsible and is shifting resource production away from the United States. The following criteria should be applied to regulations such as the Endangered Species Act, Salmon Recovery, the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, National Heritage Areas, State Heritage Areas, and all other federal, state or local land use management regulations in effect or proposed.

To be fiscally and environmentally responsible, the regulation should:
   1) Recognize property rights as the foundation for resource production.
   2) Recognize human material needs.
   3) Be driven by peer-reviewed physical science.
   4) Be administered by local governments and include necessary financial resources to meet management goals.
   5) Recognize the importance of resource development, use and production on federally-managed lands.
   6) Recognize the contribution of private landowners and resource producers in sustaining environmental quality.
   7) Be implemented through application of peer reviewed physical science and industry-recognized management practices.
   8) Include public responsibility for fair burden of cost.
   9) Be equally applied and enforced in all areas of the jurisdiction.
  10) Actively seek the input of recognized industry experts.

We support legislation that will end the repressive nature of many state laws as applied to the state’s agriculture industry. We support legislation that will reduce unnecessary regulation of the agriculture industry. When a court finds that a federal agency is in violation of law, the landowner that is in compliance with the agency rules should not be held liable for the error of the agency. Landowners should be able to continue under the existing rules until such time as the matter is settled and new rules are properly adopted. (1997, Amended 2014)

9.49 – Regulatory Reform and Legislative Review
We believe that the loss of accountability and the abuse of regulatory power by state agencies have reached a point where enactment of comprehensive regulatory reform is urgently required to rein in unelected bureaucrats, restore legislative and judicial prerogatives, and bring all agencies under tighter control.

Therefore, we strongly support legislation that will:
   1) Eliminate agency overlap of duties and responsibilities.
   2) Require explicit legislative authority for promulgation of rules and regulations by state agencies and constrain agency rulemaking to the minimum necessary to administer clear and unambiguous directives in the law. The legislature should assert its authority over administrative rules by repeal or amendment of administrative agency rules in whole or in part from time to time as the legislature deems appropriate through its oversight role.
   3) Stipulate that delegation of legislative authority to agencies shall be narrowly construed in light of both the letter and intent of applicable laws. Where the legislature has enacted a statute defining a term, all agencies and local governments must comply with that definition and are not at liberty to define the same term differently.
4) Give authority to the Joint Administrative Rules Review Committee (JARRC) to review policies, guidelines, and guidance documents produced by state agencies.

5) Amend the state Regulatory Fairness Act to require an agency to modify any proposed rule in order to minimize or eliminate any impact to small business discovered through development of a Small Business Economic Impact Statement.

6) Prior to proceeding to public hearing on any significant rule, the proposing agency must conduct an economic analysis of the impact of the proposed rule on rural communities.

7) Require new or amended rules that are significant legislative rules or that are adopted through a formal hearing process to:
   a) Clearly demonstrate why each rule is required.
   b) Show how each rule is the least burdensome and most cost-effective alternative.
   c) Be adopted before the start of the legislative session in each year.
   d) Not take effect until they are ratified by the legislature.
   e) Be subject to sunset review and formal re-issue by the adopting agency at least once every seven years in order to remain in effect.
   f) Be signed by the governor, if the agency head is appointed by the governor.

8) Allow direct appeal to superior court, at the option of the appealing party, after 60 days’ notice to the agency, and without the requirement of appeal to either the agency or some other quasi-judicial board.

9) Prohibit agencies from extending rules applicable to public lands to private property and from adopting rules that exceed standards required by federal guidelines or regulations applicable to the same activity, without explicit legislative direction for each case.

10) Prohibit agencies from applying rules to private employers but not to public employers.

11) Direct that any fine or penalty levied by an agency should be made payable to the general fund and never to a particular agency or program.

12) Authorize a court sitting in judicial review of an administrative agency decision to make its own findings of fact and interpretations of law and not be bound by the agency’s determinations.

13) No state agency policy should be enforced unless the policy is first officially adopted as an administrative rule pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act and published in the Washington Administrative Code.

We oppose the use of local land use, watershed or other plans for purposes of meeting federal public participation requirements. We firmly believe federal agencies should meet with affected local landowners in an open public process. (2004, Amended 2015)

9.50 – Research at Land Grant Colleges

We believe the agricultural research programs carried on by the land grant colleges should include both basic and applied research.

We support:

1) Continued research to ensure the economic viability of the agricultural industry, including:
   a) Acceptable controls for diseases, noxious weeds, and insects.
   b) New crop varieties with higher nutritional values and varieties suited to mechanical handling and processing.
   c) Cultural practices that improve soil and water conservation.
   d) Solutions to marketing problems.
   e) Additional uses for agricultural by-products.
   f) New uses for agricultural products.
   g) New alternative crops and to identify, investigate and encourage establishment of processing plants to make use of alternative crops.
   h) Acceptable means of recycling chemical containers.
   i) New and improved means of further mechanizing agriculture from ground preparation to harvest.
   j) Better solutions to agriculture’s environmental concerns.
   k) A less-costly method of re-certifying minor use crop chemicals.
   l) Solutions to national energy problems.

2) The use of land grant colleges for agriculturally oriented research by the United States Department of Agriculture and other governmental units and not contracting such research to agencies that have little or no knowledge about agriculture.

3) Placing a high priority on obtaining increased federal appropriations to assist land grant universities with their agricultural research programs.

4) Locating future state and federal research, development, diagnostic, and certification facilities in or near land grant college facilities, where practical, so as to further interagency cooperation.

5) Interstate cooperation to intensify research efforts and avoid duplication.
6) Continued funding of the state agriculture experiment research stations.
7) Placing the Grain Marketing Research Center within the United States Department of Agriculture’s Agricultural Marketing Service.
8) Reversing the trend toward centralization, caused in part by the increase in the percentage of research funds allocated to federal installations. (1997, Amended 2013)

9.51 – Right of Entry for Government Agents
The Constitution requires government agents to obtain a search warrant before entering private property. The Constitution further requires that the search warrant contain a specific description of the property to be searched. The Constitution applies to any government agent who enters farms or ranches in order to conduct an inspection.

We believe government agents:
1) Must ask permission of the owner or the owner’s authorized representative prior to entering a farm or ranch for purposes of conducting an inspection. If permission is denied, the agent should obtain a search warrant that specifies the reason for the inspection. The agent should inform the owner/agent that they have the legal right to ask that a search warrant be obtained prior to an inspection. Agents should not retaliate against citizens who exercise this constitutional right.
2) May enter property without the owner’s permission only if an emergency exists that constitutes an immediate threat to human life. (2002, Amended 2015, 2016)

9.52 – Selling Mailing Lists
We believe state agencies should not distribute and/or sell the names and addresses of state citizens on their rolls. (1997, Amended 1999)

9.53 – State Fish and Wildlife Commission
Farms in Washington State provide feed and significant quality habitat for the fish and wildlife.
We believe:
1) That agriculture must be fairly represented on the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission.
2) Mandating agricultural representation on the Commission would strengthen a much needed and improved relationship between sportsmen, state agency personnel, and private landowners and operators.
   1. We support:
      1) Requiring three of the nine positions on the Commission to be held by agricultural representatives since 70 percent of all wildlife is produced on private agricultural lands.
      2) Increasing opportunities for private landowners to provide input regarding potential wildlife management decisions before they are implemented because of the economic impact on agriculture.
      3) Electing the Director of the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife by the citizens of the state of Washington rather than appointed by an unelected Commission.
      4) Electing the Fish and Wildlife Commissioners by the citizens of the state of Washington, with each commissioner being elected to represent a specific region of the state. (1998, Amended 2007, 2016)

9.54 – State Lands
We believe:
1) Ownership of lands by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) should be greatly reduced and strictly limited to lands used as fish and game reserves.
2) State agencies that manage public lands must investigate complaints from landowners within 72 hours that involve noxious weeds and other pests originating on public lands. The agency must treat or remove the pest problems on their lands within 30 days.
3) That WDFW, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and other state agencies should be required to demonstrate they are in compliance with all local and state land use laws and regulations, including maintenance, on existing lands and properties before being allowed to acquire any new land or properties.
4) Public lands that can be used for agricultural purposes, when sold, should first be made available to local farmers.
5) That small acreage may be contracted with private landowners for 10 to 20 year terms for habitat for upland game restoration. A program of in lieu of taxes could be an exception.

We support requiring government agencies that own real estate to operate and/or manage those lands under the same rules, regulations, and tax liabilities as similar lands held by private individuals. This includes rules associated with the Reclamation Reform Act with the Columbia Basin Federal Irrigation Project.

We oppose:
1) DNR applying for ground water rights for all irrigable lands regardless of the limited ground water resources.
2) Wasting state funds in elaborate irrigation installations that are far in excess of soil conservation standards.
3) DNR’s Habitat Conservation Plan, a contract with the federal government through the Endangered Species Act that locks up approximately 1.6 million acres of the state’s public trust lands.
4) Fees to enter or use public lands for recreational purposes. (1993, Amended 2012, 2016)

9.55 – States’ Rights
We affirm the 10th amendment of the United States Constitution: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” (1999)

9.56 – Tort Reform
We support tort reform as enacted by the Washington legislature.

We encourage the legislature to strengthen the current tort statutes by addressing the following points:
1) Strengthen the legal concept of “fault” as a basis to determine damages.
2) Limit expert testimony.
3) Eliminate joint and several liability.
4) Limit non-economic damages.
5) Pay large awards for future damages in installments.
6) Eliminate double recovery.
7) Limit attorney’s contingency fees.
8) Encourage alternatives to lawsuits.
9) Enactment of legislation that grants immunity from personal civil liability for volunteers, officers, and directors working on behalf of nonprofit and charitable organizations and who act in good faith and within the scope of their duties.

9.57 – Use of Public Monies/Performance Audits
We believe that all government entities, city, county, state, federal, and other should be held accountable to the utmost degree concerning the public monies they spend and the revenues they raise. Therefore, we believe that all government entities should keep and maintain proper financial statements, in a standardized format, according to established accounting standards. These records are to be made available at no charge to the public, being any private citizen who requests to see them.

We support the requirement that all state agencies be subject to independent, comprehensive performance audits at least every four years and those audit results be published.

We urge that testimony presented at public hearings be limited to private citizens. Department and government witnesses should submit their testimony in writing. Public money should be allowed for only one departmental representative to attend meetings or hearings.

We oppose:
1) The use of public funds for lobbying or promotion of legislation.
2) The practice of elected officials contracting with agencies over which they have budgetary authority. (1995, Amended 2003)

9.58 – Voting Requirements
We believe elections should be fair and accurate.

We support:
1) Requiring all county auditors to be elected.
2) Requiring photo identification at the polls and proof of citizenship at the time of registration.
3) Encouraging periodic updates to the voter rolls to eliminate decedents, convicted felons, and non-citizens, as well as to ensure no duplicate voter registrations.
4) Allowing all votes from out-of-state and out-of-country military personnel to be counted until the last date of certification of the ballots.
5) Encouraging dependent college students to vote in the precincts of their parents’ residence.
6) Limiting ballots and other official government documents to the use of the English language. This is not meant to prevent the state from publishing information or educational materials in other languages to aid minority groups and to assist them in assimilating into the state’s general population.
7) Repealing the “Motor Voter” law. It is an open invitation to voter fraud. (1997, Amended 2012, 2016)

9.59 – Washington State Department of Agriculture
We support the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) as a stand-alone cabinet level agency.
WSDA should oversee agricultural businesses and should carry out inspections for the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, OSHA, WISHA, and the Washington State Department of Ecology, so as to streamline operations and omit and coordinate any overlap in inspections. (2003, Amended 2009, 2016)

9.60 – Washington State Department of Ecology
We urge the legislature to:
1) Amend the mission statement of Department of Ecology: Protect, preserve, and enhance Washington’s environment for current and future generations without compromising the economy.
2) Require Ecology to prioritize activities and budget to address causes of pollution where the most benefit can be obtained.
3) Establish safeguards to ensure that private landowner’s rights (including water rights) are not usurped by the Washington State Department of Ecology.
4) Allow landowners more influence on decisions affecting their land and water.
5) Require Ecology to consider the impact of wildlife on water quality and issue citations to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as appropriate.
6) Restrict the use of “potential to pollute” to the most egregious of circumstances.
7) Require Ecology to disclose on its website all actual or effectual closures or moratoriums of Water Resources Inventory Areas (WRIAs), basins, sub-basins, streams, stream segments, lakes, aquifers, or other water bodies available for further appropriation due to any cause, including, but not limited to, Washington Administrative Code, federal or state court order, and local governmental actions. Such disclosure shall consist of descriptive text and maps.
8) Require Ecology, as administrator of the Washington State Water Trust to:
   a) Fund all assessments due on water rights transferred to the Water Trust.
   b) Pay assessments in a timely manner.
9) Direct all environmental and conservation agencies to rely on Natural Resources Conservation Service standards to determine what is reasonable and needed in the context of agricultural activities on agricultural lands and associated conservation practices or environmental compliance requirements. A presumption of regulatory compliance applies to agricultural activities that are consistent with a current Conservation Farm Plan written by an NRCS certified farm planner, approved by the local NRCS office staff, and being implemented and maintained as approved. (1997, Amended 2015)

9.61 – Washington State University Extension
We support:
1) A sound Washington State University agricultural extension program with local participants’ direction and support in program development.
2) WSU Extension devoting more time to farmers’ needs and to the dissemination of research information to farmers.
3) WSU Extension continuing its traditional educational role of supplying unbiased factual information.
4) Maintaining the identity of WSU Extension. It should remain an agency in the United States Department of Agriculture and a part of the land grant colleges and universities.
5) WSU Extension program coordinators being knowledgeable of the areas to which they are assigned.
6) The director of WSU Extension appointing specialized agents in the areas of soil and waste management and water quality to serve as resource people for the counties impacted by the Puget Sound Partnership and similar programs.
7) The director of WSU Extension hiring county directors without requiring them to have a Master’s Degree but allowing a five-year grace period to obtain such a degree.
We oppose:
1) Dictation by the federal government through the earmarking of more funds for specific federally-directed non-farm programs. We believe any programs providing services to non-farm individuals or organizations should not come at the expense of programs for farm and ranch family businesses.
2) Lowering the traditionally high standards for 4-H projects in order to increase enrollment or for any other reason. (1992, Amended 2011)

9.62 – Welfare
We support:
1) Public aid based on individual needs.
2) Continued overhaul of state and federal welfare programs so they do not discourage welfare recipients from working, encourage aliens to live on welfare, or attract people to our state to take advantage of a higher paying welfare system.
3) Making it a felony offense to cheat on welfare.
4) A severe penalty for any welfare worker, state or federal employee, who promotes or knowingly or negligently approves or allows welfare or other entitlement payments to an illegal alien or otherwise ineligible recipient.
5) Adoption of a new approach to public welfare to achieve the following basic goals:
   a) All persons receiving welfare who are able to work should be assisted in finding a job or be required to perform useful and productive work as a requirement for assistance.
   b) All existing programs of social welfare at the federal, state, and local level should be carefully reviewed as to their purposes, effectiveness and costs.
   c) Most existing welfare programs should be repealed or reorganized under a single agency so that the annual cost can be more easily identified and results more accurately assessed.
   d) All welfare laws should be reviewed and rewritten to avoid a massive influx of alien workers into our society and to encourage alien workers who have come for seasonal jobs to return to their homelands off-season, rather than encouraging permanent residency.
   e) To minimize excessive bureaucratic red tape, and reduce abuses and cheating while, at the same time, delivering help in an efficient manner to those who deserve it.

We oppose:
   1) Penalizing welfare recipients by loss of needed benefits because of working low-paying or short-term jobs.
   2) Any federal welfare program that would guarantee an individual a set level of income.
   3) The receipt of state and federal entitlement monies (e.g., welfare, food stamps) by any person unable to present unequivocal proof of legal United States residency.
   4) Further proliferation of welfare programs through the extension of the “food stamp” concept to other necessities of life such as energy.
   5) The use of tax-supported public service broadcast productions and public service time to promote food stamps and other welfare programs.
   6) Public aid programs so lucrative that there is an economic advantage in becoming a recipient. (1994, Amended 1999, 2016)
SECTION 10 – LABOR

10.1 – Cholinesterase Monitoring
We support a requirement that cholinesterase monitoring be state funded. Once a farm has achieved two consecutive seasons where there were no incidents of workplace related cholinesterase depression, the requirements should become voluntary for that farm. (2004)

10.2 – Department of Labor Enforcement
We support:
1) Increased transparency of the investigation practices by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), including full disclosure of DOL policies, guidelines, and operating procedures such as those found in the Field Operations Handbook. When DOL notifies a grower of apparent wage and hour violations or child labor violations under the Fair Labor Standards Act, DOL must:
   a) Accurately represent its legal authority and the rights of the grower.
   b) Provide to the grower all information it relied on to determine the alleged violations.
   c) Cite the grower only for violations that DOL investigators actually observed and proved, not ones based on DOL’s belief or conjecture or made subjectively or statistically by DOL.
   d) Communicate clearly that compliance with the threat of a “hot goods” order is voluntary until the grower is able to exercise his or her due process rights and the allegations are upheld in court.
   e) Seek “hot goods” orders only when a grower has demonstrated repeated and willful violations and lack of cooperation with DOL.
   f) Not contact the grower’s customers unless DOL has already secured the necessary court orders.
2) Repeal of DOL’s authority to seek and secure “hot goods” orders on perishable commodities. (2012, Amended 2013)

10.3 – Ergonomics Standards
We support voluntary measures by business, which have proven to be the most effective way to reduce workplace-related, repetitive motion injuries. Government action regarding ergonomics must be limited to providing incentives for employers through programs such as the Farm Bureau Retro/Safety program.

We oppose:
1) Government regulations imposing mandatory ergonomics standards.
2) Any state regulation that seeks to prohibit the practice of hand weeding in container nurseries. (2002, Amended 2005)

10.4 – Guest Workers
We believe the security of our nation’s food and fiber supply depends on the ability of American farmers and ranchers to provide food and fiber for our country. Without a stable source of skilled farm workers, our country is in peril of becoming dependent on foreign sources of food and fiber. The current H-2A policy and other previous proposals for guest worker programs each fail to provide a realistic process or the desired results.

We support:
1) An immigration policy that provides a stable and continuous source of skilled farm workers for labor-intensive agriculture.
2) Legislation for comprehensive and long-term immigration reform which meets the needs of America, and enacts a realistic and economically viable guest worker program. A new immigration reform bill must include a guest worker program with the following elements:
   a) Agricultural employers must be enabled to legally hire guest workers without a long registration process.
   b) Guest worker visas must be of sufficient quantity to meet the employment requirements of seasonal agriculture. If there is a need unfulfilled by the domestic workforce, the agricultural employer may request expedited issuance of guest worker visas to accommodate the production, harvest, and processing of crops and livestock.
   c) Prospective workers must be able to obtain a guest worker visa and tamper-proof identification that legally allows the worker to seek work in agriculture in the United States and that enables employers to quickly verify the legal status of prospective employees.
   d) The guest worker visa shall be:
      i. Portable between employers.
      ii. Good for a three-year period.
      iii. Renewable for a second three-year period.
   e) To aid guest worker visa issuance and renewal, agricultural employers must be free to speak in support of individual non-immigrant guest workers, and the worker must be free to apply for immigrant status while working as a guest worker.
f) Out-of-status workers should be able to transition into a new, time restricted and renewable, non-immigrant guest worker visa program without leaving the country.

g) The program should incorporate incentives to leave the country when not employed under the specific terms of the guest worker program.

h) Any guest worker who commits a gross misdemeanor or felony while in this country should be deported after due process has been served.

i) Any worker who has not committed a gross misdemeanor or felony and who voluntarily self-deports should be immediately eligible for the guest worker program.

We oppose:

1) Mandates incorporating federal H-2A program into Washington state statutes or regulations governing agricultural related businesses, employers, or employees.

2) Use of the adverse effect wage rate or a government-mandated piece rate due to its inflationary impact on the local prevailing wage and other market-based wages for all employees.

3) Requiring agricultural employers to pay housing and transportation costs for guest worker program employees. (2003, Amended 2012, 2016)

10.5 – Health Care

We believe:

1) People should be responsible for purchasing their own health insurance, and the government should provide incentives such as tax credits to encourage this behavior. Having an individual responsible for their own health care is the most efficient system.

2) If an employer elects to provide health insurance coverage for his/her workers, or contribute to an employee’s health insurance, it should be a deductible business expense for the employer.

3) There should be no benefit or coverage mandates on insurance provided through the free market system, whether purchased individually or provided through a company.

To promote and protect access to affordable, quality health insurance options for individuals and employers, we support:

1) Efforts to increase the number of and competition among insurers offering health care plans in Washington state.

2) Greater flexibility and variety in health insurance plans, including the use of Health Savings Accounts.

We oppose:

1) Regulatory or legislative efforts that would adversely affect association health plans.

2) Mandating employer-provided health insurance benefits for employees.

3) Single-payer or mandatory “universal coverage” systems. (1995, Amended 2008)

10.6 – Workplace Safety

We believe:

1) In a safe and healthy workplace.

2) Voluntary incentives and programs should exist to encourage private-sector efforts to create, improve, and maintain safe and healthful working conditions. Such methods include establishing cooperative relationships between management, employees, and the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH).

3) The Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA) and DOSH rules should not be more stringent than federal Occupational Safety and Health Act regulations.

4) All initial inspections should be consultations to educate the employer of hazards and to advise the employer of management practices to improve employee safety, because the objectives of the WISHA can never be fully achieved by enforcement alone. The inspector should work with the employer to determine how and when to correct apparent hazards. A reasonable solution to the situation should be acceptable and shall provide for a reasonable period of time to correct findings of the inspection, generally 30 to 90 days. Should all attempts at cooperative resolution fail, DOSH may take enforcement actions, which may involve financial penalties for non-compliance. Employers who choose to have a voluntary consultation should receive a substantial reduction in any penalty assessed in a follow-up compliance inspection. Penalties for hazards should not be assessed on pieces of equipment that are not in operation.

5) Safety inspections should not interfere with farm operations and shall not proceed until written permission is obtained from the owner/operator. Routine inspections should be based on documented need, not agency perception that there is a hazard. Inspections should be performed by safety specialists who are familiar with agriculture and ag-related industries.

We strongly recommend that members participate annually in L&I’s voluntary safety and health consultation program, which, in
addition to discovery and education of noted hazards in the workplace, assesses no penalties, exempts participants from regularly scheduled inspections, provides mentoring support, and investigates complaints and incidents. (2000, Amended 2014, 2016)

10.7 – Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act
We support changes to the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (MSPA) that will allow family farmers, who are otherwise exempt from MSPA regulations, to access all private and government-provided employment resources, including word-of-mouth “recruiting” through non-family members, without jeopardizing their MSPA exemption. (Amended 2010)

10.8 – Organized Labor
We support implementation of a “right to work” law in Washington.

We believe:
1) All employees who currently have collective bargaining rights under state or federal law should have the right to join or not join a union as they choose, after a free, fair, and secret election.
2) Employers should have the right to communicate freely to employees concerning the subject of union membership, just as unions are permitted to communicate freely to those same workers.
3) Once workers vote to be represented by a union, each worker should be permitted to join or not join the union as he or she sees fit. There should be no mandatory payment of union negotiation fees.
4) Public employees should be permitted to join a union, but should be prohibited from striking. (1997, Amended 2010)

10.9 – Retrospective Rating Programs
We support retrospective rating programs for industrial insurance. These voluntary programs have a track record of success because they offer employers a financial incentive to maintain safe workplaces, resulting in safer work environments for employees.

Refunds earned through retro programs are private funds, and administration fees for those programs are voluntarily agreed to between two private entities.

We oppose efforts to classify those funds as public funds and require public disclosure of how those funds are spent by the association administering the program. (2009)

10.10 – Seasonal Farm Worker Housing
We believe:

1) That safe, affordable housing is necessary to attract and retain adequate numbers of seasonal farm workers. The current shortage of seasonal farm worker housing affects the supply and stability of the agricultural workforce, putting Washington agriculture at a competitive disadvantage.
2) Labor camp inspections should be conducted by a single agency, rather than the current system that authorizes many different agencies, including the United States Department of Labor, the Washington State Department of Health, and the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries to conduct duplicative inspections.
3) Adequate seasonal farm worker housing can be developed with both private and public sector participation.
4) Since seasonal worker housing is only occupied for a short period of time each year, it is not attractive for traditional development and financing. Therefore, housing that meets the critical needs of the seasonal worker population should receive priority in the distribution of government incentives such as low interest loans and tax credits to private individuals and associations to encourage and assist with the development of this housing.
5) Building codes should be modified to allow the construction of seasonal farm housing, including innovative ideas such as the use of tents, modular homes, trailers, or other accommodations for strictly seasonal uses.

We support construction of new on-farm labor housing that:
1) Is located at or near the work site.
2) Is supervised by the employer or association manager.
3) Meets health and safety standards.
4) Does not adversely impact community health and safety.
5) Does not adversely impact the quality of life enjoyed by adjacent owners or residents.
6) Is governed by one agency. (1994, Amended 2010, 2016)
10.11 – Unemployment Insurance
We believe the following principles should apply to unemployment insurance:

1) All workers who qualify with adequate employment history and are able to draw benefits should be covered by unemployment insurance.
2) The cost of unemployment insurance should be paid partially by the employee.
3) Claimants must be available and actively seeking work in order to receive benefit payments.
4) All baseyear employers should be notified when an applicant has applied for benefits.
5) Striking workers have voluntarily chosen to abandon work and therefore should not be eligible for unemployment benefits.
6) The unemployment insurance system should automatically decrease premiums when there are more than twelve months in reserve.
7) Benefits must reflect the work history of claimants over the past twelve months of work.
8) Seasonal employers create employment, not unemployment, and therefore should not be penalized by the unemployment system if seasonal workers receive benefits at the end of the season.
9) Unemployment insurance taxes and benefits must allow employers to remain competitive in their industries.
10) Members of an employer’s immediate family should not be charged unemployment insurance premiums or receive benefits, unless they voluntarily enroll in the program.
11) The unemployment insurance cost of living index for annual benefit and tax increases must adequately reflect economic conditions.
12) Corporate officers should not be covered or charged unless the corporation opts to cover these employees.
13) Workers who are under 18 years of age or who are full-time students should not be covered.
14) Local hand-harvest workers who are paid on a piece-rate basis and who worked fewer than 13 weeks during the preceding calendar year should not be covered.
15) Guest workers temporarily in the state for a specific job should not be covered.
16) Unemployment compensation should be based on the average wage throughout the year. This system encourages workers to seek work outside of the season.
17) With regard to fraudulent claims, if fraud is proven, benefits must be recouped and the claimant must re-qualify for benefits by work performed. Employer experience rating must not be impacted by fraudulent claims.
18) An employee must work at least 30 days for an employer before he can draw unemployment benefits against the employer’s account. (1994, Amended 2010, 2016)

10.12 – Wages
We support:

1) An employee’s right to earn a decent competitive wage for his productive work.
2) The right of farm employers to pay workers on a piece rate basis.
3) A federal minimum wage, with the following exemptions:
   a) Members of an employer’s immediate family.
   b) Local hand-harvest workers who are paid on a piece rate basis and who worked fewer than 13 weeks in agriculture during the preceding year.
   c) Hand-harvest workers under 18 years of age who are employed on the same farm as their parents and who receive the same piece rate as older employees on the same farm.
4) The federal provision that allows the reasonable value of grower-provided housing to be used as payment towards the minimum wage calculation.
5) The right of farm employers to pay all workers under the age of 18 a training wage of 85% of the minimum wage.

We oppose:

1) A state minimum wage in any form.
2) Any automatic or yearly cost of living increase in the state or federal minimum wage.
3) Enactment of mandatory worker benefits such as health insurance, sick/maternity leave, holidays, and overtime.
4) The state paid family leave law. Until that law is repealed, the leave should only be a monetary benefit that is funded by voluntary worker contributions, should be administered by private industry, and should not result in additional regulations.
10.13 – Washington Agricultural Labor Relations Act

We oppose the adoption of a state Agricultural Labor Relations Act in Washington. If adoption seems inevitable, we recommend that the act should:

1) Permit agricultural employees to decide for themselves whether they want to be represented by a union or not, and provide employees the right to choose which union will represent them in a secret ballot election, conducted by an independent Agricultural Labor Relations Board. The Agricultural Labor Relations Board should consist of agricultural employers, agricultural laborers, and members from the general public.

2) Prohibit unfair labor practices by both employers and unions, and grant the Agricultural Labor Relations Board the authority to investigate and prevent such unfair labor practices.

3) Declare that the secondary boycott is an unfair labor practice.

4) Provide for a minimum of a five-day strike notice to protect the perishability of a crop.

5) Impose upon both the employer and the union the obligation to bargain in good faith.

6) Not prevent labor unions from organizing. It should not outlaw strikes. It should not prevent any steps to improve safety and working conditions.

7) Be patterned after the National Labor Relations Act. The Act should impose obligations upon both labor and management, and grant the independent board the power to prevent abuse by either.

8) Specify that a bargaining unit consists of an appropriate group with like wages and working conditions.

9) Not contain a make whole provision.

10) Not ban temporary or permanent replacement workers.

11) Not limit employer communications with employees.

12) Not allow union access to employer property for organizing purposes.

13) Offer allowances for abandonment of crops due to market or crop conditions (1994, Amended 2010)

10.14 – Workers’ Compensation

We support a no-fault industrial accident/illness insurance program that pays the necessary medical expenses, drugs, rehabilitation, time loss, and disability for injured workers. This program should include the following stipulations:

1) The program must be a completely no-fault system. Employee lawsuits for injury claims against the employer are prohibited.

2) An injured worker can seek medical care from the caregiver of his or her choice.

3) Industrial insurance premiums are calculated based on hours worked.

4) Each employee is responsible for a portion of the premium.

5) Premiums are adjusted annually and accurately taking into account needed reserve levels.

6) All jobs are properly risk-classified according to hazard, and all classifications are reviewed periodically with representatives from the private sector.

7) Time loss benefits are paid based on an employee’s earnings within the work classification at the time of injury/illness and are based on averaging wages over a 12-month period for seasonal/intermittent workers.

8) Membership on the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals should include a medical doctor qualified to evaluate occupational medical conditions.

9) An independent audit of the state’s workers’ compensation funds should be performed annually to determine the adequacy of current levels of fund reserves.

We urge the following reforms be made immediately to our industrial insurance system:

1) The Washington State Department of Labor and Industries should conduct more routine investigations and aggressively pursue fraudulent claims. We support methods for doctors, chiropractors, and others who support fraudulent claims to be held responsible, including losing the ability to participate further in the program.

2) To be a valid claim, every accident and injury must be reported to the employer within 24 hours of occurrence. If not reported within 24 hours, the employee should bear the burden of proof that the injury is job-related.

3) We support a fair, flat rate time loss calculation based on a percentage of wages be established to replace the current sliding scale system. A flat rate system would simplify time loss calculations, therefore reducing department administration and burden. It would also speed payments to workers and make the system more understandable to both workers and employers.

   a) The flat rate system should address the Cockle and Avundez state Supreme Court decisions.

   b) It should pay each injured worker who is entitled to time loss benefits a flat percentage of their wages averaged over a continuous 12-month period that most closely represents their employment pattern over the last three-year period of
4) Time loss and disability benefits should be paid directly to the employee and should not be directed to his or her attorney first.

5) Industrial insurance premiums and reserves should be used only for workers’ compensation programs and or other risk management programs that are directly related to the industrial insurance system and not to fund other programs at the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries or other state agencies.

6) All excessive reserves should be refunded either directly to the employers who have contributed to the fund or through reduced premium rates.

7) Payment rates for all services provided under workers’ compensation should be negotiated to ensure volume discounts.

8) The Centers of Occupational Health and Education project should be expanded to all counties.

9) Employers and employees should have the option to settle claims through voluntary “compromise and release” agreements, which allow both parties to negotiate a final settlement that usually involves closing the claim in exchange for a lump-sum payment.

10) We support the establishment and expansion of employer reporting, which allows workers the option of filing workers’ compensation claims through their employer rather than just through their health-care provider.

11) We support the establishment of a “three-way” system where employers have the choice of three sources of coverage: private insurance, self-insurance, or the state-fund system. (1994, Amended 2010)

10.15 – Youth Employment
We believe that states, rather than the federal government, should establish and enforce laws regarding minor workers. We recognize that during the school year, the student’s primary responsibility is his or her own academic education. Work, while allowed, should not be detrimental to the minor’s schooling. We believe that it is the right and responsibility of the minor’s parents to make that determination.

We support:

1) Youth employment in Washington.

2) Exempting children and grandchildren of owners and management of corporate family farms from child labor laws.

3) Allowing children 12 year of age and older to work during the short seasonal harvest in selected crops, including the hand harvest of short-season crops when the minors have been excused from school in conformance with state law.

4) Requiring a Parent/School Authorization for a minor to work as it provides clarity and protection to the minor employee and employer regarding wages, hours worked, and job duties. The responsibility of obtaining the school endorsement (and other eligibility documentation) for the minor to work during the school session should rest with the minor’s parent and not the employer.

5) The requirement for employers to obtain a minor worker endorsement issued by the state.

6) Encouraging the employment of minors by decreasing the amount of paperwork required for employment and allowing the workday to begin earlier and end later.

7) Awarding tuition vouchers to undergraduate students for work performed in Washington’s agricultural sector. (1993, Amended 2012)
SECTION 11 – LAND USE

11.1 – Abandoned Rights of Way
We support:

1) Legislation granting the first right of refusal to the prior owner of land that was taken for a railroad, non-railroad, road, or other public right of way and then abandoned.
2) Basing the value of such land, including mineral rights, on the fair market value of comparable property. If the prior landowner chooses not to exercise his or her first right to purchase the parcel, the adjacent landowners should have the next opportunity to purchase the parcel using an open bid process.

We oppose:

1) Conversion of abandoned railroad rights of way and public rights of way to recreational trails or projects, with a resulting loss of private property and farmland.
2) Provisions of the National Trails Act that permits abandoned rail property to be donated and/or used for nature trails or other recreational purposes.
3) Transfer of lands and/or regulatory jurisdictions between state, federal and/or local agencies for the development of parks or trails without an open public process and consideration of the impact on surrounding land uses, including agriculture.

11.2 – Agricultural Marketing in Urban Growth Areas
We support the ability of farmers to operate a farm, cooperative agricultural-based farmers market, or agricultural stand on all property, regardless of zoning, urban growth designations, or local regulations. Operators should be allowed to enhance their agricultural products with complementary value-added farm products.
(2004, Amended 2009)

11.3 – Buffers
We believe that buffers should be voluntary.

We support reimbursement for buffer management.

We oppose:

1) “No-touch,” mandated, non-compensated buffers on private property. “No-touch” buffers are not an option in flood plains. They could severely impact river valley flood plain agriculture, jeopardize whole towns and communities, and in some cases, subject the entire region to devastating floods.
2) Practices that jeopardize maintenance, operation and utilization of drainage and flood control systems or facilities.
(2002, Amended 2015)

11.4 – Drainage, Diking, and Flood Control Districts
Man-made, developed drainage systems are infrastructure vital to any given locale for the timely removal of surface and floodwaters. They are of equal importance to agricultural areas as are sewers and drains to urban areas.

We support:

1) The right to maintain and keep clean drainage ditches on our property without restriction, permits, or planting vegetation.
2) Compensation to drainage districts, dike districts, and flood control districts for surface water and effluent discharged from urban and/or housing developments.

We oppose:

1) The intentional breaching or removal of flood control structures or facilities.
2) Regulatory requirements that degrade the function of drainage facilities.
3) Any effort to classify drainage ditches as waters of the state or United States.
4) Requiring United States Fish and Wildlife Service assessments on man-made, man-maintained facilities, including drainage ditches, as a pre-condition to construction.
(1997, Amended 2011)

11.5 – Eminent Domain
We believe the only legitimate use of eminent domain is to procure property that is used directly, physically and exclusively by or for the public use.

Taking of property or easements under eminent domain should:

1) Require that the condemning agency must identify property to be taken, state the “public use” for such property, and ensure that such property must be used for the stated purpose within seven years.
2) Be used only in cases where it can be shown that it is for a necessary “public use” and that it is not feasible to use publicly-owned land for the project.

3) Select sites that are the least disruptive to people and the environment, particularly to prime agricultural land.

4) Provide a forum for public and landowner input into potential eminent domain actions at the beginning of a site selection process.

5) Provide safeguards including direct notice by registered mail to ensure early representation of landowner concerns.

6) Require that premiums be paid to reflect the intrinsic value of ongoing farm and commercial operations. (Since agricultural land is often the least expensive to acquire through condemnation, government will tend to condemn a disproportionately large share of agricultural land.)

7) Require prompt, just, and adequate compensation. Compensation should include the amount for the property taken, plus any direct costs reasonably incurred as a result of the eminent domain action. The responsible agency should also be liable for any taxes and penalties incurred as a result of the eminent domain action.

We believe it should be at the discretion of the landowner to accept monetary compensation or some other arrangement, including, but not limited to:

1) Trade of land, tax reduction or credit, transfer of development rights, density bonus or credit; and/or,

2) Monetary compensation: regardless of its current value, the owner is to be compensated at no less than 125% of the “fair market value” at the time of taking, plus any applicable penalties when removing agricultural land from open space designation. “Fair market value” for the purpose of eminent domain compensation should use the appraising method of highest and best use.

We believe that when condemned property is not used for the stated public use or not used for that purpose within seven years from taking that:

1) The agency that took the property through eminent domain should pay the original owner or their heirs an amount to make the total compensation equal to no less than 200% of the original fair market value, due and payable seven years from the time of taking; or, at the owner’s option,

2) The land should be offered to the prior owners or their heirs at a price no higher than 100% of the original “fair market value” purchase price, less tax liabilities incurred at time of taking and less the value of any damage or depreciating influence.

We oppose the use of eminent domain to acquire land for recreational purposes, to expand the landholding of wildlife agencies, and to acquire land for resale to non-governmental entities. (1996, Amended 2007)

11.6 – Federal Antiquities Act
We support the repeal of the Federal Antiquities Act.

11.7 – Federal Control of Planning
We are opposed to any federal control of local and regional planning because it poses serious impacts to both the economy of communities and on our regional economy as a whole. (2000, Amended 2012)

11.8 – Greenways and View Sheds
A greenway is a defined area on either side of a highway, such as I-90, set aside in its natural state. Once a greenway is established, severe land use restrictions may be imposed on adjacent private lands. View sheds are defined as those areas that are as far as the naked eye can see. Like greenways, these areas may also impose land use restrictions on unsuspecting private landowners.

We oppose any attempt to establish greenways and view sheds in any agricultural and privately owned areas. (1997, Amended 2012)

11.9 – Growth Management Act
We oppose the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) as a gross violation of the constitutional right to private property and, therefore, call for its elimination. However, until the GMA is eliminated, we support:

1) Elimination of the Growth Management Hearings Board. Until the elimination of the Board occurs, we support changing the governor-appointed Board positions to positions elected by voters in each of the Board’s respective three jurisdictional regions. If state Senate confirmation for individual Growth Management Hearings Board members is considered, we demand that confirmation be limited to only those senators representing the affected jurisdictional region and that a 60% supermajority be required for confirmation. In the event the Senate fails to confirm a nomination within 60 days, the county commissioners of the affected jurisdictional region shall confirm by a 60% supermajority vote.

2) Allowing counties with an overall population density of less than 100 people per square mile to, at their discretion, opt-out
of the GMA, even if they started or are currently planning under the Act.
3) Exempting agriculture and forestry from critical areas ordinance requirements of the Growth Management Act.
4) Requiring local governments to perform a full economic analysis on the cost of the implementation, compliance and regulation of a critical areas ordinance on both public and private lands before adopting such an ordinance. If an economic analysis indicates an economic impact, then the local government shall be required to present a plan that will mitigate the economic impacts on both private and public lands. Funding for such economic analysis should be provided by the state for rural counties.
5) Limiting the use of the critical areas ordinances by local governments to the minimum required by statute. State agencies should not be allowed to require or suggest requiring or suggesting that local governments exceed the minimums required by statute.
6) The passage of legislation that would require that all critical areas ordinances, as well as any updates, be required to include “procedural due process” language as part of either original or subsequent updates.
7) The formulation of programs to control urban growth and preserve farmlands provided that land use planning is kept within the jurisdiction of local counties.
8) Amending the GMA to require cities and counties to purchase, at fair market value, private property before restricting use of the property. This property would remain on the tax rolls, and conversion of GMA-designated agricultural lands to wetland, fish habitat, or any other use inconsistent with agricultural use would be prohibited.
9) Legislative action that would mandate “agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance” be determined by the locally-affected landowners. Definitions adopted by local jurisdictions shall not be binding on other jurisdictions. All lands designated as agricultural land of long-term commercial significance must be economically viable. Where such lands require irrigation to be viable, the Growth Management Act and the water code should be amended to ensure that water is available for all such lands or they should be de-designated.
10) Limiting the use of outside experts by the Growth Management Hearings Board to providing technical advice, not opinion, and only if all parties to an appeal are notified in advance of the intent of the board to seek the outside expert and all parties are permitted to review the credentials, appropriateness, and presentations of those experts, and all parties are allowed to file briefs in response to the expert predictions. Parties to the appeal may object or agree with the use of a particular expert with or without cause.
11) In the planning process, first consideration should be given to individual property rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, including the right to own, sell or bequeath private property.

We encourage local county governments to consider the following before modifying their comprehensive land use plans:
1) All division of lands must meet the guideline regarding growth in the comprehensive plan.
2) All planning should be done at the county and local levels.
3) First consideration should be given to individual property rights.
4) Plans adopted should reflect the majority opinion of those property owners affected.
5) County planning commissions should have adequate agricultural representation.
6) Farmers’ participation on an agriculture land zone designation committee of their county and/or local governmental agency in charge of agricultural zone changes is the only acceptable method for agricultural zones to be changed, amended and/or modified. Farmers must be represented and must have input for the diverse types of uses for agricultural zoned land in order to ensure their “Right to Farm.”
7) Rural areas should not be required to accept urban development regulations without adequate agricultural input.
8) Using minimum guidelines for growth management, as recommended by the Washington State Department of Commerce in administering the Growth Management Act, to avoid permanently “locking-up” farmland through the use of agricultural zoning. (1996, Amended 2015)

11.10 – Maintenance of Federal Lands
We believe that the National Parks Service, United States Forest Service, and other federal agencies should be required to demonstrate they are in compliance with the current land use laws, including maintenance, on existing lands and properties before being allowed to acquire any new land or property. (2012)

11.11 – Negotiated Interagency Land Settlements
General land use policy discussions and decisions between public agencies should be made only in a public forum to ensure the public’s right to participate. Land use policy should be the purview of the local jurisdiction’s citizenry and not outside interests. We oppose the use of negotiated settlement agreements between public agencies that are not open to public scrutiny or rebuttal. (2007)
11.12 – Preserving Agricultural Land and Private Property
We believe that agricultural production on private farmland has priority over public recreational pursuits, and these rights should be protected by appropriate governmental departments and agencies.

The most important component in preserving agricultural land is enhancing agricultural profitability. Efforts to improve the financial climate of agriculture by increasing profitability through reduced production costs and other similar measures will enhance the continuation of agriculture as a viable industry and, consequently, the preservation of agricultural land.

Privately funded voluntary conservation programs, long-term leases, infrastructure funding, marketing programs, right-to-farm ordinances, and regulatory reform are necessary elements in a comprehensive approach to improve the agricultural economy and to preserve the economic, environmental, and scenic benefits of production agriculture.

We support:
1) Maintaining present agricultural tax incentives such as those in the Open Space Taxation Act.
2) Considering additional means to reduce production costs in the area of sales and inheritance taxes and broaden the scope of the Open Space Taxation Act to include trees and vines.
3) Amending the Growth Management Act to require cities and counties to acquire controlling interest in private property before restricting use of the property.
4) Requiring all land trusts, government agencies and non-government agencies involved in the purchase of conservation easements to follow the same disclosure requirements as real estate agents.

We believe that preserving agricultural land through purchase or transfer of development rights will not guarantee preservation of agriculture as an industry. However, the right to sell or transfer development rights is the right and option of an individual property owner.

We oppose:
1) Governmental agency transfers of uncompensated development rights.
2) Legislation that promotes any purchasing advantage for conservation or preservation buyers, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, or other state agencies over any other buyers in purchasing private property. (2001, Amended 2014)

11.13 – Protection of Land as a Resource
We believe that no governmental agency or private group should be allowed to decree any resource to be of higher value for protection than any other resource without measurable economic and logical justification.

We support:
1) Having an equal opportunity to participate in formulating river basin plans. Agricultural organizations and the Washington State Department of Agriculture must be equal partners in the development of such plans, along with the Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and non-consumptive users. Involvement from early stages of development should continue as long as the plan exists.
2) Giving owners/operators of agricultural lands flexibility (in methods, regulations, or bureaucratic procedures) in emergency situations to protect the involved lands from erosion and/or destruction from excessive water flows or course changes.

We oppose:
1) The actions of state agencies that, without sound basis, have placed a higher value on potential fish resources than the land resource along streams and rivers.
2) The formation of any ecosystem designation that would lock up public land and/or lock up or depreciate private land.
3) Designating farmlands as wetlands in order to prohibit the growing of agricultural crops in continuity through federal Wetland Reserve Program easements.
4) Restrictive permit processes regarding gravel bar maintenance. We encourage the state legislature to fund unbiased scientific studies to evaluate gravel movement and availability in Washington’s watersheds. (1996, Amended 2012)

11.14 – Right to Control Access
Private property and the right to control access shall be protected. We oppose any law, rule, or ordinance that restricts or penalizes landowners who limit or charge for access to their private property. (2014)

11.15 – Right to Farm
We urge counties to pass “Right to Farm” ordinances. We believe that agricultural lands (including in urban growth areas), aquacultural, forestry and mineral resources activity or operation must not be deemed a private or public nuisance if it is determined that:
1) No hazard to human health exists;
2) Generally accepted good management practices are being utilized; and
3) Practices are in general conformance with the accepted practice for the area.

We believe if an established farm is being encroached upon by non-farm developments, the farmer should not be restricted from nor held liable for using any agricultural chemicals, consistent with labeling and approved farm practices.

Any person or persons threatening a stop work order or lawsuit should be required to purchase a bond to cover potential damages if the lawsuit and/or stop work order is found to be without merit.

We will support developing a local program whereby each operator can voluntarily become certified to attest that all applicable rules are being followed.

We oppose any legislation that calls for reimbursement for unsubstantiated or imaginary ills attributed to chemicals, noise, drift, hours of operation, and/or odors from agricultural operations.

We believe that individuals who continually file frivolous or harassing complaints against farmers should be held accountable, both legally and financially. (1995, Amended 2008)

11.16 – Right to Plow

We support the Right to Plow, as passed by initiative by Snohomish County voters in November 2001, which declares normal agricultural activities (such as plowing, digging or cleaning ditches, and moving dirt) do not require a permit.

11.17 – Rights of Way

We favor the use of existing rights of way for all new construction of power lines, railroads, and highways whenever feasible. (1996, Amended 2012)

11.18 – Rights on Federal Lands

We believe the courts have established that private individuals can hold inheritable rights on federally-administered lands. These inheritable rights are defined as an individual’s right to hold fee interest in these lands and these rights include, but are not limited to, rights to water, grazing, access, and maintenance of improvements.

We believe these rights are afforded the protections of property rights.

We oppose any public agency attempting to deny or otherwise reduce these rights. (2004)

11.19 – Shoreline Management Act

We support the current agricultural exemption in the Shoreline Management Act and oppose any attempt to remove or alter the exemption.

We urge the passage of legislation that would require that all Shoreline Master Programs developed under the Shoreline Management Act, as well as any updates, be required to include “procedural due process” language as part of the original or subsequent updates. (2007)

11.20 – Taking of Private Property

We support:
1) The rights of people to freely acquire, use, and dispose of property.
2) Just compensation for landowners when any right is taken directly through physical seizure or indirectly through regulation.
3) Full value compensation being paid from the budget of the specific agency responsible for the regulation that restricts the rights of an owner to use his/her property.
4) Legislation that requires an economic impact statement for any regulation that might have the effect of taking of property rights.
5) Asking Congress to emphasize to the Farm Service Agency, Farm Credit System and Natural Resources Conservation Service the intent of the law under the Swampbuster provision to prevent illegal interpretation and taking of private property without compensation. If Congress is reluctant to clarify its intent, we urge legal action be taken to force uniform correction of these agencies’ interpretation of the law and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

We oppose:
1) Passage of any law that could or will diminish the owner’s control of and/or the right to own private property, including animals, real estate, and personal property. This specifically includes any legislation that authorizes, allows, or encourages any agency or subdivision of the state to utilize ecosystem management in a way that could impact the ability of the private
landowner to utilize the landowners’ property in a beneficial manner that does not measurably harm or create an immediate threat to public health, safety, or welfare.

2) Any further taking of private property with federal funding such as provided by the American Heritage Trust, Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, National Heritage Areas, or State Heritage Areas. (1993, Amended 2014)

11.21 – Transfer of Federal Lands
We support a transfer of federal lands in Washington to state ownership through the promise of extinguishable title. Further, we support private ownership and local management of these transferred lands. (2013)

11.22 – Trespass
We believe in the right of a person to protect his property and to regulate who should enter upon it.

We support:
1) Vigorous enforcement of trespass laws. Farmers and the general public should be encouraged to report violations by trespassers.
2) Mandatory penalties being levied against persons convicted of illegal entry. Penalties should be commensurate with the damage done to property. Property within the meaning of this section should include land such as summer fallow, land in crops, timberland, and planted or natural pasture. Property should also include improvements such as barns, silos, houses, machine sheds, grain elevators, yard, and utilities on or adjacent to farmland, whether posted or not.
3) Local authorities immediately impounding any motor vehicle trespassing on private property and fining the operator. Adequate compensation for any damages incurred should be paid to the property owner, before return of the vehicle.

We oppose:
1) Legislation giving the public access to private property, or upon lands to which an individual has present right of possession, without the landowner’s consent.
2) Farmers being liable for adverse health effects incurred as a result of trespass on private lands and/or consuming treated commodity. (1994, Amended 2014)

11.23 – Uses of Real and Personal Property
We believe all uses of real and personal property are lawful, unless specifically prohibited by law enacted by the appropriate legislative body, consistent with appropriate public notice and due process. (2015)
SECTION 12 – MARKETING AND TRADE

12.1 – Agricultural Import Health Standards
We support the safe production and processing of food and fiber, including fish and shellfish.

To best protect health standards, we support:
1) Requiring all food and fiber produced in foreign countries and imported into the United States to meet the same inspection standards and requirements as are present in the United States. Foreign food produced with chemicals not allowed for use by United States producers and processors under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 should not be allowed to be imported into the United States’ markets for human or animal consumption.
2) Requiring imported dairy and beef cattle to be 30 months or younger due to cases of bovine spongiform encephalopathy, tuberculosis, Johne’s, and brucellosis. Foreign feed standards and protocols must meet those of the United States.
3) A stronger cooperative relationship between the United States Department of Agriculture and each state to support individual state protocols. (1997, Amended 2008, 2016)

12.2 – Agricultural Labeling Standards
We support labeling of imported content on all retail consumer packages and displays of imported food and fiber. (1997, Amended 2015)

12.3 – Beef Checkoff
We support:
1) The beef checkoff program.
2) Allowing the free market system to work in the U.S. beef industry.
3) Ensuring that beef producers lead, direct, and control the program.
4) Ensuring full compliance of the beef industry to pay the required fee that supports the beef checkoff program.
5) That the beef checkoff revenues and costs at the state and federal level be reported annually to all beef producers.

We oppose:
1) Any changes to the beef checkoff program that take control away from producers, the Federation of State Beef Councils, and the individual beef councils.
2) Any increases in beef checkoff fees without improvements to compliance and oversight of the program. (2014, Amended 2017)

12.4 – “Buy Washington” Agricultural Products
We urge the legislature, the governor, all state agencies, schools, and correction facilities to use and promote the products produced by farmers and ranchers of the state of Washington.

We support:
1) Having state agencies look first at suppliers and manufacturers within the state for their purchasing needs, staying within the framework of competitive bidding.
2) The local purchase and distribution of locally grown agricultural commodities by retail food distributors whose consolidated purchasing offices are located outside the local area.
3) The redemption of food stamps, Women, Infant and Children (WIC) and senior coupons at on-farm markets, farm stands, organized farmers markets, and community supported agriculture (CSA) outlets. (1994, Amended 2008)

12.5 – Cargo Preference
There should be no restrictions as to the quantities or vessels on which a commodity is shipped between United States ports.

We support:
1) Repeal of the cabotage provisions of the Jones Act.
2) Exempting bulk agricultural commodities from the Jones Act to make shipping of agricultural commodities within the United States and its territories more competitive until the cabotage provisions of the Jones Act are repealed.

We oppose legislation or decisions to extend cargo preference to any U.S. farm exports, since cargo preference requirements make U.S. farm exports less competitive in world markets. (Amended 2009, 2016)
12.6 – Commodity Disparagement
We oppose the irresponsible reporting or dissemination of information that disparages or otherwise implies that any agricultural commodity is unsafe or unfit to eat without the support of clear and convincing scientific evidence. (2002)

12.7 – Dairy Import Duties
We support action to impose countervailing duties on all dairy imports allowed over and above the annual legal quota if such imports are deemed necessary by the American Farm Bureau Federation Dairy Commodity Advisory Committee. (1999)

12.8 – Exporting of Forest Products
We oppose any legislation or regulatory efforts that would limit the export of wood or wood products and raw unprocessed logs.

12.9 – Fair Prices for Farm Products
We support a market-oriented agriculture with supply and demand, rather than government action, ultimately determining production and price.

Subsequent to the Food Security Act, a consistent market-oriented farm program should be pursued that would:
1) Rely less on government and more on the market.
2) Allow farmers to take maximum advantage of market opportunities at home and abroad without government interference. 
3) Encourage production decisions based on market demand. 
4) Encourage needed adjustments in resource use. 
5) Minimize or eliminate the impact on non-program commodities. 
6) Provide for minimal government stocks. 
7) Oppose mandatory controls on wheat and feed grains. 
8) Be consistent with and complementary to international economic and foreign relations policies. 

We are opposed to packer ownership, feeding, or controlling of livestock for more than seven days prior to slaughter. However, we support an exemption to cooperatives, or entities owned by cooperatives, and packers who handle less than two percent of total United States livestock slaughtered. (1995, Amended 2005)

12.10 – Food Labeling
We support USDA approved market-based certification programs that identify the production practices used. We oppose false, misleading, or deceptive marketing and promotion and/or label claims. (2007)

12.11 – Grain Standards, Grading Inspection, and Quality Incentives
We support:
1) An incentive-based grading system that encourages the highest quality grain production in order to fill our customer’s needs.
2) Re-establishing red wheat protein grading on an “as is” basis rather than the 12 percent fixed moisture basis. 
3) A more uniform interpretation of grading between inland and coastal inspection points. 
4) Requiring producer hearings and published reports when grade standard changes are proposed from the Washington State Department of Agriculture or United States Department of Agriculture. (2001)

12.12 – Horticultural Live Plants
We support truth in advertising for the benefit of all customers when live plants are offered for sale to the general public. However, we are opposed to extending the Federal Uniform Packaging and Labeling Regulation requirements to horticultural live plants grown in containers when these products are sold on the retail level. (2005)

12.13 – Poultry
We support:
1) Weighing procedures for all poultry be enforced by the Packers and Stockyards Administration. 
2) Encouraging the use of eggs and poultry products in school lunch programs and the PL-480 export program. 

We oppose government agencies entering into any poultry projects that are in competition with farmers, except for research and/or public education. (1999, Amended 2012, 2016)

12.14 – Regional Designations
We oppose any attempts to label the cattle industries of the United States and Canada as one North American herd. (2005)
12.15 – Spearmint Marketing Order
We support the Far West Spearmint Marketing Order as currently established and its intentions as to the orderly marketing of Far West Spearmint Oils.

12.16 – Trade, Marketing, and Development Programs
We believe that trade between the United States and any other nation should provide for equal access to each other’s markets. However, trade issues should be equal in regard to fair practices between nations in agricultural chemicals, inspections, regulations, grading, containers, and label regulations.

We support:
1) Programs that increase present market share or programs that develop new markets for our products.
2) Elimination of trade barriers and discrimination against United States products.
3) Controlling importation of products that are directly subsidized by the exporting nation.
4) Efforts made by our state agencies and legislature toward dissolving barriers against Washington products.
5) An active role by the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) in the promotion of sales of Washington farm products in domestic and foreign markets.
6) Continuation of WSDA education programs aimed at farm markets, roadside markets and U-pick operations.
7) Legislation restricting wholesalers and retailers from discrimination against local farm products.

We will oppose any unilateral action by the United States to eliminate import restrictions and subsidies without equivalent commitments by other countries. (1994)
SECTION 13 – TRANSPORTATION

13.1 – Commercial Trucking Regulations
We support:
1) Eliminating the state coursework training requirement for drivers to obtain commercial driver licenses, thereby reducing costs associated with acquiring these licenses.
2) Exempting agricultural vehicles of 26,000 GVWR or less from:
   a) The state requirement to possess and display a USDOT number for intrastate commerce.
   b) Any requirement to stop at weigh stations.
3) Allowing trucks with hydraulic dump systems or other auxiliary equipment to have rear bumper clearances greater than 16 inches from the ground. (1998, Amended 2012)

13.2 – Inland Water Transportation
We support:
1) The maintenance and improvement of our lock and dam system.
2) Dredging of navigable waters, including removing silt from river channels to facilitate water transportation.
3) Additional dredging to deepen the existing channel to ensure year-round and timely shipping on the lower Columbia River from the Port of Vancouver to the Pacific Ocean.
4) Improved infrastructure at Northwest ports to better facilitate the loading of all sizes of ships.
We oppose any drawdown of any pool in the Columbia and Snake River systems beyond minimum-designed operating levels. (2004, Amended 2011)

13.3 – Insurance Requirements for Licensing Vehicles
We support:
1) Requiring proof of insurance before a license can be issued.
2) Immediate impounding of vehicles if the driver is not a legally licensed driver and/or does not have vehicle liability insurance.
3) Forging cooperative agreements with the state Native American Indian tribes that will allow effective enforcement of such regulations on Native American Indian reservations. (1997, Amended 2011, 2016)

13.4 – Railroads
We support consideration of the following issues when formulating railroad policy:
1) Historic reasoning for land grants to railroads.
2) Monopolistic operation of railroads in given areas (captive shipper).
3) Historic investment pattern of railroads maintenance.
4) Deregulation of procedures.
5) Economics of fuel usage.
6) Availability of farm-to-market highways during all times of the year.
We oppose closing any railroad lines servicing agricultural areas if such closure would adversely affect the public good (roads, highways, etc.), agricultural producers in the area, or commodity shipments. (2000, Amended 2011)

13.5 – Rest Areas
We urge the Washington State Department of Transportation to keep open and maintain sufficient rest areas 12 months of the year. (1998)

13.6 – Roadside Marketing
We support approval of the use of highway rights-of-way for roadside selling of agricultural products where safety is not a risk.

13.7 – Traffic Enforcement – Bicycle
We urge law enforcement agencies to properly enforce traffic laws as they pertain to bicycle operators. Law enforcement officials should be encouraged to ensure safe driving conditions by citing bicycle riders for illegal actions. (1998, Amended 2002)

13.8 – Transportation Funding and Road Maintenance
We support:
1) Dedicating all federal and state highway fuel tax revenues to our public roads and highway system.
2) Reorganizing the state’s spending priorities to fund needed transportation projects.
3) Farm-to-market roads being maintained and updated to handle present traffic loads.
4) Exempting fuel used for agricultural production, harvest, storage, loading, and transportation from highway fuel taxes. This exemption includes any incidental use of public roads for these purposes.
5) Laws clarifying that fines or penalties for non-farm use of dyed diesel fuel should be limited to the capacity of the vehicle fuel tank and should not be imposed on fuel contained in privately owned bulk storage tanks.
6) The prime burden of cost for metro transit systems being borne by those most directly benefitted.
7) The concept that money originally earmarked for county bridge and road maintenance be used only for that intended purpose.
8) Monies derived from farm truck permits being used exclusively for rural road improvement in the county in which the permit is purchased.
9) Legislation to build an I-90 highway tunnel on Snoqualmie Pass from approximately Denny Creek to Hyak.

We oppose:
1) Increasing tonnage fees for farm vehicles.
2) Tolls on vehicles transporting agricultural products, with the exception of a toll for the use of a Snoqualmie Pass tunnel.
3) Imposing unrealistic weight, length, and width limitations for vehicles on farm-to-market roads. (Amended 2015)
SECTION 14 – WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

14.1 – Bureau of Reclamation and Irrigation Districts
River flow operations conducted by the United States Bureau of Reclamation should be based on a balanced approach. In water short years, storage water should not be released at optimum levels for fishery interests. In addition, the maximum amount of water possible should be stored for future uses in water short years.

Charges for irrigation water must not include any “opportunity costs” associated with the potential to use the water in some other manner. Irrigation district assessments should be designed to provide the district with sufficient funds for payment of debt retirement, current operating expenses, overhead, and replacement reserve funds.

We recommend that in the case of a natural disaster situation, the United States Bureau of Reclamation should render assistance to the affected irrigation districts. (Amended 2012)

14.2 – Community Water Systems
We believe there should be no regulation of Group B community water systems or Group A water systems with less than 50 residential hookups by state or federal agencies. Local health departments should be relied upon for testing and enforcement of water quality in such systems. (1997, Amended 2004)

14.3 – Dams
We support re-licensing and maintenance of all dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers and any and all waters that feed these rivers.

We oppose the removal or breaching of any dam. (1999, Amended 2006)

14.4 – Dredging and Ditching
We support:
1) The dredging of or sediment removal from Washington rivers and creeks to increase the water holding capacity and lessen the flood danger to agricultural communities.
2) Allowing ditching and dredging when fish of economic importance or listed under the Endangered Species Act are not present in streams or during specified time frames that do not disrupt natural or annual migration.
3) Designating that manmade ditches and farm ponds come under the jurisdiction of the local Farm Service Agency (FSA) and not the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife or Washington State Department of Ecology. Management should be in accordance with FSA rules that allow for proper management of resources for best productivity.
4) Removal of sediment from rivers and streams to increase flood storage capacity, improve fish habitat, and reduce the hydraulic stress on dikes and banks. (1997, Amended 2015)

14.5 – Flood Damage Reconstruction
We believe that the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife should not have total jurisdiction over bridge construction or repair or over work necessary to construct or repair dikes or channels.

14.6 – General Stream Adjudication
We believe:
1) A general adjudication of water rights conducted by a superior court is the appropriate venue for the quantifying of water rights and water right claims within the state.
2) The court of original jurisdiction over a water right adjudication should retain jurisdiction in perpetuity over all matters pertaining to the adjudication decree.

We oppose:
1) Efforts to provide additional authority to the Department of Ecology to administratively “adjudicate” water rights.
2) Providing the Department of Ecology with the ability to select areas of the state to initiate adjudications for a small number of water rights without the request to do so by at least two water rights holders. (2009, Amended 2011)

14.7 – Ground Water Management Area
We support:
1) Ground Water Management Area (GWMA) practices intended to protect ground water from further nitrate contamination.
2) Requiring GWMA plans to be cost-effective, socially and economically acceptable, and scientifically verifiable, in order to be effectively implemented and have long-term positive results.
3) Participation at the local level planning process as being essential to success. (Amended 2011)
14.8 – Metering Water
We oppose the state of Washington or any state agency metering, measuring, or monitoring water usage out of exempt wells. In addition, we also oppose any and all attempts by the state of Washington or any state agency to require or pressure the owners of exempt wells to agree to metering, measuring, or monitoring water usage out of those wells, as a condition of being able to obtain other permits, benefits, and considerations from any government agency. (Amended 2005)

14.9 – Reclaimed Water
We believe:
1) Reclaimed water, properly treated and conditioned, is a valuable and viable source of agricultural water. Such water should be made available to farmers and irrigation districts at or below fair market value.
2) The quantity of reclaimed water should not be an additional deduction from an instream flow since it has already been deducted.
We support:
1) Utilizing reclaimed water as an additional source of agricultural water, so long as agricultural water rights are not impaired.
2) Legislation exempting reclaimed water from undue regulation.
3) Creating education for farmers, city officials, and the public of the value, safety, and conservation benefits of the use of reclaimed water. (2016)

14.10 – Sole Source Aquifer Designation
We believe when an aquifer is designated as a sole source aquifer that undesirable and excessive regulation can be the result, such as the potential for the Environmental Protection Agency to review and deny projects receiving federal assistance.

Therefore, we believe that sole source aquifer designation must only be made when peer-reviewed, credible scientific data clearly support such a designation.

We oppose designation of the Eastern Columbia Plateau Aquifer System and the Lower Yakima Valley aquifers as sole source due to lack of scientific evidence. (1996, Amended 2010)

14.11 – Washington Water Law
We support:
1) The treatment of water rights as equal to all other property rights.
2) Efficient and timely processing of water applications.
3) Allowing the transfer and change of water right permits and certificates, for both ground water and surface water, without requiring an elaborate change/transfer process.
4) Allowing water rights holders to change the place of use or purpose, for lands adjacent to or owned (or leased) by the water right holder, where the total amount of water right is not increased.
5) Removing the state water code provisions for partial relinquishment to give water holders long-term operational flexibility. Use it or lose it policy penalizes good stewardship, conservation, and investments in water saving delivery systems and fails to recognize cropping or weather patterns.
6) The water rights holder retaining “conserved” water resulting from actions to improve a water system and/or delivery efficiencies.
7) Extending the current five-year period of non-use to calculate forfeiture.
8) Limiting the look-back period used by the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) to ten years prior to the date the evidence of nonuse was submitted or the date forfeiture proceedings were commenced, whichever date occurred last.
9) Making available water rights that were historically used for agricultural production that are relinquished due to non-use for re-appropriation and limited to agricultural use. Priority shall be given to water right requests for land that has been designated agricultural lands. These water rights shall be reissued regardless of stream closures.
10) The right to transfer water without DOE or conservancy boards applying policies that decrease the amount of water transferred - We believe that the only limit on the amount of water that can be transferred is a limit that would result in no impairment of another water rights holder’s water right. A water rights holder could ask for an extension of time for periods not to exceed five years each, upon a showing of reasonable cause for such nonuse. Reasonable causes for nonuse would include:
   a) Financial crisis.
   b) Industrial depression.
   c) Operation of legal proceedings or other unavoidable causes.
   d) Climatic conditions.
11) Reverting to the pre-1967 standard of abandonment in the absence of a forfeiture statute.
12) Classifying leasing of water as a beneficial use.
13) Complete implementation by DOE of legislation empowering the water conservancy boards.
14) The adoption of a law clarifying that riparian stock watering is a water right and allowing livestock producers to transfer riparian stock water rights to a tank yet preserve the original date and right. This will encourage the use and installation of off-stream watering systems, while recognizing the historical priority of livestock water and access to watering areas.
15) Providing farms and ranches certainty for their stock watering use from exempt wells. We believe that the law is perfectly clear that the withdrawal of stock water from exempt wells is not limited to the 5000-gallon per day household limit. However, we support additional efforts to provide certainty and flexibility to stock water needs that are voluntary in nature and do not affect the exemption contained in the exempt well statute.
16) Open water markets. As a property right, water must be freely transferrable and tradable.
17) Water planning at the local level with local water planning advisory groups made up of local stakeholders within the water planning area; however, we oppose the development of regional water management strategies that involve other states, federal agencies, etc.
18) Equal treatment under the law for private water rights and public water systems (both publicly owned and privately owned) without the codification of water use efficiency requirements.
19) Legislation establishing priority for new water rights for private individuals and private entities to capture and store excess runoff for future use.

We oppose:
1) Any curtailment by the state of existing rights without notice and due process.
2) Any legislation, agency rule, or policy requiring mitigation for agricultural water rights.
3) The development of regional water management strategies that involve other states, federal agencies, etc.
4) Any basic charge or tax for private water, including emergency wells. (2002, Amended 2015)

14.12 – Water Management
Due to the conflicting goals within the Washington State Department of Ecology, we recommend that a separate agency administer water law and protect water rights in Washington state.

We believe the state of Washington should:
1) Vigorously defend state water law against federal agencies and policies that would attempt to undermine state authority over water management.
2) Identify instream flows as being junior to any water rights appropriated prior to the setting of instream flows. Instream flow requirements need to be achievable and based on the best available scientific data. Instream flows should not be set as a way to reserve water for future use or consumption. Rules that are not based on these standards, such as the Skagit instream flow rule in WAC 173-503, should be repealed.
3) Follow existing state water law and allow due consideration of social and economic values as part of the definition of public interest.
4) Change the current approach to water management that forces as much relinquishment as possible and denies new water rights and transfers, such as the involuntary relinquishment of water rights based on and equal to the amount of return flow from an individual farm or water purveyor.
5) Expand reservoir storage and Aquifer Storage and Retrieval (ASRs) as a solution to concerns of instream flows.
6) Provide for the capture, storage, and use of seasonal runoff, subject to prior appropriation, by private individuals for private use.
7) Recognize voluntary use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) in irrigation to make wise use of our water resources.
8) Conduct and consider environmental and economic impact statements before taking any action related to water resource management programs.

We oppose:
1) Any attempt to remove water from Washington to any other state or region, whether for agriculture, industrial, domestic, power generation, or any other use.
2) Government entities being allowed to forego the established laws and processes for the transfer of water rights.
3) The use of “pollution standards” to limit the full use of water rights by the Washington State Department of Ecology.
4) Mandatory BMP requirements for irrigation.

We request legislative oversight that would guarantee that watershed planning remains a local process and that watershed planning adheres to local planning board decisions. (2003, Amended 2015)

14.13 – Water Projects
We support the following water management programs:
1) Construction and funding of water storage, water conservation, and efficiency programs; streamlining the permitting of
storage projects; and state and federal cooperation in building multi-use water storage systems anywhere feasible.
2) Completion of the planned construction of the second half (East High Canal Section) of the Columbia Basin Project.
3) The completion of East Low Canal expansion in the Columbia Basin Project and the lease of excess water from irrigation districts to land currently under agricultural production.
4) Completion of the Yakima Integrated Plan or any other action that will provide more storage water for the Yakima Basin.
   (1999, Amended 2015)

14.14 – Water Rights
Water rights are property rights.
We support recognition of existing ground water and surface water rights consistent with western water law. (2001, Amended 2004)

14.15 – Water Trespass
Any action by an entity that willfully diverts water under its management or ownership onto a neighboring property shall be liable for any damages to said property. (2013)
SECTION 15 – WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

15.1 – County Wildlife Management
We urge that wildlife damage and/or predator control management be returned to the counties that so choose. We advocate reallocating Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife funds assigned to these programs to those counties opting to implement them in their place. (2002, Amended 2014, 2016)

15.2 – Goose and Turkey Depredation Plan
We support establishing an effective plan to reduce damage done to agricultural products by birds such as geese, turkeys and sandhill cranes that would include:
1) Reduction of goose, turkey and sandhill crane populations by establishing and maximizing hunting opportunities;
2) Maintaining refuges that attract geese and sandhill cranes away from agricultural land by growing crops that will attract and feed the waterfowl population;
3) Specific steps that will show measurable reduction of coliforms and pathogens contributed by wildlife in our water bodies and agricultural crop lands.
4) Increasing hazing programs provided by state and federal wildlife officials, since the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) require a Federal Explosives Permit for the use of certain types of pyrotechnics. (Amended 2011, 2016)

15.3 – Hound Hunting
We support legislation to reinstate hound-hunting seasons for bear and cougar. (2002)

15.4 – Hunting and Fishing Exemption
We support legislation to allow the occupant of a farm or the immediate members of the occupant’s family to hunt, take, kill, or pursue with a firearm or bow, a wild bird, animal, or fowl, or taking any fur-bearing animal by means of a trap or from taking fish with hand line or rod and line, in the manner provided by law during the time when it is lawful so to do, on the farm property, without being licensed. The exemption of this paragraph shall not apply to a person residing on the farm or to a tenant thereon who is not a member of the occupant family. (2007, Amended 2011)

15.5 – Livestock Damage by Dogs
We believe damage to livestock or poultry caused by a dog should be reimbursed up to triple the value of the loss by the owner of the dog. (1997, Amended 2001, 2016)

15.6 – Pronghorn Antelope
We support that private property landowners be allowed to destroy trespassing pronghorn antelope on their property without having to obtain permits or licenses.

We oppose the introduction of pronghorn antelope into areas of Washington where they are not found to be indigenous. If agencies or other entities proceed with establishment, all introduced animals shall be tested and declared clear of tuberculosis and brucellosis by an accredited United States Department of Agriculture lab and respective state lab at the point of origin. Any animals found to be positive shall not be allowed into the state. The results of all tests need to be available prior to transportation of any animal. Any animals that have been mixed or in direct or indirect contact with animals found to be positive shall not be allowed into the state. All animals are subject to the two clear tests for tuberculosis and a clear test for brucellosis in accordance with Washington State importation law as it concerns cattle.

Introduced herds of pronghorn antelope shall not be allowed to trespass onto property owned by others, either private, federal, or state-owned lands. (2008, Amended 2011)

15.7 – Special Use Control
We support the availability of all federally-approved tools for controlling predators. (2002)

15.8 – State Management of Wolves and Grizzly Bears
We believe any state management plan for wolves or grizzly bears must include, at minimum:
1) Limiting the species populations to levels that are not threatening to human life.
2) Full compensation for loss or damage to livestock or pets.
3) The ability to protect one’s family, property and livestock without penalty regardless of state or federal threatened or endangered listing status.
4) Basing the number of animals on natural migration into Washington or natural breeding within the boundaries of the state.
5) Downgrading of status and delisting at the lowest possible numbers and be based upon the economic impact of any given
region or county where no one region or county should bear a disproportionate burden.
6) Management plans should differentiate between separate species and exclude alien species.

For wolves, we support:
1) Translocation or relocation of the species throughout all regions of the state.
2) Numbers based on actual animals not breeding pairs.
3) Changing the measurement matrix for recovery from breeding pairs to packs. (2008, Amended 2011, 2016)

15.9 – State Listing of Animals as Threatened, Endangered, or Species of Concern
We oppose the authority of government entities to list species as threatened or endangered. It is a redundant process to the federal Endangered Species Act and causes confusion in the minds of the public.

We call for the immediate review of the state’s threatened or endangered species listings.

Any changes to the state’s listing should be done by a supermajority vote of the legislature and not by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife or the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission.

The grizzly bear and wolf should be removed from the state species of concern list. (2016)

15.10 – Trapping
We support the repeal of Initiative 713, the trapping ban.

We oppose any regulation against the use of traps in controlling animal populations that are damaging to agricultural crops, livestock, and human health and safety (2002, Amended 2011)

15.11 – USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service’s Wildlife Services Funding
Since the owner is specifically prohibited from trying to protect his property from predators who are protected by the Endangered Species Act, we support reinstatement of line item funding in the Washington State Department of Agriculture budget to match USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service’s (APHIS) Wildlife Services funding in the state of Washington for protection of all livestock and crops that may be in danger, damaged or destroyed by protected species and/or predators. (1995, Amended 2002)

15.12 – Wildlife Damages
We believe:
1) Farmers and ranchers have the right to protect their property and crops, including trees, range and pasture forage, and their livestock, from economic damage or destruction by wildlife, including predators.
2) Farmers and ranchers may, at their discretion, remove or restrict the entry of these wildlife by any reasonable means, including the destruction of such wildlife, if the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) cannot provide an adequate solution or protection in a timely manner.

We support legislation that will:
1) Require WDFW to respond within 48 hours to reports of damage by wildlife.
2) Require WDFW to provide resolutions, which may include, but not be limited to, any combination of compensation, provision of fencing materials, hunting, repellants, depredation permits, etc.
3) Require compensation of the actual replacement value of crops damaged by depredation as determined by a certified appraiser or crop adjuster.
4) Require WDFW to fully cover the cost of a certified appraiser or crop adjuster hired as part of a damage claim investigation.
5) Require compensation for the fair market value of each animal lost to depredation by coyotes, wolves, bears, and cougars based on an assessment conducted by an impartial third party.
6) Require compensation be delivered to the property owner no later than 90 days from the date of the filed claim.
7) Require that funding be in place to compensate agriculture for predation by wildlife in any recovery, habitat, or other type of plan proposed by government agencies.
8) Institute programs that limit the entrance of wildlife on private land.
9) Require WDFW to manage wildlife on the basis of carrying capacity of WDFW lands in a given area.
10) Require WDFW to provide compensation or reciprocal nutritionally equivalent grazing on state-owned lands to the affected lessee or landowner when grazing by deer and elk consume or damage rangeland grass on privately owned or leased land.
11) Prohibit WDFW from entering into private leases with other state agencies for grazing lands to the detriment of private livestock interests.
We request the legislature require an independent financial audit be performed annually on the WDFW showing that the money it is receiving is being properly managed in the best interest of the public. (1995, Amended 2013, 2016)

15.13 – Wildlife Enhancement Projects
We believe:
1) Any state or federal agencies owning or managing lands for wildlife enhancement projects be required to manage projects in a manner to prevent damage to private property owners.
2) Such management should include:
   a) Planting and cultivating crops suitable for wildlife within the wildlife enhancement project.
   b) Weed control efforts to prevent the spread of noxious weeds.
   c) Providing funds for wildlife damage compensation.
   d) Damage assessment to crops, rangeland, or livestock made by qualified crop insurance adjusters or appraisers should be acceptable proof of loss for compensation purposes. (2002, 2016)

15.14 – Wolf-Dog Hybrids
We support legislation that prohibits ownership of wolf/dog hybrids without a permit and prohibits the breeding, releasing, buying, selling, trading, exporting, and importing of wolf/dog hybrids. (1997)
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