



INDIANA FARM BUREAU

2024 STATE POLICY

Policies adopted at the
INFB delegate session on
August 26, 2023



Indiana Farm Bureau®

OUR MISSION

To protect and enhance
the future of agriculture
and our communities.

OUR VISION

To cultivate a thriving
agricultural ecosystem to
strengthen the viability of
Indiana agriculture.

Shared Values

- Safe, plentiful food, fuel and fiber are vital to local and global economies and communities.
- Good stewardship of animals and the environment ensures our future.
- Scientific advancements help meet the needs of a growing world.
- A free enterprise system supports diverse agriculture and the autonomy of individuals to decide how to best use their resources.
- Nurturing our communities helps us cultivate a thriving ag ecosystem.

Guiding Principles

- **Integrity**
 - We are honest, transparent, and accountable.
- **Strategic**
 - We listen, prioritize, and unify our efforts to proactively support the interests of the ag ecosystem.
- **Proactive**
 - We anticipate challenges and lead efforts to create positive results.
- **Partners**
 - We listen with respect, welcome different ag backgrounds, and collaborate to find solutions.

Religious Life

Our national life is founded on spiritual faith and belief in God. We favor leaving "In God We Trust" on coins and currency and "Under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance.

We believe it to be an individual's inalienable right to worship God, offer prayers and read the Bible as God's word in private and public places, including school rooms.

We support:

- 1) The individual's right to free exercise of religion, whether in public or private, be it verbal or visual.
- 2) The reinforcement of the responsibilities and legal rights of parents to direct the religious and moral training of their children.
- 3) The necessary steps to re-establish the right to offer voluntary prayer in public schools.
- 4) The right of U.S. citizens to conduct religious services on public lands.

If churches or church organizations intrude into political action programs, resources which are used for such activities should be denied preferential tax treatment.

We support a constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer in all "walks of life," particularly in our schools, sporting events and governing bodies at the local, state, and federal levels.

We affirm that Almighty God is the sovereign master of all knowledge and wisdom. We accept the principles in His Holy Book, the Bible, as our guide for conduct in living.



FROM THE PRESIDENT:

The policy statement adopted each year by Indiana Farm Bureau is the result of a deliberate and considered process that reaches deep into the grassroots of the organization.

This year nearly 1,300 policy recommendations were submitted for consideration by a committee of Farm Bureau members representing a variety of viewpoints within our membership. The report of this resolutions committee was then reviewed by the delegates at Indiana Farm Bureau's annual policy-setting delegate session.

At this session, the committee's report, as well as additional recommendations from the floor, were carefully discussed and acted upon by the delegates. The resulting policy statement presented in this booklet represents the composite opinion of the majority of the delegates.

The delegates met on August 26 and adopted this policy statement.

The policies contained in this booklet will direct and shape the activities of Indiana Farm Bureau Inc. throughout the coming year.

Randy Kron, President
Indiana Farm Bureau
August 26, 2023

Title	Header	Page(s)
1.Agricultural Policy		
1.A)	General Agricultural Policy	1
1.B)	Farm Size	1
1.C)	Urban County Farm Bureau Coalition	1 and 2
1.D)	Cooperation	2
1.E)	Farmer Cooperatives	2
2.Agricultural Credit		
2.A)	Agricultural Loans	3
2.B)	Bankruptcy	3
2.C)	Agricultural Business Bankruptcy	3
3.Agricultural Marketing		
3.A)	State Programs	4
3.B)	International Trade	4
3.C)	Agricultural Concentration	4
3.D)	Commodity Market Development Programs	5
3.E)	Commodity Exchanges	5
3.F)	Grain Marketing	5, 6 and 7
3.G)	Grain Pricing and Grading Standards	7
3.H)	Commercial Seed	7
3.I)	Livestock Marketing	8
4.Diversified Agriculture		
4.A)	Value-Added/Retail Agriculture	9 and 10
4.B)	Organic Farming	10
4.C)	Tobacco	10
4.D)	Industrial Hemp	11
4.E)	Honeybees	11

5. Animal Agriculture

5.A)	General Animal Agriculture Policy	12
5.B)	Beef	12
5.C)	Equine	13
5.D)	Dairy	13
5.E)	Aquaculture	13
5.F)	Animal Care	14
5.G)	Quality Assurance	14
5.H)	Identification of Livestock and Poultry	15
5.I)	Exotic Animals and Non-Traditional Livestock	15
5.J)	Companion Animals	15
5.K)	Feed Additives and Medication	16
5.L)	Diagnostic Laboratories	16
5.M)	Livestock Diseases	17
5.N)	Quarantines and Condemnations	17
5.O)	Animal Disposal	18
5.P)	Inspection Programs	18
5.Q)	Dairy Inspection	18 and 19
5.R)	Meat, Poultry, Fish and Crustaceans	19
5.S)	On-Site Inspection	19

6. Food Safety and Labeling

6.A)	Food Safety	20
6.B)	Labeling	20

7. Natural Resources

7.A)	Rivers and Streams	21
7.B)	Wetlands	21 and 22
7.C)	Endangered Species	22
7.D)	Predators and Wildlife Control	23

8. Environment

8.A)	Environmental Science and Research	24
8.B)	State Environment Laws	24 and 25
8.C)	Air Quality	25 and 26
8.D)	Hazardous Waste	26
8.E)	Solid Waste	26
8.F)	Litter	26
8.G)	Agriculture Chemicals and Fertilizer	27 and 28
8.H)	Recordkeeping of Pesticide and Fertilizer Use	28
8.I)	Animal Manure Management	28 and 29
8.J)	Contamination Liability	29

9. Weed Management

9.A)	Weeds and Detrimental Plants	30
9.B)	Weed Law Enforcement and Weed Control	30

10. Water

10.A)	Water Resources Development	31
10.B)	Water Rights	31
10.C)	Drainage	32 and 33
10.D)	Soil and Water Conservation	34
10.E)	Irrigation	34
10.F)	Groundwater Protection	35
10.G)	Surface Water	35

11. Forestry

11.A)	Industry Operations	36
11.B)	Forest Incentives Programs	36
11.C)	Publicly Owned Forestland	36
11.D)	Publicly Owned Non-Forestland	37

12. Recreation and Public Lands

12.A)	County Parks and Recreation	38
12.B)	State Parks and Recreation	38
12.C)	Heritage Trust	38
12.D)	Federal Lands	39
12.E)	Hunting, Fishing and Trapping	39

13. Energy

13.A)	Conservation-Renewable Energy	40 and 41
13.B)	Coal	41
13.C)	Oil-Gas	42
13.D)	Nuclear Energy	42

14. Utilities

14.A)	Principles of Operation	43 and 44
14.B)	Electric Utility Restructuring	45
14.C)	Rural Electric Membership Cooperatives (REMCs)	46
14.D)	Telephone	46
14.E)	Broadband Internet	47 and 48
14.F)	Global Position Systems (GPS)	48

15.State Governing

15.A)	State Constitution	49
15.B)	Agriculture Protections	49
15.C)	Protection of Indiana's Sovereignty	49
15.D)	Government Structure	50
15.E)	Elections and Public Officials	51

16.State Government Operations

16.A)	Departments of State Government, Boards and Commissions	52
16.B)	Indiana General Assembly	53
16.C)	Regulatory Agencies	53
16.D)	Indiana State Fair and Facilities	54
16.E)	Budgeting and Investment Authority	54

17.Local Government Operations

17.A)	Local Government Structure	55
17.B)	Local Control	56
17.C)	Annexation and Mergers	56 and 57
17.D)	Judicial	57
17.E)	Libraries	58
17.F)	Fire Territories	58 and 59

18.Land Use Planning

18.A)	Local Planning	60 and 61
18.B)	Agriculture Land Protection	62 and 63
18.C)	Property Rights	63 and 64
18.D)	Eminent Domain	64 and 65

19.Fiscal Policy

19.A)	State Fiscal Policy Operation	66
19.B)	Property Tax	66, 67 and 68
19.C)	Personal Property Tax	69
19.D)	Assessment	69 and 70
19.E)	Public Construction Projects	71
19.F)	Local Option Tax	72
19.G)	Sales Tax	72
19.H)	Income Tax	73
19.I)	User Fees	73
19.J)	Economic Development Incentives	73 and 74
19.K)	Legalized Gambling	74
19.L)	Coal Extraction Tax	75

20. Education

20.A)	Early Childhood Education	76
20.B)	K-12 Education	76 and 77
20.C)	School Organization	77 and 78
20.D)	Curricula	78
20.E)	Testing	79
20.F)	School Funding	79
20.G)	Higher Education	80
20.H)	Continuing Education	80
20.I)	Cooperative Extension	80
20.J)	Agricultural Research	81

21. Public Health, Safety and Well-Being

21.A)	Public Outreach	82
21.B)	Nutrition and Health	82
21.C)	Emergency Services	82 and 83

22. Transportation

22.A)	Highway Funding	84 and 85
22.B)	Highway Projects	85, 86 and 87
22.C)	Vehicle and Highway Regulations	87 and 88
22.D)	Traffic Safety and Education	88 and 89
22.E)	Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV)	89
22.F)	Railroads	89 and 90

23. Labor

23.A)	Public Employee Negotiations	91
23.B)	Strikes by Public Employees	91
23.C)	Unemployment Compensation	91
23.D)	Worker's Compensation	91
23.E)	Indiana's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (IOSHA)	92
23.F)	Agricultural Labor	92
23.G)	Immigration	93

24.Law

24.A)	Insurance	94
24.B)	Probate	94
24.C)	Landowner Liability	94
24.D)	Civil Trespass	94
24.E)	Agri-Tourism Liability	95
24.F)	Unmanned Aircraft Systems	95
24.G)	Proprietary Data	95 and 96
24.H)	Criminal Law	96 and 97
24.I)	Criminal Trespass	97
24.J)	Gun Control	97
24.K)	Fence Law	97

25.Rural Viability

25.A)	Rural Viability	98
-------	-----------------	----

1.A) General Agricultural Policy

i. We Support:

- 1) The free enterprise system.
- 2) Voluntary, science-based certification programs that help demonstrate the proactive efforts of crop and livestock producers.
- 3) Animal husbandry and crop production practices that are based on sound science and best management practices.
- 4) Protecting farmers from the dissemination of misinformation regarding production practices.
- 5) Producer ownership and control of farm-generated data.
- 6) Farmers having access to diagnostic software and equipment to make repairs to their own machinery.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Government-driven decisions that limit choices and determine the merits of products based on the political will rather than science.

1.B) Farm Size

i. We Support:

- 1) All areas of agriculture, regardless of size.
- 2) Agriculture being viewed as a business and development opportunity by local economic development organizations.

1.C) Urban County Farm Bureau Coalition

i. We Support:

- 1) The cooperation and coordination of the Urban County Farm Bureau Coalition to enhance the Indiana Farm Bureau (INFB) and the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF).
- 2) The authorization and expansion of urban agriculture and innovative production within Farm Bureau.
- 3) The USDA Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production, based on the recommendation of the 2018 Farm Bill.
- 4) Involvement with the advisory committee of the Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production, and Farm Bureau representation be strongly encouraged to have at least one member appointed by the AFBF Council of Presidents.
- 5) Urban agriculture as a growing segment of our industry. It encompasses a wide range of activities involving urban and suburban settings.

1.C) Urban County Farm Bureau Coalition

i. We Support:

- 6) Urban agriculture including the production, distribution and marketing of food and other products in a form and scale that is appropriate for the urban context, namely the cores of metropolitan areas and at their peripheries.
 - a) Examples include, but are not limited to, gardens, food-production methods that maximize production in a small area, community-supported agriculture, and family farms based in urbanized areas and their peripheries.
- 7) Urban agriculture that does not include production that is strictly for individual consumption.
- 8) The goals, objectives and policies that support and encourage the continuation or initiation of urban agriculture. Urban agriculture is complementary to production agriculture and contributes to the agricultural economy.

1.D) Cooperation

i. We Support:

- 1) Continued communication and collaboration among the various Indiana agricultural and conservation organizations.

1.E) Farmer Cooperatives

i. We Support:

- 1) Farmer-owned cooperatives which are vital in handling, purchasing, processing, marketing, and service functions for the farmer.
- 2) Directors and all cooperative stockholders making certain their associations are soundly and adequately financed, well-managed and farsighted in their policies.
- 3) Farmers controlling and guiding their cooperatives by actively participating to make them more useful and valuable to their patrons. This will allow farmers to guide policy and management to determine size, services offered, and other things needed to make the cooperative efficient and influential in the agricultural community.
- 4) Establishing a revolving fund to provide capital for well-managed value-added cooperatives.
- 5) The modernization of Indiana's Cooperative Law to facilitate the investment of non-farm capital.
- 6) Returning stock and retained earnings to farmers after five years if a farmer has not done business with the cooperative or if the cooperative leaves the area.

2.A) Agricultural Loans

i. We Support:

- 1) The availability of a variety of credit sources at the lowest possible interest rate that are responsive to the needs of agriculture.
- 2) The establishment and continuation of alternative financing programs, including low interest loan programs for veterans in agriculture.
- 3) Access and availability of flexible credit programs to young and beginning farmers.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Foreclosure moratoriums, extension of redemption periods or other actions that would cause increased interest rates and discourage credit flowing to agriculture.

2.B) Bankruptcy

i. We Support:

- 1) Protection for landowner interests when a tenant seeks bankruptcy.
- 2) Protection for the respective interests in farm products of landlords and tenants from claims by the other's creditors.
- 3) Legislation allowing landlords and tenants a secured interest in their crops.

2.C) Agricultural Business Bankruptcy

i. We Support:

- 1) Bankruptcy laws changing so that the producer retains title to farm commodities delivered until payment is received. Farmers holding grain contracts that have not been paid should not have to deliver any additional grain in case the elevator goes bankrupt.
- 2) That in the event a supplier declares bankruptcy, title to prepaid fertilizer, chemicals, feed, seed, etc., pass to the purchaser at time of payment.
- 3) A voluntary grain insurance fund.
- 4) A voluntary fertilizer indemnity fund.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The Grain Indemnity Fund investing in stocks and securities.
- 2) Farmers being in an unsecured position in prepaid situations.

3.A) State Programs

i. We Support:

- 1) The development of marketing programs designed to improve net farm income and capture a greater share of the consumer dollar.
- 2) The development of new processing plants in Indiana and retaining our established plants.
- 3) The development of a more favorable climate for agricultural product marketing.
- 4) "Indiana Grown," a merchandizing program for all Indiana agricultural products.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The use of inaccurate or deceptive marketing terms when advertisers are promoting products for sale.
- 2) The use of consumer marketing buzzwords to influence customers as to the safety or nutritional value of the products they are buying.

3.B) International Trade

i. We Support:

- 1) Current state agricultural export promotional programs.
- 2) State officials aggressively seeking new markets for agricultural commodities and value-added agricultural products.

3.C) Agricultural Concentration

i. We Support:

- 1) Contracts being the result of good faith bargaining.
- 2) Recognizing established marketing and fair-trade practices.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) State efforts to control the extent to which packers and processors may contract and/or own livestock.

3.D) Commodity Market Development Programs

i. We Support:

- 1) Reasonable farmer-controlled marketing enhancement programs.
- 2) Producer access to checkoff funding accountability.
- 3) Commodity programs being funded by means of an automatic deduction from the price of the commodity at its first point of sale.
- 4) Review procedures for checkoff programs.
- 5) Commodity checkoff programs operated by the state of Indiana if federal checkoff programs cease.
- 6) The assessment of a state soybean checkoff. However, if assessments are levied under the national soybean checkoff programs created by federal statute, no assessment shall be levied for purposes of the state soybean marketing program established. A state soybean marketing program would mirror the Indiana corn marketing program that is currently in place with a refund ability.
- 7) Formation of new state checkoffs and/or adjustment of rates for existing state checkoffs provided a majority of respondents to a survey of active producers of the commodity in question approve the change.

3.E) Commodity Exchange

i. We Support:

- 1) The commodity exchanges serving as a valuable tool in marketing.
- 2) Reviewing and updating periodically the rules and regulations under which the exchanges operate.

3.F) Grain Marketing

i. We Support:

- 1) The Commodity Futures Trading Commission being the government agency with oversight authority for agricultural commodities.
- 2) The Commodity Futures Trading Commission closely monitoring grain company trading and index funds for its effects on market prices and market manipulation.
- 3) Contracts between elevators and farmers following Commodity Futures Trading Commission guidelines.
- 4) Keeping deferred pricing contracts as an option of grain marketing.
- 5) National regulation of deferred pricing contracts.
- 6) Research on all types of marketing contracts and the resulting information should be made available to producers.
- 7) The Indiana Grain Buyers Law that encourages entry into the grain buying business.

3.F) Grain Marketing

i. We Support:

- 8) A strong Indiana Grain Indemnification Fund and urge that it be regularly reviewed and modified to assure it maintains sufficient resources to adequately protect Indiana grain producers.
- 9) Greater oversight from the Indiana Grain Indemnity Corporation over the Indiana Grain Buyers and Warehouse Licensing Agency (IGBWLA).
- 10) The use of marketing tools or other marketing alternatives.
- 11) The Indiana Grain Indemnity Fund should not be used to compensate grain producers for losses incurred by selling grain to purchasers who are not licensed by the Indiana Grain Buyers and Warehouse Licensing Agency.
- 12) Grain Indemnity Fund coverage for a term of 15 months after delivery.
- 13) Regulatory parity between grain elevators and zero asset grain merchandizers.
- 14) The pricing of deferred pricing contracts as a maximum of 15 months from the date of commodity delivery, matching the current Grain Indemnity Fund requirements.
- 15) The Indiana Grain Buyer's Warehouse Licensing Agency working with grain elevators to arrange a change of ownership or closure before a default.
- 16) The money allocated by the legislature for auditing, training, hardware and software to be the revenue source used in order to provide transparency of the Indiana Grain Buyers and Warehouse Licensing Agency and their oversight of grain marketing outlet.
- 17) Class A misdemeanor charges be brought against employees who knowingly enter incorrect data for grain elevator audits or manipulate numbers to keep elevators in business.
- 18) Indiana Grain Buyers and Warehouse Licensing Agency staff reviews to be made public.
- 19) Clearing accounts to be made public to improve transparency.
- 20) Indiana Grain Buyers and Warehouse Licensing Agency director to closely follow the statutes in place with less room for discretion of making decisions when an elevator is kept open or closed.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The formation of any type of governmental board such as interstate grain compacts, either national or regional, that would control marketing in any way.
- 2) Federal preemption of Indiana's Grain Indemnity Fund.
- 3) Forcing farmers to cash out at the end of the marketing year.

3.G) Grain Pricing and Grading Standards

i. We Support:

- 1) Water to suppress dust on grain as a bona fide method of dust control when used in approved and monitored dust control systems.
- 2) Revised grain standards that reflect the economic values of the grain.
- 3) Grain grading as an open process with opportunity for producer interaction and an appeal prior to dumping the product.
- 4) The ability to provide identity preserved grains.
- 5) Blending grains of different qualities or moisture within a narrow range.
- 6) Grain quality and standards testing being uniform, science-based, and include testing for toxins.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Blending in foreign material after it has been removed. Anything more than 1% should be listed as dockage.
- 2) Government-mandated identity tracking of grain.

3.H) Commercial Seed

i. We Support:

- 1) Strong intellectual property rights protection to allow seed developers the ability to recover the costs of research and development.
- 2) A farmer's right to retain seed he or she grows unless that seed is otherwise protected.
- 3) Farmers being held harmless from any liability based on the presence of biotech genes in the crops they produce.
- 4) Any seed purchased for use in Indiana should meet Indiana labeling laws.
- 5) State legislation of seed contracting between farmers and seed companies regarding the following:
 - a) The venue for any litigation involving the seed contract would be Indiana.
 - b) A farmer would not be liable for any inadvertent possession of seed with patented technological improvements.
 - c) A farmer would be made whole if he prevailed in a legal action based on a seed contract.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The practice of seed marketers imposing a surcharge on U.S. customers that is not imposed on foreign customers.
- 2) Genetically altered seed being classified as a pesticide.

3.I) Livestock Marketing

i. We Support:

- 1) Access to competitive markets for price discovery that accurately determines the value of livestock producers' products.
- 2) Continuation of publicly traded livestock markets (sale barns) and auctions.
- 3) Contracts and marketing regulations recognizing species-specific business and marketing structures.
- 4) Rights of producers and packers to enter into formula pricing, grid pricing and other marketing arrangements and contract relationships. Contracts and marketing arrangements should specify a negotiated base price before commitment to deliver. Such contracts and pricing arrangements should not be used to manipulate the market to the detriment of producers. We encourage producers to retain control over contract delivery and/or contract completion in furtherance of value-added marketing.
- 5) Development of new risk management tools to enhance the ability of family livestock farmers to cope with market fluctuations.
- 6) A risk management agency product for livestock producers.
- 7) New markets for livestock and livestock products working with the Indiana State Department of Agriculture.

4.A) Value-Added/Retail Agriculture

i. We Support:

- 1) Diversity in agricultural production and marketing systems in Indiana.
- 2) Establishing standards and language to better define and understand best practices for diversified agricultural enterprises.
- 3) The development of positive relationships between producers, processors and consumers that enhance market development.
- 4) Entrepreneurial initiatives as opportunities for producers and processors to add value and diversify their operations.
- 5) The establishment of a statewide program to foster entrepreneurship and assist product development.
- 6) Government initiatives for privately funded value-added agriculture.
- 7) Farmer-owned, value-added market alternatives.
- 8) Policies and initiatives at the state level that promote locally grown meat and produce in Indiana restaurants, eateries, farmers markets, schools, and other publicly supported institutions.
- 9) Processing plants.
- 10) Efforts to incentivize increases in processing and marketing opportunities for Indiana meat and poultry. Infrastructure, workforce development and processing capacity needs to be expanded to meet the current demand for locally produced meat.
- 11) The expansion of infrastructure, workforce development and processing capacity to meet the demand for locally produced meat.
- 12) Establishing commercial kitchens strategically across the state for producers to be able to test and process their products.
- 13) Unified enforcement of state regulations by counties for both on- and off-farm freezer meat sales.
- 14) The process of distilling mint into mint oil as an acceptable farming practice.
- 15) State efforts to encourage and enhance production and marketing opportunities for Indiana wines and grapes. Indiana farm wineries should be able to ship their products directly to in-state and out-of-state consumers without in-person winery verification.
- 16) Efforts to encourage the sale of locally grown products through the Indiana State Department of Agriculture's (ISDA) efforts to brand and promote Indiana agricultural commodities using the Indiana Grown Initiative, making it easy for consumers to identify, find and buy Indiana grown products.
- 17) Uniform state food safety standards for all farmers markets and roadside stands selling produce. The standards need to be based on proven practices that are economically sustainable for growers.
- 18) Keeping the ISDA director engaged with the Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC).
- 19) Expansion of both the venues and products under the home-based vendors provisions to increase opportunity to market value-added products.
- 20) The creation and expansion of local, diverse, small- and medium-size processing facilities.

4.A) Value-Added/Retail Agriculture

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Mandatory requirements to have farm stands or farmers markets utilize electronic banking transactions.
- 2) Mandatory requirements to accept Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

4.B) Organic Farming

i. We Support:

- 1) Continued research by non-biased researchers into the validity of health claims put forth by certain activist organic supporters.
- 2) U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) continuing to evaluate and improve the organic accreditation system.
- 3) Certified farmers participating in their certification management boards.
- 4) Efforts to enhance marketing opportunities for producers of organically grown commodities.
- 5) Broad availability of information on the USDA certified organic program, certification process and labeling requirements, as well as other unbiased information on production.
- 6) Marketing of organic products to consumers as a choice based on their own merits.

4.C) Tobacco

i. We Support:

- 1) The production of tobacco in the current free market atmosphere.
- 2) The rights of all Indiana farmers who desire to produce tobacco.
- 3) A diversified tobacco market system which provides growers with a fair and equitable marketing system.
- 4) Industry options for grading standards, similar to grain and livestock.
- 5) Conducting research to find other uses for tobacco.
- 6) The production of other types of tobacco to satisfy the demand for world markets.
- 7) Any tax on tobacco product revenue being reserved for product research and new crop uses.
- 8) Continued reporting of Indiana tobacco acreage by the National Agricultural Statistics Service.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Tobacco revenue being applied to various other programs unrelated to the tobacco commodity.

4.D) Industrial Hemp

i. We Support:

- 1) The state of Indiana issuing new hemp licenses for producers.
- 2) The legalization, production, and commercialization of industrial hemp as renewable fiber energy, oil production and other potential uses.
- 3) The legalization of cannabidiols (CBD) with tetrahydrocannabinols (THC) of 0.3% or less for medical use in both human and veterinary medicine.
- 4) The bonding and set up of an indemnity fund for any company that produces or buys any derivative of hemp in order to protect producers.
- 5) The production of hemp in the current free market atmosphere.
- 6) The rights of all Indiana farmers who desire to produce hemp.
- 7) A diversified hemp market system which provides growers with a fair and equitable marketing system.
- 8) Industry options for grading standards similar to grain and livestock.
- 9) Conducting research to find other uses for hemp.
- 10) The production of other types of hemp to satisfy the demand for world markets.
- 11) Any tax on hemp product revenue being reserved for product research and new crop uses.
- 12) The reporting of Indiana hemp acreage by the National Agricultural Statistics Service.

4.E) Honeybees

i. We Support:

- 1) Indiana's apiculture industry to maintain funding for research, market development and sustaining of apiculture positions at the state or state university level.
- 2) Additional funding and continued research efforts to minimize the impact of Africanized bees, colony collapse disorder, diseases and/or pests of honeybees and maintaining the high quality of hive products and services in Indiana.
- 3) Adequate funding for the apiary inspection program and placing it under the purview of an agricultural entity in state government rather than the Indiana Department of Natural Resources.
- 4) Adequate apiary inspections and standardized training for beekeepers.
- 5) The Standard State Identity for Honey to protect honey consumers, honey packers, and honey producers from deceptive product labeling.
- 6) The Food and Drug Administration adopting the Revised Codex Standard as the U.S. Standard of Identity for Honey.
- 7) The use of the Pesticide Sensitive Crop Registry site (www.fieldwatch.com) by beekeepers and private applicators who apply pesticides in areas near bee colonies.

5.A) General Animal Agriculture Policy

i. We Support:

- 1) Indiana's Certified Livestock Producer Program.
- 2) Adequate funding for the Indiana Board of Animal Health to safeguard Indiana animals and humans from disease.
- 3) Having an adequate number of well-trained large and/or food animal veterinarians to meet the needs of the livestock industry in Indiana.
- 4) The completion of the veterinary teaching hospital and classroom facilities at Purdue University.
- 5) Virtual livestock veterinary practices in the state of Indiana, where there is an established vet-client-patient relationship.
- 6) The Working Animal Protection Act.
- 7) The creation and expansion of local, diverse, small- and medium-size meat processing facilities.
- 8) Collaboration of local, state, and federal agencies to eliminate feral hog populations in Indiana.
- 9) Exhibitions and events in which animals are showcased.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any legal action, laws, or use of public funds to convey human characteristics and rights to animals.
- 2) Any methane gas tax applied to animals.
- 3) Increasing the building permit setback for confined feeding operations at current Indiana Department of Environmental Management approved permit requirements.

5.B) Beef

i. We Support:

- 1) The development, research and sharing of information on forage crops for pastureland and grasslands.
- 2) Further research of the utilization of processed byproducts for alternative feed uses for livestock.
- 3) The Indiana State Department of Agriculture actively recruiting a beef processing facility in Indiana.
- 4) The creation of a strategic plan for beef in the state of Indiana.

5.C) Equine

i. We Support:

- 1) Equine being considered livestock.
- 2) Legislation and rulings that allow the humane sale, possession and transportation of equine intended for processing.
- 3) Domestic ownership, control, and location of equine processing facilities.
- 4) Indiana's Certified Livestock Producers including equine.
- 5) Continued progressive development and promotion of all horse breeds in Indiana, including those in the Indiana horse racing industry.
- 6) A preference for rewards for Indiana-owned bred and foaled horses.
- 7) Maintaining a minimum 15% statutory allocation of adjusted gross receipts of the racino industry to the horse racing segment of the Indiana equine industry.

5.D) Dairy

i. We Support:

- 1) Dairy products being offered in all Indiana schools, including higher fat dairy products.
- 2) The inclusion of milk drink products in vending machines in Indiana schools.
- 3) Continued development of dairy products and dairy ingredients that are more marketable for export.
- 4) Fair and equitable procedures in the Federal Survey work within the dairy industry.
- 5) Market access for approved technologies for milk producers.
- 6) Consumer education programs on the safety and nutrition of all dairy products.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any regulations or legislation that will ban or limit flavored milk in schools.

5.E) Aquaculture

i. We Support:

- 1) Legislative funding for research and market development.
- 2) The establishment of a position in fish pathology at the Indiana Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory.
- 3) Aquaculture being included in the long-term Indiana agriculture plan as it is developed by the Indiana State Department of Agriculture.

5.F) Animal Care

i. We Support:

- 1) The proper treatment of animals.
- 2) Animal husbandry guidelines based on sound science and best animal husbandry practices and remain solely under the jurisdiction of the Indiana Board of Animal Health (BOAH).
- 3) Reporting known instances of animal abuse or neglect to proper authorities.
- 4) Properly researched and industry-tested poultry and livestock practices that provide consumers with a wholesome food supply.
- 5) Adoptions of practices and technologies that will provide farmers with ways to enhance biosecurity.
- 6) All livestock, poultry and livestock considered as pets, including those raised in towns or urban areas, adhering to minimum health and vaccination standards that are accepted on livestock production farms.
- 7) Compliance with applicable BOAH animal care guidelines to participate in county and state fairs.
- 8) The ability to use all available approved livestock vaccine technologies per the label.
- 9) State law preemptions of all county and local livestock animal care laws and regulations.
- 10) Legal action for any animal abandonment.
- 11) State regulations or guidelines for the taking of abused or neglected livestock animals.
- 12) A standalone animal disease surveillance fund to be administered by the BOAH.
- 13) Partnering with producers to educate the general public about modern farming practices, including the application of science to animal operations of all sizes.
- 14) Aggressively prosecuting individuals who perform acts of animal cruelty for the purpose of intentionally harming any stages of livestock production.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The abandonment of animals of any species.

5.G) Quality Assurance

i. We Support:

- 1) Quality assurance programs aimed at providing a safe and wholesome food supply at a reasonable cost to the producer.

5.H) Identification of Livestock and Poultry

i. We Support:

- 1) Premise identification programs for livestock and poultry.
- 2) Records being kept private unless an outbreak of disease takes place.
- 3) The Indiana Board of Animal Health (BOAH) having the discretion to release the location of the infected specie in the event of a confirmed outbreak.
- 4) Youth members using the same standardized identification method on all species at the county and state level.
- 5) All sales transactions being recorded and available to BOAH for disease management purposes.

5.I) Exotic Animals and Non-traditional Livestock

i. We Support:

- 1) Non-traditional livestock – cervids, camelidae, ratites and other exotic animals raised as livestock should be subject to the same Indiana Board of Animal Health (BOAH) regulations as traditional livestock.
- 2) Privately owned captive cervidae being individually identified as domestic livestock to differentiate them from wildlife.
- 3) A property owner's right to conduct hunts on his property.
- 4) Accredited cervidae (white-tail deer, elk, etc.) farming and harvesting.

5.J) Companion Animals

i. We Support:

- 1) The proper treatment of companion animals.
- 2) Research on science-based best practices for commercial dog breeders.
- 3) Authorizing only trained U.S. Department of Agriculture or Indiana Board of Animal Health officials to inspect state and federally licensed kennels.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any excessive laws and regulations affecting companion animal breeders and kennel owners.
- 2) The classification of livestock animals as companion animals.

5.K) Feed Additive and Medication

i. We Support:

- 1) The protection and availability of approved antibiotics and pharmaceuticals for use in agricultural production, including feed additives.
- 2) Continued research and the development of new animal health products.
- 3) Thorough investigation of the accuracy of tests used to determine drug residues in livestock by government agencies.
- 4) A drug residue and education program for producers.
- 5) Responsible use of animal health products.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Penalties on producers for usage of prescription drugs when used as prescribed by a licensed veterinarian.

5.L) Diagnostic Laboratories

i. We Support:

- 1) Sufficient and available disease diagnostic testing for the Indiana livestock and poultry population.
- 2) The Indiana Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory (ADDL) and its role providing disease diagnostic services to Indiana's livestock and poultry growers.
- 3) Funding and maintaining adequate facilities for the Heeke Lab at the Southern Indiana Purdue Agriculture Center.
- 4) Funding for the ADDL facilities as its own line item in the Indiana Board of Animal Health's biennial budget.
- 5) The ADDL being adequately funded by the state, and fee revenues, to provide results.
- 6) Improved service to the producer.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Fees being charged on tests required by state statutory or regulatory authorities.

5.M) Livestock Diseases

i. We Support:

- 1) Adequate funds for research and program implementation necessary to eradicate or control diseases.
- 2) The authority of the Indiana State Veterinarian and the Indiana Board of Animal Health (BOAH) to eliminate or control animal diseases in Indiana.
- 3) Farmers cooperating in appropriate disease eradication programs and encourage strong enforcement of regulations.
- 4) The establishment of a system to encourage producers to voluntarily have suspect animals tested.
- 5) Stringent testing of bovine species for Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy.
- 6) Purdue Extension developing an outreach program to educate small poultry and livestock producers on disease potential and how to identify disease in their animals or birds in order to prevent large disease outbreaks.
- 7) The state of Indiana paying for the testing and education for the prevention of Johnes and Leukosis diseases in cattle.
- 8) The BOAH requiring trichomoniasis testing for all bulls entering Indiana.
- 9) The BOAH informing growers of the protocol that would be in place in a state of emergency for various species.
- 10) Livestock producer's participation in state traceback and identification programs in an effort to maintain product integrity and value.

5.N) Quarantines and Condemnations

i. We Support:

- 1) Indemnification for losses of crops, livestock, poultry and dairy products when impounded or condemned, farms are quarantined, processing plants are shut down, or movement or sales are restricted in the public interest. Producers should be compensated in these cases and not held responsible for conditions beyond their control.
- 2) Holding negligent producers responsible for losses resulting from condemnations for excessive drug and pesticide residues.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The impoundment or restricted movement of livestock when the reason for the stop is a federal motor carrier regulation.

5.O) Animal Disposal

i. We Support:

- 1) Requiring the disposal of animals that have died of a dangerously infectious or contagious disease as determined by the Indiana Board of Animal Health (BOAH).
- 2) Research efforts for new methods of mortality disposal.
- 3) Our present rendering plants and their expansion.
- 4) The efforts of the BOAH to find appropriate means for the economical disposal of all dead animals.
- 5) Requiring that trucks used to pick up dead stock on farms be tarped or covered.
- 6) All violations of animal disposal laws being investigated by the BOAH before any charges are filed.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any efforts to restrict the humane disposal of diseased, injured or surplus animals including equine.

5.P) Inspection Programs

i. We Support:

- 1) Industry having input on inspection standards while the federal and state government be responsible for enforcement of those standards.
- 2) Increasing the number of fully funded state meat inspectors.
- 3) Consistent interpretation of inspection criteria among inspectors.
- 4) Opportunity for beef United States Department of Agriculture quality and yield grading at Indiana meat processing facilities.
- 5) Indiana Department of Environmental Management's inspections of confined feeding operations at the current frequency.
- 6) Maintenance of all inspection records be held on-farm.

5.Q) Dairy Inspection

i. We Support:

- 1) Adequate state funding of Indiana Board of Animal Health's (BOAH) Dairy Inspection Program.
- 2) State inspection of dairies with the outcome of these inspections based solely on each individual operation. If a specific dairy fails an inspection only that dairy should be penalized.
- 3) Leaving a copy of inspection sheets at the farm.

5.Q) Dairy Inspection

- 4) Requiring BOAH to provide dairy farmers with written notification of any new milk inspection regulation at least 180 days prior to the effective date of the new regulation.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) BOAH dairy inspection regulations being more stringent than the federal pasteurization standards for the interstate transportation of milk.

5.R) Meat, Poultry, Fish and Crustaceans

i. We Support:

- 1) Meat inspection program costs being paid from general revenue funds.
- 2) Increasing the Indiana Board of Animal Health inspection service funding to a level sufficient to encourage growth of the local foods industry.
- 3) Avoiding federal domination of inspection programs by developing adequate state standards.

5.S) On-Site Inspection

i. We Support:

- 1) Advanced notification to and permission from the farmer before entering the farm, and also of the results obtained.
- 2) Compliance with the farm's biosecurity protocols when entering the premises.
- 3) Identification of the complainant to the farmer if an inspection results from a complaint.
- 4) An appeals process for individuals being inspected.
- 5) The Indiana Department of Environmental Management developing a policy to consolidate facility inspections when a producer has multiple sites.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Scheduling on-farm inspections during the spring planting and fall harvest seasons.

6.A) Food Safety

i. We Support:

- 1) Quality assurance programs aimed at providing a safe and wholesome food supply at a reasonable cost to the producer.
- 2) The dissemination of educational resources focused on food safety to help the public better understand the benefits of food safety technologies and how to maintain the foods' quality once in the possession of the consumer.
- 3) Protecting the public health as the only consideration of any legislation or regulation concerning the sale of raw (unpasteurized) milk.

6.B) Labeling

i. We Support:

- 1) Eliminating misleading, inaccurate labeling used as a marketing tool.
- 2) Accurate labeling of source, e.g., lab-sourced protein.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) State labeling standards based on production practices or the use of technology.
- 2) Lab-grown and plant-based protein being labeled as meat.
- 3) Products being labeled as milk if not derived from lactating mammals.

7.A) Rivers and Streams

i. We Support:

- 1) Funding mechanisms to clean and maintain our rivers.
- 2) Protection of property rights in the administration of programs related to rivers, marshes, or wetlands.
- 3) Maintaining the usability of rivers and streams by removing obstructions and sediment in channels, stabilizing banks, and clearing trees from banks where appropriate.
- 4) Increased signage at every public launch site that talks about trespassing laws on farm fields when kayaking or canoeing Indiana's rivers and streams.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Indiana streams being designated as natural, scenic, or recreational streams or rivers.

7.B) Wetlands

i. We Support:

- 1) Urgently defining uniform, clearly understood wetland definitions.
- 2) All wetland determinations and regulatory authority on farmland resting with a single local National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) agency.
- 3) The NRCS agency determining a wetland within 60 days of application.
- 4) Prior converted wetlands and farmed wetlands being exempt from regulations as jurisdictional wetlands.
- 5) Revealing the identity of the third-party to the property owner whenever an enforcement or compliance action is initiated against a property owner based on a third-party complaint.
- 6) Any wetland classification system considering "wetlands of minimum size and effect," and exempting them from further control.
- 7) Penalties for wetlands violations being equitable to the damages.
- 8) Developing reasonable rules to allow for mitigation when wetlands are modified.
- 9) Encouraging programs of education and assistance to encourage voluntary restoration of wetlands.
- 10) Wetland construction and/or mitigation being done in a manner that does not impact adjoining properties.
- 11) Establishing a "wetland mitigation bank" program in Indiana.
- 12) Provisions of the 1987 "Federal Manual for Identifying and Delineating Jurisdictional Wetlands" in final consideration of wetlands regulations.
- 13) Wetland mitigation requirements being no more stringent than the federal requirements.
- 14) Agencies or organizations that are purchasing wetlands having enough money to not just purchase the land, but also for the long-term maintenance.

7.B) Wetlands

i. We Support:

- 15) Rulings and guidelines on wetland preservation applying equally to all property - industrial, residential, and agricultural.
- 16) Research into utilization of constructed wetlands for septic systems and manure treatment.
- 17) The ability to repair original capacity and flow of the drainage through all wetland areas.
- 18) Legislation that would limit the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's (IDEM) authority to regulate isolated wetlands.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any definition that includes these lands as waters of the United States.
- 2) IDEM being permitted to regulate isolated wetlands without specific statutory authority.
- 3) The use of privately owned wetlands and man-made wetlands being restricted by law or regulations without just compensation to the landowner, as required by the Fifth Amendment.
- 4) Any wetland program restricting maintenance and reconstruction of cropland drainage systems as needed.
- 5) Any additional state wetland regulatory program until authorized by legislation.

7.C) Endangered Species

i. We Support:

- 1) That all surveys of biological conditions must be performed by professionally trained biologists who must provide advance notice and obtain written permission to enter private property.
- 2) That all data collected be readily available to the landowner at no cost.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any national biological survey that may be used to facilitate federal land use planning and suppress private property rights.

7.D) Predators and Wildlife Control

i. We Support:

- 1) Property owners having the right to protect crops and livestock from protected wildlife, predators, and nuisance animals, without having to pay an annual fee and with unlimited permits.
- 2) Expand all existing methods available to control deer populations.
- 3) A system to compensate farmers for damages from state or federally protected wildlife.
- 4) Streamlining efforts to control black vultures by having Indiana Farm Bureau issue black vulture depredation permits to members at no charge.
- 5) Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) in expanding the taking of wildlife as a means to control excess wildlife populations and diseases. Wildlife management plans should be required to set population limits within habitat limits to prevent damage to crops and domestic livestock.
- 6) Federal, state, and local agencies controlling wildlife parasites and diseases which can adversely affect human health and domestic animal health.
- 7) Greater coordination and cooperation among federal and state wildlife agencies, Extension Service and U.S. Department of Agriculture Wildlife Services programs for farmers.
- 8) IDNR considering economic losses from vehicle collisions and crop revenue when defining what constitutes a satisfactory deer population.
- 9) Requiring IDNR to conduct public hearings locally and also provide an environmental and economic impact study prior to relocation or introduction of any wild animals and be financially liable for any personal or property damages as a result of such relocation or introduction.
- 10) The development of an eradication program through IDNR working with the Indiana Board of Animal Health to control the feral hog population.
- 11) IDNR establishing a trapping season for otters.
- 12) Prohibiting the use of illumination devices for spotting wildlife on private property from public roadways.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The protection of non-native species that have been introduced and may pose harm to crops and livestock.

8.A) Environmental Science and Research

i. We Support:

- 1) Coordinated research and education on environmental issues that improve the quality of soil, water, and air.
- 2) The use of scientific information to identify sources of environmental impairments and methods of improvement.
- 3) The use of a cost-benefit analysis for regulatory decisions.
- 4) The development of voluntary, transparent, nationwide carbon credit market standards.
- 5) Carbon credit opportunities for producers including new and existing practices.
- 6) The development of (science-based) standards for the determination of soil carbon capture and the development of exchange markets.
- 7) The establishment of research programs for improved septic systems and domestic waste handling.
- 8) Coordinated research and education on Kentucky 31 Fescue Grass and its effects on spontaneous animal abortions.
- 9) Transparency and education to producers when developing carbon credit programs.
- 10) Monitoring the quantity and quality of carbon and the placement in pore space for any injection and geologic sequestration in Indiana.
- 11) Educating the public on the facts associated with climate change - including the effect of removing CO₂ from the atmosphere - on agricultural production, based on sound peer-reviewed science.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) An individualized state approach to the development of carbon markets and credit standards.
- 2) Carbon trading systems that have a detrimental effect on agricultural producers.
- 3) Penalties on agricultural producers for overselling or for inconsistent carbon capture measurements for past practices or for discontinuing a practice.
- 4) Any carbon sequestration mandate that does not take landowner and tenant rights into consideration.

8.B) State Environment Laws

i. We Support:

- 1) Enforcement consistent across all agencies.
- 2) Regulatory personnel being bound by the same private property restrictions as other law enforcement agencies and require notification to the property owner before entering.
- 3) Requiring a cost/benefit analysis for all new regulations and/or rules.
- 4) Local and state agencies being responsible for implementation of any federally mandated environmental programs.
- 5) Funding accompanying any such mandates.

8.B) State Environment Laws

i. We Support:

- 6) Cost share and technical assistance being included for landowners to implement site-specific plans.
- 7) Holding those who file unwarranted complaints or frivolous lawsuits accountable and require that they reimburse state agencies and accused individuals for expenses related to the investigation and defense of the issue.
- 8) Practical agricultural experience and continuing education being required of all state agencies' staff that impact agriculture.
- 9) Drinking water testing programs that efficiently protect public health without overburdening local private water supplies.
- 10) Agricultural exclusions from stormwater regulations and assessments or taxes.
- 11) Uniform local regulations regarding all livestock and poultry farms that are no more restrictive than those required by the state of Indiana.
- 12) Applications for permits should be acted upon within 30 days.
- 13) State and local authorities using scientifically based standards for the development of any new rules or regulations.
- 14) Coordinating all state permits required for an agricultural activity through a streamlined process.
- 15) Livestock farms being subject to the construction standards that existed at the time of their original approval.
- 16) The stormwater quality fee rate for farmers in each county not exceeding the stormwater quality fee rate for private homeowners in that same county.
- 17) A permitting process with all deficiencies addressed at a single time and within agency time limitations.
- 18) Indiana Department of Environmental Management's (IDEM) inspections of confined feeding operations (CFOs) being paid for by the General Fund, rather than by user's fees.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any requirements for farm entities to post surety bonds to deal with possible future environmental clean-ups.

8.C) Air Quality

i. We Support:

- 1) The state assuming the cost of all emissions testing in those counties where such testing is required.
- 2) Investigation on impacts to agriculture of passage of legislation on carbon and greenhouse gas emissions.

8.C) Air Quality

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Mandatory air quality standards for farmers and agricultural businesses that are not science-based and do not consider economic costs versus environmental benefit.
- 2) Regulations of agricultural enterprises as it pertains to greenhouse gas, dust and noise.

8.D) Hazardous Waste

i. We Support:

- 1) Rules that discourage the generation of hazardous wastes.
- 2) Generators of hazardous wastes being responsible for disposal and damage resulting from improper storage or disposal of that waste.
- 3) Indiana adopting a hazardous waste management plan that would accommodate Indiana business and industry needs and provide environmental protection.
- 4) Efforts to develop programs for disposal of farm chemicals that are no longer usable and recycling empty pesticide containers.
- 5) Research on the cost and appropriate disposal or recycling of renewable energy project materials.

8.E) Solid Waste

i. We Support:

- 1) The reduction of waste and the establishment of financial incentives for preferred long-term disposal methods.
- 2) Recycling of all recyclable materials.
- 3) Incentives for finding new markets for recycled materials.

8.F) Litter

i. We Support:

- 1) Strict enforcement of roadside littering laws.
- 2) Those sentenced with community service hours and prison labor to clean up litter, weeds and brush along county and state highways.
- 3) A container return policy in Indiana.

8.G) Agriculture Chemicals and Fertilizer

i. We Support:

- 1) Programs and added research in integrated pest management (IPM) and alternative practices.
- 2) Programs to inform the public of practices farmers use.
- 3) That decisions on the registration, re-registration or banning of agricultural input supplies must be based on comprehensive scientific review and benefits.
- 4) That users who follow label directions when applying agricultural chemicals should not be liable for environmental or property damages.
- 5) Limiting the damages paid for crops affected by spray drift/off target movement to only the area affected and only the value of the crop.
- 6) More opportunity for approval of special use permits for pesticides.
- 7) The continued administration of the pesticide applicator licensing program by the Office of the Indiana State Chemist (OISC).
- 8) Exemptions for farmers from obtaining permits for transporting or storing fertilizer and pesticides for their own use.
- 9) Exemptions from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) rules requiring a stormwater discharge permit.
- 10) That vendors or legitimate users of anhydrous ammonia should not be liable for the theft and subsequent misuse of the product.
- 11) Voluntary use of locks on anhydrous ammonia tanks.
- 12) Research to be conducted for a cost-effective additive for anhydrous ammonia to make it unusable for the manufacture of illegal substances.
- 13) Expansion of incentive programs for farmers who invest in environmental protection facilities or equipment.
- 14) Portable storage trailers should not be considered a facility.
- 15) Exemption from diking requirements for liquid fertilizer storage facilities, up to a maximum of six 2,500-gallon tanks.
- 16) An exemption from being a storage facility when liquid fertilizer is stored for less than 45 days.
- 17) Nutrient applications being based upon agronomic needs as documented in a nutrient management plan.
- 18) Education efforts and standards for environmental stewardship for use of fertilizer and chemicals on residential and commercial turf, as well as for agricultural use.
- 19) Establishment of a research and stewardship fee on all sources of commercial fertilizer to be administered with majority representation from users of fertilizer products based upon the percentage of market share.
- 20) Implementation of 4R nutrient stewardship certification program.
- 21) Continued ability to use glyphosate and dicamba.
- 22) Flexible buffer zones for the use of herbicides to prevent noxious and invasive weeds from becoming established on field edges and borders.
- 23) Efforts to review any cut-off date for application of dicamba, especially in years where spring planting is delayed due to weather, etc.
- 24) Pesticides approved by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and/or neighboring states being expedited for review by the OISC.

8.G) Agriculture Chemicals and Fertilizer

i. We Support:

- 25) Limiting the liability of agricultural producers and agricultural retailers/applicators for contamination of polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) on agricultural commodities or land used for agricultural production.
- 26) An exemption for pesticides/crop protection products in PFAS federal and state regulatory processes.
- 27) Not requiring a pesticide license when not directly applying the product.
- 28) Maintaining rodenticides as a retail-available product.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The Office of the Indiana State Chemist (OISC) superseding EPA or FDA approval of pesticides.
- 2) The OISC requiring separate certification for each applicator of a Restricted Use Pesticide (RUP).

8.H) Recordkeeping of Pesticide and Fertilizer Use

i. We Support:

- 1) Private and confidential retention of complete records of pesticide and fertilizer applications to include residences and commercial applicators for residences.
- 2) Documentation of on-farm location of pesticides and fertilizers, and voluntary sharing of this documentation with local emergency personnel.
- 3) Cooperation of state and federal agencies in developing standardized recordkeeping protocol.
- 4) Maintaining rodenticides as retail-available products.

8.I) Animal Manure Management

i. We Support:

- 1) Regulatory agencies continuing to recognize animal manure as a plant nutrient when properly applied to the land.
- 2) Farmer participation on commissions and boards charged with developing or recommending rules, regulations or guidelines dealing with the utilization of animal manure.
- 3) A clear definition of who assumes the liability at different stages of the nutrient handling process, including staging, storage, loading, transport and application.
- 4) Regulations based on sound science, current practices, and unique qualities of specific areas of the state.

8.I) Animal Manure Management

i. We Support:

- 5) The Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) nutrient regulations based upon agronomic needs of the plants being grown with consideration for innovations which change nutrient needs.
- 6) The development of regulations that provide regulatory oversight of satellite manure storage facilities not located on the site of livestock production facilities.
- 7) Rules for manure management that consider the economic impact.
- 8) State legislation that allows livestock producers to apply manure on frozen ground in a manner that is protective of the environment, if the farm cannot practically store its manure all winter.
- 9) A process for extension of time to apply staged manure in the event of weather-related delays or other mitigating circumstances.
- 10) Study of regulations that govern the storage and application methods of solid versus liquid manure, including differentiating the properties of each.
- 11) Manure facilities having a cost share for new or upgraded manure facilities that meet state regulations.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Existing farms being required to meet new construction requirements for existing manure containment structures.

8.J) Contamination Liability

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Landowner liability for contamination that occurs without the knowledge or consent of the landowner or for contamination that occurred under prior ownership.

9.A) Weeds and Detrimental Plants

i. We Support:

- 1) Landowners, managers, and tenants of all Indiana land - public and private - having the responsibility to prevent the spread of weeds, especially prohibited noxious weeds and invasive species, to neighboring lands.
- 2) Retailers labeling landscaping shrubs and other plant materials that are deadly or harmful to livestock and domestic pets.
- 3) Working with state agencies to limit or stop invasive animal and or plant species that are introduced into our areas.
- 4) Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) regularly reviewing and updating the invasive species list.

9.B) Weed Law Enforcement and Weed Control

i. We Support:

- 1) The state and counties mowing and spraying complete rights-of-way before noxious weeds go to seed.
- 2) Strictly enforcing laws requiring control of detrimental plants and invasive species on railroad rights-of-way, along highways and other public and privately owned property.
- 3) Encouraging local officials to utilize appropriate legislation as a means to control the spread of detrimental plants on all lands.
- 4) Research to find more effective control methods for these and other problem weeds.
- 5) Giving flexibility to county weed control boards to adopt programs to control weeds in addition to those identified in weed board legislation.
- 6) County Farm Service Agency committees cooperating with county weed boards or township trustees in controlling noxious weeds and detrimental plants on set aside and conservation reserve acres.
- 7) All seed being sold for bird feed in Indiana be rendered unable to germinate in an effort to control the spread of noxious weeds.
- 8) Florist, floral designers and "hobbyists" being prohibited from using noxious weeds in their arrangements or work.
- 9) Educating people to identify these plants.
- 10) Prohibiting the sale of noxious and invasive weed plants and seeds unless they are going to be used for educational purposes.
- 11) Producers using forage sorghums that produce a sterile seed to prevent volunteer growth.
- 12) Adequate funding for weed control on publicly controlled property.
- 13) More education about Indiana weed laws and invasive species at the local level of county and township government.
- 14) More enforcement of the Indiana Weed Law at the local level of county government.
- 15) The controlled burning of weeds and invasive species.

10.A) Water Resources Development

i. We Support:

- 1) Efforts to accurately determine agriculture's contribution to water quality and quantity concerns.
- 2) Local public health departments considering septic system permits which utilize state-approved technology systems.
- 3) The state of Indiana developing and acting on any existing plan ensuring that infrastructure is in place to provide all citizens of Indiana with reliable water service.

10.B) Water Rights

i. We Support:

- 1) The protection of landowner rights to water uses so long as its use does not permanently lower groundwater levels nor reduce stream flows below normal historic lows; nor should it raise levels in a manner that impacts other property, including drainage systems, without appropriate compensation.
- 2) Development of a comprehensive water resource management plan that assures agriculture's position as a priority water user.
- 3) The protection of farmer's rights to water resources.
- 4) Local control to oversee withdrawals of water.
- 5) Regional water-use advisory panels to help determine water allocation.
- 6) Adequate resources for a water resource inventory and monitoring program.
- 7) The Great Lakes Compact.
- 8) Any potential watershed oversight such as watershed assessment or report cards be developed based solely on a commonsense approach with approved background data that shows consistent testing methods, periods, and timeframes allowing for seasonal fluctuations.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any potential watershed assessment or report card becoming regulatory.

10.C) Drainage

i. We Support:

- 1) The use of the county drainage board legislation, joint drainage boards, conservancy districts or ditch associations to solve problems that pertain to drainage.
- 2) Distribution of local projects on county regulated drains to be dispersed throughout the watershed in an equitable and timely fashion as practical.
- 3) A seat, with voting ability, dedicated to agriculture on each local drainage board.
- 4) Avoiding land-disturbing activities that may destroy the effectiveness of roadside ditches.
- 5) Treating tree stumps to prevent re-growth on ditch banks and public rights-of-way. The tree should be cut down to the ground level before being treated for re-growth.
- 6) Proper removal and distribution of soil.
- 7) Reseeding of ditch banks and areas near ditches which are prone to erosion.
- 8) Correction by the responsible party of erosion or drainage problems on private lands resulting from highway or utility construction.
- 9) Proper drainage of county and state roads and keeping ditches.
- 10) Voluntary use of buffers and/or filter strips along all drainage ditches.
- 11) Limiting the authority of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) to an advisory role in making decisions concerning man-made waterways, mutual drains, open ditches and stormwater.
- 12) Minimizing IDNR and IDEM authority to regulate the cleaning and maintenance of local regulated drains and maintain oversight at the local county drainage board.
- 13) A modification of regulations to allow landowners to remove natural obstructions and accumulated sediment from rivers, creeks, ditches, or other waterways.
- 14) The development and state budgeting for a plan to remove trees that have fallen or are at risk of falling into a waterway.
- 15) Landowners being permitted to remove debris deposited by a flood with any mechanized equipment without permits from any regulatory agency.
- 16) Recording private drainage easements.
- 17) Any drain that crosses the property of more than one landowner should be considered a mutual drain absent clear evidence to the contrary.
- 18) Allowing landowners to connect to adequately sized drainage tile crossing that individual's land or to make improvements to handle increased flow if the existing tile is undersized.
- 19) That any parcel receiving drainage benefits should be assessed to reflect benefits being received.
- 20) The use of drainage assessment and interest for the benefit of the drain on which it was collected.
- 21) Reviewing drainage assessments to account for modern farming practices.
- 22) The use of state or federal funds to offset the additional cost of compliance with environmental rules.

10.C) Drainage

i. We Support:

- 23) A drainage board's ability to set the interest rate for money borrowed for a drainage project based on the terms of the loan.
- 24) Increasing the number of years for repayment into a reconstruction fund to 10 years with additional requirements for finance control measures.
- 25) Increasing the number of years from four to eight without a hearing for the collection of the maintenance fund for drainage ditch repair.
- 26) That new developments be required to establish and maintain proper drainage with regular inspections and enforcement used to correct problems on a timely basis.
- 27) Mandating that both surface and subsurface agricultural drainage be given consideration during planning and construction of infrastructure improvements including but not limited to roads, utilities and other improvements, and plans made for repair during any feasibility study prior to construction.
- 28) An increase in the total cubic yards of creek rock allowed to be removed in a calendar year with a general license.
- 29) Requiring sellers to notify buyers of the existence of a mutual drain.
- 30) Requiring property owners to maintain their proportion of a mutual drain.
- 31) The development of a uniform policy with the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and railroads to repair, replace, and maintain aging private farm tiles within their right of way. The policy shall include provisions that provide notification to adjoining landowners when repairs are to be made.
- 32) Local county drainage boards maintaining their authority over local drains.
- 33) Encouraging IDNR to gather input on dam water levels from local officials.
- 34) Relaxing notice requirements for minor permitted projects.
- 35) The state enhancing the maintenance of drainage on state-owned and -managed lands.
- 36) An exemption from the Flood Control Act for tree removal on farms in the floodplain, as long as they are currently farmed and compliant with federal farm programs.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Mandating memberships for buried drainage tile in the Indiana Underground Plant Protection Service/Ind. 811.
- 2) Any alteration of the natural flow of surface water if it causes unreasonable damage to a neighboring landowner.
- 3) Using drainage assessments to address stormwater quality.
- 4) The obstruction of flow in drainage ditches or streams to create wetlands or water features.
- 5) Local officials having the ability to borrow funds from the local county drainage fund for other county purposes.

10.D) Soil and Water Conservation

i. We Support:

- 1) Soil conservation programs at the federal, state and local levels.
- 2) The removal of trees, creek gravel, sand bars and debris that causes flooding or erosion of creek banks, waterways, and rivers in conjunction with site-specific installation of conservation practices and vegetation.
- 3) Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) having the authority to implement projects which benefit flood prevention and agricultural water management.
- 4) The Indiana State Department of Agriculture (ISDA) Division of Soils providing support to the SWCDs for technical assistance for landowners/land users wanting to use non-federal programs or non-cost share programs to install conservation practices.
- 5) A stable, dedicated funding source for "Clean Water Indiana".
- 6) Voluntary soil conservation plans carried out by farmers.
- 7) Regulations to require landowners to adopt erosion control measures if:
 - a) Sediment is causing damage to a neighboring landowner.
 - b) Technical assistance and incentive programs are available.
- 8) Incentive programs that enhance soil health, improve water quality, limit soil erosion, and aid in nutrient management.
- 9) Assistance for reviewing applications and inspecting development sites permitted by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) and MS4's or from grants to SWCDs/counties for technical positions.
- 10) New and alternative funding sources for SWCD outside and in addition to the current funding structure.
- 11) Working with SWCDs and Southern Indiana Cooperative Invasives Management (SICIM) to help reduce and control invasive species.
- 12) The state legislature finding a more permanent funding source for our local soil and water organizations.

10.E) Irrigation

i. We Support:

- 1) Research and information programs regarding more efficient use of water in the agricultural sector.
- 2) Keeping irrigation water off public roads.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Local units of government placing restrictions on farmland irrigation.

10.F) Groundwater Protection

i. We Support:

- 1) Protecting groundwater from contamination that would make the water unusable for its present or projected uses.
- 2) Groundwater quality standards based on reasonable criteria necessary to protect human health.
- 3) Working with appropriate state agencies to develop the strategy and implementation plan to protect Indiana's groundwater.
- 4) Protecting groundwater from contamination from abandoned wells or any sources as a primary concern of farmers.
- 5) Urging all citizens to cap abandoned wells utilizing approved standards.
- 6) All rural families testing private water wells for the presence of bacteria and nitrates.
- 7) Training programs for all pesticide applicators also including training on the potential for groundwater contamination from pesticides and ways to prevent contamination.
- 8) Reasonable setbacks from adjoining property for new wells so as not to hinder agricultural activities.
- 9) Research on the long-term impact of sewer treatment facilities (non-septic) on the replenishment of aquifers.
- 10) Protecting farmers rights to resources, such as water.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any move requiring private water well testing where test results are made public.

10.G) Surface Water

i. We Support:

- 1) Developing additional designated uses for state waters, such as agricultural drainage uses, that are based on proper use attainability analysis.
- 2) The General Assembly defining "waters of the state."
- 3) Non-point source programs that are flexible and voluntary.
- 4) Voluntary exclusionary fencing of livestock from all bodies of water.
- 5) Accurate and current water quality studies to determine the causes of water quality impairment.
- 6) Reasonable setbacks from adjoining property for new ponds so as not to hinder agricultural activities.
- 7) Local control over ditches, creeks, and streams.
- 8) Each of the 92 counties having at most one stormwater board with countywide jurisdiction.
- 9) Having at least one member of county stormwater boards be actively engaged in production agriculture.

11.A) Industry Operations

i. We Support:

- 1) Efforts to build and maintain a strong forestry and wood industry in Indiana to enhance farm income and to protect fragile land from soil erosion.
- 2) Promotion of the production of high quality, high value wood products.
- 3) Conservation and educational programs to help forestland owners with managing and marketing their timber to attain maximum returns.
- 4) Programs to encourage the international export of timber products.
- 5) A streamlined and aggressive system to allow for salvage timber harvest.
- 6) The encouragement of forestry as a career path in order to train and retain the foresters needed to protect the industry statewide.

11.B) Forest Incentives Programs

i. We Support:

- 1) Forestland as vital for timber production, air quality, and wildlife habitat.
- 2) Federal and state incentive programs and technical assistance as a means to encourage private forestland owners.
- 3) The state establishing a fee structure for technical assistance on private forestland, other than that required by law.

11.C) Publicly Owned Forestland

i. We Support:

- 1) Sound multi-use woodland management systems for federal and state-owned forestlands, including recreation, wildlife, timber harvest, downed, dead or diseased timber removal, timber stands improvement watershed protection and oil exploration.
- 2) Forest management plans including the selective marketing of timber to help reduce property taxes.
- 3) State and federal property managers complying with rules on plugging abandoned wells.
- 4) Having local hearings and input from county representatives for any lands being acquired by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) about how state-owned lands can best be used to benefit the local area.
- 5) Allowing the Division of Forestry to manage the Indiana-owned forest in a manner that is approached scientifically, based on practical experience and research.
- 6) Logging activities to continue to be allowed in state forests and parks according to sound forest management practices.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Adopted forest management plans being subject to further appeal.

11.D) Publicly Owned Non-Forestland

i. We Support:

- 1) The use of these lands for grazing if it is properly fenced for forage harvesting.

12.A) County Parks and Recreation

i. We Support:

- 1) Revenue for land acquisition, development, and operation costs in connection with park and recreation programs at the county level being obtained from sources other than property tax and be operated and maintained by user fees.

12.B) State Parks and Recreation

i. We Support:

- 1) State control of Indiana parks and other public lands.
- 2) User fees as a major source of funds for the annual operation and maintenance of state parks, state forests and state recreational areas.
- 3) A portion of user fees going back to the county to cover any additional costs to the county, e.g., ambulance, police, fire department, roads and loss of county property tax base, or those responsibilities should be assumed by the state.
- 4) Accommodation of pre-existing uses adjacent to rail-trails through the construction and maintenance of fences, levees, ditches and crossings that accommodate agricultural traffic.
- 5) Public hearings for rail-trails to allow all concerned citizens the opportunity to express their opinions about the projects.
- 6) Use of non-tax revenue to establish a fund to provide compensation to adjacent landowners for property damage, theft, littering and/or vandalism caused by trail users.
- 7) State and local funds being used to address more essential needs before being used to construct rural linear parks.
- 8) A moratorium on funds being taken from road funding to build rails-to-trails.
- 9) Rail-trails and other rural linear parks, including water trails, only if clear title has been voluntarily obtained from the owner of the property, without the use of eminent domain, adjacent landowners are not subject to liability due to trespassers, and problems of litter, maintenance and policing are addressed.
- 10) Land acquisitions by state government for state parks and recreation areas be tax neutral for local government in the county of acquisition.

12.C) Heritage Trust

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The acquisition of additional land by the Indiana Heritage Trust Fund due to the loss of county property tax base.

12.D) Federal Lands

i. We Support:

- 1) A moratorium on state government and federal government land purchases.
- 2) Compensation by the federal government to state and local governments for lost property taxes on federally owned property.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The establishment of additional federal migratory bird refuges or total wilderness areas without the consent of the Indiana General Assembly and adjoining landowners.
- 2) Any wetlands conservatory which would remove productive farmland from farming.

12.E) Hunting, Fishing and Trapping

i. We Support:

- 1) That all hunters on private property have written permission signed by the landowner or tenant in their possession when hunting on their property.
- 2) Hunter education programs that emphasize trespass laws and encourage obtaining written permission to hunt, fish or trap on private lands.
- 3) Requirements that all hunting stands or blinds be plainly marked with the hunter's name and phone number.
- 4) Having expanded hunting limits and/or seasons on wild turkey, deer, and additional detrimental wildlife.

13.A) Conservation-Renewable Energy

i. We Support:

- 1) A state energy policy and plan being developed.
- 2) Expanded research, use of new technology, production and utilization of energy produced from renewable resources such as wind, solar, hydro, biomass, animal byproducts and manure.
- 3) The use of all forms of viable energy.
- 4) Keeping the siting on wind and solar issues local.
- 5) Encouraging local governments to use and develop renewable energy according to established precise and scientific standards.
- 6) Decisions should be evaluated and prioritized locally where to site renewable energy production and storage facilities including considerations regarding the productivity of farmland, availability of marginal land/reclaimed mines/brownfields, and impact on existing uses of land in the area.
- 7) Repairing property, including drainage systems, roads, and utilities, damaged in the construction or maintenance of an alternative renewable energy to the pre-construction condition at the cost of the developer.
- 8) Renewable energy production and storage sites providing a required plan of environmental mitigation through buffer strips, setbacks, drainage, appropriate spraying and maintenance of grounds and roads prior to construction.
- 9) Holding vendors liable when performance does not meet advertised claims of renewable energy systems.
- 10) Financial incentive programs for Indiana's biofuel industry.
- 11) If incentive programs are used for renewable energy projects, they should be used towards development on non-productive ground.
- 12) The use of biofuels blended fuel in publicly owned vehicles and equipment where available.
- 13) Efforts to increase the use of biofuels throughout the state and support the establishment of a state Biofuels Task Force that would recommend policies to encourage the research, development, production, promotion and use of biofuels.
- 14) The development of a reasonable Renewable Portfolio Standard.
- 15) Incentive programs for energy produced from biomass.
- 16) Additional state initiatives to expand research into cellulosic, manure and other technologies.
- 17) A very precise and scientific standard to assure the quality of blended biofuels.
- 18) The state of Indiana mandating a 5% or above biodiesel blend.
- 19) Promotion and use of ethanol and biodiesel fuels through advertising, education, and research into producing these agriculture-based fuels.
- 20) The use of existing incentive programs to support the installation of biofuel pumps, including blending pumps.
- 21) The testing of fuel for biofuel content at local retailers by Division of Weights and Measures.

13.A) Conservation-Renewable Energy

i. We Support:

- 22) Utilities, public and member-owned, to offer and continue net metering to customers who produce behind the meter with wind, solar, biomass, or biogas systems.
- 23) Existing net metered customers to receive credits equal to a full reasonable rate of electricity for excess energy.
- 24) The reasonable use of virtual net metering.
- 25) A decommissioning bond for wind and solar leases to be in place before any construction begins.
- 26) The integration of agricultural practices with the use of renewable energy sources.
- 27) New individual energy production systems be compensated for excess energy produced and be compensated at a reasonable level for excess energy that goes back on the grid.
- 28) Requiring all components of solar panels to be recycled upon decommissioning.

13.B) Coal

i. We Support:

- 1) Research to expand the utilization of Indiana coal that will meet environmental standards and the safe disposal of coal combustion waste.
- 2) Protection of landowner rights by requiring permission from and just compensation to the surface owner when coal bed methane sources are developed.
- 3) Coal bed methane as a separate estate distinct from other mineral estates.
- 4) Groundwater monitoring for coal combustion ash (fly ash) being placed into strip mine pits.
- 5) Strip mine reclamation plans that:
 - a. Assure production potential of the land being restored as soon as practical.
 - b. Protect the quantity and quality of groundwaters.
 - c. Strictly enforce rules requiring entire cropland areas be planted and proved capable of prior productivity.
- 6) Reclaimed coal mine land that is used for commercial purposes (industrial parks, hunting, grazing, etc.) being taxed at the appropriate rate.
- 7) Reclamation plans encouraging timber production if desired by the landowner.
- 8) Clarification on how "sodbuster" provisions impact farming of reclaimed mine land.
- 9) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) involvement in planning of specifications and approval of soil conservation work before bond release on strip mined lands.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Public utilities selling or retiring reliable capacity electric generation resources, such as coal facilities, without providing a plan to ensure continuous, reliable and affordable energy.

13.C) Oil-Gas

i. We Support:

- 1) Leaseholders for oil and gas drilling being required to notify all lessors and surface owners of any change in ownership of those leases.
- 2) Oil well financing procedures to assure sufficient funds are available to properly plug and clean up abandoned well sites.
- 3) Leaseholders of all oil and gas wells being exclusively held liable for any spills or leakage of operating or abandoned wells.
- 4) The elimination of blanket bonds for oil and gas producers in favor of a per-well bond.
- 5) Bonds to ensure that abandoned wells and contaminated property are properly restored.
- 6) Off-shore oil exploration and production with appropriate environmental safeguards.
- 7) Strengthening surface owners' property rights, including:
 - a) Compensation for damages such as fertility loss, loss of revenue through reduced future yields and loss of production areas, and damage to land improvements.
- 8) The use of hydraulic fracturing under standards established by the state of Indiana.
- 9) Development of new wells and exploration.

13.D) Nuclear Energy

i. We Support:

- 1) Research on the use of nuclear energy that will meet environmental and safety standards.

14.A) Principles of Operation

i. We Support:

- 1) All low-cost energy options.
- 2) Utilities being extremely prudent in their purchase of raw materials and look at input resources including biomass and renewables in order to provide their services at the lowest possible cost.
- 3) Baseline power generation capacity within the state that will permit continued economic expansion and allow for satisfactory reserves.
- 4) Energy audits.
- 5) Full consideration to future impact which the location of lines and equipment will have on the use of the land by the property owner.
- 6) Advanced written notice by registered mail to all affected property owners and the county surveyor for any planned construction, reconstruction, or maintenance project.
- 7) Approval of a majority of the affected landowners before a regional/rural utility easement, including sewer, is submitted.
- 8) Accountability to the users for regional sewer districts.
- 9) Requiring any company with buried utilities and oil and gas pipelines to belong to the state underground locator service and therefore, must assume liability if an individual has met and followed all guidelines set and a line is cut.
- 10) Burying underground utilities in a manner to not impair existing agricultural drainage, its improvement or maintenance, and maintaining reasonable cover at the utility company's expense.
- 11) Utility company liability for any damages to existing infrastructure.
- 12) Overhead utility and broadband line heights, setbacks, and maintenance programs for utility poles as indicated by existing regulations that accommodate safe passage of large equipment.
- 13) Utility company responsibility for mowing, spraying, clearly marking, etc. around the above-ground installations to keep them visible.
- 14) A requirement that utility companies test for stray voltage upon request from a customer.
- 15) A local public hearing held by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC) when public utilities or municipalities restructure, expand or establish service territories.
- 16) Investigation of impacts to agriculture due to passage of legislation on carbon and greenhouse gas emissions.
- 17) That rural property owners have the right to accept or reject connection to rural utilities.
- 18) The requirement that utilities buy excess energy from wind-powered, water-powered, and other power production methods that have excess energy.
- 19) Improving the natural gas infrastructure and supply management for natural gas and LP.
- 20) Alternative rates to demand charges.
- 21) Utilities educating customers regarding their demand charge rates.
- 22) The creation of a state utility siting framework.

14.A) Principles of Operation

i. We Support:

- 23) That any company, assignees, or successors installing utilities be responsible for repairs for damaged drainage tiles.
- 24) Annual notification to landowners identifying the utility who owns transmission lines and contact information for the utility.
- 25) Property tax reductions for farmland impacted by utility easements when the easements limit land use.
- 26) Growth of three-phase power availability.
- 27) Utilities accommodating height requirements of large agricultural equipment when adding utility and broadband lines.
- 28) Consideration/cooperation by utility providers in agricultural areas to apply rates conducive to agricultural enterprise needs and usage.
- 29) Right-of-way easements at a reasonable cost to utility companies on state and federal lands.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Private sewer systems being forced upon landowners and going through private land without consent and compensation.

14.B) Electric Utility Restructuring

i. We Support:

- 1) The federal government setting the framework for the implementation of changes in the structure of the electric utility industry.
- 2) Allowing state government to decide whether or not to deregulate.
- 3) The following principles being met before implementation of any restructuring plan that deregulates electric utilities and establishes retail competition:
 - a) Changes in the structure of the electric industry must not be undertaken without full and informed public debate.
 - b) Benefits of deregulation should be measured primarily in terms of economic and social consequences.
 - c) The results of restructuring should ensure that all customers have access to reliable electrical service at fair and reasonable prices.
 - d) Restructuring should be consistent with the goals of protecting the environment, cost-effective sustainable energy technologies.
 - e) Restructuring should maintain adequate staff levels and training to ensure safety, reliability, customer service and planning standards.
 - f) Rural consumers must be assured of reliable service and competitive prices.
 - g) Provide a phase-in to purchase electric power in a competitive market.
 - h) Provide a mechanism for small customers to pool their electric power consumption into a larger marketable share through aggregation in order to attract and better obtain low-cost electric power.
 - i) Provide authority to Rural Electric Cooperatives to decide whether to enter into a deregulated marketplace.
 - j) Indiana's low-cost energy should not be sold to out-of-state users and replaced with higher cost power.
 - k) Consumers should be able to stay with their current supplier unless they actively choose to switch to another supplier.
- 4) These decisions being left to the cooperative member owners and their boards of directors.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any change in the current utility law concerning retail wheeling to large industrial customers that would have a negative impact on the residential and farm customers of Indiana's utilities.

14.C) Rural Electric Membership Cooperatives (REMCs)

i. We Support:

- 1) The maintenance and continuation of a strong and economical rural electrification program.
- 2) Territorial boundaries being preserved unless released by mutual agreement and just compensation provided.
- 3) The responsibility to provide an adequate supply of reliable low-cost electricity, utilizing renewable sources, as feasible.
- 4) Funding from the revolving fund administered by the federal Rural Utilities Service should not be withheld from solvent REMCs.

14.D) Telephone

i. We Support:

- 1) Legislation prohibiting public and private institutions from selling personal names and phone numbers to telemarketing institutions.
- 2) Stricter enforcement of the "Do Not Call" list in Indiana.
- 3) Improving infrastructure in rural areas to make cellular service comparable to that in metropolitan areas.
- 4) The continuation of landline phone services.
- 5) The Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC) reviewing the Extended Area Service to allow local telephone service to communities that are community related.
- 6) Rural patrons being provided residential service at fair and equitable rates.
- 7) Zone changes being discontinued in exchange where this policy is practiced.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The concept of local measured telephone service.
- 2) The "zone charges" levied on rural patrons of certain exchanges.
- 3) Further rate changes that may include similar unfair practices against rural patrons.

14.E) Broadband Internet

i. We Support:

- 1) Rural broadband, as it is essential to modern agriculture, the farmers and ranchers who grow our food, and the quality of life for rural Americans.
- 2) The state of Indiana developing and implementing a plan ensuring that broadband infrastructure is in place to provide access to all citizens of Indiana with reasonable and reliable high-speed Internet service to the last mile. The plan must consider that service to the last mile is the most expensive and needs incentives to attract investment.
- 3) More state funding for rural broadband deployment.
- 4) The use of funds geared toward the proliferation of rural communications toward newer technology as technology expands and develops.
- 5) That all government funding for broadband deployment be based on unserved and underserved number of homes and businesses.
- 6) Affordable and reasonable costs for connection and monthly fees.
- 7) Increased efforts to speed up installation of broadband infrastructure in rural counties for high-speed internet service.
- 8) State and local governments allowing easier access into the market for new internet service providers by allowing an interested investor/internet provider, who is able to obtain an approved Certificate of Territorial Authority (CTA) and/or Eligible Telecommunication Carrier (ETC) designation from the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC), to compete for federal grants flowing through the state of Indiana.
- 9) Statewide enforcement of minimum upload and download speed standards for broadband internet in all areas of Indiana.
- 10) Property owners accessing upgraded broadband services when lines cross the property, when feasible.
- 11) The promotion of Internet Service Provider (ISP) competition that improves service provisions and reliability.
- 12) State and federal grants that allow open access, municipal networks and/or cooperative models that may be necessary in some rural areas.
- 13) Aligning state with federal grant policies to create competition and a fair playing field.
- 14) Keeping Broadband Equity Accessibility and Deployment (BEAD), Digital Equity, and additional funding coming to Indiana separate and free from Next Level Connection (NLC) grants restrictions.
- 15) BEAD funding to be focused on prioritizing fiber to the premise of identified unserved and underserved areas of the state.
- 16) NLC grant regulation and timelines that are in sync with the federal BEAD and Digital Equity programs.
- 17) Allowing federal middle mile grants to be awarded to local government entities.
- 18) Effective, regular broadband grant evaluation to ensure fulfillment of all application parameters, especially for access to several locations with consistently reliable internet speeds.
- 19) Programs that educate future workers on computer technology, broadband deployment, end-user connectivity and digital literacy in the P-16 continuum.

14.E) Broadband Internet

i. We Support:

- 20) Expanding Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC) workforce credits, incentives, and programs so that internet service providers may apply and receive them.
- 21) Standard definitions for anchor institutions in state and federal broadband programs and grants.
- 22) The organization of local broadband task force across all of Indiana that includes agricultural representation and coordinates with local and state government(s).
- 23) Local county governments attaining broadband ready status with the state of Indiana.
- 24) The development of broadband cooperatives for areas where ISPs are unwilling to provide service.
- 25) Technology infrastructure that improves the internet of things (IoT) in agriculture applications.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Limiting competition for high-speed internet access.
- 2) A lengthy NLC challenge process that favors ISPs who do not provide high quality service.

14.F) Global Positioning Systems (GPS)

i. We Support:

- 1) Protecting the viability of current GPS technologies.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Anything that would render current GPS equipment ineffective or unusable.

15.A) State Constitution

i. We Support:

- 1) The existing Indiana Constitution and the framework and protections provided for agriculture.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) A state constitutional convention.
- 2) The "gaming" of Indiana's vote in the electoral college for presidential electors that would undermine the state "winner take all" method.

15.B) Agriculture Protections

i. We Support:

- 1) Laws that enable farmers to use farming practices and technology available to agriculture to provide feed, food, fiber, shelter, and fuel.
- 2) Holding individuals, public figures, and organizations financially and lawfully accountable for their actions that mislead the public or cause financial loss to a farmer.

15.C) Protection of Indiana's Sovereignty

ii. We oppose:

- 1) The use of Executive Orders, Proclamations, Treaties, or other agreements that would place designations upon public or private lands and waters in Indiana unless the designations are specifically authorized by state legislation.

15.D) Government Structure

i. We Support:

- 1) The election of strong, independent, and responsible state and local government with adequate checks and balances for the preservation of self-government and individual freedom.
- 2) Public functions being performed by qualified individuals in the unit of government closest to the people.
- 3) Enforcement of continuing education and training for elected officials specific to the office to which they are elected.
- 4) State agencies coordinating their regulations, so citizens are not forced to deal with conflicting advice.
- 5) The Indiana Public Access Counselor having sufficient authority to enforce access to public records.
- 6) Communication between public officials and private citizens being confidential.
- 7) Efforts to reduce the state's unfunded liability in public employees' retirement funds.
- 8) Moving the farm market U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Women Infants and Children (WIC) voucher program from the Indiana Department of Health to the Office of Rural Affairs.
- 9) All boards that can levy taxes being elected not appointed.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Efforts of the Metropolitan Association of Greater Indianapolis Communities or any other regional group remaking central Indiana into a "city-state" that extends beyond Marion County's borders.
- 2) Regional taxes to help fund poor relief in Marion County.
- 3) Unfunded mandates put on local governments.

15.E) Elections and Public Officials

i. We Support:

- 1) A dependent student registering and voting in the same precinct as the student's responsible parent.
- 2) Voters being required to register in person a minimum of 30 days prior to the election.
- 3) Proof of citizenship as a prerequisite for voter registration.
- 4) Any innovations of other measures to guarantee the integrity of the election process in Indiana.
- 5) All primaries being held on the same day in all states and no election results being announced until all polls in the nation are closed.
- 6) An earlier date for the primary election in Indiana.
- 7) The election of all public officials, including school board members, in general elections in even-numbered years.
- 8) Purging inactive voters from the registration rolls.
- 9) Limiting the amount any official or candidate may spend on a campaign.
- 10) Restricting all campaign activity to the 90 days preceding the election.
- 11) District lines that are defined by existing precinct lines and do not divide precincts.
- 12) All referendum and remonstrance elections being held only in the general elections.
- 13) Appointing a bipartisan commission to draw boundaries for redistricting.
- 14) If property taxes are paid in the referendum district, a taxpayer should be able to vote on the referendum issue.
- 15) That voting be permitted only in person or by an individually requested absentee ballot.
- 16) The state and local election boards having a viable contingency plan for failure of voter systems.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) A person being permitted to vote in any election in any community where he has not established a permanent residence for at least 30 days.
- 2) A college student being allowed to vote in the district where attending college unless that student is a permanent resident.
- 3) The elimination of candidate districts and their replacement with "at-large" positions for school board, county commissioners and county council.

16.A) Departments of State Government, Boards and Commissions

i. We Support:

- 1) The re-creation of an agriculture advisory committee that must review agricultural assessment regulatory changes proposed by the Indiana Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF).
- 2) This agriculture advisory committee being made up of representatives from across the state representing different types of farming and soil quality.
- 3) All commissions and boards created by the Indiana General Assembly that affect agriculture by law having maximum representation from agriculture.
- 4) When the Indiana General Assembly authorizes a state agency to administer a permit program it should also include a specific time frame by which the agency involved must act upon permit applications. Failure by the agency to act within the established time frame should result in automatic approval of the application.
- 5) Legislation granting an appeal process to the state nepotism statute, made the same as is allowed with the state statute concerning conflicts of interest.
- 6) Any county with a port having a county representative on the State Port Authority.
- 7) Legislation regarding "pilot projects" being site-specific and containing a sunset provision.
- 8) The Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC) developing engagement protocols for speculative development that includes locally elected county officials and economic development.
- 9) The IEDC should provide a detailed annual report to the Legislative Council on expenditures for site developments.
- 10) All state agencies allowing for paper testing and submission for credentials in addition to electronic.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The Indiana General Assembly establishing new agencies and departments of state government until such time as detailed studies and comprehensive recommendations for reorganization are agreed upon.
- 2) The Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC) funding large development districts using taxpayer money without seeking approval from the county legislative body.

16.B) Indiana General Assembly

i. We Support:

- 1) The continuation of the "citizen-type" legislature.
- 2) A constitutional amendment that will limit the length of the legislative session.
- 3) Denying members of the Indiana General Assembly additional pay if they cannot accomplish the state's business during the normal business sessions.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The Indiana General Assembly creating unfunded mandates on local units of government. Methods of financing any such programs should provide that those benefiting from the program bear the burden of cost.
- 2) Second house amendments that are not relevant to the subject matter of the bill as passed by the first house.
- 3) The Indiana General Assembly avoiding difficult issues by referring them to the electorate as a ballot initiative.

16.C) Regulatory Agencies

i. We Support:

- 1) All state regulatory agencies proceeding as expeditiously as possible with all rulemaking and permitting activity.
- 2) Regulatory mandates based on sound science rather than emotion or public sentiment.
- 3) Any citizen accused of violating a regulation being entitled to know the identity of the party alleging a violation has occurred.
- 4) Notifying a property owner prior to inspection if a private individual or governmental entity is to inspect private property. The inspection must be done in the presence of the property owner or their representative.
- 5) The property owner being able to request an independent laboratory to evaluate any sample of water or soil to be analyzed.
- 6) All fines imposed by government agencies going into the General Fund and being subject to the legislative appropriations process.
- 7) Citizens having the right to appeal adverse decisions by regulatory agencies directly to local courts rather than be required to proceed in an administrative adjudication procedure within the agency itself.
- 8) State regulations that are funded by user fees as a model structure.
- 9) The creation of a food and ag liaison role within the Indiana Department of Health
- 10) County elected executive officials having approval over public health emergency policy recommended by county health officials.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) State agencies employing convicted felons in positions where they will have authority to enter private property.

16.D) Indiana State Fair and Facilities

i. We Support:

- 1) The Indiana State Fair as a showcase of Indiana agriculture and continuing as such.
- 2) Any changes in the law governing the state fair improving its ability to function.
- 3) Full funding of maintenance and improvements needed to use the fairgrounds year-round as a viable showcase for Indiana agriculture.
- 4) The complete retention of the current system of vesting the responsibility for overseeing the year-round operations of the Indiana State Fairgrounds to the Indiana State Fair Commission.
- 5) The Indiana State Fair Board having the responsibility for planning, overseeing, and conducting the annual state fair.
- 6) The Indiana State Fair Board consisting of individuals who represent the state's agricultural community and have specific knowledge of various commodities and activities showcased at the state fair.
- 7) The administration of electing and appointing state fair board members as directed in the law governing the Indiana State Fair Board.

16.E) Budgeting and Investment Authority

i. We Support:

- 1) County councils being given binding reviews of tax rates and tax levies of all elected and non-elected civil governmental agencies and boards.
- 2) Local governments, including school corporations, being allowed to invest their funds only where those funds are insured by the full faith and credit of the United States.
- 3) Investment income being credited to the fund which generates it.
- 4) Indiana's state comptroller and state treasurer jointly developing and providing guidelines for the safe investment of county funds.
- 5) Provisions to approve library bonds and districts by public referendum.
- 6) The concept of privatization as another method to be used by governments in meeting the needs of its citizens.
- 7) Privatization only be used when it is the most practical and economical method available.

17.A) Local Government Structure

i. We Support:

- 1) Local county commissioners and county councils as now organized.
- 2) County commissioner districts continuing to be based upon area rather than population.
- 3) Retaining the township trustee and township advisory boards as now organized.
- 4) That if townships are to consider merging, a clear plan for the process of the merger, the services provided before and after the merger, and the property tax implications are made available to the public before it goes to a referendum.
- 5) If a merger of townships occurs, the capital and financial resources including but not limited to vehicles and other owned assets of the merging townships should be dedicated or expended to the areas where the financial resources were collected.
- 6) Rebalancing of township general and fire maximum levies and other revenues based on a fiscal plan that is adopted by the township board and approved by the commissioner of the Indiana Department of Local Government Finance.
- 7) Prohibiting employees of a local government unit from serving as elected officials within the same local government unit.
- 8) The planning commission director may be dismissed by the elected county commissioners instead of by the appointed planning commission board.
- 9) The balanced reorganization of county government, other local government units, and local government services after fiscal review that improves efficiency without diminishing rural representation or unnecessarily restricting agricultural practices, such as drainage issues, animal feeding practices, manure applications, etc.
- 10) Any consolidation of city and county government occurring only after the voters of incorporated and unincorporated areas have independently approved a comprehensive consolidation plan.
- 11) The combination of government services if the voters in each affected governmental unit independently approve of such combination.
- 12) All local government annual reports, taxpayer notices and announcements being published in both local newspapers with circulation more frequent than weekly and on county and city government websites.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The idea of a single person as county executive.
- 2) The involuntary creation of districts by consolidating smaller townships.
- 3) County-wide control of poor relief funds.
- 4) Mandatory consolidation of township government.
- 5) Legislative action to seize the financial assets of any political subdivision or mandate the expenditure of their funds or reallocate assets to the benefit of the state of Indiana or another political subdivision.

17.B) Local Control

i. We Support:

- 1) The concept that local regulation of agricultural operations should be no more stringent than the corresponding state or federal standards.
- 2) Proper structuring of local government to ensure responsiveness to the needs of its citizens.
- 3) Elimination of duplication of services in the county by improving efficiency and reducing costs.
- 4) A system of checks and balances to ensure local government does not have the ability to close a local business (food and agriculture) without just cause or ability to appeal and no reasonable process in closing that business.
- 5) Local control and siting standards regarding the development of solar and wind.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any ordinances or regulations that will restrict property rights or the use of property.
- 2) Moratoriums on projects that have been approved and permitted by state regulators.
- 3) Any local, state, or national ordinance to regulate odor from livestock or agriculture enterprises, specifically any regulations trying to limit odors from leaving property lines.
- 4) Any fencing permit requirements for agriculture-zoned land.

17.C) Annexation and Mergers

i. We Support:

- 1) Notifying landowners being annexed and adjacent landowners no less than 30 days by registered letter prior to any annexation proceedings taking place.
- 2) Municipalities collecting signatures from 65% of the landowners in order for an area to be annexed.
- 3) A uniform petition for annexation similar to the school remonstrance petition.
- 4) Requiring county commissioner approval prior to expansion of the two-mile buffer.
- 5) Recourse for property owners for the liabilities incurred as a result of annexation.
- 6) Property being exempt from additional taxation if no new services are provided as a result of annexation.
- 7) Provisions made for the reversal of an annexation of an area if equivalent services are not provided in the annexed area within three years of annexation.
- 8) Annexation laws being reviewed and amended to protect the territorial rights of rural water, fire districts and sewage districts from being jeopardized by annexation.
- 9) Abolishing spot annexation and the two-mile buffer zone.
- 10) Any consolidation of city and county government occurring only after the voters of incorporated and unincorporated areas have independently approved a comprehensive consolidation plan.

17.C) Annexation and Mergers

i. We Support:

- 11) A restriction in newly annexed areas where utility service providers will not change due to the annexation unless the original utility is fully compensated.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Involuntary annexation.
- 2) Landowners having to petition a court to oppose an involuntary annexation.
- 3) Opposition waivers as a required condition for the provision of municipal water, fire districts or sewer services outside the municipal limits.
- 4) Any city or town annexing open farmland for sub-divisions petitioning for annexation without the approval of farmland owner.
- 5) A county, city or town gaining control of or attempting to control property and resources outside of its jurisdiction.
- 6) Agriculture land that remains in active production after being annexed into a city or town being subjected to municipal taxes or to more stringent regulations.
- 7) County commissioner approval on annexation.

17.D) Judicial

i. We Support:

- 1) The county council having the final authority to establish the budget of its courts thereby eliminating the courts' mandate power over county funds for their operations.
- 2) The concept of "family" courts with comprehensive jurisdiction and encourage their establishment statewide.
- 3) Transferring the responsibility for all funding of the state trial court system to the state, including public defenders and probation.
- 4) The state of Indiana reimbursing counties for the cost of legal representation of inmates in state custody.
- 5) A campaign for judicial education of modern agriculture and farming practices.
- 6) The following concepts regarding reform of the Indiana trial court system:
 - a) The creation of districts based on population that would allow transfer of cases between courts to alleviate backlogs and crowded dockets.
 - b) The shifting of funding for trial courts to a non-property tax source.
 - c) Election of trial court judges by the citizens for whom they serve.
 - d) Reviewing the percent of distribution of court costs from county to state.

17.E) Libraries

i. We Support:

- 1) Public library access as an important educational and cultural asset, especially in rural communities.
- 2) Any reorganization or consolidation of purchases that would enhance the delivery of these services.
- 3) The approval of library budgets by the county or city council whose jurisdiction the library is organized because the library boards are appointed rather than elected.
- 4) Funding approved by referendum for libraries being raised from the full assessed value, before deductions, of residential properties.

17.F) Fire Territories

i. We Support:

- 1) Township trustees and their boards that contract fire services having influence over the budget process of the departments they gain service from.
- 2) Development of a fire territory being done without charging any additional levies to taxpayers of the various units within the territory.
- 3) Participating units of a fire territory being able to have different rates and levies.
- 4) The adoption of a fire territory by participating units occurring before March 1 for taxes payable in the following year.
- 5) Proposing units providing a detailed legal notice that includes the proposed budget rate and levy for each of the participating units prior to the creation of a fire territory.
- 6) The notice providing projected fire service within each unit of the territory, future needs and planned expenses, both operating and capital expenditures for the fire territory for a five-year period.
- 7) Participating units holding at least three public hearings before the establishment of the territory is adopted.
- 8) Formation of fire territories including the same taxpayer rights as those available to taxpayers affected by the creation of a fire district, including:
 - a) Petitions by freeholders to establish the new jurisdiction.
 - b) Thresholds for petitions that reflect the will of the majority of property owners.
 - c) Stopping the creation of the territory.
 - d) Reviewing the creation of the fire territory by the county commissioners in the same manner as fire districts are handled currently in statute.
- 9) Revenues that follow property taxes like local option income tax and vehicle excise tax being deposited in the funds of the fire territory in proportion to property taxes collected for the fire territory.
- 10) Efforts to fund fire protection from sources other than property taxes.

17.F) Fire Territories

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Siphoning off revenues that follow property taxes to the operating funds of the provider unit.
- 2) Spreading prior obligations from any participating units to taxpayers of the other participating units when a fire territory is created.

18.A) Local Planning

i. We Support:

- 1) State and federal agencies conferring with local planning officials in planning of projects that would cause a change in land use.
- 2) The use of cost-of-services studies to guide zoning decisions and economic development in each county.
- 3) The use of soil surveys and other information available from the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Soil and Water Conservation Districts as a basic source of data for land use planning.
- 4) The official notification of landowners and adjacent landowners in the change of zoning, the comprehensive plan, or official actions that change allowable uses for those affected properties by certified mail prior to public comment periods, in a timely manner.
- 5) A disclosure being included in the sale of all property within the county as to their current zoning.
- 6) That whenever property adjacent to any farm or ranch is re-zoned for purposes other than agriculture, the farm or ranch remain free to continue and expand its agricultural operations. This includes the freedom to change the nature or character of agricultural operations.
- 7) That local control of land use planning can best be accomplished at the county level of government.
- 8) The responsible use of appropriately zoned land, such as an agricultural park for related agricultural enterprises.
- 9) That agricultural enterprises should not have to get a special zoning exemption if already in an agriculturally zoned area.
- 10) Utilization of the model zoning ordinances developed by the Indiana Land Resource Council.
- 11) Reciprocal setbacks for other types of development.
- 12) The plan commission requiring an erosion control plan under Rule 5 as part of their permitting process, and that drainage impact, both runoff speed and amount, should be no more than prior land use.
- 13) Public notice and hearings prior to purchasing properties or easements.
- 14) Legislation requiring that plan commissions and legislative bodies provide individualized written findings for any vote they cast.
- 15) Providing public and civil notices be posted on county municipal websites.
- 16) Landowners and county planning and zoning officials being notified and/or consulted prior to implementation of changes to floodplains or floodways.
- 17) Developers providing recorded easements for existing underground or surface drainage systems and be responsible for the maintenance of these systems when necessary to provide drainage of adjacent farmland.
- 18) The use of an impact fee on residential developments occurring in unincorporated areas for utilities, infrastructure costs, schools, and farmland preservation.

18.A) Local Planning

i. We Support:

- 19) The simplification of the impact fee statute to assist counties in mitigating the immediate costs of providing public services and infrastructure to residential, commercial, or industrial developments.
- 20) Training for planning and zoning officials that provide an agricultural perspective.
- 21) Having someone knowledgeable from the production agricultural community to serve on all plan commissions for a better understanding of rural land use.
- 22) Defined divisions of authority with respect to regulating confined feeding operations, having local officials control where operations are sited and state agencies controlling how operations function within current regulations.
- 23) Repurposing abandoned box store buildings.
- 24) A time limit on construction of residential development after receiving zoning approval.
- 25) Protecting the rights for raising poultry and rabbits in municipalities.
- 26) Land under a solar array remaining agriculturally zoned.
- 27) Municipalities designating urban agricultural zones.
- 28) Investment in municipal parcels to enable the development of urban agricultural zones.
- 29) Encouraging counties to review comprehensive land use plans at least every 10 years.
- 30) Local governments taking into consideration the impacts of light pollution on crops and farmland.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The imposition of livestock moratoria by local officials or the state.
- 2) Overlay districts dictating change in agricultural uses.
- 3) Mandatory enrollment of abandoned commercial buildings and ag facilities by local, state, or national government without consent of property owner and local officials.
- 4) A fee on abandoned commercial buildings or ag facilities that is funded by local, state, or national government.

18.B) Agriculture Land Protection

i. We Support:

- 1) Indiana's right-to-farm law.
- 2) A voluntary, incentive-laden policy designed to encourage the protection of agricultural land as a base for future food production and a viable agricultural industry.
- 3) Including farmers on state and county committees that are looking at highway and building projects to ensure family farms are represented during project planning stages.
- 4) Comprehensive planning for orderly urban growth that will reduce conflict with agricultural crop and livestock production.
- 5) Encouraging residential development within established utilities and existing development.
- 6) Changes in zoning in an agricultural area (e.g. agricultural to residential) to require a record of covenant on all property deeds between original owner and subsequent owners stating that:
 - a) This property is in a predominantly agricultural area and all normal, reasonable, and necessary agricultural practices - including but not limited to livestock and field crop operations - may continue to be operated within the buffer zone of the residential area and not be considered a nuisance.
 - b) With this understanding, the new owner on behalf of himself and any future owner and occupants of the property shall waive right to bring claim against any farmer or agriculture producer in this area who is acting within these guidelines.
 - c) The producer has the right to expand, change or enlarge his farming operation and still be protected by this covenant.
 - d) All such agreements and restrictions shall run with the land and shall be binding upon the applicants' and their successors' interest.
- 7) A requirement for local and state agencies to consider other lands and use alternative designs that require less acquisition of agricultural land.
- 8) Repeal of the statutes which provide cities and towns the authority to zone an area within two miles of their municipal boundary.
- 9) The right of farmers farming inside a buffer zone to expand their farming business.
- 10) A requirement for local governments to consider the economic and environmental impacts on agriculture when new development is proposed or infrastructure extended.
- 11) Legislation establishing a state procedure on the conversion of farmland for public use.
- 12) Legislation for a state farmland protection policy and adequate funding for the Indiana Land Resources Council.
- 13) Indiana State Department of Agriculture leading the coordination of state agencies to coordinate farmland preservation and ag conservation easements.
- 14) Brownfield redevelopment taking precedence over new greenfield development. Tax incentives and property liability protection should be provided to developers to encourage brownfield redevelopment.
- 15) Farmland easements and voluntary classified preservation programs in Indiana.

18.B) Agriculture Land Protection

i. We Support:

- 16) At the point of real estate title transfer, in all areas zoned agriculture, a disclosure shall be given and acknowledged with signature, alerting the buyer(s) to the sights, sounds, odors and activity as part of production agriculture. The disclosure shall also give notice that Indiana is a right-to-farm state.
- 17) Education of current and new rural residents on permitted uses and special exceptions allowed in agricultural zones.
- 18) Official notification of the current title deed owner simultaneously with filing a new title deed for the property.
- 19) The ban of foreign adversaries from purchasing Indiana farmland.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Legislation and local ordinances that would interfere with a farmer's right-to-farm.
- 2) Involuntary conversion of farmland for mitigation of the conversion of other natural resources, such as wetlands or endangered species habitats.
- 3) Extraterritorial jurisdiction of cities and towns, including buffer zones, surface and sub-surface water and minerals.
- 4) The use of a comprehensive plan as a tool to restrict the expansion of current and future agricultural operations.

18.C) Property Rights

i. We Support:

- 1) The competitive enterprise system in which property is privately managed and legally operated for profit and individual satisfaction.
- 2) Legislation stipulating that notice of termination of a farmland lease must be given by Sept. 1, unless otherwise stipulated in a written contract.
- 3) Legislation prohibiting dumping of either domestic or wild animals in rural areas.
- 4) Strict interpretation of easements so as to limit their use to their original intent. Any further use of an easement should be renegotiated.
- 5) Property tax exemptions when public use easements are granted by private landowners.
- 6) The retention of pore space property rights by the surface owner unless expressly transferred as part of a lease or conveyance.
- 7) The protection of landowner rights by requiring consent of the owners of the pore space underlying at least 70% of the surface area above the proposed storage facility and just compensation when pore space is acquired.
- 8) Laws that recognize and maintain the status of animals as property.
- 9) Creating a statewide right-of-way definition to eliminate confusion as to the boundaries of a right-of-way and what is permitted within it.

18.C) Property Rights

i. We Support:

- 10) Carbon sequestration projects:
 - a) Being required to provide notice to landowners.
 - b) Negotiating with landowners prior to projects being implemented a reasonable and fair market rate of compensation.
 - c) All projects in Indiana be required to adhere to the 70/30 statute that requires approval from 70% of the landowners for the project to proceed.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Restricted use of privately owned property by law or regulation without just compensation paid to the landowners.
- 2) The use of open fields doctrine to gain access to private land without a warrant or probable cause.
- 3) Private for-profit companies using county rights of way without landowner compensation.

18.D) Eminent Domain

i. We Support:

- 1) Prior to the commencement of any statutory condemnation procedures:
 - a) Landowners being notified by registered mail before discussion of eminent domain proceedings by a government agency or condemning authority, absent a national security interest.
 - b) Condemning agencies being required to hold public hearings on the need and location of the property to be taken.
 - c) Property owners having the right to judicial review of the needs and location of the take.
 - d) Agencies using existing easements and considering alternatives which least disrupt natural resources and agribusinesses.
 - e) Owners of condemned property being reimbursed at fair market value plus anticipated future income or post-project development value, whichever is greater.
 - f) Landowners being compensated for damages to the remainder of the property.
 - g) Legislation to compensate defendants who win eminent domain cases for reasonable legal fees.
 - h) That funds deposited in banks for eminent domain suits by the state should be put in interest-bearing accounts with the property owner receiving the interest.
 - i) Property owners and government jurisdictions being notified at the time of application to the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission.

18.D) Eminent Domain

i. We Support:

- 1) Prior to the commencement of any statutory condemnation procedures:
 - j) Property owners having the use of their condemned property until construction begins, including the sale of timber or any crops.
 - k) Eminent domain exercised by an appointed board being approved by the most directly elected governmental body in order to be enacted.
 - l) The condemning entity maintaining tile and surface drainage through the easement when a landowner loses property through eminent domain.
- 2) The remaining property being left in a profitable state if any portion of a property is to be taken by eminent domain or easement. In the event that it is not, the remainder of the property must be purchased at fair market value if it is the desire of the landowner.
- 3) That after five years following the condemnation, land be offered for sale to the original property owners if it has not been developed for the original purpose, at no more than the original purchase price.
- 4) Proceeds from the sale of property obtained through the process of eminent domain, or threat of eminent domain, being exempt from taxes at the local, state and federal levels.
- 5) Property owners being fully and fairly compensated when property is condemned for support services and access to a new industrial site. The loss of tenant's rights should also be fairly compensated.
- 6) Condemning agencies being authorized to trade properties when that would satisfy a displaced property owner. Property acquired for trade must not be acquired by eminent domain. Condemned farmland should be compensated at the highest ratio wetlands are mitigated.
- 7) State governmental agencies acquiring property under eminent domain being required to satisfy existing liens or levies on such property and provide for the assumption of the bonded indebtedness imposed by other governmental agencies when the property was considered a part of the base for paying such indebtedness.
- 8) Environmental and economic study on property gifted or sold to federal, state, county and city governments before the jurisdiction takes ownership.
- 9) The repeal of statutory authority (I.C. 8-4-10) regarding lateral railroads.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The use of eminent domain to secure property for private interests.
- 2) The use of eminent domain to acquire land exclusively for recreational purposes, such as trails, linear trails or parks, water trails, paths, greenways or other walking, hiking, bicycling or equestrian use, private economic development or to expand the landholdings of wildlife agencies.
- 3) Non-governmental entities being conferred the authority to condemn private property.
- 4) Use of eminent domain by utilities or private companies to acquire subsurface pore space.

19.A) State Fiscal Policy Operation

i. We Support:

- 1) The timely enactment of a biennial budget for the state of Indiana in odd-numbered years as the first priority of both the Indiana General Assembly and the administration.
- 2) Budget restraints at all levels of government.
- 3) Amending the state's balanced budget law to include the statement that county governments and other agencies cannot be put on "deferred payment" lists in order to balance the state budget.
- 4) A line-item veto for the governor of Indiana with respect to expenditures and appropriations.
- 5) Greater accountability at all levels of government.
- 6) A public revenue system that requires affirmative votes by a body of elected officials on all tax increases.
- 7) State legislators adopting new legislation impacting our tax system to make the new rules effective the following tax collection year.
- 8) The Indiana State Budget Committee having the annual budget prepared in ample time to be distributed at least 48 hours before it will be voted upon.
- 9) County governments being reimbursed by the state for juvenile detention to avoid unfunded mandates.
- 10) Efforts for drug rehabilitation programs to be funded more by state government compared to local government.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Shifting the responsibility for funding programs mandated by the state or federal government to local taxing units.

19.B) Property Tax

i. We Support:

- 1) Permanent and substantial measures to free Hoosiers from the burden of property taxes.
- 2) Lowering the property tax caps for farmland, farm buildings, and farm machinery to one percent of the assessed value.
- 3) Property owned by tax-exempt organizations, such as churches, charitable, educational, and governmental groups, being reviewed to assure that all income producing property is being taxed.
- 4) All exemptions and deductions being reviewed by the Indiana General Assembly and measured as to their fairness and equity.
- 5) The elimination or reduction of the supplemental homestead deduction.

19.B) Property Tax

i. We Support:

- 6) Implementing a minimum amount of property taxes being paid by all property owners regardless of exemptions in order for all taxpayers to have a vested interest in the infrastructure supported by property taxes.
- 7) Such minimums increasing proportionately if there is a proposed tax increase.
- 8) Cost-of-services study to determine which classes of property use the most state and local services to determine that cost and payments for services are equitable between classes.
- 9) The elimination of entire levies, including levies used to support courts controlled by the state.
- 10) A local option income tax for school operating expenses and/or construction expenses, rather than a school operating/construction referendum, which comes from property taxes if the state fails to meet its obligations to fund schools.
- 11) Allowing all property owners, including non-resident owners, to vote on a referendum for a new capital project or increased operating expenses.
- 12) Projects, such as new capital projects of increased operating expenses, being supported by state funds, such as income, corporate, sales or a combination tax.
- 13) Increasing state revenues only to remove or reduce property tax levies.
- 14) Reductions to school debt service levies with a state grant that is distributed on a per-student basis and weighted based on assessed value.
- 15) The state of Indiana setting aside substantial monies to be awarded annually to offset the principal of school construction projects that meet state guidelines.
- 16) Grants for reductions to school debt service levies and monies to offset the principal of school construction projects being established through a statewide source, such as sales tax.
- 17) Having all local bonding treated as controlled projects that are subject to referenda.
- 18) Shifting library funding away from property tax.
- 19) The continuation of an oversight system for local property tax and local option income tax.
- 20) The investigation and development of alternative forms of revenue generation to property tax that would require all citizens to contribute on an equitable basis.
- 21) Abolishing Article 10 of the Indiana Constitution to assure permanent property tax relief.
- 22) The removal of entire levies from property tax funding until the abolishment of Article 10.
- 23) Rescinding the authority to use property taxes in the future for the purpose of levies that have been removed from property tax funding.
- 24) State guidelines to limit county assessors from changing classification of property.
- 25) Expanding the statutory list of youth, veteran and charitable organizations whose tangible property is exempt from property taxation to include 4-H and FFA in order to assure fairness and equity.

19.B) Property Tax

i. We Support:

- 26) Legislation making it mandatory that all counties in the state mail property taxpayers a notice of assessment and any changes in classification to give ample time to review it before taxes are due.
- 27) State government compensating counties for any tax revenues lost as the result of property being included in a "classified" program or state-owned property.
- 28) Every property owner receiving a detailed notice of his/her property tax even if it is paid from an escrow account.
- 29) State and federal governments making direct cash payments to local governments in lieu of property tax for all state and federally owned property to offset property taxes lost.
- 30) Property tax as an unfair and outdated method of raising government revenue.
- 31) A shift away from property taxes to be the best economic development incentive the state and local governments could use.
- 32) The adoption of a simplified tax system that Indiana taxpayers can understand.
- 33) The continued re-evaluation of the property tax formula and its effects.
- 34) The property tax calculations and annual budget forms being simplified so that the general public can understand them.
- 35) All government budgetary and tax data being available to the public in a standard digitized database for comparative analysis.
- 36) Allowing local governments to establish service districts with differentiated levels of service and corresponding tax rates.
- 37) A program that would gift vacant property to adjoining landowners in an effort to get these properties back on local tax rolls.
- 38) Beginning farmer entry assistance and mentorship through tax incentives.
- 39) Multi-year property tax phase-in for new home construction. The new construction must be in a city or town where electric, water and sewer are already available. The area must be designated as blighted.
- 40) A study to determine the feasibility of limiting voting in referenda on changing property tax levies to affected property owners only.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any property tax relief mechanism that favors another class of taxpayers at the expense of agriculture.
- 2) The same controlled project being pursued within three years of its defeat in a referendum.

19.C) Personal Property Tax

i. We Support:

- 1) The elimination of personal property tax; however, non-property tax revenue must be found before elimination. A credit for personal property tax paid on agricultural personal property until personal property tax can be eliminated.
- 2) A clear definition of guidelines for assessment of tangible items on personal property – they are unclear such as abnormal obsolescence vs. normal obsolescence.
- 3) Consistent assessment definitions and application of penalties and interest.
- 4) Farm equipment depreciation being taken per depreciation pool.
- 5) The 30% floor requirement to be eliminated.
- 6) Farm machinery possessed for 10 years being removed from property tax.
- 7) Giving local officials latitude in imposing fines and removing late filing fees if individuals are found to have made good faith efforts in reporting personal property tax assessments.
- 8) Private firms being compensated on a flat-fee basis rather than a percentage basis if firms are used to audit personal property.
- 9) The commissioners being the only authority to sign personal property audit contracts.
- 10) Livestock structures and equipment being taxed as real property agricultural assessment.
- 11) Greater transparency to county assessors on any state assessed property with county commissioners being able to appeal.
- 12) The state personal property tax de minimis exemption applying to all personal property taxpayers.
- 13) Requiring the state to replace the lost local government and school funding revenue from any decrease in business personal property tax, rather than shifting the burden to other property taxes like farmland or residential.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The use of private firms to audit personal property.
- 2) The assessor's ability to sign the personal property audit contracts.

19.D) Assessment

i. We Support:

- 1) The uniform assessment of property that complies with assessment rules of the Indiana Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) that are based on the law and use standard cost tables.
- 2) Assessed valuation of commercial property based on a combination of cost basis and current use.
- 3) Assessing being done by local officials unless the county requests the DLGF to help assess a commercial building.

19.D) Assessment

i. We Support:

- 4) Professional help, if needed, being provided only by a contractor who has been determined by the state to be qualified.
- 5) Assessors holding a Level III designation.
- 6) The DLGF providing training to local assessors to assure compliance with assessment standards established by the state.
- 7) Assessing agricultural lands based on productivity regardless of the size of the parcel.
- 8) A "value-in-use" system of assessing farmland rather than a system of "highest-and-best-use."
- 9) The concept of a trending rule to adjust assessed values to reflect changes in the market between reassessments.
- 10) Any changes to the soil productivity factor for farmland assessment and taxation requiring legislative approval.
- 11) The trending rule being implemented by applying mathematical adjustments.
- 12) The "Property Tax Neighborhood Factor" only being applied to residential structures.
- 13) A transparent property tax trending equation so that property owners as well as county assessors are aware of any proposed changes.
- 14) Reassessments being conducted in 4-to-6-year intervals to keep the assessments of various types of property in alignment.
- 15) Appointed Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals (PTABOA) members attending training from the DLGF on their duties.
- 16) The PTABOA board being a minimum of five people.
- 17) A property owner having representation at a PTABOA hearing by a person having power of attorney.
- 18) Woodland being taxed as agricultural woodland with an 80% influence.
- 19) An assessment exemption for at least one acre around each electrical tower or communication structure that is in an agricultural production field.
- 20) An individual's right to privacy for PTABOA and for personal property tax audits.
- 21) That during the commencement of action for eminent domain, the state's petition must ask that appraisers appointed to appraise the value of the property must be certified in the state of Indiana.
- 22) Local government officials' right to appeal utility personal property assessments to the DLGF.
- 23) A clear definition of guidelines for assessment of real property improvements – they are unclear such as abnormal obsolescence vs. normal obsolescence.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Allowing the DLGF to increase the soil productivity influence factor above the current level of 128% of the base assessed farmland value for establishing property taxes on farmland.
- 2) Mini reassessment being required to implement adjustments.
- 3) Trending for value adjustments on-farm improvements.
- 4) Employees or contractors of the assessor or the auditor and certified state appraisers being allowed to serve on the PTABOA.

19.E) Construction Projects

i. We Support:

- 1) The use of standardized building plans and specifications for public construction whenever practicable.
- 2) State law requiring contractors to provide a bond that will protect the public entity financing the project from subsequent contractor-requested change orders that will significantly increase the cost of the project.
- 3) State law requiring contractors to provide a quality construction bond to protect against faulty material or workmanship for a period of at least 18 months following the completion of a construction project.
- 4) Requiring that school corporation bonds be approved by the fiscal body of the municipal or county government containing the greatest proportion of assessed value in the school district.
- 5) A change in the 1995 petition-remonstrance law for local government bodies to control the use of debt to finance capital improvements.
- 6) A secret taxpayer ballot for the petition remonstrance process.
- 7) That all property owners, including non-resident owners, should be eligible to vote on a referendum for a new capital project or increased operating expenses.
- 8) That the School Capital Projects Fund should be used exclusively for capital projects.
- 9) Lowering the \$5 million referendum threshold limit in a calendar year to have more input and control by taxpayers.
- 10) The use of Indiana and USA materials and local labor on public construction projects.
- 11) Impact fees being allowed for school facilities.
- 12) Funding approved by referendum for schools being raised from the full assessed value, before deductions, of residential properties.
- 13) Units violating bond procedures automatically becoming a control unit.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Needing to bring a whole building up to code when necessary to upgrade a particular portion of a public building.
- 2) Using bond proceeds for operational expenses without the approval of the Distressed Unit Appeal Board.

19.F) Local Tax Option

i. We Support:

- 1) Local option income taxes for expenses that are local.
- 2) Local option income taxes as an excellent method of funding local civil government costs from a non-property source.
- 3) No local unit receiving local option income tax unless the elected governing body votes to adopt the tax.
- 4) Raising the cap on local option income taxes provided the additional income be used to lower property tax.
- 5) Local option income taxes and other dedicated funds that are raised for a specific purpose, like the Property Tax Replacement Credit, being segregated and used for the original purpose for which they were enacted.
- 6) Local governments being given the discretion to spend revenue from various sources in the event of a declared emergency.
- 7) Proceeds of a County Economic Development Income Tax (CEDIT) being administered on a county-wide basis for the benefit of all citizens in the county.
- 8) All loans of CEDIT funds for economic development projects including full recapture provisions.
- 9) Local option income taxes only if the revenue generated offsets local property revenues, dollar for dollar.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) A commuter tax imposed by the county where a person works but doesn't reside.
- 2) Any attempt by the state getting a fee for collecting the local option taxes.

19.G) Sales Tax

i. We Support:

- 1) Clarification of the sales tax exemption applied to agricultural production items to a single direct test.
- 2) The elimination of sales tax on any agricultural production items.
- 3) Indiana cooperating with other states to assure the collection of sales tax on internet and catalog purchases.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The creation of a value-added tax.
- 2) Sales tax being placed on services unless it replaces property tax.

19.H) Income Tax

i. We Support:

- 1) State income tax depreciation rules matching federal rules.

19.I) User Fees

i. We Support:

- 1) The user fee concept as a fair and equitable means of raising revenues for services that benefit only the user.
- 2) Reviewing these services.
- 3) Giving local governments the opportunity to raise revenues in this manner.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) User fees that would raise revenues above the costs of the service.
- 2) Revenues raised being diverted to purposes unrelated to the fee.

19.J) Economic Development Incentives

i. We Support:

- 1) The attempts at improving the state's economic development.
- 2) A cost of services study to guide zoning decisions and economic development in each county.
- 3) The termination of all tax abatements on any property that is vacated.
- 4) Economic development taxes remaining in the county where they are collected unless used for rural or agricultural development in a neighboring county that would promote other development in both counties.
- 5) The Indiana General Assembly clearly extending the existing economic revitalization laws to agricultural businesses and farming operations.
- 6) The enactment of a state income tax credit to encourage private investment in enterprises that add value to agricultural products in Indiana.
- 7) Full disclosure of all public incentives offered to any industry, company or individual to induce a decision to locate in a community including direct payments, tax abatements and ancillary benefits such as roads, utilities, land, etc.
- 8) An increased funding emphasis for rural development and growth that balances state support for efforts such as regional cities.
- 9) Penalizing beneficiaries of economic development incentives when they fail to honor the promise given to a community to induce the incentive.
- 10) The expansion of the marketing of Indiana tourism and promotion of tourist's attractions to in-state and out-of-state residents to bolster economic development.

19.J) Economic Development Incentives

i. We Support:

- 11) Promotion of local agritourism efforts to promote agriculture and its historical value to our communities.
- 12) State incentives to encourage agritourism growth.
- 13) All units of government affected by the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District being created to be advised of the public hearing scheduled to consider its creation.
- 14) Tax incentives for brownfield and grayfield development.
- 15) The life and development objectives of a TIF being clearly defined.
- 16) The boundaries of a TIF only encompassing the areas of the project to be assisted.
- 17) The state legislature establishing and enforcing a penalty for TIFs in violation of their uses.
- 18) The state legislature establishing and enforcing clear time limits for the duration of each TIF.
- 19) Any debts issued after the initial issuance will not extend the life of the TIF.
- 20) The mandatory release of excess captured assessed valuations collected by TIFs after 10 years so as not to unnecessarily increase property taxes.
- 21) The sun-setting TIF districts where the development objectives have been met.
- 22) Accountability and transparency in TIF districts and local allocation of surplus funds.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Tax abatements, enterprise zones, tax deferrals, and economic development bonds falling on the property taxpayer in an unfair proportion.
- 2) Extending the life of a TIF.
- 3) The transfer of a TIF for uses other than the original purpose.

19.K) Legalized Gambling

i. We Support:

- 1) The state legislature limiting approved gambling to lotteries, racinos, horse racing and riverboat gambling in those counties where it has been endorsed by a local referendum, since Indiana voters have approved a change to the constitution permitting forms of legalized gambling.
- 2) Re-directing the riverboat subsidy to personal property tax relief for farmers in the event that the horse racing subsidy from riverboat gambling taxes is eliminated.
- 3) Any proceeds over direct costs being directed to property tax relief and/or road improvements with total accountability.
- 4) Regular, accurate public disclosures of all lottery proceeds and the distribution of those proceeds on a county-by-county basis.

19.L) Coal Extraction Tax

i. We Support:

- 1) Legislation establishing an extraction tax for local governments on coal removed from the ground.

20.A) Early Childhood Education

i. We Support:

- 1) Increased financial investment and equal access at the state level that directly leads to increasing the availability and financial viability of early childhood education and of licensed childcare in rural areas.
- 2) Incentives to reduce the cost to families and increase the availability of quality, licensed childcare.

20.B) K-12 Education

i. We Support:

- 1) Equal opportunities and resources for rural and urban schools and students.
- 2) The superintendent of public instruction remaining an elected position.
- 3) English being taught as the official language of Indiana.
- 4) The Indiana Department of Education working with state post-secondary schools to offer avenues to all Indiana schools for e-learning or online courses not offered at local schools.
- 5) A positive portrayal of agriculture incorporated in K-12 curriculum statewide.
- 6) School curricula that focus on science-based facts, not promoting or advocating the concept of animal or plant rights.
- 7) Increased funding, availability and access to career and technical education along with internships in pathways to a trade, including entrepreneurship classes associated with these trades, as well as partnerships with local businesses which allow students to experience the application of their trade and how to conduct a business in their field or trade of choice.
- 8) Mandatory statewide Kindergarten programs adhering to uniform standards.
- 9) Family involvement, realizing it is essential to a student's academic success.
- 10) Community support and involvement in our public schools, as reflected in programs like career days, local intern programs, and co-op program opportunities.
- 11) Strengthening school safety for all schools.
- 12) The flag of the United States displayed in all classrooms.
- 13) The use of local Indiana farm-fresh products in school lunch programs.
- 14) At least one member of the State Board of Education being a certified agricultural teacher or FFA/4-H advisor.
- 15) Agriculture education and agriculture sciences curriculum in all Indiana schools.
- 16) The Indiana State Board of Education Graduation Pathways requirements encompassing employability skills with the focus on work-based learning experience.
- 17) K-12 schools incorporating instruction in such subjects as personal finance, nutrition and wellness and healthy living.

20.B) K-12 Education

i. We Support:

- 18) Upgrading the red flashing lights on school buses to increase visibility and illumination of red flashing light and requiring a strobe light to be mounted on the top of the back of every bus.
- 19) All students being served the same meal options regardless of financial position.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Public schools using public funds to advertise and market their school corporation, attempting to attract out of district students to their school systems.
- 2) Public school corporations providing transportation for out of district students to attend the corporation's school.

20.C) School Organization

i. We Support:

- 1) Local control of school districts.
- 2) The option of the school year being a minimum of 180 days or 1,200 hours, and to be configured by each local school board to reflect community needs.
- 3) Protecting agricultural programs during summer break like 4-H, state fair, etc.
- 4) Local control determining:
 - a) The organization of school districts.
 - b) Consolidation of administration and resources for efficiency purposes.
 - c) The beginning and end of school years.
 - d) The length of school days.
 - e) How and when to make up school days to meet state instructional requirements.
 - f) For what purposes student absences will be excused.
- 5) Opportunities to share agriculture and career technical programs, especially in school systems that cannot fund them on their own.
- 6) Hiring of excellent teachers that are knowledgeable, competent, that inspire learning, that are of the highest moral character, that are held accountable, and that hold a valid teaching license or appropriate waiver.
- 7) Teachers being treated as professionals.
- 8) Criteria being developed before making major changes to school districts.
- 9) Local Farm Bureau boards deciding whether to advocate for or against local charter schools.
- 10) Holding charter schools that receive state funding to the same standards as public schools.
- 11) Local control of school districts.
- 12) The option of the school year being a minimum of 180 days or 1,200 hours, and to be configured by each local school board to reflect community needs.
- 13) Protecting agricultural programs during summer break like 4-H, State Fair, etc.

20.C) School Organization

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The reorganization of school districts being based solely upon student population numbers.

20.D) Curricula

i. We Support:

- 1) Curricula that adhere to state standards and promotes highest achievement.
- 2) A standardized agriculture education program, including FFA chapters, family and consumer science, career and technical training, personal finance, and business management in schools and career centers.
- 3) Agriculture education students, FFA and 4-H, learning about the legislative process and issues affecting agriculture.
- 4) Expanding modern agricultural education in K-12 schools with science-based, hands-on information regarding farming, environmental practices, various grain production, livestock production and other agriculture specialty enterprise so that our students will have a basic understanding of where their food, fiber and fuel comes from.
- 5) Basic agriculture education such as Indiana Farm Bureau's "Agriculture in the Classroom" program to pre-K, kindergarten, elementary, middle, and high school students.
- 6) Awareness programs about the harmful effects of alcohol, tobacco, narcotics, and methamphetamine, including programs such as Students Against Destructive Decisions.
- 7) Counting science-based agriculture classes toward science credits for all diploma designations.
- 8) A citizenship portion to teach civic responsibility in all high school government classes.
- 9) Schools partnering with local businesses and industries to provide internships and apprenticeships to prepare a local workforce.
- 10) Graduation pathways that align with industry and local needs while providing for flexibility to match student interests.
- 11) Local and state exploration of the education certificate program possibilities for students related to agriculture.
- 12) A full-time agricultural education program manager position in the state of Indiana.
- 13) We encourage the addition of jr. high FFA chapters in schools with an FFA program.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The teaching of Critical Race Theory or any similar program in Indiana education curriculum.

20.E) Testing

i. We Support:

- 1) Accountability of students and school corporations to promote achievement and protect community interests by means of annual grade-level testing.
- 2) The Indiana Department of Education and the state legislature to audit Indiana high schools to ensure that they adhere to statewide testing waiver regulations.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) State testing as part of the evaluation process for teachers.

20.F) School Funding

i. We Support:

- 1) The state of Indiana providing, without delay, adequate and equitable financial resources to local school general funds coming from state income and sales taxes.
- 2) Tax money for schools being divided based on an accurate and fair formula.
- 3) Public funding of textbooks from sources other than property taxes.
- 4) Higher base funding per student to stabilize funding for small rural schools to help ensure they receive the same opportunities as those in larger school corporations.
- 5) Efforts to increase teachers' salaries.
- 6) Prioritizing increases in school funding for agricultural education above other career and technical education offerings or funding per student.
- 7) Funding precision agriculture curriculum in Indiana high schools in the high demand grant category.
- 8) State financial support of the Indiana FFA Leadership Center.
- 9) School corporations having to evaluate funding sources and presenting the options to the public prior to proposing a referendum for capital projects.
- 10) The publication of all financial reports, annual reports, budgeting reports, etc. via the public school website.
- 11) Career and Technical Education remaining as a line item in the state budget.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Unfunded mandates for public schools.
- 2) Legislation that cuts or eliminates state funding for public school agricultural education and family consumer science courses.
- 3) Education funding for private school vouchers that are greater than public schools' dollars per student.
- 4) Legislation that creates direct payment to parents/guardians for vouchers.

20.G) Higher Education

i. We Support:

- 1) Funding for land grant and agricultural higher education institutions in the state of Indiana.
- 2) That research conducted by public universities be for the benefit of the people of the state.
- 3) Having more precision agriculture related courses available in vocational schools and community colleges.

20.H) Continuing Education

i. We Support:

- 1) The establishment of a center for farmers with the cooperation of Purdue University and the Indiana State Department of Agriculture to:
 - a) Coordinate educational programs and services for beginning/young farmers.
 - b) Assess needs of beginning/young and retiring farmers to identify opportunities for programs and services.
 - c) Link beginning/young and retiring farm families.
- 2) Using career and technical education facilities and resources for continuing education as a form of workforce development for private industry.
- 3) Increased funding for career and technical education.

20.I) Cooperative Extension

i. We Support:

- 1) The cooperative extension education programs, especially 4-H.
- 2) The necessary funding to continue extension services in every county.
- 3) Allowing public university employees and cooperative extension employees to advocate for science-based facts about modern agriculture in the public space.
- 4) All efforts to restore funding from the state of Indiana back to full levels for extension educators.

20.J) Agricultural Research

i. We Support:

- 1) Federal, state government and commodity group funding for agricultural research.
- 2) Development of new uses for our commodities.
- 3) The continued development of new crops and varieties, including those enhanced through biotechnology.
- 4) Educating the public on biotechnology.
- 5) Both basic and applied research.
- 6) Grants for university-based research that will focus on the development of reliable methods of dealing with odors and nutrient management planning that promotes a positive view of agriculture.
- 7) U.S. colleges, universities and private institutions moving ahead with biotechnology research.
- 8) Accelerated research in the areas of pest, weed and disease control.
- 9) Research focused on utilization of co-products from bioenergy.

21.A) Public Outreach

i. We Support:

- 1) Programs that give the general public better understanding of modern agriculture.

21.B) Nutrition and Health

i. We Support:

- 1) Public programs on nutrition and health based on reliable, unbiased research.
- 2) All public assistance recipients and adult members of the same household being required to pass a drug/alcohol test to receive and continue to receive any benefits.
- 3) Requiring the completion of addiction recovery programs for those who fail drug tests prior to reapplying.
- 4) Programs to ensure comprehensive healthcare services for residents of Indiana.
- 5) Access to affordable healthcare.
- 6) Policies and grants that help eliminate food access challenges.
- 7) Screening all public assistance recipients appropriately to determine eligibility.
- 8) Reforming the legal standard of medical malpractice.
- 9) Policies and grants that address food waste at all points in the supply chain.
- 10) State and local governments' continued efforts on ending the opioid and drug crisis.
- 11) The development and funding assistance of mental health programs for rural areas with a special focus on individuals and families in the agricultural industry.

21.C) Emergency Services

i. We Support:

- 1) Accessible rural health care and emergency services.
- 2) The state and federal government reimbursing local governments for emergency services provided at public facilities, interstate highways, federal infrastructure, and the toll road/bridge(s) and not at the expense of local property taxpayers.
- 3) Local emergency communication systems being compatible with statewide systems.
- 4) The first responders/fire departments dispatch in the closest proximity should be dispatched regardless of the county origination.
- 5) More sufficient broadband availability for emergency services.
- 6) Grants for volunteer fire department training and equipment including farm rescue protocol such as grain bin rescue.
- 7) Fiscal responsibility concerning new/additional volunteer emergency responder training requirements.
- 8) Strengthening the emergency contact system in Indiana to properly target addresses using technology and GPS to route emergency personnel.

21.C) Emergency Services

i. We Support:

- 9) Strengthening the system to leave no one behind and eliminate dead zones where rural citizens are not even able to utilize the 911 service.
- 10) Better and more seamless integration of services across county and state lines to cut down response times in rural Indiana which due to distance already face challenging response times.
- 11) A uniform statewide communication system that every municipality, department, and county use.
- 12) Funding specifically for an emergency contact and response system to improve service across the state and specifically in rural areas.
- 13) Increased funding to support local emergency response personnel and local volunteer fire departments.
- 14) Landowners being notified by the responding law enforcement agency if a vehicle accident occurs on their property.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Counties taking on responsibility for emergency services to the state parks in the area without financial reimbursement back to the county.

22.A) Highway Funding

i. We Support:

- 1) Financing the construction and maintenance of city, county, state and federal highway systems with revenue derived from highway users.
- 2) Priority use of transportation dollars for maintenance and upgrades of county roads.
- 3) The concept of a data-driven solution for long-term road funding. We urge the General Assembly to find ways to raise more funding for state and local roads and bridges in addition to raising fuel taxes and shifting current sales tax on fuel for road construction and maintenance.
- 4) Any additional user tax (e.g., fuel, tire, registration, wheel, toll, etc.) being used exclusively for road and bridge construction and maintenance.
- 5) Exploring alternatives to increasing the property tax rate limitation for bridge improvements.
- 6) Transportation funds being made available with fewer restrictions to allow construction and maintenance of roads and bridges to meet infrastructure needs.
- 7) Legislation that would allow the county commissioners to submit a notice to remove a historic bridge and/or historic structure. Upon notification, the division of historic preservation and archeology must remove the bridge from the register.
- 8) County authority to implement local option taxes to raise revenue for county roads and bridges.
- 9) The Indiana General Assembly providing a greater share of new revenue to county authorities than funded through the present formula.
- 10) Shifting the local share of gas tax back to 47%.
- 11) Including any licensed passenger vehicle in which a seatbelt is required to be worn in the road tax distribution formula.
- 12) All light- and medium-duty trucks, SUVs and vans being licensed as passenger vehicles.
- 13) Working partnerships of multiple county highway departments.
- 14) A special use tax on all electric/hybrid, methane, compressed gas, natural gas, propane or other alternative-fueled vehicles, horse and carriages to make up for lost gas tax revenue used exclusively for road construction and maintenance.
- 15) A state road funding formula indexed to inflation/fuel mileage.
- 16) The Community Crossings Matching Grant Program.
- 17) The Ports of Indiana returning a percentage of revenue to the county in which they reside to pay for roads and county services.
- 18) Economically feasible solutions to historical bridge and road repairs.
- 19) County executive offices having more control over bridges that are listed under the state and federal historic registry list.
- 20) Ongoing studies of the impacts of electric and alternative fuel vehicles that will impact the gas/fuel tax fund and explore additional options for maintaining road funding.
- 21) Efforts for additional funding to complete local road and bridge repairs within the county.

22.A) Highway Funding

i. We Support:

- 22) Efforts for additional funding to complete and upgrade weight limits for local road and bridge repairs within the county.
- 23) State budget surplus money being reinvested into fixing local roads and bridges.
- 24) Equitable road funding with the state imposing a financial surcharge for all electric vehicles based on usage or by increasing the registration fees for electric vehicles.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Bonding for maintenance and construction of the highway system.
- 2) GPS-based mileage monitoring and reporting for taxation.
- 3) Funding for road and bridge infrastructure through property taxes.
- 4) A wheel tax that would be forced upon county government by the state of Indiana.
- 5) A state wheel tax.
- 6) Cities, towns, or counties imposing a wheel tax if a state wheel tax is enacted.

22.B) Highway Projects

i. We Support:

- 1) The use of agriculture-based road products, such as soybean oil suppressant and corn-based calcium magnesium acetate, when financially feasible.
- 2) All government agencies coordinating their maintenance schedules to minimize economic impact and inconvenience, especially road closures during planting and harvest.
- 3) The return of permanently closed roadways on abandoned rights-of-way to the original tract.
- 4) All highway plans taking into account the transportation needs of agriculture such as width of equipment and ensuring access to sufficient county road crossings.
- 5) That the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) be financially responsible for repair and maintenance of roadside drainage structures and fences located on state and interstate highway property if the structures and/or fences were designed and installed by the state during the original construction/reconstruction of the highway.
- 6) Changes or new infrastructure and highway projects to consider emergency and fire response times.
- 7) That farmland should be recognized as already developed land and not be the first choice on which to locate new highway construction.
- 8) The study of more durable road construction product conducive to the specific region of the state.

- 9) Locating new highways along upgraded and existing roads rather than new construction where possible.
- 10) The use of independent economic, environmental and traffic flow studies.
- 11) Requiring INDOT to sell odd parcels or severed land acquired for highway projects after a specific period of time. This land should first be made available to the owner of the tract from which the land was purchased originally at the original purchase price or less.
- 12) Consultation by INDOT officials with affected landowners and county drainage boards regarding drainage plans for proposed construction of a highway.
- 13) When county or state roads are constructed or improved, field access must be installed.
- 14) The state including local farmers on committees that are looking at highway and building projects to ensure family farms are represented during project planning, funding, and construction stages.
- 15) Requiring a public notice, notification to adjacent landowners, and a public hearing on any public road decommissioning or closure lasting 30 days or more.
- 16) The state establishing an oversight committee for INDOT projects composed of citizens, legislators and local officials, including an agriculture seat.
- 17) Agriculture having a permanent seat on the community advisory committees for INDOT in the discussions for expansion and maintenance of roads.
- 18) Reimbursement to counties for damage to local roads during state road construction.
- 19) That all roundabouts should be large enough to accommodate agriculture equipment, bus and semi-truck traffic.
- 20) Adequate interchanges and overpasses along limited access highways.
- 21) Development of infrastructure in rural communities to support electric vehicle charging stations.
- 22) Any construction, reconstruction, improvement, or maintenance of new or existing roads or infrastructure maintaining or improving current and future drainage capabilities, including new and existing private tiles.
- 23) Construction standards for bridges in rural communities in order to be able to transport products.
- 24) Ongoing maintenance of state highway line markings and signs.
- 25) That a contractor that is contracted by the local government or INDOT to do road repair is responsible for any damages done to public and private property that occurs during the repair work.
- 26) Counties should not be held responsible for any utility damages under the road surface that occur during road maintenance such as grading.
- 27) Ongoing maintenance of all easements and rights-of-way for vegetation control and debris removal.
- 28) Coordination between local units of government and INDOT when construction plans remove or limit county accessibility to major highways.
- 29) Maintaining and enforcing standards for white line markings on both sides of all state highways.
- 30) An agricultural liaison within the staff at INDOT.
- 31) Transparency of INDOT projects and plans and notice for changes to those projects.

22.B) Highway Projects

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The permanent closing of any road or bridge accessibility that adversely affects the economic viability of agriculture.
- 2) The construction of new highways on new terrain, especially farmland.
- 3) The state of Indiana requiring a local government unit to accept responsibility for maintenance of a highway.
- 4) Construction plans that unreasonably remove or limit county accessibility to major highways.

22.C) Vehicle and Highway Regulations

i. We Support:

- 1) Continued exemption of implements of agriculture from plate requirements.
- 2) The restoration of the 54,000-pound, 30,000-pound, and 11,000-pound farm plates.
- 3) The restoration of previously consolidated weight classes and fees for trailers.
- 4) The retention of the farm truck plate.
- 5) Tax exemptions for diesel fuel used in off-road equipment.
- 6) An aggressive effort to enforce current laws that apply to the correct purchase and application of farm truck plates.
- 7) A more streamline ability to appeal a warning traffic ticket, which affects commercial driver's license (CDL) safety scores and can result in higher insurance premiums.
- 8) The uniform interpretation and application of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations and current state regulations by enforcement agencies.
- 9) Maintaining the current oversize/overweight exemptions for implements of agriculture on local county roads and state highways.
- 10) That all horse-drawn vehicles be required to have a vehicle identification number (VIN) and that license plate laws be enforced.
- 11) The option to add an annual overweight permit.
- 12) All horses used for transportation on public roads, if shod, must wear composite horseshoes.
- 13) Using the Equivalent Single Axle Limit to allow trucks to increase from five axles to six axles in order to increase the maximum weight to 97,000 pounds with no additional stress on the roads.
- 14) Reciprocity between adjacent states in conjunction with their Farm Bureau organizations to recognize and honor farm plates and fuel permits.
- 15) State and federal highways having the same speed limit for passenger vehicles and semis.
- 16) All permits being understandable and not subject to interpretation.
- 17) Exemptions from federal motor carrier commercial status for people hauling livestock to shows or events.

22.C) Vehicle and Highway Regulations

i. We Support:

- 18) Maintaining definitions and requirements with respect to farm exempt licensing for use to move agricultural commodities.
- 19) Buggies and horse-drawn vehicles utilizing taillights, turn signals, and a regulation slow-moving vehicle sign.
- 20) CDL training and testing be made more accessible and affordable to Indiana farmers and ag-related employers.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The Indiana Department of Transportation using diagnostic tools not readily available to the public to assess fines.
- 2) Local road ordinances that impede normal agricultural commerce and practices.
- 3) The assessment of points to the driver of an overweight commercial motor vehicle.
- 4) Additional fingerprinting being required every four years for CDL Class A renewals.
- 5) The \$5,000 civil penalty that can be assessed by the Indiana Department of Revenue on oversize and overweight loads for up to three years following the date of the citation by Indiana State Police.
- 6) Licensed autonomous vehicles operating on public roadways until proven safe.
- 7) Forced adoption of alternative energy vehicles and equipment.

22.D) Traffic Safety and Education

i. We Support:

- 1) Extremity lighting on farm equipment used on public roads, especially in inclement weather and darkness.
- 2) Proper maintenance of intersection rights-of-way to ensure visibility.
- 3) Education and enforcement of standard sized slow-moving vehicle emblems for all slow-moving vehicles, including horse-drawn vehicles.
- 4) Careful analysis by state and local highway officials regarding the location of road signs, width of bridges, shoulders and roundabouts, and height of bridge railings to allow for safe movement of modern agricultural equipment on road rights-of-way.
- 5) Safety education programs aimed at creating a safe environment in which all people can live and work.
- 6) Driver education for slow-moving vehicle signs and traffic safety habits when encountering agriculture machinery on roadways.
- 7) Stricter enforcement for the proper use of slow-moving vehicle signs.
- 8) Efforts for the county and state highway departments to harvest dead or dying trees along state and county roads.
- 9) Upgrading county roads to a wider width including the shoulder and properly maintaining vegetation to meet equipment size.
- 10) Reasonable costs of training schools and materials needed for new school bus drivers.

22.D) Traffic Safety and Education

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Use of slow-moving vehicle signs to mark driveways and entrances.
- 2) Use of field lights in place of proper hazard lights.

22.E) Bureau of Motor Vehicles

i. We Support:

- 1) The state mandating the Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMVs) be open during lunch hour if the state is going to continue the policy of restricting days of operation.
- 2) Restoring local telephone service to all BMV offices and publicizing each local BMV office telephone number.
- 3) Local BMV's need to accommodate all BMV transactions at the local level.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The BMV selling personal information to third parties or using personal information outside the scope of the agency need.

22.F) Railroads

i. We Support:

- 1) As much private ownership as possible to support rail commerce.
- 2) That when a railroad is abandoned, the right of way should be returned to the adjacent property owner without delay, but not be taxed until after three years of production.
- 3) That when ownership of abandoned railroad property is transferred, the adjacent property owner has the right of first refusal.
- 4) That when a railroad is abandoned across any public highway, that public highway shall receive fuel tax money to restore the grade of the highway back to normal.
- 5) Railroad rights of way, along with the drainage, being maintained, even if abandoned, for as long as the railroad continues control.
- 6) Railroad crossing inclines being so constructed as to accommodate agricultural traffic.
- 7) Railroads being maintained to a standard that would allow for passage of a locomotive or the tracks should be removed.
- 8) The use of automatic railroad crossing guards and railroad emergency warning lights at all railroad and roadway intersections.

22.F) Railroads

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The abandonment of railroad segments where there is traffic potential for a viable operation.
- 2) Construction of new terrain railroads without a showing of local economic development need or public necessity.
- 3) The closing of any railroad crossing without local agriculture community support.

23.A) Public Employee Negotiations

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Binding arbitration.
- 2) Compulsory unionism.
- 3) Broadening the scope of negotiable items.

23.B) Strikes by Public Employees

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Strikes or work disruptions by public employees.
- 2) The use of lawlessness and blatant disregard for public welfare to obtain demands.
- 3) Public employee negotiation legislation.

23.C) Unemployment Compensation

i. We Support:

- 1) Higher quarterly payroll thresholds while subject to unemployment insurance.
- 2) State unemployment tax rules being the same as federal.
- 3) Unemployment benefits being available on a declining scale for a maximum of 18 months.
- 4) Unemployment applicants having been employed for at least six months before being eligible to collect benefit.
- 5) Drug testing for receiving unemployment benefits, with consideration for the safety and welfare of children involved.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Unemployment insurance for agriculture.

23.D) Worker's Compensation

i. We Support:

- 1) Continued voluntary coverage of farm workers under the state's worker's compensation program.
- 2) A strong educational program on the current agricultural exemption.

23.E) Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA and IOSHA)

i. We Support:

- 1) The exemption from Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Indiana Occupational Safety and Health Administration (IOSHA) regulations for farms with 10 or fewer employees.
- 2) Regulations to clearly define both the threat and the specific standards needed to be met to protect against that threat.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) OSHA and IOSHA regulating non-licensed grain storage and handling facilities.
- 2) IOSHA rules prohibiting firefighters from using grain rescue tubes during times of distress or in training.

23.F) Agricultural Labor

i. We Support:

- 1) Maintaining a legal guest worker population for agriculture.
- 2) A stable and legal supply of labor for Indiana agriculture.
- 3) A simplified agricultural guest worker program to supply migrant agricultural labor for terms longer than the H-2A program, especially as many livestock operations have year-round labor needs.
- 4) Agriculture's right to use minors in a responsible and ethical way under adult supervision.
- 5) All elected officials diligently seeking common ground so our valuable employees may more fully contribute and benefit in the opportunities our state has to offer.
- 6) Elected officials seeking a legal process whereby these workers can safely transit to and from their places of employment without fearing the violation of our state laws.
- 7) Migrant laborers being allowed to hold temporary driver's licenses so long as they can obtain a temporary driver's license and provide proof of insurance at all times.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) The labor needs of Indiana agricultural operations being addressed solely by domestic workers or seasonal migrant workers of the federal H-2A program.

23.G) Immigration

i. We Support:

- 1) Immigration issues being handled on the federal level.
- 2) Comprehensive immigration reform addressed by Congress.
- 3) The creation of a new employment-based preference category for legal, agriculturally skilled persons with a guaranteed offer of employment who seek to reside as immigrants.

24.A) Insurance

i. We Support:

- 8) Continuing the state regulation of the insurance industry.
- 9) Requirements that every vehicle be insured before being driven on public roads.
- 10) Efforts for regulations of uninsured motorists to be reviewed and strengthened, and efforts to increase the state minimum liability limits to \$100,000 and \$300,000.
- 11) Access to health insurance with underwriting provisions.
- 12) Stopping the "surprise, out-of-network" billing for medical services performed.
- 13) Providing Indiana residents with timely health care pricing information.

24.B) Probate

i. We Support:

- 1) Continued modification and clarification of Indiana law to provide more efficient, simplified, and economical methods of transferring assets at death.

24.C) Landowner Liability

i. We Support:

- 1) Limited liability be granted to farmland owners who lease to agricultural operations where the landowner does not have functional control.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Changes in the law that would make landowners or tenants liable to persons injured while trespassing on their property.
- 2) Changes in the law that would give the same duty of care to guests and business invitees.
- 3) The concept of allowing individuals or municipalities to sue individual landowners on behalf of a watershed since there are already local, state, and national agencies to regulate and police harmful actions to the environment.

24.D) Civil Trespass

i. We Support:

- 1) The establishment of a civil cause of action for malicious trespass against agricultural, farmland and forestland.

24.E) Agritourism Liability

i. We Support:

- 1) Limitation of liability laws for agritourism.

24.F) Unmanned Aircraft Systems

i. We Support:

- 1) The use of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) for commercial purposes (e.g., agriculture, forestry, and other natural resource use).
- 2) Requiring the operator of the UAS to gain the consent of the landowner and/or farm operator if the UAS will be surveying or gathering data about the landowner's property.
- 3) Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) development of reasonable certification and safety training of UASs.
- 4) Requiring the operator of the UAS to obtain financial liability insurance.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Agencies using UASs for the purpose of regulatory enforcement, litigation and as a sole source for natural resource inventories used in planning efforts.
- 2) UASs surveying and gathering data without the consent of the landowner and/or farm operator.
- 3) FAA regulations of UASs as manned fixed-winged aircraft.

24.G) Proprietary Data

i. We Support:

- 1) Efforts to better educate farmers and ranchers regarding new technology or equipment that may receive, record, and/or transmit their farming and production data.
- 2) Requiring companies that are collecting, storing, and analyzing proprietary data to provide full disclosure of their intended use of the data.
- 3) Formation of standardized protocols regarding privacy and terms of conditions to ensure a standard definition of all components within the contract. Indiana Farm Bureau should be an active participant in developing these protocols.
- 4) Compensation to farmers whose proprietary data is shared with third parties that offer products, services or analyses benefitting from that data.
- 5) Multiple participation options being included in all contracts.
- 6) All proprietary information between the farmer and the company remaining between the two entities. This would not preclude a farmer from sharing data with whomever he/she chooses (e.g., a consultant).
- 7) Using all safeguards to ensure proprietary data is stored at an entity that is not subject to a Freedom of Information Act or Access to Public Records Act request.

24.G) Proprietary Data

i. We Support:

- 8) The farmers' right to enter into agreement and their rights to sell their proprietary data to another producer (e.g., in a land sale.)
- 9) Private companies entering into agreements which would allow for the compatibility/updating of equipment and updating of software.
- 10) The right of a farmer to have access to his or her own data, regardless of when it was shared with a company.
- 11) The right of the producer who no longer wishes to participate in aggregated data sharing with a private company, to remove their past aggregated data from the company's database and revoke that company's ability to sell or use that data in the future.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Any federal agency or FOIA-eligible entity from serving as a data clearinghouse for all proprietary data or aggregated data collected by private companies.

24.H) Criminal Law

i. We Support:

- 1) County officials studying the feasibility of multi-county jail facilities.
- 2) Diligent law enforcement and maximum punishment for those individuals who are making and/or distributing methamphetamine.
- 3) The imposition of maximum penalties for the theft of methamphetamine precursors or trespassing for methamphetamine production purposes.
- 4) Treating acts of eco- and agro-terrorism as felonies.
- 5) Anyone taking a job on an agricultural operation under false pretenses being subject to criminal prosecution.
- 6) Any person or persons convicted of damage to farm property, machinery and livestock or their theft, including the slaughter of livestock, whether it is a misdemeanor or felony, be mandated to pay damages to the owner.
- 7) Stiff penalties for scrap metal buyers who do not obey the current seller identification laws.
- 8) The Indiana State Department of Agriculture investing in training programs for Indiana Law Enforcement Academy and Indiana State Police. The training will consist of guidelines and information concerning agricultural equipment theft, livestock theft, and general agricultural theft and general animal ownership issues.
- 9) Rehabilitation programs inside jails.
- 10) Criminal penalties for individuals or organizations that cause the malicious distribution of or contamination with infectious materials with the intent to cause injury or harm.

24.H) Criminal Law

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Granting regulatory agencies the ability to define what actions constitute a violation punishable as a felony.
- 2) Requirements that all violations of environmental regulations should be Level 6 felonies.
- 3) Law enforcement citation for traffic violations, unless they witness the violation or there is other evidence of the offense occurring.
- 4) Discriminatory application of criminal laws.

24.I) Criminal Trespass

i. We Support:

- 1) Strict enforcement and increased penalties of criminal trespass laws.
- 2) Requirements that trespassers who deliberately damage property should lose their driver's license and have their vehicles or animals impounded or confiscated.
- 3) Requirements that trespassers who deliberately damage property should pay for the damages.

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Posting requirements for enforcement of trespass laws.

24.J) Gun Control

ii. We Oppose:

- 1) Further laws that require firearm or gun registration or interfere with the right to buy, sell, own, or use for legal purposes any firearms or ammunition.
- 2) Any special taxes or fees on firearms or ammunition.

24.K) Fence Law

i. We Support:

- 1) Retention and enforcement of the present fence laws. It should be made clear that the present fence laws apply to local, county and state governmental entities.
- 2) The ability for a property owner to construct and maintain a partition fence.

25.A) Rural Viability

i. We Support:

- 1) Consistent long-term state and local policies that are transparent and promote community and economic growth in rural communities.

