

HB

82

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2001 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HB82
 () Publish Date: _____
 Dept. Affected: Natural Resources
 BRU: Information/Data Mgmt.
 Component: Recorder's Office/UCC
 Component Number: 802

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____
 Title: "An Act relating to agricultural facilities and operations as private nuisances...."
 Sponsor: Rep. Harris
 Requester: (H) JUD

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Personal Services	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.5

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
TOTAL	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2

Estimate of any current year (FY2001) cost: none
 Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY2002 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time	1	1	1	1	1	1
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

HB 82 includes a provision that would require a disclosure statement to be recorded in conjunction with conveyances of any interest in real property located within one mile of an agricultural facility. It places the burden on the person transferring the property to ensure that the disclosure is provided to the buyer and recorded with the conveyance document. This would serve to increase the recording volume throughout the state, but the actual volume increase cannot be ascertained at this time as there is no way of determining how many properties meet the criteria of being within one mile of an agricultural facility, and of them, how many might possibly be conveyed in any given year.

Prepared by: Sharon Young Phone 907-269-8882
 Division: Support Services Division Date/Time 29-Mar-01
 Approved by: Pat Pourchot Date 29-Mar-01
 Agency: Natural Resources

For distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office

ANALYSIS: (continued)

Statewide, the Recorder's/UCC section records upwards of 30,000 deed transactions each year. For purposes of this fiscal note, it is assumed that 5 to 8 per cent of them might possibly fall within the scope of this bill, resulting in 1500 to 2400 additional recorded documents annually. This increase in volume would necessitate additional staffing equivalent to one half-time position. The additional revenue generated by the volume increase is not expected to be sufficient to cover the added staffing cost. Historic staffing levels have averaged approximately 4500 documents per full time employee annually. Volume for a half-time position would be 2250 documents. If each disclosure statement is two pages in length and is attached to an existing document, the revenues generated by 2250 such statements would be \$13,500 (2250 x 2 pages x \$3 per page). Therefore, the \$13,500 in new program receipts revenues would not offset the added personnel costs of \$19,200, and the difference of \$5,700 would have to come from existing general fund program receipt revenues that are collected above the regular appropriation level.

The bill also would amend AS 40.17.110 to indicate that if the document being recorded is a disclosure statement under AS 34.70.300, it must comply with the requirements of that section. Recorders do not monitor any documents for content, and all documents of any type are entitled to recordation if they meet minimum statutory recording requirements. DNR cannot determine if the addition to 40.17.110 is there for the purpose of documenting for the benefit of the user the other substantive legal requirements that such a document must meet in order to be valid, or whether it is intended to modify our basic recording requirements. If the provision is there as a modification of our recording requirements, the Recorder's/UCC section would strongly urge its removal. Recorders cannot police any types of documents for substantive legal validity.

Overall, HB 82 is not anticipated to have much impact on the Recorder's Office operations. The numbers utilized for purposes of this fiscal note are estimates only. Actual conveyances requiring the disclosure statements could vary significantly from those estimates.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2001 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: HB 82
 () Publish Date: _____
 Dept. Affected: Natural Resources
 BRU: Minerals, Land & Water Dev.
 Component: Land Sales /Muni Ent.
 Component Number: 2456

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____
 Title: Agricultural Facilities and Operations
 Sponsor: Rep. HARRIS, James, Coghill, Whitaker, et.al.
 Requester: H JUD

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Personal Services	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	see note	see note	see note	see note	see note	see note
-------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	14.9	14.9	14.9	14.9	14.9	14.9
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
1153 Land Disposal Income Fund	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1
TOTAL	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2001) cost: None

Check this box if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY2002 budget proposal: []

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

The disclosure requirement in Section 4 of the bill will add costs to all disposals of state land. Every time the state proposes to lease, sell, transfer, or exchange state land, DNR staff will need to determine the location of agricultural operations and facilities, map where they are, and figure out if the state disposal is within one mile. If the agricultural facility or operation is within one mile of a state land sale, DNR will need to factor the disclosure into the appraisal, include it in the brochure, sale contract, and deeds, and then record the disclosure. This will add several more steps every time the state disposes of land.

The disclosure requirement applies to all "transfers of real property", including land sales, timber sales, oil and gas leases, municipal land transfers, and numerous other real property disposals by the state. The definitions of agricultural facility and operations are so broad as to include commercial greenhouses in Anchorage, and horse barns on the Anchorage Hillside.

Prepared by: Bob Loeffler Phone 269-8600
 Division: Mining, Land and Water Date/Time 04-Apr-01
 Approved by: Pat Pourchot Date 04-Apr-01
 Agency: Natural Resources

For distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2001 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____
Bill Version: SSHB 120
() Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Dept. of Public Safety
Title: National Crime Prevention & Privacy Compact BRU: Statewide Support
Sponsor: Representative Coghill Component: Criminal Records & ID
Requester: House Judiciary Component Number: 1190

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

FUND SOURCE	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2001) cost: 0.0

Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2002 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: *(Attach a separate page if necessary)*
DPS will amend regulations governing criminal record dissemination. This will be done with existing resources.

Prepared by: Kenneth Bischoff Phone 465-4336
Division: Administrative Services Date/Time 4/3/01 12:00 AM
Approved by: Commissioner Glenn G. Godfrey Date 4/3/01
Agency: Department of Public Safety

For distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
REPRESENTATIVE JOHN HARRIS
STATE CAPITOL 513, JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801-1182 (907) 465-4859

Sectional Analysis
Proposed CS for HB 82 (version "P")

Sec. 1 – amends current AS 09.45.235 [Actions Relating to Real Property] to protect agricultural facilities and agricultural operations from becoming “private nuisances” due to changing land uses in the area surrounding an existing agricultural operation. This section also clarifies the time at which an agricultural operation began and thus gained protection by the section. The CS deletes a requirement that the operation has to have been going for more than three years to gain protection. Finally, this section ties the protection to the fact that the operator has a valid farm conservation plan on file with the local soil and water conservation district.

Sec. 2 – adds “illegal” conduct of agricultural operations to the list of acts that are not covered by the protection afforded in AS 09.45.235(a).

Sec. 3 – amends the definition section of AS 09.45.235 to separate “agricultural facility” from “agricultural operation,” and provide further definitions of activities that fall under each of those headings.

Sec. 4 – amends AS 34.70 [Disclosures in Residential Real Property Transfers] to require that a disclosure statement, accompanying the transfer of real property, contain a provision that notifies transferees (buyers) of the real estate that they are responsible to determine if there is an agricultural facility or operation in the vicinity of the property they are buying.

Sec. 5 – amends AS 40.17 [Recording in Public Records] to clarify that documents recorded under the provision of Section 4 must comply with the requirements of that section.

Sec. 6 – applies the disclosure requirements of Sec. 4 and 5 to real estate contracts on property within one mile of an agricultural facility or operation. The CS changes “real property” to “residential or recreational property.”

Sec. 7 – gives instructions to the revisor of statutes.



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
REPRESENTATIVE JOHN HARRIS
STATE CAPITOL 110, JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801-1182 (907) 465-4859

Sponsor Statement
Right-to-Farm Bill

The State of Alaska has invested millions of dollars in the development of its natural resources, both renewable and nonrenewable. Fishing, timber and agriculture are our basic renewable resources, and the Legislature has endeavored to enhance these for future generations. The Right-to-Farm bill seeks to protect and enhance Alaska's agricultural sector.

With the export of potatoes and carrots from Alaska, and the increasing local demand for fresh vegetables, hay, barley, milk, pork and beef, we can see agriculture "taking root and growing" in many diverse locations across the state. Yet, as the state's population grows and urban areas expand, we see a corresponding need to protect our interest in agriculture.

Many farmers have already had some experience with an encroachment on their right to farm. As urbanization swallows up farming areas, oftentimes the newcomers don't like the smells of agriculture – or the chemicals – or the sounds – or the animals.

The Right-to-Farm bill would add some protection to existing agriculture operations and put new property buyers on notice if the property they are acquiring is within one mile of a farm or agricultural operation. This also protects the new property owners through full disclosure that should keep them from getting into a situation that will become unpleasant to them later on.

People who move to the country need to know what they are getting into. And it appears that other areas of the nation – where urban sprawl is creating a bigger problem than we have experienced yet in Alaska – are taking action to protect existing agricultural operations and avoid unnecessary lawsuits.

The "Code of the West" is a small pamphlet adopted by many counties around the Western U.S. and distributed to prospective property buyers. It basically says that if you want to move to the peaceful countryside, you must be willing to accept that cows poop, hay balers make noise late into the night, farmers use chemicals, tractors drive slower than you do, and so forth. And most importantly that these activities were going on before you moved there, and will continue to go on after you arrive.

**SPONSOR
STATEMENT**

The Right-to-Farm bill takes the innovative approach of coupling a farmer's grandfathered right to continue his agricultural activities to the filing and maintaining of a farm conservation plan with the U.S.D.A. Soil and Water Conservation Service. Expansion of operations or other changes to the conservation plan would not necessarily be grandfathered in regard to existing rights of surrounding property owners.

Alaska has the opportunity to place protections in statute now – both for the farmers and the new property buyers – so that future agricultural operations will be able to supply the foodstuffs Alaskans will need.

Bill History/Action Display



BILL: HB 82

SHORT TITLE: FARM
OPERATIONS:DISCLOSURE/NUISANCES

BILL VERSION:

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S)HARRIS, James,
Coghill, Whitaker, Masek, Ogan, Green, Meyer, Dyson

CURRENT STATUS: (H) RES

STATUS DATE: 04/06/01

HEARING: (H) RES Apr 09 1:00 PM CAPITOL 124

TITLE: "An Act relating to agricultural facilities and operations as private nuisances; and to disclosures in transfers of real property located within one mile of an agricultural facility or an agricultural operation."

Full Text No Fiscal Notes Available

Committee Action with Bill History

Jrn-Date	Jrn-Page	Action
01/19/01	<u>0130</u>	(H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/19/01	<u>0130</u>	(H) JUD, RES
01/22/01	<u>0147</u>	(H) COSPONSOR(S): GREEN
02/07/01	<u>0269</u>	(H) COSPONSOR(S): MEYER
03/20/01	<u>0670</u>	(H) COSPONSOR(S): DYSON
04/06/01		(H) JUD RPT CS(JUD) NT 5DP
04/06/01		(H) DP: KOOKESH, COGHILL, MEYER, JAMES,
04/06/01		(H) ROKEBERG
04/06/01		(H) FN1: (DNR)
04/06/01		(H) FN2: (DNR)
04/06/01		(H) REFERRED TO RESOURCES

Similar Subject Match or Exact Subject Match

AGRICULTURE

DISCLOSURE

FOOD

HATCHERIES

LAND

LIABILITY

Bill Root: Display Bill Root

BASIS HAS BEEN RE-PROGRAMMED THIS YEAR



TO REPORT PROBLEMS WITH BASIS INQUIRY

Return to Basis Main Menu (22 Legislature)

Return to Legislature Home Page

HX

THE
FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S)
ARE
POOR
ORIGINAL
COPIES

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE

TONY KNOWLES, GOVERNOR

CENTRAL OFFICE
1800 GLENN HIGHWAY, SUITE 12
PALMER, ALASKA 99645-6736
PHONE: (907) 745-7200
FAX: (907) 745-7112

X NORTHERN REGION OFFICE
3700 AIRPORT WAY
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99709-4699
PHONE: (907) 451-2780
FAX: (907) 451-2751

PLANT MATERIALS CENTER
HCO4 BOX 7440
PALMER, ALASKA 99645-9706
PHONE: (907) 746-4469
FAX: (907) 746-1568

February 23, 2001

Mr. Pete Fellman
Legislative Assistant
Representative John Harris
State Capitol 513
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Mr. Fellman:

Per your request, the requirements for State Farm Conservation Plans are provided below.


AS 38.05.321 (d)(1) is the statutory authority that allows the State to require Farm Conservation Plans for agricultural land that it sells. The State has used this authority in every State agricultural land sale and has required a Farm Conservation Plan for every parcel sold.

The information that is required in a State Farm Conservation Plan is outlined in 11 AAC 67.180. The Plan must include:

1. A map of the farm indicating:
 - a. The planned location of clearing and breaking of ground.
 - b. Planned location of windbreaks, farm pond and similar conservation measures and improvements.
2. Planned soil conservation measures.
3. A plan for burning any clearing debris, including any vegetation that has previously been chained-down.
4. All real property improvements must be depicted and described in the Plan.

If you need additional information, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,



Ed Arobio
Regional Manager

NAT. RES

Quality
Countsaccountemps
Specialized Financial StaffingRHI MANAGEMENT
RESOURCES
Project Financial ProfessionalsAd
Infoseattletimes.com
HOME

Classified Ads

YellowPages

Contact Us

Search Archives

Web Archive

- ▶ [Search Again](#)
- ▶ [Browse by Date](#)

Copyright © 1999 The Seattle Times Company

Editorials & Opinion : Thursday, May 27, 1999

Go east, young urbanite, but remember the Code



Susan Nielsen

I CAN picture it now. Husband and wife make one last trip to Pottery Barn before fleeing Seattle for the country life in Eastern Washington.

No more traffic, they exult. No more crowds jostling for space. Just think, honey, acres and acres of farmland dotted with the sweetest Holstein cows you've ever -

HEY! What's that smell?

The commissioners of Spokane County are so tired of newcomers' complaints about manure and other rural indelicacies that they've printed a 20-page booklet for newcomers. "Code of the West," it's called, a polite reminder for displaced yuppies that, yes indeed, s--t happens.

"This document is not intended to dissuade you from living in the country," the introduction says, "but it is important for you to know that life in the country is very different from life in the metropolitan area."

Cows smell. Neighbors hunt. Snow stays unplowed. Welcome to the rural West.

This humble booklet is getting nationwide attention, and for good reason. It's not just about things that go moo in the night, but a whole philosophy of governing. It reminds that government can't, and shouldn't, perfectly tailor your environment.

Spokane actually borrowed most of its Code of the West from Larimer County, Colo. The Code

ARTICLES

is a pointed tribute to the pioneers who led the United States' westward expansion. These people were "rugged individualists," it says, "bound by an unwritten code of conduct. The values of integrity and self-reliance guided their decisions, actions and interactions."

Translation: This ain't no latte stand, pardner.

The Code of the West

(<http://www.spokanecountv.org>) briskly outlines scenarios that could require rugged individualism. Most of them are self-inflicted. For example, if you build your house deep in the arid forest, like Goldilock's wee cabin, it might burn down in a forest fire. Build it next to a farm, and your nocturnal sheep-counting may be accompanied by the bleating of crop dusters.

Other highlights:

-- "The fact that you can drive to your property today does not necessarily guarantee that you, your guests or emergency vehicles can achieve that same level of access at all times."

(If you have to upgrade your SUV to a Humvee to get up your driveway, don't come crying to Spo-kane County.)

-- "It is very important to know what minerals may be located under the land and who owns them."

(If you're planning a garden party, first be sure Sen. Slade Gorton hasn't approved an open-pit mine under your patio.)

-- "Agriculture is an important business in Spokane County. If you choose to live among the farms and ranches of our rural countryside, do not expect county government to intervene in the normal day-to-day operations of your agribusiness neighbors."

(Yes, the cows poop and the dust-clouds billow and the flies are bigger than ping-pong balls. The county didn't mislead you. Martha Stewart did.)

For people who grew up in rural areas, it is inconceivable that someone would have the gall to complain about manure. For them, an errant whiff of cow produces a curious surge of nostalgia. It prompts memories of the dozen glorious smells of a working farm: sawdust, compost, hay, unpasteurized milk, tractor oil.

It is inconceivable, and yet people do. From Spokane to Snohomish to Clark County, the suburbs built next to farms are stuffed full of people indignant that their neighbors are acting like animals! My all-time favorite is a Snohomish County resident who railed so bitterly against a crowing rooster that the rooster-owner was charged with disturbing the peace.

The rooster-owner requested a jury trial. The Marysville City Council hastily created a Small Farms Ordinance - a short version of the Code of the West.

The number of complaints against farmers in King County for dust, noise and smells have dwindled over the years, though the acreage of farmed land has stayed roughly the same since 1979.

No wonder. The dairy farms are rapidly turning into hobby farms, which are disarmingly easier on the senses. Such farms foster a false sense of rural life - no mess, no fuss and a QFC around the corner. All the more reason for rural counties to be, uh, proactive with their newcomers.

The asphalt roads of Seattle, Bellevue and surrounding areas are full of people dreaming of escape.

In rush hour today, at least two drivers trapped in the I-90 tunnel considered abandoning their cars in the idling traffic and walking stolidly along the shoulder until they reached dirt.

Tonight after dinner, at least one urban couple will dream of retirement in a place like Spokane County. There, they say, everything will be perfect.

No more traffic, they muse. No more stress or rude surprises. Just think, honey, acres and acres of farmland dotted with the sweetest Holstein cows you've ever seen.

Susan Nielsen's column appears on Thursdays.

So this is what people with
social lives have been doing.



Datebook
Entertainment Guide



Farm Conservation Plan in Perpetuity

The 1997 statutory revisions to state agricultural land law in AS 38.05.321(d)(1), based upon the authority of AS 41.10, ~~might be~~ ^{be} understood as evidencing legislative intent to extend the FCP requirement to the generic class "state agricultural landowner", regardless of any landowner's/purchaser's specific status. If so, then the cited regulations 11 AAC 67.177 and .180 should have been modified appropriately. They were not, so continue to identity the FCP document exclusively with original or successive purchasers of state agricultural parcels from the state. (See 11 AAC 67.177 "...the farm conservation plan will be required as a condition of sale." and "...before consummation of the sale." and 11 AAC 67.177(c) advising that purchaser's bid deposit becomes forfeit if/when purchaser fails to provide/submit FCP timely). The state lacks authority or practical means to so intervene in private real estate transactions between sellers and buyers of patented agricultural parcels.

The essential question:

Given the effective insulation of private land transactions from state control, does any of Alaska's extant law and regulation authorize and require perpetuation of the state Farm Conservation Plan as condition of agricultural land ownership for subsequent purchasers following issuance of patent? If yes, how shall such control be effected?

FINDarticles.COM A LookSmart™ Service

[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

Successful Farming
Feb, 2000

When good fences don't make good neighbors.(laws and legal cases that affect farmers)(Brief Article)
Author/s: Cheryl Tevis

It takes more than a good fence to separate nuisance issues

It's been one year since Iowa's Agricultural Area Law was declared unconstitutional in the case of Bormann v. Board of Supervisors for Kossuth County.

The landmark 7-0 decision stated that ag areas or zones "amounts to a commandeering of valuable property rights without compensating the owners and sacrificing those rights for the economic advantage of a few."

The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, which allowed the ruling to stand.

Farm organizations railed against the ruling, predicting the demise of right-to-farm laws in all 50 states. Rural neighbors gained hope that they would have more clout in the courts.

Today neither outcome prevails. Nuisance lawsuits have been filed in New York, Michigan, Utah, Kansas, Nebraska, and West Virginia.

Law upheld in Michigan

Last March, a judge upheld the constitutionality of the Michigan Right-to-Farm Act, ruling against neighbors fighting an expanded 4,000-head beef operation near Breckenridge.

"All evidence says that modern agriculture must grow to be competitive and economically viable," wrote Judge Randy Tahvonen. "The Stonemans' decision to consolidate and expand is financially prudent, financially sound and environmentally practical."

Under Michigan's act, Stoneman Cattle, Inc., operated by four brothers, adopted voluntary Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices. The Stonemans were awarded \$77,338 in legal fees.

Legal authorities such as Neil Harl, Iowa State University, point out that this trial decision lacks the stature of Bormann, which was an appellate decision. The case has not been affirmed by an appeal.

Two neighbors in nearby Alganssee Township, Michigan, recently won a lawsuit against a hog producer, using a township zoning ordinance prohibiting creation of dust, noise, and odor that leaves property lines. Michigan's law requires farmers to comply with town-ship ordinances to gain protection.

As a result, House File 4777 and S. 205 have been introduced to stop township

ordinances from preempting state or federal laws.

Distinctions are important

"Iowa law offered blanket protection from nuisance lawsuits, but Michigan's protection is based on following Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices," says Jack Laurie, Michigan Farm Bureau president.

Iowa still has two other laws containing nuisance protection for live-stock producers. "It's still not known how the Bormann case will affect these laws," says Roger McEowen, associate professor of ag economics, Kansas State University.

He argues that right-to-farm laws, enacted in the late 1970s and early 1980s to protect farmers from objections to odor, dust or noise, differ.

The "taking" argument in Bormann is based on the Fifth Amendment, providing that property not be taken for public use without compensation.

"Right-to-farm laws likely do not create a property right to produce odors over adjacent property," McEowen says. "I don't feel that these laws are in jeopardy."

COPYRIGHT 2000 Meredith Corporation
in association with The Gale Group and LookSmart. COPYRIGHT 2000 Gale
Group

WJL



startribune.com

Metro

Published Sunday, June 28, 1998

Effects of farm preservation law are uncertain

Statewire

MADISON, Wis. (AP) -- A new law to protect farms against urban sprawl will cause only a minor shift of property taxes to homes and other nonagricultural real estate, a researcher says.

Municipal officials argue the law's provisions for shielding suburban farms against tax increases will force homeowners and nonagricultural businesses to pay higher property taxes.

The critics, who are challenging the law in court, also contend it unfairly means higher taxes for farmland in northern Wisconsin while providing tax breaks for land speculators in urban areas.

A Circuit Court trial in Madison is scheduled in August.

However, Phillip Spranger, an author of a study by the Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance, says the law evidently will do what the state Legislature intended by reducing farm taxes with a "fairly minor shift to other taxpayers."

The tax assessment law is similar to farm-preservation statutes in 48 other states. It requires assessors to calculate real estate taxes in accord with a property's use.

This protects agricultural land against assessments for market-value increases that are caused by the approach of subdivisions, industrial parks and other commercial development.

The assessment system is being phased in over a 10-year period. If it were fully in effect this year, taxes on nonagricultural property would rise 1.2 percent while assessed farmland values would decrease 43.3 percent, the study says.

Edward Huck, executive director of the Wisconsin Alliance of Cities and a critic of the law, says the 1.2 percent increase "translates into a lot of money."

The study's calculation of farmland tax increases in 11 northern counties is a shock, Huck said.

The report says Douglas County, whose biggest community is Superior, would have a 79 percent increase in farmland values and a 74.5 percent increase in property taxes while the levy on other properties would fall 0.4 percent.

Other counties that would experience higher farm taxes are Ashland, Bayfield, Burnett, Forest, Iron, Price, Rusk, Sawyer, Taylor and Washburn, it says.

A reason for higher farmland assessments may be the acreage has not been assessed at market value, Sprange said.

Milwaukee, Waukesha and Kenosha counties in the southeast would have large reductions in farm taxes.

Milwaukee County leads the state with a predicted decrease of 83 percent in property value and an 82.9 percent drop in farm taxes.

There would be no shift in tax burden, however, because the county already has little agricultural acreage remaining, the study says.

Southwestern counties would experience the greatest shift in tax burdens to nonfarm property, led by Lafayette County with an estimated 20.2 percent shift, followed by Iowa, Grant and Green counties.

" The shift is misleading, however, since these counties are heavily agricultural, " the report says.

While the law is designed to preserve farmland and suburban greenery, it doesn't prevent farmers from selling to developers if the price is right, Spranger said.

Farmers in Kenosha County, which borders the Illinois state line, sold land at an average \$6,665 an acre in 1996, he said. Farmland in Dane County, whose main city is Madison, sold for an average \$3,601 an acre.

" Just because farmers will be paying lower taxes doesn't mean it's going to remove pressure to sell to another use. " Spranger said. " The money is incentive alone to sell "

~~THE MONEY IS INSUFFICIENT TO USE.~~

State Revenue Secretary Cate Zeuske calculated in October that the law's assessment guidelines can ease property taxes for 89 percent of Wisconsin's cropland and pasture land.

Beginning in January 1996, the law froze the assessment of farmland at 1995 fair market value through 1997 and now reduces it gradually by 2009.

Assessments for an estimated 13.5 million acres are being geared to various factors including the type of crop, its average five-year price, the richness of the soil, management expenses and even the weather.


A lawsuit filed by municipalities was dismissed last June by the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The court ruled there was not enough information about the case to make a decision on it.


A new Circuit Court challenge was filed Sept. 24 in Madison by the Huck's group, the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, the mayors of Milwaukee, Manitowoc, Menasha and West Bend, and four owners of farmland in Columbia and La Crosse counties.

In addition to the assessment law, a measure the Legislature sent Gov. Tommy Thompson earlier this year eases what farms must pay when sewers are constructed past their acreage to subdivisions and other commercial developments.

When farms have no need of the service, assessments are deferred until the property is used for nonagricultural purposes.

Copyright 1998 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

 startribune.com

 Metro

© Copyright 1998. All rights reserved.

Preserve our farming roots

Growth is an unavoidable fact of life throughout the United States and Alaska. For residents of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, growth seems even more difficult to avoid as we welcome more and more people who decide to make their homes here.

With even more people come more jobs and economic opportunities — in retail, services and construction. And with growth, we seem willing to accept certain sacrifices — such as the loss of open and wild space.

But frequently enough, with the loss of open space, comes the loss of agricultural lands. Throughout the Lower 48, farm land is being consumed by development at an alarming rate. The economic benefits of such development often mask the disappearance of farm lands, hiding the real tragedy of the loss of farms to the community.

One needs only to look at California's Santa Clara Valley — better known now as Silicon Valley. Once an important center for agriculture in the United States, Santa Clara Valley produced fruits, vegetables and wine for consumption throughout the country. Looking out over the valley from the Calaveras hills, one could see thousands of acres, miles and miles, of orchards, truck farms and vineyards.

In the 1970s, the almond orchards began to give way to microchip plants, and now agriculture is all but a memory.

Few would argue that the computer revolution hasn't been a boon to life in America, or more specifically, Alaska, but Californians made a huge sacrifice when they exchanged the Santa Clara Valley for Silicon Valley.

Here in the fastest-growing region of Alaska, we see subdivisions paving over our open space again, and developers eyeing the Matanuska Valley's farmlands as attractive sites for new houses.

Agriculture has played a critical role in the growth of the Valley. It was the lure of agriculture that inspired President Franklin Roosevelt to bring hundreds of farming families here in the 1930s as part of the Colony project.

Farming continues to be a substantial player in the economy of the Valley, although it was long ago outstripped by retail and construction. Farming, many might argue, continues to feed the soul of Mat-Su, literally and figuratively.

So, with that ideal in mind, we applaud the recent introduction of Senate Bill 60 by Sen. Lyda Green. SB 60 seeks to preserve farmland in Alaska, by granting grandfather rights to already existing agricultural facilities, and by providing a process for mitigating potential conflict between development and farming.

Taking note of the conflicts that have developed between new homeowners and already existing farms in much of the United States, SB 60 directs developers and anyone else selling real property to warn potential home buyers about their proximity to nearby farms in plain, unromanticized language.

Farming is a smelly, noisy, dirty business; for some reason, that seems to come as a great surprise to those who are moving next door to a farm for the first time. Lawsuits often develop, and often enough, it's the farmer — who was there first — who loses.

SB 60 will prevent those conflicts from taking place here in the Valley.

In the end, we all win as a result.

A couple of recent articles in the *Alaska Hospital Association* and the *Alaska Journal of Law and Medicine* contain with unjust and unconvincing rulings and the ranting pretends to be calling it some attention.

I speak of the dubious ruling and the ever-perpetuating Bess (Spectrum, 1/22) in shots at the hospital board.

I dismiss Bess' pretense stab at directors allegedly deserved benefits for the reference to his conclusion, agenda anyway.

He wrote, "We need to end the politics of hospital politics, seek a solution for all factions in the area [and] elect the community experienced people to the board."

Whatever does he mean? Obviously his end goal is to reject "faction" on the board. And quick, too, before ruin everything by privatization association. Then Valley avoid providing abortion.

Maybe this reasoning is it is obvious to the rest of the "politics" are of precisely abortion policy falls under (and) do not perform abortion form abortions.) Hence, I argues the pro-life position.

I understand the frustration. I am sure Mr. Bess and his would love to see this along with the pro-life board and in the community going to happen. And I've them, there is no "common" sought either.

What Bess and his followers

Chuck Ledge
© 2001

EXAM
ROOM


Lyda Green agriculture-protection bill

By ERIC BURKETT
Frontierman reporter

MAT-SU — A bill presently making its way through the Alaska Senate could go a long way in helping preserve agricultural lands in the Matanuska Valley.

Senate Bill 60, introduced last week by Sens. Lyda Green, R-Wasilla, and Robin Taylor, R-Wrangell, is modeled after a similar law passed by the Pennsylvania legislature, according to Larry DeVilbiss, a Lazy Mountain farmer. A similar measure has been introduced in the House by Rep. John Harris, R-Valdez.

"SB 60 is the number-one legislative priority of the Alaska Farm Bureau," DeVilbiss, who also represents District 1 on the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly, said Friday.



Senate Bill 60, introduced by Sens. Lyda Green and Robin Taylor, could help preserve agricultural lands in the Matanuska Valley.

See BILL, Page A4

To: Pete Fellman
 From: Rob Wells

BILL: Aimed at protecting farmers from lawsuits

Continued from Front Page

DeVilbiss was in Juneau last week with the Alaska Farm Bureau to push for passage of the bill.

"Basically, the intent is to preserve a rural ambiance, especially in developing areas," he said. "This valley's where the legislation is most needed and most critical right now."

The bill seeks to protect agricultural properties by granting

them grandfather rights, especially when they may come up against complaints by neighboring housing developments.

While it hasn't been a huge problem in Alaska so far, in other parts of the United States, many farmers have found themselves and their farms the subjects of lawsuits filed by their neighbors.

"In the Lower 48, you see people moving into farming areas and realizing manure stinks, and

tractors make noise at all hours," Hans Neldig, chief aide to Sen. Green, said.

"They end up suing the farmers, and they've actually won in some cases," he said.

The bill requires sellers to notify their buyers with a written notice that they are purchasing property within a mile of an agricultural facility.

"The property you are about to acquire is located within one mile of an agricultural operation," the notice would read. "Lawful application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers occur in agricultural operations."

The notice goes on to warn potential homeowners they may be subject "at any time to odor, fumes, dust, smoke, burning, vibrations, insects, rodents" and other potentially unpleasant occurrences.

"It's kind of a two-way protection," DeVilbiss said. "It serves as a way for people moving into an area to let them know there are farms there."

The bill has been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Farm Bureau is also looking for legislative support in two other areas this session, DeVil-

biss said.

Farmers are hoping to see the passage of a law which would allow them to hire adolescents.

Rep. Scott Ogan, R-Palmer, supports the effort, DeVilbiss said, and has drawn up legislation that would let children pick vegetables and do other agricultural work with the signed, written permission of both parents or a guardian, or in the presence of a parent or guardian. The legislation has not yet been introduced in the House.

Presently, children who work have to produce identification, which must be presented to state officials in person.

During haying season, farmers must be able to move quickly to bring hay in, and they need to be able to hire help as soon as possible. A single day's rain can easily destroy a farmer's hay crop.

The permits would be for agricultural work only, DeVilbiss said.

"When we made the rounds in Juneau, that was very well received," he said.

Another bill would limit the liability to farmers for livestock that are set free by the actions of trespassers.

CITY OF WASILLA

CITY OF WASILLA
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING SEWER ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

The Wasilla City Council will hold a public hearing on the Monday, February 26, 2001, at 7 p.m. in the Wasilla City Council Chambers, 290 E. Heming Avenue, Wasilla, Alaska, on the special assessment roll for the following sewer assessment district:

BROADVIEW SEWER SPECIAL ASSESSMENT DISTRICT; 9981

The properties to be assessed are all lots and parcels within the sewer assessment district listed above. The improvements constructed by the sewer assessment district, which are the subject of the special assessment roll include the necessary engineering design, construction of sewer mains, treatment facilities, inspection and other equipment and appurtenances necessary to the completion of the sewer project within the sewer assessment district. The purpose of the hearing is to:

- Consider objection to the assessment roll.
- Confirm the special assessment roll of the paving assessment district.
- Establish a schedule of dates when installment payments become due.
- Establish the method of determining the interest rate on installment payments.
- Establish delinquency dates.
- Establish a penalty of 6% for delinquent payments.
- Establish that delinquent assessment installments and penalties shall draw interest at a rate of 3% per annum higher than the rate payable on assessment installments until paid.

The assessment may be financed over 10 years at an interest rate equal to the

House bill protects state farms

■ **ESSENCE:** New neighbors would have to accept that pesticides and odors come with the territory.

The Associated Press

FAIRBANKS — Alaska farmers are lining up in support of legislation seeking to ensure that newcomers to an area cannot sue a neighboring farm because of a distaste for the smell or noise.

The Right to Farm bill is sponsored by Rep. John Harris, R-Valdez, who represents Delta Junction.



Legislature in session

The legislation, HB 82, is a priority of the statewide Farm Bureau. It would prevent people who move next to a farm from seeking to declare it a nuisance.

"We need to protect our farms," said Alaska Farm Bureau president Bob Franklin, who operates B-Y Farms between Fairbanks and North Pole.

He said people could move to Delta Junction to work on a national missile defense project and buy property next to a farm. It is quite possible that the new property owner could then decide that the smell is intolerable.

"We're looking at future (land) use," Franklin said.

Harris' bill is modeled on Lower 48 farm laws that have withstood court challenges, said Pete Fellman, a Delta Junction dairy farmer and a legislative aide to Harris.

To meet the legal requirements, Harris wants to add a provision that requires anyone selling land within a mile of an agricultural facility to disclose to the buyer the existence of the operation.

The buyer would have to be warned that pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers are legally used in agriculture and that noise and odors could be present.

"This really protects anybody who sells

BILL: Measure seeks to protect farmers from suits

Continued from B-1

only a possibility of the farmer being sued but also the person who sold the land."

Lower 48 legal issues have also focused on how the courts can determine whether the farmer in question is a responsible individual who is farming in a safe manner.

Harris' bill requires that to qualify for protection from nuisance lawsuits, farmers must have a soil and water conservation plan, available free through consultation with the state.

"I think most farms have a soil and water conservation plan anyway," Franklin said.

“
This
really
protects
anybody
who sells
land.
Because
there is
not only a
possibility
of the
farmer
being
sued but
also the
person
who sold
the land.”

— Pete Fellman,
Delta Junction
dairy farmer

E-mail this article to a Friend

MICHIGAN FARM NEWS

July 15, 1999



New York court decision mirrors Michigan's Right-to-Farm ruling

by Jennifer Vincent

As urban sprawl continues to carve out random pieces of farmland, the proximity between farm owners and rural homeowners closes. Neighbors began to complain about odor, property values and so-called infringements on their property rights, while challenging the farmers' right to continue operating -- despite the appropriate ag zoning in the area.

While no farm is exempt from nuisance lawsuits, New York and Michigan farmers can take note of two recent court rulings that back their rights to continue if they are following good management guidelines as defined by the states.

The New York Supreme Court recently ruled that its right-to-Farm law is constitutional, similar to a recent ruling in Michigan.

"Both these rulings give farmowners, who are following these stringent guidelines, the right and ability to continue to do business, knowing that they will not lose their operations because of unfounded challenges from neighbors," said Kevin Kirk, Michigan Farm Bureau livestock and right-to-farm specialist. "Everyone has rights -- on both sides of the road. But both Michigan and New York have now said that producers, if operating in compliance with those set guidelines, will be protected from nuisance lawsuits."

Stoneman Cattle Inc. in Gratiot County garnered a victory for Michigan agriculture in late March, when a lengthy bench trial ended with a ruling in favor of the family farm operation's 3,910-head feedlot facility near Breckenridge.

The plaintiffs in the Stoneman case said that flies, increased traffic and odor created a nuisance and, therefore, a taking of their property values. Circuit Court Judge Randy Tahvonen disagreed, however, after listening to many hours of expert testimony -- including that from Kirk -- which found the operation to be in compliance with Michigan's Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (GAAMP). Tahvonen also said the farm was not a source of flies, farm traffic did not harm the plaintiffs, nor did property values decrease because of the operation.

New York's decision was almost identical.

Pure Air and Water Inc. (PAW), citing environmental concerns for the suit, challenged Trengo Farms (a confinement hog operation), as well as the Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets.

Trengo Farms received a "Sound Agricultural Practice Opinion" from the agricultural commissioner prior to the lawsuit. However, PAW, a group of neighbors, said the Trengo operation and the ag commissioner's opinion caused an improper "taking" of private property by allowing the Trengos to maintain a nuisance over neighboring property. The suit centered on manure management practices.

The case went all the way to the New York State Supreme Court, where the court handed down a decision declaring the state's Right to Farm law and Opinion to be constitutional.

NEW YORK 7/26/01 10:50 AM

Illinois Farm Nuisance Suit Act

By Allison Gordon and Beth Phipps

Is your farm operation a nuisance to your neighbors or the general public?

Municipalities, factories, subdivisions, and other uses of land may create conditions that invade the rights of farmers and hence amount to nuisance.¹ Negligence in regards to sanitation, air quality, or noise levels can all lead to becoming a nuisance. Rather than be a victim to a possible suit from an angry neighbor claiming bodily discomfort or mental distress from obnoxious odors, noises, or other conditions arising from your farming practices, be informed about your rights to farm in Illinois.

Common law and statutory principles provide a resolution for claims of property nuisance. The Illinois Farm Nuisance Suit Act, also known as the "Right to Farm Law," provides farmers protection from nuisance suits under certain circumstances. The Act became effective July 29, 1981:

It is the declared policy of the state to conserve and protect and encourage the development and improvement of its agricultural land for the production of food and other agricultural products.....the purpose of the Act is to reduce the loss to the State of its agricultural resources by limiting the circumstances under which farming operations may be deemed a nuisance.²

Nuisance can be defined as using one's property in such a way to **substantially and unreasonably interfere** with the use and enjoyment of another person's property. Nuisances can be classified as either private or public. A private nuisance is a dispute over land use between two parties. The injured individual must personally sue the person creating the nuisance. A public nuisance involves a dispute between more than two individuals. In a case where many people are affected by a nuisance, they may sue individually or the state's attorney may sue on behalf of the injured parties.

Facts and circumstances are the key determinants in pinpointing existence of a nuisance. An act, occupation, or structure which creates **continuous** obnoxious conditions is a **nuisance per se**. This is factual regardless of circumstance, location, or surroundings. These nuisances are obviously crude and are commonly regarded as "on their face." Offensive disposal of waste for the public to see is an example of nuisance per se. A **nuisance in fact** is also an act, occupation, or structure but is determined by location, surroundings, or circumstances. It can be defined as **unreasonable conduct in its context**. An example of a nuisance in fact would be the establishment of a livestock feeding operation 50 feet from an elementary school. A nuisance in fact can eventually become a nuisance per se.

How can you defend yourself against nuisance suits that arise from changing conditions around your farming operation? Development of areas surrounding farmland can often lead to nuisance suits due to incompatibility of certain land uses. Livestock operations and subdivisions do not make good neighbors. The Illinois Farm Nuisance Suit Act provides protection to farm operators against changing conditions:

No farm...shall be or become a private or public nuisance because of any changed conditions in the surrounding area occurring after the farm has been in operation for more than one year,...provided, that the provisions of this Section shall not apply whenever a nuisance results from the negligent or improper operation of any farm or its appurtenances.³

The Illinois Farm Nuisance Suit Act deals only with nuisance suits and may not be used in defense against lawsuits whose basis is The Environmental Protection Act.⁴ The Environmental Protection Act provides statutory definition of water, air, and noise pollution. Suits against farm operations can be brought on the grounds that one or more of these types of pollution are occurring.

In conclusion, to ensure your farm operation is not a nuisance to your neighbors or the general public, take into consideration the size and nature of the enterprise, the manner in which it is operated, as well as proximity to residential property. Avoid operating your farm in a negligent manner and properly

ILLINOIS

maintain in all aspects of your farm (animals, equipment, and structures, etc.).

The state of Illinois is committed to conserving and encouraging the improvement of its agricultural land. To reduce farmer vulnerability to nuisance suits, the state has enacted the Illinois Farm Nuisance Suit Act. This Act allows farmers protection from nuisance suits under certain circumstances. A farm may not be deemed a nuisance if the locality of the farm is subject to change (for example, development of a golf course) provided two criteria are met: 1) the farm has been in operation for more than one year, and 2) the farm was not a nuisance when it was established. An exception to both of these criteria occurs if the farm is being operated in a negligent manner. The Illinois Farm Nuisance Suit Act cannot protect your operation in every situation, but it does offer a possible defense against a suit from an angry neighbor or passerby.

For more information consult the following web sites:

www.law.utexas.edu/dawson/nuisance/nuisance.htm

<http://farm.fic.niu.edu/fic-ta/tafs-rtf.html>

-
1. Looney and Uchtmann. Agricultural Law: Principles and Cases. New York: McGraw- Hill, 1994.
 2. 740 ILCS 70/1 www.law.utexas.edu/dawson/nuisance/il_nuis.htm
 3. 740 ILCS 70/3
 4. 415 ILCS 5/1
-

Maintained by: [Alesia Strawn](#)

[Return to Agricultural Law Information by Subject Page](#)



[Return to the ACE Homepage](#)



[College of Agricultural, Consumer,
and Environmental Sciences](#)





Agriculture Policy Project

Issue Paper: Nuisance and Right-to-Farm Laws

Many urban residents move to the rural countryside because of its aesthetic qualities and open space, amenities which exist in great part because of the presence of farming. As exurbanites move into rural areas, however, they often clash with farmers over common farming activities and their off-site impacts. Aerial spraying and pesticide drift, animal odors, dust, food processing operations, and other common agricultural activities that had not been questioned previously, are perceived as nuisances by the new residents (Lisansky and Clark 1987). (See Issue Paper: Agriculture on the Urban Interface for more information about other concerns associated with development pressures in rural areas).

Strategies have been developed at the state and local level to help farmers and their neighbors resolve these conflicts. Two such strategies are (1) nuisance lawsuits brought against farmers by their neighbors, and (2) right-to-farm laws which seek to protect farmers from these nuisance lawsuits. Common law nuisances are classified as private or public: a public nuisance impairs the health, safety, morals, and comfort of a community without necessarily harming particular property rights while private nuisance unreasonably interferes with the use and enjoyment of another's lands (Lapping and Leutwiler 1987). Nuisance lawsuits may help protect rural residents from unwanted agricultural practices and development. For example, they may be used to establish restraints on established farming practices such as spraying and hours of operation. In some cases, rural citizens have used nuisance suits to deal with problems related to large hog farms (DeVore 1997). In these cases, nuisance complaints can act as a reminder to farmers of the need to monitor the impact of their farming practices on the environment. However, these disputes can also result in driving farmers off their land or out of business (AFT 1993; Lapping and Leutwiler 1987). Widely adopted around the country, right-to-farm laws seek to offset nuisance complaints by nonfarming neighbors by statutorily declaring that standard farming practices are reasonable land uses, despite their perceived adverse impacts on neighboring lands (Lapping and Pfeffer 1997). Although they vary in content in different localities and states, right-to-farm laws generally attempt to supersede the common law of nuisance and favor agricultural uses of land above all others (Lapping and Leutwiler 1987).

The issues surrounding nuisance and right-to-farm laws are difficult to reconcile. Some producers may have difficulty understanding the legitimacy of their neighbor's concern about the unwanted, but unintentional effects of their farming practices (Lapping and Pfeffer 1997). Simultaneously, farm neighbors may not respect the practical needs of farmers to use certain practices that are necessary to make a living (AFT 1993), and may not understand that farms create many of the landscape and amenity values that attracted them there in the first place (Lapping and Pfeffer 1997). This impasse promises to continue in many places, but farmers and rural residents could also be encouraged to look at some of the win-win solutions now available in Europe where farmers are becoming actively involved in the management and development of the environment and landscape. For example, in the Netherlands, farmers are entering into cooperative agreements with various governmental and non-governmental organizations to manage waterways, develop wetlands, landscape their farms, develop bird habitats, etc. They receive subsidies for this, in return for enhancing water quality, wildlife, habitat and landscapes and reduce the grounds for conflict with their neighbors (see Broekhuizen et al., 1997).

References Cited:

American Farmland Trust (AFT). 1993 Fall. "Growing Pains in New York: Mix of Farms, Residences Gives Rise to "Nuisance" Complaints," American Farmland. p. 21.

Broekhuizen, R. van, L. Klep, H. Oostindie, and J.D. van der Ploeg. 1997. *Renewing the Countryside*. Netherlands: Misset.

DeVore, Brian. 1997. "Greasing the Way for Factory Bacon: Corporate Hog Operations and Their Lagoons Threaten the Financial and Physical Health of Family Farms," Sustainable Farming Connection. (<http://sunsite.unc.edu/farmpoli/features/greasing/htm>).

Lapping, Mark B. and Leutwiler. 1987. "Agriculture in Conflict: Right to Farm Laws and the Peri-Urban Milieu for Farming" Sustaining Agriculture Near Cities. (ed.) William Lockeretz. Iowa: Soil and Water Conservation Society. p. 209-218.

Lapping, Mark B. and Max J. Pfeffer. 1997. "City and Country: Foraging New Connections Through Agriculture," Visions of American Agriculture. (ed.) William Lockeretz. Iowa: University of Iowa Press. p. 91-104.

Lisansky, Judith and George Clark. 1987. "Farmer-Nonfarmer Conflicts in the Urban- Fringe: Will Right to Farm Help?" Sustaining Agriculture Near Cities. (ed.) William Lockeretz. Iowa: Soil and Water Conservation Society. p. 219-230.

Go Back To

[Issue Papers Main Page](#)

[WAGPOL Home Page](#)

CONTACT INFORMATION (until May 2000):

Agriculture Policy Project
Henry A. Wallace Center for Agricultural and Environmental Policy
Winrock International
9200 Edmonston Rd. Ste 117
Greenbelt, MD 20770-1551
Telephone: (301) 441-8777; Fax: (301)220-0164; Email: wagpol@winrock.org
Website: www.hawiaa.org/wagpol.html

Last updated on 8 February 2000



*Assuring Michigan Agriculture
Producers the Right to Farm
while Promoting
Environmental Stewardship*

The Right to Farm Act Affects Everyone

Michigan agriculture is a \$37.5 billion industry involving every county of the state. A wide variety of crop and livestock production strengthens our farm economy and helps to enhance the natural environment.

The Michigan Right to Farm Act, P.A. 93, was enacted in 1981 to provide farmers with protection from nuisance lawsuits. This state statute authorizes the Michigan Commission of Agriculture to develop and adopt Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (GAAMPs) for farms and farm operations in Michigan. These voluntary practices are based on available technology and scientific research to promote sound environmental stewardship and help maintain a farmer's right to farm. The GAAMPs cover five specific areas of production agriculture, including:

- Manure Management/Utilization
- Pesticide Utilization/Pest Control
- Nutrient Utilization
- Care of Farm Animals
- Cranberry Production

These agricultural and management practices are protective of the environment and have been designed to serve the needs of Michigan farmers and non-farm residents alike. The practices are reviewed annually and may be revised as necessary by the Michigan Commission of Agriculture.

Manure Management and Utilization

For Michigan's animal agriculture industry to remain viable and competitive, it must have the flexibility and the opportunity to change with market conditions and adopt new technology. With an increase in the scale of commercial livestock production comes new management challenges to control odors and handle agricultural wastes such as livestock manure, poultry litter, milkhouse wastewater, and barnyard runoff.

Sound manure management practices can lower production costs for farmers. Careful storage, handling, and application of farm animal manure will help control odors and protect our water resources. When properly utilized, livestock and poultry manure supplies nutrients for growing crops and reduces commercial fertilizer needs.

GAAMPs for Manure Management and Utilization were first adopted in June 1988. They are written to help assure that reasonable farm management practices are implemented to protect our natural environment, and allow our livestock and poultry industry to remain profitable and competitive.

These practices include recommendations for:

- Runoff Control
- Odor Management
- Manure Storage Facility Design
- Manure Application to Land

**Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices for Manure Management and Utilization
Pesticide Utilization and Pest Control**

American agriculture has been able to meet consumer demands for a reliable and abundant food supply through the use of improved technology. For over 50 years now, this technology has included the use

PAGE 1



Right To Farm Law Changes!

After studying the draft amendments to AS 09.45.235 and studying other state's 'Right To Farm laws' that have been found constitutional, two weaknesses were found:

- No relief for the Alaska farmer under Section 2, AS 09 45.235(b) – The following needs to be added:

(2) Flooding caused by the agriculture operation Except in cases of unusual weather events 25 yr flood – unusual downpours etc.

- ♦ Nowhere in these changes is mentioned notification to realtors, home buyers or other interested parties. I believe a pamphlet should be printed and made available to Title Companies, Realty Boards Etc. By taking a proactive stance right from the beginning, a lot of possible litigation can be avoided. Most of all a proactive statement from the State government under the Seal of Alaska would work wonders compared to a numbered line containing stiff language in a law review.

Included in this Fax are other views on what works and what doesn't, including law reviews.

Jimmie R. Ellison, Publisher/Farmer
Contact; Phone 488 1970, Fax 488-4789, Mail: POB 55590, North Pole, AK 99705

Cc by fax:
Harris
Felmen

INTERESTED PARTIES

PAGE 2

Are Right-to-Farm Statutes in Danger?

By Joe Miller

Livestock Policy Specialist & Regulatory Legal Analyst
Public Policy Division
American Farm Bureau Federation

May 3, 1999

Are Right-to-Farm Statutes in Danger?

The short answer to that question, in my opinion, is no. Now for the long explanation.

Recently the Iowa Supreme Court struck down that state's right-to-farm statute as being unconstitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the case, which means that the Iowa ruling stands. That has brought about discussions in other states as to whether their right-to-farm statutes are in danger of being struck down in the courts.

It is important to understand what right to farm statutes are and what they are not. Most of the right-to-farm statutes in the U.S. are set up to be a defense to a nuisance lawsuit. That means the first thing that has to happen is for someone to claim that an operation is causing a nuisance. The general definition of a nuisance is when someone causes an unreasonable interference with another person's comfortable use and enjoyment of his land.

Once a nuisance has been established by the complaining party the agricultural operation then raises the defense proved by the right-to-farm statute. Most right-to-farm statutes require the producer to comply with very specific requirements to receive protection from a nuisance claim. The person bringing the complaint then has to prove that the agricultural operation is not within one of those exemptions. Right-to-farm statutes changed common law nuisance by creating this protection from what would otherwise be a nuisance.

Most right-to-farm statutes do not protect agricultural operations if they were operated in a negligent or illegal manner. Negligence is generally defined as a failure to exercise that degree of care required by the circumstances. Hence, most of these types of lawsuits state that the operation was being operated negligently.

The Iowa statute went farther than most other states in trying to protect agricultural operations. The Iowa statute stated that "a farm operation - shall not be found to be a nuisance regardless - of the agricultural activities of the farm or farm operation." The argument to the court was that this gave agricultural producers the right to "create or maintain a nuisance over the neighbors property, in effect creating an easement in favor of the applicants." The challenge was based on the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution as a "taking" of property rights.

The Iowa court reasoned that the Iowa statute was in fact an easement because it gave agricultural operations the right to do things that could affect neighboring landowners and it also prohibited those landowners from bringing a legal action against the agricultural operation as a matter of law. This meant that Iowa agricultural operations could in fact create a nuisance and that adjoining landowners could do nothing about it. And that the creation of the easement took away the property right of being able to defend that property by lawsuit and that this was done without just compensation to the adjoining landowner.

It was this final step that made the Iowa law unconstitutional. Most other states allow a lawsuit to be brought against an agricultural operation if they could prove that the operation did not fit within the narrow protected items in the statute. In Iowa, as long as the agricultural operation was not breaking any state or federal law, adjoining landowners could not sue for nuisance. In other states they can.

The Iowa court concluded by saying that the "legislature exceeded its authority by authorizing the use of property in such a way as to infringe on the rights of others by allowing the creation of a nuisance without the payment of just compensation."

In summary, most states should not have a problem with their right-to-farm laws because they allow adjoining landowners to sue for nuisance against agricultural operations. The Iowa statute stated that no agricultural operation shall not be a nuisance and thereby prevented adjoining landowners from bringing a nuisance suit.

This is what created an easement and that easement was not paid for. Therefore it was a "taking". As long as your state statute allows adjoining landowners to bring a nuisance suit and the right-to-farm statute only offers a defense, not a prohibition against a lawsuit, it should withstand any test of its constitutionality.

AM FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

PAGE 3

Court upholds Michigan farm law

By Sue Stuever Battel

Neighbors were pitted against farming neighbors in a recent Gratiot County (Mich.) legal battle that challenged the state's Right-to-Farm Act. In a precedent-setting case, a circuit court judge upheld the constitutionality of the act, ruling that a feedlot operation near Breckenridge, Mich., causes no nuisance.

The Stoneman family, who operates the 3,000 head feedlot facility, said they are relieved the case is over, but are frustrated they had to endure a two-year-plus legal battle. "We always felt we would win because we knew we were doing nothing wrong," said Dave Stoneman.

The Stonemans said they kept neighbors informed about their new cattle facility and took odor and other factors into consideration when selecting the site and building the barn. They also kept detailed records and followed a written manure-management plan.

But the plaintiffs in the case who live within a mile of the cattle barn alleged that flies, increased traffic and odor constituted a nuisance and, therefore, a "taking" because they lived in the area before a cattle barn was added and were not compensated for what they believed to be losses. But the judge dismissed the claim.

While acknowledging that the case was favorable for Michigan agriculture, state Department of Agriculture Director Dan Wyant said he expects similar suits in the future as urban populations encroach on rural land.

"We do know agriculture is at a crossroads with respect to being challenged in this case," Wyant said. He contends that Michigan's Right-to-Farm Act is solid enough to stand up to challenges and will likely serve as a model for other states. All 50 states have right-to-farm laws, but none are as stringent as Michigan's.

"This verdict sets us on the course of moving into the 21st century with some assurance that we can have modern-day, friendly agriculture in the state of Michigan," said Jack Laurie, Michigan Farm Bureau president and a Tuscola County dairy farmer.

"The Stonemans have an undeniable record of utilizing best management practices, and their operation is truly environmentally friendly."

Sue Stuever Battel is editor of member publications for Michigan Farm Bureau.

PAGE 7

by Mike Kroll

One month ago, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the appeal of an Iowa Supreme Court ruling overturning that state's "right to farm" law. The court's action, or rather inaction, was done without comment and remains open to speculation over why the case was not heard. This offers little solace for farmers and their allies in Iowa who now fear widespread legal challenges to their way of life.

Iowa legislators tried to deal with the anticipated problems or conflicts between rural neighbors by passing the "right to farm" law in 1982. It was designed to protect farmers from the threat of lawsuits brought by neighbors. Many modern agricultural practices, such as mega-hog farms or chemical spraying, are often viewed as nuisances by neighbors. This legal immunity protected Iowa farmers from lawsuits over the "operation or expansion of the agricultural activities of [a] farm" located "within an agricultural area" as long as the nuisance does not result from a violation of a federal statute, regulation, state statute, or rule" and the farm owner or operator was not found negligent. "Additionally, there is no immunity from suits because of an injury or damage to a person or property caused by the farm or farm operation before the creation of the agricultural area."

The law allowed local county officials to designate "agricultural areas" for protection. This is part of Iowa's statewide effort aimed at "agricultural land preservation" in the face of developmental pressures on behalf of nonagricultural residents in traditional farming communities. Specifically, a person could not buy land adjacent to a farm, build a new home and then take his farmer neighbor to court over issues such as odor or dust associated with farming.

Officials in Kossuth County designated approximately 960 acres of farmland as an agricultural area subject to protection under this law in January 1995. Three months later, a group of neighbors filed suit in Iowa District Court claiming that this action violated their rights under both the Iowa and U.S. Constitutions. They said such a law denied them the right to protect their property from *potential* actions by neighbors that could adversely affect the value or marketability of that property without fair compensation. An interesting feature of this lawsuit is that while both sides agreed that no such nuisance had yet occurred, the fear was that the immunity protection removed the option of legal redress from the nonagricultural neighbors. Initially, the Iowa District Court threw out the lawsuit but the Iowa Supreme Court heard the matter on appeal and reversed the lower court in September 1998. In effect, they agreed with the plaintiffs that the Iowa "right to farm" law was unconstitutional under both the state and federal Constitutions. This infuriated farm groups across Iowa who attempted to take the case before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In their brief to the high court, the coalition of farm groups claimed that if the Iowa Supreme Court decision was allowed to stand more than 100,000 farmers in that state could face the prospect of costly nuisance lawsuits just because "they look and sound and smell like farms." The brief also warned that action by the Iowa Supreme Court posed a legal threat to "right to farm" laws in numerous other states as well. Iowa's new Governor Tom Vilsack was quoted by the Associated Press as saying that the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling made it very likely that Iowa state lawmakers would revisit this issue.

Iowa farmers and officials aren't the only ones shocked and surprised by this set of events. Scott Jensen, State Assembly Speaker in neighboring Wisconsin, immediately announced that he was asking that legislature's legal counsel to review the Iowa decision and evaluate its likely impact in Wisconsin. Jensen, a Republican from Waukesha, said he was proud of the Wisconsin "right to farm" law—among the first legislation passed when the Republicans assumed the majority in the Assembly in 1995.

Illinois does not have a similar "right to farm" law but the recent controversy over regulating large livestock operations touches on some of the same issues and concerns. The crux of Knox County's ongoing case against Jim & Doug Baird and their Highlands hog farm near Williamsfield is due to be presented to the Illinois Supreme Court. In that case Knox County State's Attorney Paul Mangieri has argued that there must be some logical limitations on the Illinois law that prohibits local governmental control of agricultural land use. Knox County attempted to enforce zoning restrictions to block construction of the Highlands' large scale hog farrowing operation contending that the very size of this operation takes it out of the realm of traditional agriculture. While Mangieri has been unsuccessful so far in both the Circuit and Appellate courts, a strong dissenting opinion by one member of the three-judge Appellate Court panel has offered him some reason for optimism.

PAGE 8

Asked if the Iowa court drama may have some impact on Knox County's legal battle, Mangieri was blunt and to the point. "While the ruling is amazing in a state as agriculturally-based as Iowa it has no standing whatsoever here in Illinois. The relevant laws in Iowa are totally different from those in Illinois and the facts of our case differ as well. This decision will undoubtedly have significant impact within Iowa but little direct legal application outside of that state. Things could have been much different had the U.S. Supreme Court heard the case and issued an opinion supporting the Iowa Supreme Court. It is impossible to interpret meaning into a refusal to hear this case."

While the Iowa ruling will have little effect on the specific Knox County case, it may have far reaching effect on Illinois. Operators of mega farms and their corporate parents will logically migrate to the least restrictive states such as Illinois. As recently as this week, Illinois legislators failed to strengthen the Illinois Livestock Facilities Management Act.

Posted to Zephyr Online March 27, 1999

Return to the Zephyr home page: <<http://www.thezephyr.com>>

Phil Nagley

New York's Right to Farm Law Found "Constitutional"

On May 25, Justice Thomas Keegan of Albany County Supreme Court issued a landmark decision for New York State agriculture in the case of PAW v. Davidsen, in which the Court declared the New York State Right to Farm Law (RTFL) constitutional. The RTFL provides nuisance suit protection to farming operations that have received a "Sound Agricultural Practice Opinion" from the Commissioner of Ag and Markets, which Trengo Farms, a confinement hog operation in Chemung County, received in 1997. PAW, a small environmental group, claimed that New York's RTFL was unconstitutional because it caused an improper "taking" of private property, alleging that the opinion allowed the Trengos to maintain a nuisance over neighboring property, creating an easement in the Trengos' favor. The creation of that "easement," PAW argued, resulted in a "taking" of private property. The Court decided that the RTFL did not authorize the Trengos' to create a nuisance, nor does the RTFL provide blanket immunity from nuisance suits. Thus, the statute does not create a property right in favor of the farm in the neighboring property, so no taking of private property occurred under the RTFL. Look for further details on this momentous decision in the next issue of the Advocate.

Alaska's Right To Farm Law Needs Overhaul

By Jim Ellison

Good well written laws make for good Neighbors

During the last several decades, more and more city and Lower forty-eight people have migrated into rural areas to pursue their Alaska dream. They seek a peaceful place in the country, away from the pollution, noise, and crime of cities and suburbs. Many choose homes in modest (some times not so modest) subdivisions that press into former and future agricultural lands.

This intrusion of urban life into rural life results in an inevitable conflict. How surprised some neighbors are to wake up one spring morning to roaring machinery, buzzing flies, the stench of manure and a mist of pesticides in the air. And how angry many become when they learn that they can't do anything about it.

The Legal 'Right to Farm' States now gives farmers a basic "right to farm" without the fear of lawsuits brought by offended neighbors. As one judge remarked while dismissing a lawsuit against a hog farmer, "pork production generates odors that cannot be prevented, and so long as the human race consumes pork, someone must tolerate the smell."

Before the right-to-farm laws were enacted (most of them in the 1980s), courts shut down many a farmer's operation because it was a nuisance to the neighbors. For example, a group of annoyed neighbors, whose homes had sprung up around a Massachusetts hog farm, sued and closed it in 1963. Some judges tried to strike a middle ground and ended up applying restrictions that would let the farming operation continue.

A Florida court, for example, allowed a hog farm to stay in business but limited how many hogs the farmer could have. The judge also issued instructions on how to store and feed the garbage the hogs were accustomed to eating.

These two illustrations prove the wrong-head-a-ness of judges being farm managers - neither hog operation could continue and remain economically viable.

In another case, retirees at Sun City in Arizona discovered that they had traded their frigid climates for warm breezes laced with the odor of a cattle feedlot. A resulting lawsuit closed down the feedlot, but the judge ordered the developer of the community to pay the cost of relocating the cattle operation. The action all but broke the developer.

The right-to-farm laws supposed to take judges out of the farm management business and protect farmers from the nuisance laws that apply to ordinary neighbors.

Every state in the country has passed a right-to-farm law.

North Carolina's law is typical. It declares that an agricultural operation, which has existed for a year without being a nuisance, is presumed not to be a nuisance even when new neighbors move in. If the farm operations are conducted in a reasonable manner, the new neighbors can't legally complain.

Several states list specific annoyances that are not considered a legal nuisance to neighbors. The lists include odor, noise, dust and the use of pesticides--the very conditions which, without the laws, could lead to a lawsuit by a neighbor.

Right-to-farm laws do not give farmers complete freedom to do as they please. Farmers must operate in a legal and reasonable manner to be eligible for the law's protection.

Some states -- New York, for example -- do not allow a protected farming operation to undergo a large increase in size. Many don't allow farmers to substantially change what they are doing if they are to remain protected under the law and this law's limiting factor has driven several livestock operation out of business. In farming as any business -- the farmer must adjust his operation to fit the ever-changing economic conditions. Thus in some cases a farm must grow or die, in others, maybe a complete change in operations including value added products or go from grain crops to animals.

No law should protect a farmer who does not follow normal procedures or who deliberately annoys neighbors.

Alaska's "Right To Farm" (see side bar - subsection 09.45.235) law is simple and easily understood as written and that could be the rub; it has holes in it that any capable lawyer could drive a D-10 Cat through sideways even if he didn't even know what a dozer looked like.

For example look at section (a); If some one moved in next to a farmer that was just beginning to clear fields and setup, the new neighbor wouldn't consider the farmer a threat to his bliss until he looked out one morning and seen the crop duster flying by or maybe the farmer's kid out spraying thistle on his four-wheeler. Two ways to cure this - change from three years to one and require notification from sellers to buyers that the property is close to farming operations.

Now if you think that was bad look at section (b) 1 and 2; that part is clearly open to interpretation; for example; Farmer clears off a couple a hundred acres - levels it to 1:60 grading for flood irrigation but not yet planted, along comes a frog choking rain - say a couple inches in a hour - oops small flood right in our new neighbor's door. Could be interpreted as the farmer's fault.

I believe by rewriting the law and writing a new law governing notification to real estate buyers "Sniff Before You Leap Law" and requiring that land deeds in agriculture and farmable areas be so restricted by such notification "I told you so law", would make for good neighbors. Other states have these laws already in place

I have written such laws based on other state's laws, read them and if you agree pass them along to your local lawmaker. This is for our own protection.

Jim



Law of the Land Review

An Occasional Report to Local Government Officials
Regarding Rules and Regulations
For Natural Resources Use or Management

Additional Information Available From:

MARCH, 1994

RIGHT TO FARM LAW: DEFENDING AGAINST NUISANCE LAWSUITS BY NONFARM OWNERS

Owners of nonfarm residences sometimes file lawsuits to limit livestock production or farmland cultivation practices which they believe threaten their health, safety, or welfare. Several states have "right to farm" laws to protect farmers from complaints from noise, odor, and dust arising from normal farming practices. While the words "right to farm" do not appear in state law, Wisconsin statutes do afford a farmer some protection against a nuisance action brought by a neighboring landowner. Also, towns and counties are authorized to develop land use plans, to adopt exclusive agricultural zoning, and to support farmer participation in the farmland preservation program. Such approaches can be used to discourage building of nonfarm residences in productive agricultural areas.

INTRODUCTION. Around the nation, where nonfarm residences have intruded into agricultural areas, land use disputes have arisen. Farmers, who are accustomed to operating farm machinery at any time, are receiving noise complaints from persons who buy country homes in pursuit of "peace and quiet." Other farming practices that sometimes generate nuisance complaints are manure handling, concentrated livestock housing, and chemical applications.

FARM NUISANCE CASE STUDIES. Contra Costa County, California has produced apricots, grapes, and livestock products for more than a century. Yet, many persons working in nearby San Francisco have been attracted to the county by its affordable housing. Prospective new owners consider the county's green farm fields to be like urban park land. Because they have little knowledge of farming, newcomers seldom consider how the need to plow, plant, cultivate, and harvest may affect their lives. Faced with a growing number of complaints and nuisance suits, county officials proposed a right to farm ordinance. The

measure would discourage nuisance actions against farmers and would require realtors to inform prospective nonfarm owners about possible "inconveniences" caused by necessary agricultural practices. Some local residents are challenging the proposed ordinance and will seek to overturn it if it is adopted.

Near Alliance, Ohio, a nonfarm family was offended by the construction of a facility that houses more than 100,000 chickens. The family contends that property values have been adversely affected by the farm operation. It has repeatedly complained about odors to the Stark County Health Department. Inspections by county officials and state natural resources staff have uncovered no air quality or manure handling violations. Nonetheless, a lawsuit is likely to ensue.

ADVENT OF RIGHT TO FARM LAWS. One approach used to minimize the threat of nuisance lawsuits has been the passage of state "right to farm" laws. For instance, Michigan enacted a right to farm law more than ten years ago.

Chapter 286 of Michigan law states that a farm operation shall not be found to be a nuisance if it "existed before a change in the land use or occupancy of land within 1 mile of the boundaries of the farm land" and if the farming operation would not have been considered a nuisance before the nearby residences were built. Also, an operation cannot be considered a nuisance if it "conforms to accepted agricultural and management practices." "Acceptable" practices are annually reviewed and listed by the state's agriculture commission in consultation with state university, state agency, and USDA officials.

Laws specifying a right to farm also are present in Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Virginia.

ARE RIGHT TO FARM LAWS FAIR OR EFFECTIVE? Neil D. Hamilton wrote a book titled What Farmers Need to Know About Environmental Law (Drake University Agricultural Center, Des Moines, IA, 1990). Hamilton claimed that some right to farm laws do not adequately protect farmers from nuisance lawsuits. He cited a case in which a hog farmer spent \$50,000 to contest a suit filed against him. His neighbor had objected to a proposed expansion. The farmer "won" the suit yet lost financially because he could not recover his defense costs.

In New York, one attorney argued that right to farm law afforded farmers too much protection. He claimed it was unfair to give farmers protection from legal action by another class of citizens. The attorney represented a town board in a Niagara County case where a dairy farmer wanted to increase his herd from 500 to 850 cows. The board refused to grant a building permit for a new barn when nonfarm residents complained to town officials about nuisances at the "factory-sized" farm.

WISCONSIN STATUTES AND FARM NUISANCES: State law allows a person or local government unit to ~~abate~~ abate a public nuisance. This statutory authority can be applied when a citizen complaint is brought forward against a farm

(or nonfarm) property owner.

Note: In the 1981 case of State v. Quality Egg Farm, Inc., nuisance was defined by the courts as unreasonable activity or use of property that interferes substantially with comfortable enjoyment of life, health, or safety of others.

Wisconsin law does not contain the words "right to farm." However, it does say (Wisconsin Statutes, 823.08) that, "to the extent possible consistent with good public policy, the law should not hamper agricultural production." When a farm zoned for exclusive agricultural use is subject to a nuisance action, similar farming is allowed to continue unless the court decides it would endanger health or safety. If not so zoned, the court may order the farmer to use alternative practices to reduce the nuisance. If a court finds that the farming practice is a nuisance and if the person complaining moved into an area where the farming activity considered to be a nuisance was consistent and ongoing, then the court may assess only nominal damages. A farmer may recover the legal costs for his defense if a nuisance action is dismissed by the court.

THE NEED TO SEPARATE FARM AND RESIDENTIAL USES. Conflicts between farm and nonfarm landowners often can be avoided in areas where some land is set aside for agricultural use while other land is reserved for residential use.

Town and county government can help reduce the threat of nuisance lawsuits when they: [1] prepare a local land use plan and [2] support their plan by encouraging farmland preservation program participation and by adopting exclusive agricultural zoning to limit the construction of nonfarm residences within farmland areas.

Note: This information is not intended as a substitute for legal advice from a licensed attorney.

Prepared by:
Donald Last
Extension Natural Resource Policy Specialist
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
715-346-2386

**Board of Agriculture & Conservation (BAC)
Resolution 2001-1**

**Resolution in Support of Agricultural Legislation Pending in the 22nd
Alaska Legislature**

Whereas one of the principal functions of the Board of Agriculture and Conservation (BAC) is to address issues affecting agriculture in Alaska; and


Whereas there is currently legislation pending before the 22nd Alaska Legislature which pertains to agriculture in Alaska; and

Whereas the Board of Agriculture and Conservation supports in concept HB 82 "An Act relating to agricultural facilities and operations as private nuisances; and to disclosures in transfers of real property located within one mile of an agricultural facility or an agricultural operation"; and

Whereas the Board of Agriculture and Conservation supports in concept HB 128 "An Act relating to employment of certain minors in agriculture";

Now therefore be it resolved that the Board of Agriculture and Conservation requests that the 22nd Alaska Legislature, after appropriate committee referral and review, support and approve HB 82 and HB 128.

Board of Agriculture and Conservation


James V. Drew, Chair

02-26-01
Date

RESOLUTIONS

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE

TONY KNOWLES, GOVERNOR

CENTRAL OFFICE
1800 GLENN HIGHWAY, SUITE 12
PALMER, ALASKA 99645-6736
PHONE: (907) 745-7200
FAX: (907) 745-7112

NORTHERN REGION OFFICE
3700 AIRPORT WAY
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99709-4699
PHONE: (907) 451-2780
FAX: (907) 451-2751

PLANT MATERIALS CENTER
HCO4 BOX 7440
PALMER, ALASKA 99645-9706
PHONE: (907) 745-4469
FAX: (907) 746-1568


March 2, 2001

Dear Legislator:

At the Board of Agriculture and Conservation meeting on February 20, 2001, the board unanimously approved a resolution on agricultural legislation pending in the 22nd Alaska Legislature. The resolution supports, in concept, HB 82, "An Act relating to agricultural facilities and operations as private nuisances; and to disclosures in transfers of real property located within one mile of an agricultural facility or an agricultural operation;" and HB 128, "An Act relating to employment of certain minors in agriculture".

One of the principal functions of the newly created Board of Agriculture and Conservation (BAC) is to address issues affecting agriculture in Alaska. Therefore the BAC requests that the 22nd Alaska Legislature, after appropriate committee referral and review, support and approve HB 82 and HB 128. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



James V. Drew, Chair
Board of Agriculture and Conservation

Board of Agriculture & Conservation (BAC)
Resolution 2001-1

Resolution in Support of Agricultural Legislation Pending in the 22nd
Alaska Legislature

Whereas one of the principal functions of the Board of Agriculture and Conservation (BAC) is to address issues affecting agriculture in Alaska; and


Whereas there is currently legislation pending before the 22nd Alaska Legislature which pertains to agriculture in Alaska; and

Whereas the Board of Agriculture and Conservation supports in concept HB 82 "An Act relating to agricultural facilities and operations as private nuisances; and to disclosures in transfers of real property located within one mile of an agricultural facility or an agricultural operation"; and

~~Whereas~~ the Board of Agriculture and Conservation supports in concept HB 128 "An Act relating to employment of certain minors in agriculture";

Now therefore be it resolved that the Board of Agriculture and Conservation requests that the 22nd Alaska Legislature, after appropriate committee referral and review, support and approve HB 82 and HB 128.

Board of Agriculture and Conservation



James V. Drew, Chair

02-26-01
Date

Adopted: 02/20/01

**MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH ASSEMBLY
RESOLUTION NO. 01-007**

A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH ASSEMBLY IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILL 82, AN ACT RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL FACILITIES AND OPERATIONS, AND TO DISCLOSURES IN TRANSFERS OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN ONE MILE OF AN AGRICULTURAL FACILITY OR AN AGRICULTURAL OPERATION.

WHEREAS, the legislature is considering House Bill 82 relating to agricultural facilities and operations, and to disclosures in transfers of real property located within one mile of an agricultural facility or an agricultural operation; and

WHEREAS, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough has a long history of agricultural operations; and

WHEREAS, the majority of agricultural activities in the state take place in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough; and

WHEREAS, in 1999 over 57 percent of the value of agricultural production in the state came from the Matanuska-Susitna Borough; and

WHEREAS, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough is the fastest growing community in the state; and

WHEREAS, the majority of that growth is residential; and

WHEREAS, House Bill 82 proposes that prior to real property being transferred, notification will be provided indicating the property is within one mile of a defined agricultural facility or operation, and that the purchaser should be prepared to accept that the by-products and activities of agricultural facilities and

operations are a normal and necessary aspect of living in an area with a strong rural character and an active agricultural sector.


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly supports the a'option of House Bill 82.

ADOPTED by the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly this 20 day of February, 2001.



TIMOTHY L. ANDERSON, Borough Mayor

ATTEST:



SANDRA A. DILLON, Boroug.. Clerk

(SEAL)

Sharon Davies
1510 "P" Street
Anchorage, AK 99501
Telephone 277-5547 Fax 277-5502


Representative John Harris
Alaska State Legislature
FAX 465-3799

Dear Mr. Harris:

I strongly support the concept of HB 82. I have read several times of farmers having legal problems from people who had moved into new housing near them and decided they did not like some of the practical aspects of farms such as odors, noises and agricultural chemicals. I did not and do not find this fair nor reasonable.

It is beneficial for all Alaskans to protect our farms and farmers because we all need to eat.

Sincerely yours,


Sharon Davies

CORRESPONDENCE



Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the HOUSE JUDICIARY
committee name

Committee on HB 82, dated 4/4/01
bill # / subject

SEC 4. AS 34.70.050 AMEND - UNDER SEC.
34.70.050.

ADD:

(4) WHERE INFORMATION ABOUT LOCATION
OR AGRICULTURAL FACILITIES / OPERATIONS
CAN BE OBTAINED.

~~NOTABLY~~ NOTABLY - THE LOCAL SOIL &
WATER CONSERVATION ~~IS~~ DISTRICT.

Signed:

Testifier

BARBARA A. NARO

KENAI ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS - CHAIR

Representing (optional) INDUSTRY ISSUES

105 SWADY LN SELDONA, AK 99669

Address

907 262 3958

Phone number



Alaska State Legislature

Please enter into the record my testimony to the House - Judiciary
 committee name
 committee on HB 82 . dated 4-4-01
 bill/subject

I am in favor of this bill. I have a small (30 acre) farm on the outskirts of Homer. The area is rapidly becoming subdivided into smaller and smaller residential lots. This bill would protect my right to continue my farm operation (cattle - horses - chickens, etc.) which has been a farm since the 1950's!

Signed: Mavis Kilchen
 Testifier
Seaside Farms
 Representing (Optional)
40904 SEASIDE FARM RD, HOMER, AK 99603
 Address
907 - 235 - 7540
 Phone No.