AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

111th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES TO FARM BILL FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

PREPARED BY STAFF

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 2010

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2010

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES TO FARM BILL FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

111th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES TO FARM BILL FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

PREPARED BY STAFF

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 2010

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2010 61–953 PDF

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota, *Chairman*

TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania, *Vice Chairman*
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa
JOE BACA, California
DENNIS A. CARDOZA, California
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
STEPHANIE HERSETH SANDLIN, South Dakota
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
JIM COSTA, California
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
STEVE KAGEN, Wisconsin
KURT SCHRADER, Oregon
DEBORAH L. HALVORSON, Illinois
KATHLEEN A. DAHLKEMPER, Pennsylvania
BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama
BETSY MARKEY, Colorado
FRANK KRATOVIL, JR., Maryland
MARK H. SCHAUER, Michigan
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina
JOHN A. BOCCIERI, Ohio
SCOTT MURPHY, New York
WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York
EARL POMEROY, North Dakota
TRAVIS W. CHILDERS, Mississippi
WALT MINNICK, Idaho

FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma, *Ranking Minority Member*
BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON, Illinois
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
STEVE KING, Iowa
RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
ADRIAN SMITH, Nebraska
DAVID P. ROE, Tennessee
BLAINE LUETKEMEYER, Missouri
GLENN THOMPSON, Pennsylvania
BILL CASSIDY, Louisiana
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, Wyoming
THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

ROBERT L. LAREW, *Chief of Staff*
ANDREW W. BAKER, *Chief Counsel*
LIZ FRIEDLANDER, *Communications Director*
NICOLE SCOTT, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Questionnaire	2
Abbott King, Barbara, Aurora, NY	3
Adair, Kristin, Washington, D.C.	7
Aderhold, Eric, Seattle, WA	8
Adkins, Brian, Chilhowee, MO	9
Agate, Ryan, Somerville, MA	9
Agudelo, Eva, Bellingham, WA	9
Akers, Lowell, Sycamore, IL	10
Albertson, Donald, Spring Mills, PA	10
Albertson, Jackie, Courtland & Republic, KS	10
Alderman-Tuttle, Zoey, Vienna, OH	11
Allen, Alice, Wells River, VT	11
Allen, Amanda, Washington, D.C.	12
Andersen, Ronald, Washington, IA	12
Anderson, Doug, Juniata, NE	13
Anderson, Dwayne, Lynn Center, IL	13
Anderson, Glen, Lacey, WA	13
Anderson, Linda, Okemos, MI	13
Angelus, Nathan, Portland, OR	14
Antrim-Cashin, Elizabeth, Dobbs Ferry, NY	14
Archibald, Tom, Ithaca, NY	14
Asbury, Allison, Pittsburgh, PA	15
Askerooth, Scott, Fargo, ND	15
Asmundson, Faye, Berthold, ND	16
Atkins, Gene, Muleshoe, TX	16
Augenstein, Tracy, East Lansing, MI	16
Aumann, Kent, Nokomis, IL	17
Aust, Rich, Germantown, TN	17
Austin, Lenore, Idaho Falls, ID	17
Avis, Sharon, Dos Palos, CA	17
B., Sarah, Metter, GA	17
Backer, Susan, Courtenay, ND	18
Baehler, Vernon, Moscow, KS	18
Bair, Krystina, Seattle, WA	18
Baker, David, Hermosa, SD	19
Baker, Patricia, Boston, MA	19
Baldisserotto, Valerie, Seattle, WA	21
Baldwin, Todd, Aledo, IL	21
Balke, Gary L., Clayton, IL	22
Ball, Kathy, Mililani, HI	22
Ballantyne, Jerrad, Westhope, ND	22
Band, Melissa, Park City, UT	22
Bandini, Vic, Plainfield, IN	23
Banducci, Gianna, Dixon, CA	23
Banks, David, David, MO	23
Barber, Brian D., Phillips, NE	23
Barmann, Lawrence, Red Oak, IA	23
Barnett, Leslie, Sherborn, MA	24
Bates, Emily, Fallston, MD	24
Batie, Dean, Kearney, NE	24
Bauman, Brandon, Stuttgart, AR	24
Baur, Gene, College Park, MD	25
Bayless, Elaine, Glen Ridge, NJ	26

Page
Beadling, Bianca, Miami, FL 26
Bear, Ida, New York, NY 26
Beck, Ronnie, St. Pete, FL 26
Becker, Beverly, Oakland, CA 26
Becker, Kelly, Pearl City, HI 27
Beckwith, Jennifer, Lewis Center, OH 27
Beier, Douglas, Independence, IA 27
Belanger, Nik, Danville, VA 27
Bender, Glenn, Fargo, ND 28
Bender, Hillary, Waltham, MA 28
Bendick, Robert, Arlington, VA 28
Benjamin, Beth, Boulder Creek, CA 30
Bennett, Carol, Tempe, AZ 31
Benson, Alan, Alan, MI 31
Berg, Joel, Brooklyn, NY 31
Berg, Madalyn, Tiburon, CA 33
Berger, Brett, Albion, IL 33
Bergeson, John, Runnells, IA 34
Bernan, Sanford, Montoursville, PA 34
Bertsch, Rodney, Champaign, IL 34
Beswick, Eric, Kennewick, WA 34
Betcha, Hugh, Southampton, NJ 34
Bhakti, Sara, Kirkland, WA 35
Bingnear, Barbara, Melbourne, FL 35
Bitner, Van, Mason City, IL 35
Black, John, West Branch, IA 35
Blair, Pam, Chicago, IL 35
Blakely, Brenda, Eupora, MS 36
Blanchfield, Brett, Des Moines, IA 36
Blean, Michael, Morrison, IL 36
Bliss, Arthur, Somis, CA 37
Bochonko, Kathy, Cumming, GA 37
Bodien, Alysha, Mt. Pleasant, MI 37
Bogli, Kathereine, Granby, CT 38
Bohman, John, Troy, ID 38
Bolin, Julia, Middlebourne, WV 38
Bonvouloir, A., Sunnyvale, CA 39
Borjesson, Joel, Corvallis, OR 39
Boruta, Matthew, Dearborn, MI 39
Bosco, Sam, Ithaca, NY 40
Bosold, Patrick, Fairfield, IA 40
Bosserd, Thomas, Ypsilanti, MI 41
Boustead, Marilyn, Woodbine, IA 41
Bowman, Tyler, Hermiston, OR 42
Boyd, Bruce A., Idalou, TX 42
Bransgrove, William, Hereford, TX 43
Brant, Shelley, Sparks, NV 43
Bregitzer, Lisa, Atlanta, GA 44
Bremner, Elisa, Armonk, NY 44
Briggs, Chandler, Vashon, WA 44
Brink, Steven, Sacramento, CA 44
Briscoe, Joshua, Charleston, WV 45
Britten, Kevin, Red Oak, IA 45
Brooks, Judd, Vaughn, MT 46
Brorsen, Andrew, Kankakee, IL 46
Brzuchalski, Amy, Findlay, OH 46
Buck, Renee D., Hayti, SD 46
Buckner, Marian, Shepherdstown, WV 47
Buell, Nancy, Tempe, AZ 47
Buitenwerf, Mike, Altoona, IA 48
Buller, Gary, Sutton, NE 48
Bulluck, Vancy, Winton, CA 48
Bulman, Thomas, Decorah, IA 48
Bultsma, James, Hot Springs, SD 48
Bunning, Steve, Plymouth, MN 49
Burgess, Michelle, Oswego, NY 49
Burke, Barbara K., Olympia, WA 49

Page
Burke, Derrick, Snohomish, WA 49
Burley, David, Hammond, LA 50
Burnside, Michael, Bay City, TX 50
Burton, Pete, Danville, IN 50
Busch, Ruth, Lafayette, AL 51
Bustin-Hatheway, Beverly, Hallowell, ME 51
Butt, Fred, Crescent City, IL 51
Butts, Alan, Bismarck, ND 52
Byrd, Linda, Saint James, MO 52
Cable, Brian, Superior, IA 52
Callaghan, Matt, Rockton, IL 52
Callahan, Sharon, East Windsor, NJ 53
Callaway, Ginette, Jonesboro, GA 53
Canright, Mark, Asbury, NJ 53
Caouette, Jessica, Denver, CO 54
Capelle, Janet, North Fairfield, OH 54
Capozzelli, J., New York, NY 55
Carl Isle, Luna, Wailuku, HI 55
Carlisi, Cathy, Atlanta, GA 55
Carnahan, Lisa, Fortuna, CA 55
Carnel, Bob, Cannon Falls, MN 56
Carnes, Erin, Portland, OR 56
Carpenter, George, South Berwick, ME 56
Carroll, Katherine, Atlanta, GA 57
Carroll, Susan, Lake Ariel, PA 57
Carstens, Richard, Fresno, CA 57
Carter, Boone, Las Cruces, NM 58
Carvajal, Amanda, Merced, CA 58
Casler, Elizabeth, Fort Thomas, KY 59
Castaneda, Jason, San Diego, CA 59
Catanzaro, Donald, Lowell, AR 59
Caylor, Cortney, Fort Worth, TX 60
Ceva, Cindi, Montauk, AR 60
Chapman, Katherine, Seattle, WA 61
Chek, Paul, Vista, CA 61
Childress, Thomas, Rugby, ND 61
Christensen, Cindy, Sioux Falls, SD 61
Christman, Kim, West Chester, PA 62
Church, Cassandra, E. Montpelier, VT 62
Churchill, Debbie, Fremont, NE 62
Cielukowski, Cocoa Beach, FL 62
Clare, Peter, Tiburon, CA 63
Clark, Rosemary, Madison, WI 63
Clark, Shawn, Portland, OR 63
Clausen, Steve, Chatham, IL 64
Clements, Robert, Elmwood, NE 64
Clow, Jeffrey, Harrisburg, SD 64
Cochenour, Chris, St. Meinrad, IN 65
Codella, Deborah, Murrells Inlet, SC 65
Coffman, Dick, Hinton, IA 65
Collins, David, Cherokee, OK 66
Collins, Marybeth, Troy, VA 66
Comer, Lindley, Elwood, IN 67
Comes, Daniel, Mapleton, IA 67
Compton, Glenn, Nokomis, FL 67
Cox, Cynthia, Fox, AR 68
Coy, Oona, Northampton, MA 68
Cradduck, Kevin, Savannah, GA 68
Crandall, Lorin, Saint Louis, MO 68
Crawford, Dana, Flower Mound, TX 70
Crockett, Nicholas, Partridge, KS 70
Crom, Paul, Holdrege, NE 70
Crowley, Joyce, Morton, PA 71
Cude, Bret, Nashville, IL 71
Culbertson, Danny, Alachua, FL 71
Czosnyka, Pete, Chicago, IL 72
da Silva, Peggy, San Francisco, CA 72

Page
da Silva, Peggy, San Francisco, CA 72
Da Silva, Veronica, Dover Plains, NY 72
Daberkow, Rachel, Lakefield, MN 73
Dahl, Darrell, Walnut, IL 73
Darling, Joanne, Willis, MI 73
Dau, Bev, West Chicago, IL 74
Davis, Amelia, Charlotte, VT 74
Davis, Matthew, Detroit Lakes, MN 74
Davis, Russell B., W. Harrison, NY 75
Davis, Steve, Loveland, OH 75
Dawes, Chuck, Springville, PA 76
Dawning, Desdra, Queen Creek, AZ 76
Deaton, Kathleen, Fayetteville, AR 76
DeCarlo, Lisa, Fort Myers, FL 76
Dee, Gerald, Byron, MN 76
Delinck Manley, Marianna, Mishawaka, IN 77
Delzio, Melissa, Portland, OR 77
Den Hartog, Larry, Sheldon, IA 77
Denenberg, Deborah, Omaha, NE 77
Denis III, A.H., Vancourt, TX 78
Denlinger, Marvin, Arcanum, OH 78
DeRemer, Anthony, Laceyville, PA 78
DerGarabedian, Denise, Clearwater, FL 79
Derstine, Mary, Kinnelon, NJ 79
Deryckx, Woody, Concrete, WA 80
Devorak, Thomas, Fargo, ND 80
Dick, Tiffiney, Courtenay, ND 80
Dickhut, Randy, Omaha, NE 80
Diehl, Ken, Wamego, KS 80
Dimock, Mary, Poughkeepsie, NY 81
Dippel, Renee, Rolling Meadows, IL 81
Dodson, Bruce, North Platte, NE 81
Donahue, Susannah, Suffolk, VA 82
Donovan, Stacey, Windham, NH 82
Dorsett, Cindy, Lubbock, TX 82
Douglas, Mary, New York, NY 82
Douglas, Michael, Stephen, MN 83
Dowling, Maura, Hanover, MA 83
Doxey, Chad, Ann Arbor, MI 83
Draper, Breland, Boise, ID; on behalf of Idaho Hunger Relief Task Force and Idaho Interfaith Roundtable Against Hunger 84
Drayton, David, Berkeley, CA 85
Drown, Jim, Parkers Prairie, MN 86
Dubert, Jane, Maquoketa, IA 86
Ducre, Michelle, Carl Junction, MO 86
DuGan, Dana, Hailey, ID 86
Dumbrill, Lucille, Newcastle, WY 87
Dunbar, Daniel, Chicago, IL 87
Dunbar, Gene, San Antonio, TX 87
Dunham, Molly, New York, NY 87
Dunlap, Jim, Sioux Falls, SD 88
Durensky, Roger, Barnesville, MN 88
Dvorsak, Evan, Turtle Lake, WI 88
Dybing, Thomas, Lanesboro, MN 89
Eardley, Bradley, Boxford, MA 89
Edmiston, Elizabeth, Durham, NC 89
Edmundson, Stanley, Colby, KS 90
Ehlers, Amy, Washington, D.C. 90
Elliott, Phyllis, Santa Monica, CA 92
Ellis, Michael, Sparta, IL 92
Ellis, Steve, Washington, D.C. 93
Elmore, Jonathan, Grove, OK 93
Elting, Bradley, Hebron, NE 93
Engstrom, Troy, Watertown, SD 94
Erickson, Deanna, Seattle, WA 94
Ernest, Pamela, Plainfield, CT 94
Evans, Max, Urbandale, IA 94

Page
Evans, Rick, Springville, IA 95
Evans, Shavaun, Nashville, TN 95
Falkenstein, Roxanne, Cave Junction, OR 95
Fasching, Jim, Plainview, MN 96
F-Dillard, Patricia, Beaverton, OR 96
Feeding America, Food Bank Network, D.C. Policy & Research Dept., Chicago, IL 96
Feldman, Anna, East Lyme, CT 97
Fenley, Jodi, Chariton, IA 98
Fenster, Daniel, Bellerose, NY 98
Ferro, Colleen, Plantation, FL 98
Fickenwirth, Ann, Hingham, MA 98
Fike, Dennis, Westmoreland, KS 98
Fike, Jennifer, Ann Arbor, MI 99
Fink, Andrea, Katonah, NY 99
Fischer, Alfred, Aberdeen, MS 99
Fitzgerald, Jerome, Shoshone, ID 100
Fitzpatrick III, Wesley, Crystal Springs, MS 100
Flaherty, Kevin, Storm Lake, IA 100
Flemign, Gena, San Marcos, TX 101
Flora, Arjan, Brooklyn, NY 101
Fogt, Joshua, Seattle, WA 101
Follman, Randy, Inver Grove Heights, MN 102
Forcelli, Dawn, Yonkers, NY 102
Ford, Nancy, Olympia, WA 102
Fourez, Steven, Fairmount, IL 103
Fox, Jean, New York, NY 103
Franco, Darlene, Waleska, GA 104
Franich, Tamara, Chattanooga, TN 104
Frank, Bobbie K., Cheyenne, WY 104
Fry, Christine, Oakland, CA 105
Funk, Kent, Hillsboro, KS 107
Gaines, Jeff, Pacific, MO 107
Galati, Marc, Atlanta, GA 108
Galbraith, Hadley, Topeka, KS 108
Galbraith, Marc, Topeka, KS 109
Gammino, V., Atlanta, GA 109
GaNun, David, Lebanon, NJ 109
Garcia-Padilla, Diana, Harlingen, TX 111
Gardner, Scott, Clinton, MO 111
Garvey, Lydia, Clinton, OK 112
Gates, Brianne, Los Angeles, CA 112
Gaudzels, Michael, Nashville, IL/Martinsville, IN 113
Geddes, Suzanne, Cumming, GA 114
Gehrke, David, New Ulm, MN 114
George, Doug, Sutton, NE 114
Geri, Olivia, Vineland, NJ 115
Gerritsen, Jim, Bridgewater, ME 115
Getz, Elliott, Lubbock, TX 116
Gillespie, Stephanie, Redford, MI 117
Gillison, William, Lake Village, AR 117
Gilson, Luke, Los Angeles, CA 117
Giombolini, Katy, Salem, OR 117
Glenn, David, Hillsborough, NJ 118
Goldsmith, Bruce, Galt, CA 118
Gonzalez, Maria, Tulare, CA 118
Gonzalez, Michelle, Providence, RI 118
Goode, Deany, Kansas City, MO 119
Goodrich, Katherine, Doylestown, OH 119
Goodson, Lynette, Longview, TX 119
Goolsby, Larry, Washington, D.C. 119
Gorbett, Sabrina, Fairview Park, OH 120
Gordon II, Rawson, Suwanee, GA 121
Gotham, Bryan, Hermon, NY 121
Grace, Natalie, New Hope, MN 122
Grahn, LoriJayne M., Pelican Rapids, MN 123
Grandin, Philip, Grafton, MA 124

Page
Graves, Bennie, Abilene, TX 124
Graves, Tammy, Richfield Springs, NY 125
Gray, Whisper, Manteca, CA 125
Greder, Fred, Mason City, IA 125
Green, Tabita, Brookfield, WI 126
Greene, Maya, Austerlitz, NY 126
Griggs, Karen, Stockton, CA 126
Grillo, Robert, Chicago, IL 126
Grimes, Janice, Webster, IA 126
Grimes, Marian, Dudley, MA 127
Groen, Dick, George, IA 127
Grotegut, Christopher, Hereford, TX 127
Guenther, Debra, Durango, CO 128
Guith, David, Atwater, CA 128
Gustafson, Randall, Phillips, NE 128
Guttormson, Terry, Hendrum, MN 129
Guttridge, Laura, Vero Beach, FL 129
Guynup, Traci, Lancaster, PA 129
Hagan, Frank, Everett, WA 130
Hagert, David, Emerado, ND 130
Hagman, Leah, Arlington, TX 130
Haines, Barbara, Louisville, KY 130
Hall, Judy, Livingston Manor, NY 131
Hall, Richard, Scotland, SD 131
Hamilton, Betty DuBose, Brownfield, TX 131
Hamlin, Deborah M., Falls Church, VA 132
Hammer, Janet, Cambridge, MA 133
Hansen, Gary J., Aledo, IL 133
Hansen, Lynn, Anita, IA 134
Hanus, Ann, Salem, OR 135
Hargrove, Donna, St. Petersburg, FL 136
Harms, Jennifer, Orlando, FL 136
Harpster, Tim, Wapakoneta, OH 136
Harris, Boyd, Centralia, MO 137
Harris, Patricia, Raleigh, NC 137
Harrison, Beth, Woodburn, OR 138
Harter, Jay, Susquehanna, PA 138
Hartway, Nathanial, Albion, NY 138
Haskell, Kristen, Lovell, ME 138
Haslett, Kurt, Modesto, CA 139
Hastings, Brenda, Burton, OH 139
Hasty, Caroline, Denver, IA 139
Hauff, Debbie, Harvey, ND 140
Hauserman, Chris, Clay Center, KS 140
Hays, Robert, Malvern, IA 140
Healy, Douglas, Norris City, IL 140
Hedberg, Dana, Atwater, MN 141
Hedlund, Melanie, Lexington, MA 141
Heiden, R. Bruce, Buckeye, AZ 141
Heikens, Lance, Lake Park, IA 142
Heimes, Scott, Worthing, SD 142
Heine, Michael, Chase, KS 142
Helland, Paule, Mapleton, MN 143
Heller, Roger, Olivia, MN 143
Heminger, Deloris, Dannebrog, NE 143
Hendricks, Robert, Charleston, SC 144
Henry, Maggie, Bessemer, PA 144
Hernberg, Elizabeth, Mechanicville, NY 144
Hezel, Linda, Kearney, MO 144
Hickman, Rich, Papillion, NE 145
Hignite, Sara, Dallas, TX 145
Hill, Jaque, Atlanta, GA 145
Himes, Sarah, Lansing, MI 146
Hitch, Dixon, Malta, MT 146
Hoag, Bill, Beallsville, OH 146
Hodges, Louise, Hanford, CA 147
Hodgetts, Robert, Carnegie, PA 148

Page
Hoekstra, Bill, Oakdale, CA 148
Hoekstra, Bud, San Andreas, CA 148
Hoesli, Steve, Delphos, KS 148
Hofer, Quint, Huron, SD 149
Hoff, Brian, Wykoff, MN 149
Holderly, Sid, Reynolds, IN 149
Holloway, Tammy, Vale, OR 150
Holsinger, Sheldon, Flora, IN 150
Honas, Jeffrey, Aurora, NE 150
Hoots, Gary, Fargo, ND 151
Hopkins, Ruth, Le Grand, CA 151
Horihan, Fred, Spring Grove, MN 151
Houser, Brian, New Albany, OH 151
Housing Assistance Council (HAC), Washington, D.C. 151
Howard, Jammie, Traer, IA 152
Huang, Priscilla, Washington, D.C. 152
Hubner, Gregg, Avon, SD 153
Hudson, Dale, Brewster, KS 153
Hudson, Julie, Waymart, PA 153
Humstone, Elizabeth, Charlotte, VT 154
Hursen, Elaine, Charleston, SC 154
Hursh, David, Lewisburg, PA 155
Huston, Jenny, Oakland, CA 155
Huston, William, Dresden, OH 155
Hutchens, Clarice, Ballwin, MO 156
Hutcheson, Sandra, Saint Augustine, FL 156
Ibach, Steve, Berthold, ND 156
Ichwantoro, Kristina, Sandy Springs, GA 157
Iddrissu, Suahd, New York, NY 157
Ingvalson, David, Sauk Rapids, MN 157
Ingvalson, Mike, Blooming Prairie, MN 158
Inverarity, Taylor, Lawrence, KS 158
Iovan, Deanne, Ferndale, MI 159
Irwin, Alec, New York, NY 159
Irwin, Alison, Desert Hot Springs, CA 159
Iversen, Burton, Austin, MN 160
J., John, IN 160
Jaffe, Jon, Seattle, WA 160
Jager, Matthew, Philomath, OR 160
James, Sarah, Berkeley, CA 161
James, Stacy, Champaign, IL 161
Janowski, Jon, Milwaukee, WI 161
Jenks, Michael, Watford City, ND 163
Jensen, Nathan, Conroe, TX 163
Jermark, Brock, Logan, KS 164
Joeres, Erhard, Sanibel, FL 164
Johnson, Brad, Crosby, ND 164
Johnson, Douglas, West Fargo, ND 164
Johnson, Jayson L., Mound City, MO 165
Johnson, Julia, Sunol, CA 165
Johnson, Karla, La Crescenta, CA 165
Johnson, Kelly, Cavalier, ND 166
Johnson, Louise, Modesto, CA 166
Johnson, Marti, Central Coast Region of California, CA 166
Johnson, Nadia, Forest Hills, NY 167
Johnson, Rodney, Norfolk, NE 168
Johnston, Andrew, Decatur, GA 168
Johnston, Carole, Avondale Estates, GA 168
Johnston, Laura, Mishawaka, IN 168
Jones, Jessica, Los Angeles, CA 169
Jordan, A.J., Peru, IN 169
Kahre, Bret, Wolsey, SD 170
Kallenberg, Hayky, New York, NY 170
Kamath, Anu, Brooklyn Park, MN 170
Kamer, Krista, Merced, CA 171
Kanable, James, Philip, SD 171
Kanak, Richard, Cherry Valley, IL 171

Page
Kane, Tom, Honesdale, PA 171
Katz, Ruth, Pocantico Hills, NY 171
Kaylor, Odile, Sahuarita, AZ 177
Keeter, Jerry, Olney, TX 177
Keifer, Jolee, Hamburg, PA 177
Keller, Wayne, Steeleville, IL 178
Kelley, Sharron, Gleneden Beach, OR 178
Kellogg, Lorelei, Santa Fe, NM 178
Kelsey, Jeff, Alpena, SD 178
Kennedy, James, New York, NY 179
Kennett, Mark, Grinnell, IA 179
Kent, Peggy, Dawsonville, GA 179
Kerns, C. Brent, Brownsburg, IN 179
Kerr, William, Woodstock, NY 180
Keyes, Glenn, Charleston, SC 180
Kiley, Patrick, Okemos, MI 180
Kinman, Linda, Des Moines, IA 181
Klaas, Erwin E., Ames, IA 182
Klein, David, Normal, IL 183
Klein, Pamela, Sunset, TX 183
Kluis, Farryl, Faribault, MN 184
Knapper, Anthea, Wildomar, CA 184
Koenigshof, Dave, Cumming, IA 185
Koenigshof, Justin, Sacramento, CA 185
Kolevzon, Kenneth, Oakland, CA 185
Kondracki, Kim, Cranbury, NJ 185
Kopp, Edward J., Lexington, KY 186
Kotecki, Walter, Stockton, CA 186
Kramer, David, Minden, IA 186
Kraupie, Darrell, Bridgeport, NE 186
Krech, Allan, Rolla, ND 187
Kreft, Timothy, Williston, ND 187
Kreuder, Chris, Indianola, IA 187
Krieger, Greg, Galesburg, ND 188
Kriegl, Josef, Redwood Falls, MN 188
Kriese, Richard, Mitchell, SD 188
Krull, Eldon, Marshall, MN 188
Krupnick, Wendy, Santa Rosa, CA 189
Kugel, Mary Lou, Shawano, WI 189
Kuper, Keith, Ackley, IA 189
Kupstas, Matthew, Elkins, WV 190
Kvols, Jon, Sioux City, IA 190
Lambert, Gwen, Dayton, OH 190
Lambert, Kaitlyn, Brookfield, MO 191
Landis, Brian, Lebo, KS 191
Lang, Sam, Star, ID 192
Langevin-Doran, Lynne, Girdwood, AR 192
Lantz, Sarah, Media, PA 192
Lappin, Max, San Diego, CA 192
Larabee, Lee, Burlington Jct., MO 192
Larson, Chris, Park River, ND 193
Larson, John, Buffalo Center, IA 193
Larson, Mike, Perham, MN 193
Lawrence, Bryan, Chatham, NJ 193
Lebacken, Bob, Reynolds, ND 193
Lechtenberg, Barbara, Hutchinson, KS 194
LeClercq, Ann, Oswego, IL 194
Ledgerr, Gregory, Chicago, IL 195
LeDuc, William, Mankato, MN 195
Lee, Adolfo, Brooklyn, NY 195
Leezer, John, Toulon, IL 196
Legner, Dan, Princeton, IL 196
Lerman, Steve, Plainview, NY 196
Levin, Emma, Wilsonville, OR 196
Leviton, Stuart, Baltimore, MD 196
Lewin, Jake, Santa Cruz, CA 197
Lewis, Debra, Beardstown, IL 197

Page
Lewis, Jerry, West Point, NE ... 198
Lewis, Laura, Shelton, WA ... 198
Limkeman, Darrell, Bloomfield, IA ... 198
Lincoln County Wyoming, Board of County Commissioners, Kemmerer, WY ... 199
Lineberry, T., Crestview, FL ... 199
Liss, Mary, Kearney, NE ... 199
Litwiller, Timothy, Hillsboro, KS ... 199
Livingood, Frank, Postville, IA ... 200
Lloyd, Sarah, Wisconsin Dells, WI ... 200
Locker, David, Slidell, LA ... 200
Loe, Rob, Cooperstown, ND ... 200
Logan, T., Austin, TX ... 200
Logsdon, Theresa, Lakeport, CA ... 201
Long, Michael, Camrillo, CA ... 201
Loos, Gary, Clear Lake, IA ... 201
Loseke, Joel, Chamberlain, SD ... 202
Lourenco, Michelle, Corona, CA ... 202
Lovas, Sarah, Hillsboro, ND ... 202
Lubiner, Cari, Highland Mills, NY ... 203
Lunt, Tobias, Brooklyn, NY ... 203
Luse, Jay, Lebanon, IN ... 203
Lutter, Joseph, Zell, SD ... 204
Lyon, Kristie, St. Louis, MO ... 204
Lyon, Shari, Mesa, AZ ... 204
M., Jennifer, Pompano Beach, FL ... 204
Ma, Lup, New York, NY ... 204
Maciewski, David, Worcester, MA ... 205
MacMillan, Catriona, Sydney, Australia ... 205
Madeira, Jody, Bloomington, IN ... 205
Magneson, Scott, Cressey, CA ... 206
Maine, Gretchen, Waterville, NY ... 206
Mandzik, Steven, Arlington, VA ... 206
Manion, Kevin, Sangerfield, NY ... 207
Manning, Jr., J. Rives “Judge”, Roanoke Rapids, NC ... 207
Marin, Gerardo, Oakland, CA ... 208
Marks, Tara, Pittsburgh, PA ... 210
Marshfield, Amanda, Marcellus, NY ... 211
Martin, Carol, Ashland, ME ... 211
Martin, Kent, Kahoka, MO ... 211
Martin, Nicole, Baton Rouge, LA ... 212
Martin, Patrice, Homewood, IL ... 212
Martin, Robert, Modesto, CA ... 212
Martin, Ron, Steele, ND ... 212
Martinsen, Chad, Elgin, NE ... 213
Marvin, Judith C., Lewisburg, PA ... 213
Marx, Paul, Corning, NY ... 213
Masley, Michael, Manville, NJ ... 214
Mason, Jeff, Jefferson, IA ... 214
Masten, David, Greencastle, IN ... 215
Matthes, Loy, Rapid City, SD ... 215
Mattson, Judith, Tucson, AZ ... 215
May, Jenifer, Yonkers, NY ... 216
Mayer, Gabriele, Okemos, MI ... 216
McBride, Lynne, Lafayette, CA ... 216
McCann, Sarah, Philadelphia, PA ... 222
McClatchey, Walter, Alexandria, LA ... 222
McCleary, Marlene, Upper Sandusky, OH ... 222
McClure, Dale, Omaha, NE ... 223
McCollester, Chad A., Silver City, IA ... 223
McCrea, Peter, Westport, CT ... 223
McElhaney, David, Hookstown, PA ... 224
McGarry, Allison, Flint, MI ... 224
McGarry, Kyle, Ammon, ID ... 224
McGillis, Corey, Portland, ND ... 225
McGinty, Sean, Lutz, FL ... 225
McGuire, Tim, Seattle, WA ... 225
McHale, William J., Stockton, CA ... 226

Page
McKay, Virginia, Sprague, WA 226
McKendrick, Jennifer, Manti, UT 226
McLean, Ph.D., Teresa A., Watkinsville, GA 226
McLellan, Liz, Halfway, OR 227
McManigal, Monica J., Center, NE 227
McNair, Mary Anna, Driscoll, TX 228
McNamara, Susan, Southampton, MA 228
Meekins, Thomas, Tom, SD 228
Meibergen, Joey, Enid, OK 228
Meisner, Julie, Harpursville, NY 229
Melbourne, Wolf, Rocky Mount, NC 230
Melugin, Elizabeth, Raleigh, NC 230
Mencher, Dr. Joan P., New York, NY 231
Menozzi, Isabelle, Fairfield, CT 235
Merrill, Greg, Stockton, CA 235
Meyer, John, Brattleboro, VT 235
Meyer, Melody L., CA 236
Meyer, Naomi, Boston, MA 236
Middleton, Patricia, Queensbury, NY 237
Millard, Brian, Arenzville, IL 237
Miller, Barbara, Yuma, AZ 238
Miller, Delvis, Norton, KS 238
Miller, Diane, Southampton, NJ 238
Miller, Duane, Cobleskill, NY 238
Mills, Beverly, San Francisco, CA 239
Mills, Cecile, Royal Oaks, CA 239
Mitchell, Bradley, Charleston, SC 239
Moberg, Barb, Marietta, OH 239
Moltzen, Kelly, New York, NY 240
Montgomery, Jeff, Phoenix, AZ 240
Monti, Michelle, Mansfield, MA 240
Moore, Margaret, Calabasas, CA 241
Morello, Phyl, White Pine, TN 241
Morgenstern, Ava, Cambridge, MA 241
Morlock, Jack A., Indianapolis, IN 242
Morris, Jarrett & Ruth, Clayton, AL 242
Morrison, Heather, Long Beach, CA 243
Moss, Emanuel, Austin, TX 244
Moststad, Gregory, West Fargo, ND 244
Mowers, Laralyin, New York, NY 244
Mroz, Annie, Media, SC 244
Mulcahy, Lee, Huntersville, NC 244
Murbach, Randy, Ellicott City, MD 245
Murfin, Vicki, Satellite Beach, FL 245
Murphy, Cortney, Langhorne, PA 245
Murphy, Macy, Vincennes, IN 245
Murphy, Thomas, Livingston, CA 246
Naake, Larry E., Washington, D.C. 246
Nash, Kevin, Salt Lake City, UT 247
Nash, Sean, Santa Cruz, CA 247
Nation, Gary, Pittsfield, IL 248
Neal, Nancy, New York, NY 248
Nebel, David W., Nevada, IA 248
Neil, Ruth, Austin, MN 248
Nelson, Kyle, Moorhead, MN 249
Nep, Shauna, New York, NY 249
Nesburg, Robin, Fairfax, MN 249
Newman, Robert, Burlington, OK 249
Newton, Joseph C., Eufaula, AL 249
Noethe, Patti, Britt, IA 250
Nofi, Erica, Brooklyn, NY 251
Nolen, Timothy R., Carmi, IL 251
Norgaard, Michael, Tyler, MN 252
Nosal, Dan, Castle Rock, CO 252
Nuttle, David, Tahlequah, OK 254
O'Brien, Colleen, Mont Vernon, NH 254
O'Bryan, Phil, Paris, IL 255

Page
O'Donnell, MaryBeth, Manchester, VT 255
O'Dowd, James, New Paltz, NY 256
Olson, Kent, Bismarck, ND 256
Olson, Steve, Mayville, ND 257
Oppelt, John, Castroville, TX 257
Ormiston, Jim, La Conner, WA 258
Osborne, Scott, Bandon, OR 258
Otto, Ray, Palmyra, MO 258
Overby, Paul, Wolford, ND 258
Paap, Kevin, Blue Earth County, MN 258
Pado, Christine, Third Lake, IL 260
Palevsky, Stacey, San Francisco, CA 261
Palmer, Michael, Stillwater, OK 261
Parenti, Noel and Meghan, Winston-Salem, NC 261
Parham, Andrea, Sherborn, MA 261
Park, Alvin, Mililani, HI 262
Park, James D., Presque Isle, ME 262
Parker, Melissa, Westport, CT 262
Parker, Riley, North Bend, WA 262
Parr, Dr. Damian, Davis, CA 263
Patrick, Clifford, Alexandria, MN 263
Patrone, Kerry, High Point, NC 263
Patterson, Paul, Morris, IL 263
Patzer, Darrell, Jamestown, ND 264
Patzer, David, Jamestown, ND 264
Payne, Dexter, Boulder, CO 265
Peachey, Mark, Pratt, KS 265
Peirce, Nicole, Holland, PA 265
Pence, Justin, Omaha, NE 266
Pennington, Amy, Seattle, WA 266
Perkins, David, Saint Augustine, FL 266
Perry, Julie, Towanda, PA 267
Pettus, Melissa, Lafayette, LA 267
Pevarnik, Christine, Mobile, AL 268
Pfeiffer, Adam, Oak Harbor, OH 268
Phillips, Kathleen, Wellington, FL 268
Pitchford, Richard, Waverly, IL 268
Placke, Janet, Central City, NE 269
Plank, Nora, Milford, MI 269
Pliml, George, Cook, MN 269
Ploetz, Douglas R., Little Genesee, NY 269
Plunkett, Laura, Marblehead, MA 270
Polkow, Steven, Owatonna, MN 270
Poppe, Brian, Falls City, NE 270
Porter, JoAnn, Port Townsend, WA 271
Powell, Kathleen, Fresno, CA 271
Powell, Scott, Seattle, WA 272
Powers, Kristen, Chapel Hill, NC 272
Prasad, Aravind, Arlington, MA 272
Price, Terrell, Modesto, CA 273
Probasco, Todd, Exeter, NE 273
Probst, Kimball, Logan, UT 273
Pugh, Becky, Bethesda, MD 274
Qua, Fisher, Seattle, WA 274
Quarterman, Gretchen, Hahira, GA 274
Quasius, Pete, Ft. Myers, FL 275
Radford, Richard, Clinton, KY 275
Ragan, David, Effingham, IL 275
Rakich, James, Visalia, CA 275
Ramsay, James, Loma, CO 275
Rathmann, Patricia, Moscow, ID 276
Redding, Dave, Naples, FL 276
Redig, Ann, Rochester, MN 276
Redlin, Brad, St. Anthony, MN 277
Reeder, Anne, Salem, OR 277
Refici, Jennifer, Macedon, NY 278
Reilly, Kevin, Atlanta, GA 278

Page
Renala, Angela, Dunwoody, GA 278
Renault, Gillian, Atlanta, GA 281
Resej, Charlotte, Lewisburg, PA 281
Rettele, Ben, Fairview, KS 281
Rex, Linda, Boynton Beach, FL 281
Reynolds, Julie, Leasburg, NC 282
Richards, Melanie, Gainesville, FL 282
Richey, Mark, Eagle, ID 282
Richman, Nessa, Takoma Park, MD 283
Rickard, Lynn E., Bakersfield, CA 284
Rickard, Pam, Pismo Beach, CA 285
Rida, Karen, Worthington, MA 286
Ridgeway, Jessica, Aptos, CA 286
Riedell, Francis, Wall Lake, IA 286
Riley, Derrick, Lee's Summit, MO 286
Ringenberg, Chad, Grand Forks, ND 287
Ritchings, Anne, Placitas, NM 287
Rizzuto, Robert, Brooklyn, NY 287
Roach, Ed, Plainfield, IA 288
Robinson, Patti, Thomaston, GA 288
Rode, Harmony, LaMoure, ND 288
Rodriguez, Parthena, Sebastian, FL 288
Rogers, Lori, Ossian, IN 288
Rogers, Sheilah, Redwood Valley, CA 289
Roggenbuck, Amanda, Unionville, MI 289
Rohrer, Daniel, Verdigre, NE 290
Roos, Leslie, Grand Forks, ND 290
Rosengren, John, Sterling, IL 290
Rose-Walter, Debbie, NY 290
Ross, Rose, Almo, KY 291
Rossiter, Jerry, Atwater, CA 291
Rossman, Jr., Russ, State College, PA 291
Roth, Todd, Holcomb, KS 292
Roy, Julie, Laingsburg, MI 292
Royer, Jarad, Industry, IL 292
Royer, Nana, St. Augustine, FL 293
Ruddell, Greg, Meridian, ID 293
Ruddock, Peter, Palo Alto, CA 293
Ruderman, Russell, Keaau, HI 294
Rugaard, Kevin, Creston, IA 294
Rutkowski, Joseph, Dallas, TX 294
Ryals, Darren, Palmyra, MO 294
Ryals, Roger, Unionville, MO 295
Ryan, Darcy, Nipomo, CA 295
Ryan, Hope, Boise, ID 295
Ryan, Wendy, Silver Spring, MD 296
Rypkema, Ryon, Caputa, SD 296
S., Ray, Modesto, CA 296
Saccato, JoAnn, Clearlake Oaks, CA 296
Sadowsky, Jesse, Dickinson, ND 297
Saeter, Timothy, Fosston, MN 297
Sahba, M.D., Glayol, Sacramento, CA 297
Sahnow, Charlotte, Eugene, OR 298
Salman, Rania, Plano, TX 298
Sander, Christine, Fairfield, CT 298
Sangle, Kirien, New York, NY 298
Schaaf, Gene, Neligh, NE 299
Schaefer, Leah, Blue Ash, OH 299
Schickedanz, Jason, Perryton, TX 299
Schmitz, Bob, Grandin, ND 300
Schneider, Adam, Waverly, IA 300
Scholl, Dwight, Garden City, KS 300
Schonbeck, Mark, Floyd, VA 300
Schoneberg, Bonnie, Pahala, HI 303
Schroder, Gwen, Powell, MO 304
Schroeder, Eric, Austin, TX 304
Schumacher, Gus, Washington, D.C. 304

Page
Scott, Chad, West Point, MS 305
Scott, David, Memphis, TN 308
Scully, Sarah, Alexandria, VA 309
Seamer, Rick, Goose Lake, IA 309
Secrest, Claudia, Robstown, TX 309
Seliman, Ahmed, New York, NY 309
Seppanen, Loretta, Olympia, WA 310
Serda, Daniel, Kansas City, KS 310
Severson, Carol, Gem, KS 310
Sewell, Joshua, Washington, D.C. 310
Seydel, Gail Robin, Albuquerque, NM 311
Shaffer, James, Hilmar, CA 311
Shamblin, Tim, Burley, ID 311
Shaneyfelt, Garth, Greenfield, MA 311
Shannon, Dennis, Auburn, AL 312
Sharp, Jerad, Indianola, IA 312
Shaw, Randy, Big Springs, NE 312
Shea, Karen, Scituate, MA 312
Shelly, Katherine, Thompson, PA 313
Shepard, Ron, Mazeppa, MN 313
Shepherd, Jill, Bloomington, MN 313
Sheppard, Tracey, Fort Wayne, IN 314
Sheridan, Morgan, Albuquerque, NM 314
Sherman, Katie, Minneapolis, MN 314
Sherman, Mary, Cincinnati, OH 314
Sherman, Valerie, Palatine, IL 315
Sherrets, Scott, Independence, IA 315
Shinn, Ray J., Seneca, KS 315
Shiraki, Jean, Washington, D.C. 316
Shoemaker, Wendy, Lawrence, KS 317
Shoots-Reinhard, Brittany, Columbus, OH 317
Sierra Nevada Conservancy, Auburn, CA 317
Sihm, Rochelle, Grant, NE 318
Silver, Margaret, Atlantic Beach, FL 318
Silver, Ronald, Atlantic Beach, FL 318
Singleton, Greg, Springfield, VA 319
Sitzman, Michael, Surprise, AZ 319
Skaggs, Ruth Ann, Fredericktown, MO 320
Slater, Bethany, East Syracuse, NY 320
Slough, Rad, Rad, GA 321
Smiley, Helen, Houston, TX 321
Smith, Charles, Houston, TX 321
Smith, Cheryl, Gorman, TX 321
Smith, Christine, Boise, ID 322
Smith, Grace, Adamsville, AL 323
Smith, Kim, Vancouver, WA 324
Smith, Larry, La Porte, IN 324
Smith, Marietta, Mount Prospect, IL 324
Smith, Mark, Marietta, GA 325
Smith, Robert, Boise, ID 325
Smith, Timothy, Harper, OR 326
Smith-Dieng, Angela, Burlington, VT 326
Solanki, Arvind, Laurel, MD 326
Soltwedel, Norbert, Shumway, IL 327
Sorensen, Denise, Kannapolis, NC 327
Souza, Tony, Tulare, CA 328
Spindle, Audrey, Checotah, OK 328
Staab, Nathan, Hays, KS 328
Stadler, Ellen, Dalton, PA 329
Stanbro, Deb, Tipton, IA 329
Stangl, Terri, Flint, MI 329
Stanley, Edh, Sacramento, CA 330
Stark, Natasha, College Park, GA 330
Starr, Helen, Easton, MD 330
Stearman, Kim, Cookeville, TN 331
Steedman, Lindsay, North Bethesda, MD 331
Stein, Jeffrey A., Hankinson, ND 331

Page
Stein, Leora, Port Townsend, WA 332
Steinacher, Todd, Litchfield, IL 332
Stenseth, Stu, Bismarck, ND 332
Stepanek, Brian, Fresno, CA 333
Stern, Jessica, Arlington, VA 333
Stevenson, Stefanie, Cincinnati, OH 333
Stewart, Travis A., Mankato, MN 334
Stieg, Trevor, Hazel, SD 334
Stock, Mary, Phoenix, AZ 334
Stoller, Neil, Toulon, IL 335
Stone, Rebecca, Cooperstown, NY 336
Story, David, Woodward, OK 336
Stotesbery, Phil, Pelican Rapids, MN 336
Strand, John, Minneapolis, MN 336
Strand, Reno, Bottineau, ND 337
Striepe, Rebecca, Atlanta, GA 337
Suarez, Vickie, Sayre, PA 337
Sunderman, Byron, Villisca, IA 337
Svoboda, Alan J., Burwell, NE 338
Swanson, Aaron, Lake Norden, SD 339
Swartz, Greg, Starbuck, MN 339
Sweckard, Jennifer, Dallas, TX 339
Sweet, Kristina, New York, NY 340
Swires, Bobbie, Danville, IL 340
Tarvestad, Trent, Devils Lake, ND 340
Tatarsky, Kindra, Montauk, NY 340
Tate, Robin, Antioch, TN 341
Taylor, Jr., James R., NC 341
Tellez, Anna, Arcata, CA 341
Thoene, C.M. “Cy”, Ansley, NE 342
Thomas, Elizabeth, Trumansburg, NY 342
Thomas, Rod, Gooding, ID 342
Thompson, Patina, Willcox, AZ 343
Thornbrough, Monty, Altus, OK 343
Thorpe, Jim, Aberdeen, SD 343
Tibbitts, William, Salt Lake City, UT 344
Tibbles, James, Council Bluffs, IA 344
Tinjum, Rodger, Detroit Lakes, MN 344
Todd, Russel, Cleghorn, IA 344
Toll, Matt, Lindsborg, KS 345
Tomlinson, Wayne, Rushville, IL 345
Toney, Holly, Fleetwood, PA 345
Torgerson, Keith, Wahpeton, ND 345
Tracy, Jennifer, San Diego, CA 345
Travis, Jill, Atlanta, GA 346
Treger, Stanislav, Vernon Hills, IL 346
Trenado, Erain, Livingston, CA 346
Tucker, Kenny, Lyons, KS 346
Tucker, Lori, Baldwyn, MS 346
Twombly, Mike, Brooklyn, NY 347
Tymkiw, Liz, Rosemont, PA 347
Ueckert, Douglas, Dickinson, ND 347
Valado, Martha, Bethesda, MD 347
Van Der Merwe, Jacobus, Berkeley, CA 348
Van Hulzen, Kraig, Oskaloosa, IA 348
Van Ness, Cheri, Newark, DE 348
VanDerWerff, James, Plattsmouth, NE 348
Vandevender, Sharon, Ormond Beach, MS 349
VanLaere, Marsha, Northwood, ND 349
Vaughan, Peter, Reedley, CA 349
Ver Steeg, Eugene, Inwood, IA 350
Viker, Owen, Mankato, MN 351
Vikre, Ron, Harmony, MN 351
Vitello, Samuel, Roslyn Heights, NY 351
Vogel, Hugh, Joplin, MO 351
von Tscharner Fleming, Severine, Cambridge, MA 352
Vorachek, Paul, Park River, ND 352

Page
Vrbka, Tom, Plattsmouth, NE 352
Wagester, Raymond, Batavia, NY 352
Walker, Malynda, Norfolk, VA 353
Wall, John, Minier, IL 353
Wallace, Edward, Atlanta, GA 354
Wallace, Ira, Mineral, VA 354
Wallace, Lori, Gulf Breeze, FL 355
Walrod, Rosemary, Olympia, WA 355
Wanko, Ginger, Catonsville, MD 355
Watts, Larry, Winterset, IA 355
Weber, Kathryn, Huntington Beach, CA 355
Weber, Matt, Bruning, NE 356
Webster, Martha, Lubbock, TX 356
Webster, Steven, Devils Lake, ND 356
Weisenborn, Heather, Watkinsville, GA 357
Welber, Arnie, Sunrise, FL 357
Welch, John, Santa Cruz, CA 357
Wert, Robert, Malvern, PA 357
Wesely, Francis, Kansas City, MO 357
West, Paul, Wichita, KS 358
West, Van, Murfreesboro, TN 358
Westrum, Tim, Albert Lea, MN 358
Westwood, Julie, Centerville, OH 358
Wheeler, Christopher, San Pedro, CA 359
Wheelock, Donnette, Mankato, MN 359
Wheelock, Greg, Mankato, MN 359
White, Cody, Chickasha, OK 360
White, Cynthia, Duxbury, MA 360
White, Derrel, Woodward, OK 360
Whitman, Cody, Venice, CA 361
Whitney, Mark, Social Circle, GA 361
Wickersham, Lisa, Caledonia, OH 362
Wiebe, Tim, McCook, NE 362
Wietbrock, Tom, Lowell, IN 362
Wilber, Cassidy, Fullerton, CA 362
Wiley, Dinah, Washington, D.C. 363
Wilkins, William, Troy, OH 364
Wilkinson, Brad, Atlanta, GA 364
Williams, Earl P., Fresno, CA 364
Williams, Everett, Madison, GA 365
Williams, Kim, Paicines, CA 368
Williams, Lindsey, Bowling Green, VA 368
Williams, Nikki, Atlanta, GA 369
Williams, Ross, Raleigh, NC 369
Williams, Ted and Louise, Lake Charles, LA 370
Willlard, Susan, Peekskill, NY 370
Wilson, Karen, Evans Mills, NY 370
Wilson, Lorne E., Arapahoe, NE 370
Windecker, Deb, Frankfort, NY 371
Winfield, Tammy L., Corvallis, OR 371
Winslow, Robert, New York, NY 372
Winter, Bette, Locust Grove, VA 372
Wollschlager, Velma, Revillo, SD 372
Woods, Jason, Sioux City, IA 373
Woolsey, Edward, Prole, IA 373
Wooton, Scott, Alden, NY 374
Worley, Don, Kettle Falls, WA 374
Worrell, Allan, Jacksonville, IL 374
Worrell, Luke, Springfield, IL 374
Wright, Dana, Knoxville, TN 375
Wright, Melissa, Redding, CT 375
Wright, Sr., Johnnie, Vance, SC 375
Wyatt, Russell, Hot Springs, SD 376
Yezbak, Dee, Strongsville, OH 376
Yost, Joy, Hayes, SD 376
Yost, Randy, Hayes, SD 377
Young, Joshua, Carlinville, IL 377

Page
Young, Nathan, Los Angeles, CA 377
Young, Thomas, Rapid City, SD 377
Yount, Curtis, New Madison, OH 378
Zanter, Keith, Beresford, SD 378
Zeeb, Paul, Sioux Falls, SD 378
Zentner, Dave, Duluth, MN 378
Ziegler, Connie, Oakley, KS 379
Ziegner, Diane, Talkeetna, AK 379
Zook, Caryl, Pembroke Pines, FL 379
Zuchowski, Pamela, Wellsboro, PA 379

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES TO FARM BILL FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

SEPTEMBER 2010

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

PREFACE

Prior to writing a new farm bill, the House Committee on Agriculture traditionally embarks on a series of field hearings throughout the United States. The purpose of these hearings is to hear testimony and gather comments and information from those whose livelihoods are most affected by the policy that the farm bill creates. For those who did not get a chance to testify at the field hearings, the Agriculture Committee created a venue in which any interested party could submit constructive comments on the direction they would like to see the new farm bill take. The Committee received over 1,000 responses to the online questionnaire, reflecting issues from commodities and conservation to organics, energy, and crop insurance. The responses are presented here, in alphabetical order, by individual name.

The Committee would like to thank all those who participated in this process. The information presented in this compilation will be helpful in future discussions related to the next farm bill.

★ ★ ★ Farm Bill Feedback ★ ★ ★

As the House Agriculture Committee prepares to consider the next Farm Bill, we want to hear from you. Please visit the Committee's website and share your thoughts about the future of farm policy.

In order for your comments to be considered part of the Committee's Farm Bill field hearing record, please submit your comments on the Committee's website by June 14, 2010.

We look forward to hearing from you!

www.agriculture.house.gov

Congressman Collin C. Peterson, Chairman
House Committee on Agriculture 1301
Longworth House Office Building,
Washingon, DC 20515, 202.225.2171

★ ★ ★

COMMENT OF BARBARA ABBOTT KING, AURORA, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Barbara Abbott King.
City, State: Aurora, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment:

Dear Members of the House Committee on Agriculture,

I have been very interested in reading about Farmer Mac and his barnyard buddies, the pigs at AIG and Goldman Sachs . . . most of whom graduated from the same school of economics at Cornell, and probably slept at the same fraternity.

I know not a better way of making money then betting on the demise of farmers like me. What chance did I have paying my mortgage by milking cows when my pay check was determined by the same people setting commodity prices by jockeying milk and lending money, and betting on my failure? The little guys are picked off but the next group, the mid-sized producers are in their sights. Dairylea has funded three expansions on my block. Unless these farmers are receiving more for their milk than the current pay-price. there is no way in hell, they can collateralize their loans. 150% per dollar of debt is demanded from FSA, and I am sure there is some kind of Federal guarantee involved in Farm Credit's liberal lending.

A few years ago, I wrote a three paragraph letter to Congressman Maurice Hinchey. I gave to his aide, Dan Lamb at a fund-raiser to give to him. I asked for an audit of the Syracuse FSA office and Western NY Farm Credit.

Farmer Mac, as I have read, sells securities to the same players who are now being investigated for selling short. Is there a better a way to gain market access, and valuable land then from a neighbor's timely demise? It's like sitting on the seat of your tractor honestly going about your work and getting picked off by sharpshooting bankers who have literally gotten away with financial murder.

Dairylea, and all of its member program tentacles reach far into the business dealings of my neighborhood and put a stranglehold on credit as well. There is a strong Dairylea/HSBC connection, as Dairylea bought up the large bank's farm debt portfolio. These days, it seems only the chosen farms survive. Farm Credit is the only farm lender in town, so the Processor weeds out those that get in the way of processing efficiencies.

Philip Angelides, chairman of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, at a hearing held by his panel on Jan. 13, questioned how banks could underwrite poisonous securities and then bet against them. "It sounds to me a little bit like selling a car with faulty brakes and then buying an insurance policy on the buyer of those cars," he said.

Following that hunch, it seems in the case of a common, shared interest, Farm Credit and Dairylea designed, manufactured. and financed, as well. It is a win-win for the big producers financed by Farm Credit, and who hold contracts owned by Dairylea. Farmer Mac's CEO was a former Farm Credit of Western NY manager so it is no surprise to me that the observations in this testimony below are obvious to the professionals in another competitive business . . . banking!

A comment about "timely lending" . . . I was put in default with FSA because that GSE lender would not subordinate my refinancing package in 2007 to my local Independent banker, although the paperwork was on the President's desk for two months ready to sign. I had good credit with both lenders, and $65,000 in a personal CD to back up my mortgage with FSA. The mortgage was written for 5% for 30 years. Terms easily affordable even with $13.00/100# milk. I was forced to surrender my cash savings to the "government bank" or I would have lost all that was secured by UCC's. Everything! Even a garbage truck that I owned that helped with the mainstay of alternate income. That UCC was filed without my permission. Guess they really wanted my land to sell at auction. My assets were valued at a million. The "Bank of Last Resort" wanted to make sure they were my Last Bank.

Predatory Lenders . . . or just plain slow? but for the Lendee the clock ticks and default approaches . . . time is not relevant to the GSE banker. Just what the inside hedgers wanted? and FSA made damn sure I defaulted by holding up refinancing proceedings. As a bonus to the Syracuse FSA office for system efficiency ratings, they successfully GOT ME OFF THEIR BOOKS! My being one of only l00 accounts, not that many to service in a premier dairy region of Central NYS. I just wasn't one of the 'premier dairies', as I was signed to Agri-Mark, a competitor of DFA, and not Dairylea.

I am curious how Dairylea orchestrates select farm expansions, and what "sophisticated instruments" are used in helping these farmers realize THEIR financial dreams. I wonder how long Farm Credit will let them live out their dreams before more valuable real estate assets are added to the Dairylea ledger. It a competitive business in the trenches, or should I say "traunches". Dairylea and Co. successfully put my business in the gutter, and subsequently shut me out of Democrat Party politics.

Congessman Ed Townes sponsored legislation to allow the GAO to audit GSE's (Farmer Mac) books in the event of a lawsuit. Are you planning to do that in your Committee as a watch dog of farmers like me? Could you reveal that subprime is still alive and well in Cayuga Co., NY, and that the very top of the market (the CME) ultimately determines the lender's credit decisions at the bottom . . . Farm Credit, Farmer Mac and CoBank ever strengthen, and so do those individuals enabling the scheme. The large farmers get their Farm Credit dividends and are always secured for whatever expansions they wish to make, and there have been many here, even in a prolonged down market.

What better way for Dairylea to make money when the milk price stays low to the processors, but the risky lendee fails due to the sustained low mailbox price. So the bet is on, by means of security sales to hedgers who already know that the farms will fail because of lack of cash. And Mr. Schumer, please don't exempt corrupt cooperatives from anti-trust. If FSA lent me money for my little processing plant I would have my own market . . . locally. Funny how they lend on cows and not a pasteurizer . . . isn't that farm equipment? I would not be forced to sign terrible contracts with terrible companies. I would be that family farm entrepreneur that my State wants me to be furnishing fresh milk, meat and grains to my hungry community.

Over the years, the same players have moved from production, processing, banking, insurance, milk boards, government agencies like chess pieces. As the Public mourns the loss of farms, really, an elaborate inside banking-trading scam is resulting in a huge and efficient transfer of wealth from Farmer Brown and family to Farmer Mac and co-conspirators. Mike Gerber knows that big deals are made with a couple phone calls. Find out, to whom.

Thank you, Barbara Abbott King, age 59, landowner since 1974.

I am adding this testimony to underscore others concerns in the banking industry years prior to the current bank failures:

TESTIMONY OF THE 108TH CONGRESS

FARMER MAC

Independent Community Bankers of America

Written Statement

JOHN EVANS, JR.,
D.L. Evans Bank,
Burley, Idaho.

Hearing to Review the Federal Agriculture Mortgage Corporation (Farmer Mac)

June 2, 2004

House Agriculture Committee
Washington, D.C.

Introduction

Thank you Chairman Goodlatte and Ranking Member Stenholm for holding this hearing on Farmer Mac and for the opportunity to provide this statement for the record. I am John Evans, Jr., CEO of D.L. Evans Bank in Burley, Idaho and also the Chairman of ICBA's Agriculture-Rural America Committee.

ICBA represents the largest constituency of community banks in the nation and is dedicated exclusively to protecting the interests of the community banking industry. Seventy-five percent of ICBA's members are located in communities with a population of 20,000 or less and our members are heavily involved in financing agriculture and rural development across the country. Commercial banks continue to provide approximately 40 percent of the financing for farmers and ranchers, more than any other lender group.

We appreciate the Committee holding this hearing. As you know, Farmer Mac is a government-sponsored enterprise (GSE) within the Farm Credit System (FCS) with a mission to provide a secondary market for agricultural mortgages. Although the purpose of this oversight hearing is to review the recent General Accounting Of-

fice (GAO) report on Farmer Mac, we would also like to offer our suggestions for additional oversight activities by the Committee pertaining to GSE's.

As you know, the housing GSE's have been under considerable scrutiny by their Congressional Committees of jurisdiction and the Administration in recent months. We believe the larger agricultural GSE, the FCS, should not be exempt from close scrutiny. We are particularly concerned about the FCA's board structure and the FCA's predilection to facilitate the FCS's expansion agenda through regulatory changes. Therefore, we believe additional hearings would provide the opportunity to build upon the Committee's oversight function by focusing attention on the broader GSE, the FCS, in addition to just looking at Farmer Mac.

Furthermore, as the numbers show, the use of the Farmer Mac I program by commercial banks has decreased significantly over time. In light of this, we believe there is a need for further program enhancements that would improve the usefulness of Farmer Mac for community banks. The use of the Farmer Mac II program by banks continues to be significant.

We have several recommendations for improving the Farmer Mac I program that we believe would allow banks to more fully utilize this secondary market for agricultural real estate loans.

Greater GSE Oversight

The Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee has held 7 hearings on GSE's in the 108th Congress and the House Financial Services Committee has held 3 such hearings this Congress. Given that Farmer Mac is part of the FCS, a GSE, and the Administration's recent concerns over the housing GSE's and its efforts to enact new legislation establishing a stronger regulator, we believe it would be appropriate for the Committee to hold a hearing focusing on the role the FCA plays as the regulator of the FCS, of which Farmer Mac is an independent entity.

Even though the FCS is regulated by the FCA, which is charged with regulating and examining all FCS institutions, it is important to point out that the FCA board has no mandated participation by members that are objectively and primarily concerned about protecting the general public's interests. It is possible, for example, for all three members of the FCA board to have previously been employed by the FCS and/or have direct ties to the FCS.

Here are some recent examples of the FCS expansionist agenda, which are described in more detail below.

Allowance of illegal activities by institutions if using "excess capacity in good faith".

Scope and Eligibility proposal that would allow unlimited lending to anyone for non-agricultural purposes even if the borrower has only a tangential involvement in agriculture.

Development of broad new lending programs under the guise of "investment" authorities.

Illegal Activities

The FCA allows FCS institutions to engage in "illegal activities" if it is proven that the institution is operating with so-called "excess capacity and good faith". This has the effect of encouraging more FCS institutions to seek the same exemptions for illegal activities and to build up excess capacity for this purpose. We believe such decisions have dubious legal underpinnings and should cause the Committee major concerns given the FCA's role as a regulator to prohibit any illegal activities by FCS institutions. The fact that a regulator would continuously allow illegal activities to take place under the guise of "excess capacity and good faith" certainly calls into question its objectivity and the level of independence the regulatory agency and its general counsel has regarding the industry it is mandated to regulate.

Scope and Eligibility

This proposal would allow the FCS to go far beyond its traditional GSE mission of serving "*bona fide*" farmers as required by statute and allow the System to make an unlimited amount of loans virtually unrelated to agriculture to borrowers that have little or no real involvement in farming. This proposal is currently pending within the FCA.

Investments as Loans

The FCA board recently directed staff to prepare a proposed rule allowing FCS institutions to offer retail lending for business and consumer loans for items completely unrelated to agriculture. This "Farmers Notes" proposal would allow the FCA to take a minor statutory authority to regulate FCS investments and turn it into broad retail and consumer-lending programs. We believe this is an abuse of FCA's authorities and was never envisioned by Congress.

It is important to point out that such actions by the FCA have a direct bearing, not only on FCS institutions, but also on all lenders involved in the rural credit markets, including thousands of community banks across the country. According to the Federal Reserve, there were 2,600 agricultural banks as of June 30, 2002 and thousands of other banks lend in rural areas. Further expansion of what is supposed to be a limited purpose GSE to one that competes against the private sector by providing retail lending products and services to all rural residents will diminish the ability of community banks to serve agriculture and rural communities, resulting in fewer credit choices for rural residents.

To begin addressing some of these issues, we offer the following recommendations:

Increase the FCA board from 3 members to 5 members, adding board members who are objective and required to be principally concerned with protecting the public interest. This would help diminish criticism of the FCA as an advocate for the FCS and allow it to be considered an arms-length, objective, world-class regulator, on par with the housing GSE regulator that the Senate Banking Committee and House Committee on Financial Services are working to establish.

Prohibit the FCA from using the so-called "excess capacity and good faith" loophole and require the FCA to publish all instances of illegal activities by FCS institutions.

Prohibit the FCS from using their so-called "investment authority" as a façade for expanded lending activities.

Require the FCA to monitor and report on below-market, predatory pricing practices of FCS lenders.

Reduce or eliminate FCA's exemptions under the Freedom of Information Act, as it appears the agency is creating a lack of transparency and accountability to the public, by using closed board meetings to consider important policy matters.

Banks' Use of Farmer Mac I

Community banks were a strong advocate for the creation of a secondary market for agricultural real estate loans when Farmer Mac was chartered in 1987. However, the participation of banks in the Farmer Mac I program has decreased from 80 percent of program loans in 1996 to 22 percent in 2002, according to the 2003 GAO report on Farmer Mac. The FCS now accounts for about 55 percent of Farmer Mac I loans. For comparison, commercial banks held 34 percent of the nationwide agricultural real estate debt in 2003, while the FCS held 36 percent. As can be seen from these numbers, commercial banks have not been able to utilize the Farmer Mac I program on a level comparable with their agricultural real estate lending volume because the program has not been user friendly for community banks and small lenders.

To give a personal perspective, my bank was the 6th largest originator of Farmer Mac I loans in 1999 and this year we haven't originated a single loan with Farmer Mac. We have dropped from originating $11–$12 million in loans four years ago to $0 this year in the Farmer Mac I program. This tells me there are some issues that need to be resolved so that community banks can resume the level of activity that once existed.

New Farmer Mac Products

In 1999, Farmer Mac introduced a long-term standby purchase commitment (LTSPC) product, which is a commitment by Farmer Mac to purchase eligible loans from financial institutions at a future date if the loan deteriorates or the holder chooses to sell the loan. This program allows lenders to transfer the credit risk of loans to Farmer Mac, while maintaining the loan in their portfolio. In exchange for this agreement, the lender must pay Farmer Mac an annual commitment fee based on the outstanding balance of the loans covered by the LTSPC. Commercial banks have not participated in the LTSPC program to date; only FCS institutions have been participants in the LTSPC, which now represents approximately 40 percent of Farmer Mac's loan and guarantee portfolio. As of year-end 2003, there were $2.3 billion of LTSPC with Farmer Mac.

We will be exploring the LTSPC program further with commercial bank lenders to ascertain whether Farmer Mac is marketing the program equally aggressively to banks as to FCS associations.

In a positive move, Farmer Mac is planning to eliminate some of the pre-payment penalties on their products, which should be a help for lenders who have not used Farmer Mac because of the potential costs of such penalties if borrowers decide to pay off the loan earlier than anticipated.

Recommendations for Farmer Mac

The GAO report on Farmer Mac in 2003, "Some Progress Made, but Greater Attention to Risk Management, Mission, and Corporate Governance is Needed" out-

lines a number of recommendations for Farmer Mac and its board to undertake as well as recommendations for the FCA and Congress. GAO urged the FCA to assess and report on the impact Farmer Mac activities have on the agricultural real estate lending market.

But, Farmer Mac also needs to focus on further developing and enhancing its offerings to the thousands of community banks in rural America. There may be some external issues that have contributed to the reduced level of participation by community banks in Farmer Mac programs. However, we believe there are significant internal issues that need to be addressed that would allow banks to better utilize the Farmer Mac I program. We would recommend the following:

Offer more competitive interest rate options so Farmer Mac loans are competitive with the FCS.

Ensure consistency in the application of underwriting standards across loans.

Provide for electronic submission of loan packages and ensure an efficient approval process (days, not weeks or months as has been the case).

Ensure all users of Farmer Mac, both large and small, are treated equally.

Greater outreach and communications by Farmer Mac to community banks and promote products without bias to the types and size of lenders.

Require Farmer Mac to engage in four to six well-publicized listening sessions with agricultural lenders in different regions of the U.S. to gather input and ideas on how to streamline and enhance their products.

Consider eventually altering the makeup of the Farmer Mac board by reducing the board size. This would include reducing the number of seats allotted to the FCS representatives, since this is supposed to be an independent entity within FCS, and placing a cap on the total number at eleven members instead of the fifteen members now on the board.

Farmer Mac II

While commercial banks' use of the Farmer Mac I program has been on the decrease, the smaller Farmer Mac II program, which buys the guaranteed portion of USDA loans, continues to be used primarily by banks. In 2003, 650 lenders participated in the Farmer Mac II program, about 95 percent of which were commercial banks. The 2003 loan volume was approximately $270 million with a total loan portfolio of $1.5 billion.

Conclusion

In short, Farmer Mac was to provide a simple mechanism for lenders to securitize pools of long-term agricultural real estate loans at a low overhead cost, freeing up additional capital to lend to farmers. At this point, we believe Farmer Mac still has room for improvement if it is to reach the expectations that were envisioned when it was created. In particular, if Farmer Mac is to ever achieve the success once envisioned, it must offer a better array of competitively priced products tailored to the needs of community banks. It does not now offer products that allow community banks to compete with FCS lenders. This reality is inconsistent with lowering the cost of credit to farmers. Congress should ask "Why"? Why are the Farmer Mac interest rates uncompetitive with those of the FCS? And, why is its cost of funds in the AgVantage program uncompetitive with the other sources of funds?

Again, we thank the Committee for holding this hearing and for the opportunity to provide this input. We urge the Committee to hold additional hearings in the future on the impact of both agriculturally oriented GSE's. If the housing GSE's and their regulatory structure are going to receive intense scrutiny by Congress, the Agriculture Committees would be remiss to avoid similar scrutiny over the GSE's under their oversight—particularly the Farm Credit System.

ICBA would welcome the opportunity to assist in the implementation of any recommendations that will improve Farmer Mac programs in a way that is beneficial to community banks.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF KRISTIN ADAIR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Kristin Adair.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Legislative Counsel.
Comment:

A Farm Bill That Promotes a Healthier America

The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) supports passage of a Farm Bill with significant changes to agriculture and nutrition policy—changes that will improve the health of Americans by providing healthy meals (low-fat/low-cholesterol/high-fiber) to school children, senior citizens and needy families; and making it easier to purchase healthful foods.

Health Priorities for the Farm Bill:

- Minority groups disproportionately rely upon federal food programs. Minorities have higher rates of virtually every chronic disease related to over-consumption of fat and under-consumption of fiber. The majority also cannot digest lactose. Improving the quality of foods can serve to significantly reduce demographic health disparities.
- Food programs must be based on the health needs of their constituents. Therefore, they must emphasize vegetables, fruits, nuts, legumes, whole grains, plant-based (vegetarian) meals, and nondairy beverages.
- The sole criterion for federal expenditure on commodities for most food programs, including school lunch and breakfast, is supporting producers. There is no statutory health basis for these expenditures. USDA spent eight times more on beef, cheese, and butter than on all fresh fruits and vegetables combined.
- Any federal expenditure that effectively procures commodities for federal food programs, especially child nutrition programs like school lunch and breakfast, must be based solely on science-based information on the role of food in health and illness.
- Subsidies for corn and soy may undermine Americans' health more than any other federal policy. Corn and soy, which together with dairy and meat comprise about 73% of total agriculture subsidies, are primarily used as feed. Corn and soy subsidies are a direct discount to factory farms producing meat, dairy, and eggs. Byproducts of feed production are sugars and oils also made from corn and soy.
- Congress should significantly reduce or eliminate any subsidies that support production of commodities high in saturated fat and cholesterol—especially corn and soy.

Summary of Priorities for the Farm Bill:

- Significantly reduce or eliminate subsidies that support production of commodities high in saturated fat and cholesterol.
- Increase the availability of food that is low in fat and high in fiber by augmenting Conservation and other Programs to provide incentives for farmers engaged in production of meat and feed crops to shift to the production of fruits, vegetables, legumes, and whole grains.
- Bring federal food assistance programs in line with science-based information about the role of food in health and illness.
- Expand the foods available to recipients of federal nutrition programs to include healthy nondairy beverages, and to emphasize fruits, vegetables, legumes and whole grains.
- Make it easier for students in the School Lunch and School Breakfast program to receive low-fat, low cholesterol, high fiber meals, as well as nondairy alternative beverages.
- Provide grants to every school in every state to ensure adequate supply of fruits, vegetables, legumes, and whole grains for school meals.
- Authorize a substantial increase in funding for any discretionary food assistance programs to increase the availability of fruits and vegetables.
- Increase funding for any programs that provide incentives for or otherwise promote the consumption of fruits, vegetables, legumes, and whole grains.

Founded in 1985, PCRM is a nonprofit health organization that promotes preventive medicine, especially good nutrition. PCRM also conducts clinical research studies, opposes unethical human experimentation, and promotes alternatives to animal research. PCRM has more than 100,000 members nationwide comprised of physicians and lay people.

COMMENT OF ERIC ADERHOLD, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 3:35 a.m.

Name: Eric Aderhold.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Software engineer.
Comment: I would like to ask Congress to please consider reducing or eliminating subsidies for commodity crops such as corn. By artificially lowering the market price of these crops, Congress is encouraging the use of unhealthy food ingredients that have been shown to contribute to the worsening health of this country.

Commodity crop subsidies are a major reason why junk food is less expensive than fruits and vegetables. This needs to stop. The U.S. is the world's largest exporter of food. As such, the American people would be in no danger of starving if a few farmers exited the market after losing their subsidies. Furthermore, in times of trillion dollar deficits, it is imperative that we cut everything out of the budget that we can possibly do without.

As a graduate of Iowa State University, I know full well the impact that the agriculture industry makes on rural economies. Even so, I think the rewards we would see in terms of public health and better fiscal solvency are well worth the risk.

Thank you for your consideration,

ERIC ADERHOLD.

COMMENT OF BRIAN ADKINS, CHILHOWEE, MO

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Brian Adkins.
City, State: Chilhowee, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: The unavailability of non personal information (primarily tillable acres.) from FSA makes my job very difficult and affects the accuracy/integrity of my reports. By having to estimate the tillable acres . . . I cannot accurately appraise an agricultural property. Please consider revising this oversight from the previous bill.

Thanks,

BRIAN ADKINS,
Ritter Appraisals, Inc.
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF RYAN AGATE, SOMERVILLE, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Ryan Agate.
City, State: Somerville, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Print Buyer.
Comment: I am just writing to let you know that I think there needs to be some sort of change in the current system, getting farmers to produce sustainable foods over the overproduction they are doing now, and getting more fruits and vegetables. It makes sense to keep things local and I know that cannot work, but encouraging farmers to grow things that will keep their soil fertile and give them and future generations a chance to provide people with things they really need is important.

COMMENT OF EVA AGUDELO, BELLINGHAM, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Eva Agudelo.
City, State: Bellingham, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nonprofit small farmer advocate.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF LOWELL AKERS, SYCAMORE, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Lowell Akers.
City, State: Sycamore, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Rural Appraiser & Professional Farm Manager.
Comment: Since the access to information at the FSA offices has not been available to me and the services, such as AgriData, Inc. I subscribe to my work has been more difficult and more time involved to complete appraisals. As a result, my fees have to be increased. This is true of all appraisers of rural properties. The cost to the farmers and farm owners is greater as a result.

Since tax money is involved, it would appear this is and over protection to those receiving it.

USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF DONALD ALBERTSON, SPRING MILLS, PA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Donald Albertson.
City, State: Spring Mills, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Software Developer.
Comment: Dairy Farmers need a fair price for their milk. I'm not talking about thousand cow confined feeding operations, I mean family farmers with 100 cows or less. Continuing to concentrate production on fewer and fewer large farms exposes everyone to the risks of a catastrophic failure in a small area. (Like seafood from the Gulf, for example.)

COMMENT OF JACKIE ALBERTSON, COURTLAND & REPUBLIC, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Jackie Albertson.
City, State: Courtland & Republic, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retail Business.
Comment: I feel that we CANNOT do accurate work if we are not allowed to have access to the mapping system. We print maps for ALL our FARMER CUS-

TOMERS so that we get to the right field and can soil sample and grid sample for them to put on the right PRODUCTS. If we aren't allowed to have this info our business will go down hill.

COMMENT OF ZOEY ALDERMAN-TUTTLE, VIENNA, OH

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Zoey Alderman-Tuttle.
City, State: Vienna, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: Monetary support for company-owned or corporate farming should cease or, at the very least, be severely curtailed. Instead, the Farm Bill could benefit the economy by subsidizing or providing assistance for small farmers. There is a tremendous interest in sustainability and agriculture among young people, and a supportive Farm Bill would ensure that farming becomes a real career choice for many, not just a hobby or a job that one does in addition to another. This is a job sector that many are interested in, but in which they cannot compete with the large agribusinesses.

but gradually, in a way that gives farmers time to diversify. There is so much corn and soy that it forms part of almost every processed food, many hygiene products, and much packaging. Humans are omnivores—so much corn can be the attributed cause of many health problems, including obesity, due to an imbalance of nutrition. Furthermore, almost all our meat is corn fed. Cattle do not eat corn naturally, but grass. Again, we are losing trace nutrients that come only from the grass and soil cows consume naturally. Salmon are being engineered to eat corn. This is clearly neither natural or right, and the last thing Americans need is a diet with more corn. Repeated monocropping of corn and/or soy destroys the land and robs farmers of money.

Instead, formulate a real (without the numerous loopholes and costs that render the USDA organic label unreliable for consumers and monetarily unattainable for small farmers) definition of permaculture (growing diverse crops in a sustainable ecosystem-like pattern), and subsidize farmers who employ permaculture. Permaculture protects the soil from degradation, reduces dependence on foreign oil (less equipment is needed), reduces pests and the needs for pesticides and herbicides, and promotes biodiversity. Permaculture also allows small farmers to grow enough variety to make local farmers' markets more appealing to the consumer and profitable to the farmer. Money in the markets means money in the local economy, which means local jobs, which leads to economic recovery of a more sustainable kind. Furthermore, local permaculture will help to ensure that America does not suffer the devastating food crises occurring in Africa and other parts of the world. It will allow for more specialized flexibility at a time when the climate is rapidly changing (partly caused by methane from feedlot cattle, carbon lost through monoculture, and from the chemicals and elements used in pesticides and tractors).

Finally, GMO growth and use should not in any way be encouraged or subsidized. God has given us all the biodiversity that humankind can need. GMOs are appealing when the land is destroyed through monocropping, when monoculture has led to the appearance of disease, and when farms are so large that weeding becomes too difficult. With permaculture or even smaller farms, the need for GMOs will disappear, and the world will not starve more than it already is with them.

In conclusion, the 2012 Farm Bill most pressingly needs to stop supporting agribusiness to the detriment of small farmers, and this will boost the economy. The Bill needs also to gradually cease the subsidization of corn and soybeans, instead subsidizing permaculture. This will make the U.S. more independent and stable in terms of food and national security. It will also improve the health of Americans and reduce obesity. Finally, GMOs are not any kind of answer. Please consider the future, small farmers, and all those who eat with health and love in mind.

Thank you for your time and careful consideration.

COMMENT OF ALICE ALLEN, WELLS RIVER, VT

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Alice Allen.
City, State: Wells River, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.

Comment: For thirty-seven years I've been in business as a dairy farmer. The past four years as certified organic. It doesn't matter whether we are conventional or organic one of the major problems in all of agriculture is "CONSOLIDATION of MARKETS". At present there is government attention to antitrust violations—especially in dairy. BUT, we need action more sooner than later! For most of my years in the dairy business I've been actively involved in milk marketing coops, milk marketing study groups and was even sent to Washington, D.C. to meet with staff members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees (Aug. 2001) to give a farmer perspective on the dangers of consolidation in dairy marketing. To what avail? If anyone is interested I am willing to share more of my thoughts for the new farm bill. THANK YOU.

COMMENT OF AMANDA ALLEN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Amanda Allen.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Attorney.
Comment: As an only national multi-issue Asian and Pacific Islander women's advocacy organization, the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF) would like to express our strong support to ensure that the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill of 2012) removes barriers to the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) that prevent immigrant women and their family members from enrolling in this vital anti-hunger program. As a women's rights organization, we recommend that the following provisions be included into Farm Bill 2012 to eliminate some of these harmful barriers.

1. Fairness for legal immigrants. Eliminate the five year waiting period imposed on immigrant adults under current law. Hunger does not wait five years, nor should lawfully residing families have to wait before gaining access to the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program. Currently, women and girls represent more than half of the immigrant population gaining legal permanent resident status. Yet immigrant Asian women face immigration restrictions, language barriers, and social constraints that limit their ability to achieve economic self-sufficiency and independence. They are twice as likely as their male counterparts to be widowed, divorced, or separated. They are also more likely than U.S. born women to live in poverty, be unemployed, and lack health insurance. When they do join the work force, immigrant women are relegated to low-wage work sectors despite having similar educational attainment levels as U.S.-born women. Removing barriers to SNAP would encourage immigrant women to be self-sustainable and provide for their families.

2. Clarify eligibility for immigrant families with children. Eliminate sponsor deeming rules for SNAP households that include children. Exempting only immigrant children from deeming does not go far enough to remove barriers that prevent U.S. citizen and lawfully residing immigrant children from obtaining assistance or that reduce the amount of food available to these families. Removing barriers in SNAP would help immigrant women's ability to support their families. According to the U.S. census data, approximately 85% of immigrant families with children are mixed status families. Confusion over eligibility under the immigration and legal systems deters many immigrant women from seeking necessary social care for themselves and their children. Furthermore, majority of foreign-born women are of childbearing age. Approximately 42% of immigrant women are between the ages of 25–44 years old, while U.S. born women comprise approximately 26% of that age segment. The proportion of childbearing-aged women increases among Asian and Pacific Islanders; about half of API women are of reproductive age. Immigrant women should not be afraid to access necessary social services such as food stamps both for themselves and their children.

We urge Congress to reauthorize the Farm Bill and strengthen the SNAP program to meet the needs of hungry families and promote program participation.

COMMENT OF RONALD ANDERSEN, WASHINGTON, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Ronald Andersen.

City, State: Washington, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As a certified real estate appraiser, my obligation to my clients is to provide the market value of agriculture property. Without the availability of accurate information on field sizes, CRP *etc.,* on farms, I cannot readily do my job. The bill for the whole ag. program is paid from taxes, so the information on farms should not be any more private than the pay for teachers, police and other public employees. Please consider the need for open information for appraisers to be able to do the job we are obligated to do. Thanks.

COMMENT OF DOUG ANDERSON, JUNIATA, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Doug Anderson.
City, State: Juniata, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retailer.
Comment: The CLU data is essential to provide accurate and precise custom applications.

COMMENT OF DWAYNE ANDERSON, LYNN CENTER, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Dwayne Anderson.
City, State: Lynn Center, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: As a farm owner/operator and ag business owner and professional, I urge you to support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. Your support will reinforce the huge benefits that CLU data provides for businesses who work closely with producers, particularly providing producers more timely, accurate and cost-effective services. If you are reluctant in any way to support this measure, I want to remind you that in Section 1619 there is no compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data. Thank you in advance for your support.

COMMENT OF GLEN ANDERSON, LACEY, WA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Glen Anderson.
City, State: Lacey, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired government professional.
Comment: Small farms made America great.
Giant agribusiness is destroying small farms.
The federal government has been subsidizing giant agribusiness and hurting small farms. REVERSE YOUR PRIORITIES!!!
Support small farms and very small farms.
Stop giant agribusiness with its chemical-intensive practices which destroy our environment and consume petroleum and natural gas.
Support truly organic farming. Do NOT water down the meaning of the term "organic."

COMMENT OF LINDA ANDERSON, OKEMOS, MI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Linda Anderson.
City, State: Okemos, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please support sustainable agriculture, urban agriculture, and access for all income groups to healthy food in the next Farm Bill.

Although I personally live in an affluent ZIP CODE and can afford to buy whatever food I want, I work (as a volunteer) in Lansing in a neighborhood where access to healthy food is a challenge. With colleagues, I have started a nonprofit corporation to support city farms on vacant property to grow vegetables to sell to local residents at reduced prices (*i.e.,* prices that sustain the farm, but are affordable to low-income residents). Ventures like ours need help to get started, like any other small business, but can then stand on their own. If the Farm Bill included support, either through grants or low-interest loans, it would go a long way toward making more healthy food available to people at all income levels.

COMMENT OF NATHAN ANGELUS, PORTLAND, OR

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Nathan Angelus.
City, State: Portland, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Accountant.
Comment: I believe local community agriculture support is of great benefit. Support of our local farmers and food producers keeps money in the local community. In this time of economic uncertainty additional support provided through the farm bill would bolster local economies. Please consider these small producers when deciding on oversight and regulatory norms. We need oversight that works to keep us safe and healthy that suits large agribusiness however this same oversight could hurt the small producer. Please consider this.

I am not in the food/farming/agriculture business. I am just a citizen who believes there are practical benefits to supporting smaller local farmers such as boosting the local economy and less dependence on foreign oil which assists in national security.

Thank you for considering my opinions when deciding on the farm bill.

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH ANTRIM-CASHIN, DOBBS FERRY, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:06 a.m.
Name: Elizabeth Antrim-Cashin.
City, State: Dobbs Ferry, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: I realize that this bill is trying to be brought together more quickly than originally anticipated, and I am writing in hopes that this does not mean that changes in policies and money allotments will be any less radical.

We are in the beginning stages of what could be an absolute revolution in the way we farm. Organic, bio-dynamic, alternative: farming that involves a little more thought and a little less chemicals is beginning to gain rapid popularity. The sustainability of the sustainable movement, however, is utterly dependent on changes in policy.

Now, more than ever, changes in our lives are calling for a change in agriculture. The passing of health care legislation indicates that the government is ready to do something reactionary in response to rising health costs and increased rates of diet-related illness. The 2012 Farm Bill has the chance to do something preventative, by changing diets before we end up in hospitals.

In addition, the rate of unemployment is at 9.7%, and thousands of Americans are sitting, unemployed, on plots of land that could be utilized as the demand for local and organic sources of food increases.

What I would love to see in this bill is an expansion of the list of subsidized crops and a reallotment of subsidies and incentive money that encourages polycultures and diversity. In addition, money should be allotted to a transition program that would aid in educating farmers about organic methods, and in recruiting new farmers.

Organic agriculture is one of the fastest growing segments in U.S. agriculture, and it is your responsibility to reflect these changes in your policy decisions.

COMMENT OF TOM ARCHIBALD, ITHACA, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Tom Archibald.
City, State: Ithaca, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Graduate Student and Evaluator.

Comment: I applaud recent increases in support for organic and small-holding farmers in recent years yet I also strongly urge you to redouble such efforts. I believe that support for large, industrial farming is still disproportionate in the Farm Bill—hiding the hidden costs and externalities which allow the continuation of unwise and unsustainable practices with dire consequences for our country's health, nutrition, energy use, and community vitality.

My first child will be born later this summer—your decision to increase support for organic and small-holding farmers will be a huge step in ensuring that she has access to healthy, sustainably produced food and can live in a strong, vibrant, diverse rural community. I thank you in advance.

COMMENT OF ALLISON ASBURY, PITTSBURGH, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 p.m.

Name: Allison Asbury.

City, State: Pittsburgh, PA.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Chronically laid off.

Comment: Do right by your benefactors (the taxpayers) and support local, sustainable production. Our government should be ENCOURAGING small scale farming, not hindering these efforts! Show us that we have a government by the people and for the people, not the corporations. Our government seems either inept or corrupt (or both). Going after raw milk and small farms? Worry about factory farms which produce dangerous and/or non-nutritious food!

COMMENT OF SCOTT ASKEROOTH, FARGO, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 12:05 a.m.

Name: Scott Askerooth.

City, State: Fargo, ND.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Insurance Adjuster/Agent.

Comment: I have spent 29 years out of my 49 years, working crop insurance claims and running crop companies from North Dakota to Kansas and all states in between. I have personally worked (adjusted in the field), and been responsible for over 5,000 claims, paying out countless millions of dollars to insured's. My expertise in the crop insurance industry is second to no one from claims, to production to compliance and reinsurance agreements.

it but what our elected representatives are trying to do to this program is absolutely idiotic, disingenuous and completely without moral character.

The Crop Insurance program administered by private insurance companies and independent insurance agents are without doubt, the brightest and most professional businessmen and women in the country.

I am very much opposed to reducing the reimbursement and underwriting gains to the companies. This will negatively affect the servicing policies and ultimately, claims. This I know for a fact as I have been in this industry my entire life, and prior to that, my father and grand father were in the crop hail business since 1919.

Companies and Insurance agents like myself, do not need the USDA to mandate the income of private Insurance Companies or private Insurance Agents. This administration is hell bent on making certain that everyone is at the same level and hamstringing all who want to make a better life for themselves.

Reducing profits for Companies and reducing commission to agents is just unfair and on the heals of being a socialist theme.

Crop Insurance is a unique field that is different than any other type of insurance and MUST be treated differently. Listening to Government bureaucrats and so called professional and industry experts carry on about the excess profits of companies is laughable. Does anyone remember the 1980's and the high loss ratios and excessive losses that companies had and which took years to make up those losses?

It appears that some in Congress and other Government offices have it in for some companies and agents with the appearance of being personal in nature.

Crop Insurance is business, pure and simple. Companies and agents perform a service to another business. It should not and cannot be the Governments role to regulate all aspects of a business that was asked to take over the Federal Crop program back in 1980. There is a reason why the Congressman and Senators wrote into law, the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act. Because they understood, they could not handle it in an efficient and professional manner.

The Crop Insurance program is actuarial sound for the most part, and profits are on the rise for BOTH the USDA and private companies, I wonder if this is the reason why the USDA wants to hamstring companies and lower their profits? Once has to wonder.

Lowering the reimbursement to companies will adversely affect all aspects of the crop insurance program from administration to claims and ultimately, will negatively affect the insured, the farmer. As I said, I doubt that there is anyone in this country that has had the amount of experience I have personally had dealing with all aspects of the crop insurance program and I can assure you, reducing the reimbursement will be the start of insured not taking out the necessary risk management protection that they need.

If you ever want to talk and get the real answers from someone that won't blow smoke up any ones shorts, you know where to get a hold of me.

COMMENT OF FAYE ASMUNDSON, BERTHOLD, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Faye Asmundson.
City, State: Berthold, ND
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Agent.
Comment: Please do not make any changes to the current crop insurance program. My farmers like the program as it is, and none of them are in favor of ACRE or SURE. Please use the SURE and ACRE monies to keep the crop insurance program the good risk management tool that it is. It has worked over the past many years, and will continue to serve our farmers well if funding is there to keep it as is. The ACRE and SURE programs are not the answer to a disaster program, so the money to fund them would go to better use in crop insurance. It is imperative not to cut crop insurance subsidies; the program is working as is. Thank you.

COMMENT OF GENE ATKINS, MULESHOE, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Gene Atkins.
City, State: Muleshoe, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1000+ acres.
Comment:

Honorable Committee,

I have several hundred highly erodible acres in Lamb/Bailey Counties in Texas. It has provided wild life cover and water sources for several years. It is my understanding that the CRP program has not met the target acres first appropriated for. My land was not renewed after receiving a letter from Kansas City that it would be. I would like to have it back in the CRP program. Please do not do away with this program and allow us to resign up these sensitive acres.

Sincerely,

GENE.

COMMENT OF TRACY AUGENSTEIN, EAST LANSING, MI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Tracy Augenstein.
City, State: East Lansing, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Registered Nurse.
Comment: Please consider the plight of CAFO raised animals and enact legislation protecting them from cruel and inhumane living and slaughter conditions across the country. I would also like to see more funding and support for organic farming to help with greening the environment and ecosystem sustainability. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please watch *Earthlings* the documentary which highlights the issues plaguing factory farming and the environment.

COMMENT OF KENT AUMANN, NOKOMIS, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Kent Aumann.
City, State: Nokomis, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser, Auctioneer.
Comment: I support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. This data is important to assist in the valuation and sale of farm land. There is no personal or financial data in this information. Just acres and soil types. Please consider the Reinstatement of this important information.

Thank you,

KENT AUMANN.

COMMENT OF RICH AUST, GERMANTOWN, TN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Rich Aust.
City, State: Germantown, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professional Farm Manager.
Comment: One of the problems we all know we will face is the continued extension of fixed payments under the DCP program. We are now in the third farm bill with this program. The problem is that these payments, by being tied to crop bases, subsidize the land tract and not the producer for the crop he is taking a risk on in any given year. We continue to set ourselves up for continued criticism by not changing the program. Pay a producer on the risk they take in that year; not on some historical bases that were built up in times past. If a producer grows all corn and beans in a given year then why would USDA pay them for cotton and rice base if the farm had any. They are not taking the risk of growing rice or cotton that year. Farmers make their decision on what to plant based on profitability. The farm program should pay fairly based on what is out there—not what someone might return to in three years.

COMMENT OF LENORE AUSTIN, IDAHO FALLS, ID

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Lenore Austin.
City, State: Idaho Falls, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraisal Service Representative.
Comment: As an Appraisal Service Representative I assist rural appraisers in gathering information for property appraisals. Every case we do needs an aerial map for correct assignment of land type. If we did not have use of the AgriData site, we'd have to contact respective FSA offices for this information which would be time consuming. All the information we use if for the benefit of our clients.

COMMENT OF SHARON AVIS, DOS PALOS, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Sharon Avis.
City, State: Dos Palos, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Farm Owner.
Comment: It is very important to provide responsible access to water for California farmers. If we don't, the U.S. will find itself reliant on foreign nations to provide food for our Country. We cannot allow this to happen. We are already sending industry and manufacturing to other countries and it is time to stop. It is time to support local growth and provide jobs for our citizens through industry, commerce, agriculture to keep the U.S. viable and strong.

SHARON AVIS.

COMMENT OF SARAH B., METTER, GA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 10:06 p.m.

Name: Sarah B.
City, State: Metter, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Struggling beginner farmer and struggling landlord.
Comment: I am a female socially disadvantaged beginner farmer, and a landlord. I am finding it very difficult to assess information. When I call the USDA, FSA or any of the other agricultural office's they are always in a hurry to get off the phone and saying I do not qualify for any grant or low income program, most of the time before I can explain the program clearly that I am referring too, they tell me they are not familiar with the grant or program I am inquiring about. I spoke with a director in the rural housing department in the FSA Office in Lamar County, Barnesville, Ga. He claimed he did not know anything about the programs I was referring too. Ask me where did I get my information from, I told him, I got the information from the FSA and USDA website. He said I can not believe the information on the website. I ask him if he was familiar with the programs he was responsible for sharing and explaining to the people interested in applying for the programs. He ask me to tell him where I found the information and I walked him over all the programs I was referring to and all at once he said his computer could not click on NOFA page. I need help in getting my farm going and with renting my apartments that most of my tenants can not afford to pay because of lack of work and minimum income. I am trying to hold on but things are really bad. It would be wonderful if I could get a farm grant and a section 8 housing grant so my tenants will have some place to call home for a while. A renovation grant will also be great so they would a place they can be happy to live in. Lamar County has an extremely high unemployment rate, since most of the factories have closed. Tried getting a loan but my credit score is so low I do not qualify for a loan. NEED HELP !!!!!!! By the way, all the agents at the FSA, USDA, NIFA and others should be trained and required to have knowledge about their jobs or fired. Because I do not know any one they have helped. It appears as if they are saving the funds for the people they know. Please, please someone, please reads this.

COMMENT OF SUSAN BACKER, COURTENAY, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 12, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Susan Backer.
City, State: Courtenay, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dry Beans & Peas, Field Crops.
Size: 1000+ acres.
Comment: Crop Insurance is our BEST RISK MANAGEMENT TOOL and it's working. Our ag lenders like it also. We do not like whole farm units, it has too many variables. DO NOT LET Congress CUT any subsidy to the farmer for the purchase of crop insurance. Our next farm bill needs to relate to crop insurance and respond more quickly with our changing weather patterns and farming practices.

COMMENT OF VERNON BAEHLER, MOSCOW, KS

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Vernon Baehler.
City, State: Moscow, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agriculture Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am asking that you consider reinstating the CLU data in Section 1619 of the Farm Bill. I you this information for the appraisal's I do for producers. I my case so they can obtain financing for operating or land purchases.

Thank you for your time,

VERNON BAEHLER,
Appraiser,
Farm Credit of Southwest Kansas.

COMMENT OF KRYSTINA BAIR, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Krystina Bair.
City, State: Seattle, WA.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Purchaser.
Comment: Organic, sustainable agriculture is the future. There is no other way to maintain healthy life on this planet. Money and power need to be taken out of the hands of those that continue to pollute our world with chemical fertilizers and pesticides (*i.e.,* MONSANTO). Please do whatever it takes to shift the paradigm from large agribusiness & factory farms to sustainable, organic family farms. Thank you.

COMMENT OF DAVID BAKER, HERMOSA, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: David Baker.
City, State: Hermosa, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: Section 1619 and the lack of CLU data has increased the time required to complete an agricultural appraisal and has, therefore, increased the cost of an appraisal to the user. Section 1619 was not part of the 2008 Farm Bill, but was inserted into the bill during the Conference Committee process without public input. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not include compliance information, wetland, CRP or ownership information so allowing appraiser to access this information does not violate privacy concerns or reveal confidential information. The prohibition of allowing public access to CLU data creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts the appraisers ability to provide timely service. Please remove the Section 1619 restriction from the upcoming farm bill.

COMMENT OF PATRICIA BAKER, BOSTON, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Patricia Baker.
City, State: Boston, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chair, Massachusetts Food SNAP Coalition.
Comment:

Dear Members of the House Committee on Agriculture:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments in anticipation of your deliberations on the 2012 Farm Bill. Please accept these comments on behalf of members of the Massachusetts Food SNAP Coalition. The Coalition formed in 2000 to address the Commonwealth's woefully low participation in the federally-funded food stamp program. The Coalition is comprised of representatives from community based anti-hunger organizations, hospital and community health care clinics, social services and day care agencies, legal services advocates, faith-based organizations, private foundations, immigrant organizations, local city government representatives, the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (DTA), the Executive Office of Elder Affairs, and the USDA Food and Nutrition Service (FNS).

For the past ten years, the Coalition has worked closely with DTA and FNS to identify and promote policies, pilots and waivers that expand participation and increase the value of monthly SNAP benefits in the Commonwealth. Many Coalition members also directly assist households in filing SNAP applications, securing documents for eligibility and otherwise assisting low income households to access these benefits. The primary goal of the Coalition is to increase the ability of low-income households in Massachusetts to buy food in a dignified and client-centered way, and to thereby address the root cause of hunger.

Before giving your specific recommendations for the 2012 Farm Bill, we would like to take the opportunity to highlight the accomplishments of Governor Deval Patrick and his Administration's efforts to increase access to critical nutrition benefits. The Patrick Administration has wisely recognized that SNAP benefits are the first line of defense against hunger for low income families, recently unemployed households, seniors and persons with disabilities. Toward that end, Massachusetts has vigorously pursued federal and state options to improve access to the program for needy residents. We are very proud of our state and wish to highlight this great work for members of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As the House Committee begins its deliberations on the 2012 Farm Bill, the Coalition wishes to emphasize the importance of the SNAP program as an important fork-ready stimulus for both families and our state and national economy. Congress

wisely recognized in the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that SNAP serves a unique countercyclical function, which is why ARRA included a 13.6% benefits increase in household benefits. In addition to families' increased spending power, federal research has shown that every SNAP dollar spent creates $1.84 in local economic activity—or $9 for every $5 in SNAP benefits.
http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/outreach/business-case.htm.
Few other programs bring this level of federal dollars directly into the hands of needy households.

The Coalition has a number of priorities which we encourage the Committee to consider in its deliberations for the 2012 Farm Bill:

First, we urge the Committee to take note of the increased food insecurity in all Congressional Districts in the United States, including Massachusetts. The recent Gallup food hardship data produced for the Food Research Action Center, *http://frac.org/pdf/food_hardship_report_2010.pdf* highlights the extent to which food insecurity is prevalent in every Congressional District in the United States. Members of the Food SNAP Coalition continually report significant demand for emergency food, including, sadly, seeing at their food pantry doors many of the households that previously donated food to the feeding programs. The 2012 Farm Bill needs to ensure continued and strong funding of SNAP and other child and adult nutrition programs as long as the national and state economies are struggling.

Second, we strongly urge the Committee to embrace the principals and goals of the President's campaign to End Hunger in 2015. As detailed in FRAC's detailed report, *http://frac.org/pdf/endingchildhunger_2015paper.pdf*, the 2012 Farm Bill should include a number of key initiatives to end hunger for all Americans such as restoring economic growth and create jobs with better wages for lower-income workers; strengthening the SNAP/Food Stamp Program and Child Nutrition programs; working with states, localities and nonprofits to expand and improve participation in federal nutrition programs and ensuring all families have convenient access to reasonably priced, healthy food.

Third, we urge the Committee to consider specific important changes to the SNAP program that will improve access, level of benefits and address the needs of long underserved constituencies. Specifically, the Coalition urges Members of Congress to include in the 2012 Farm Bill the following:

- Change in the methodology for calculating the core SNAP benefit amounts. It is increasingly difficult for individuals and households to meet their basic food needs on the meager Thrifty Food Plan, and especially to purchase many of the foods recommended by USDA for a healthy food diet. Access to affordable fruits and vegetables, fresh meats and fish is exacerbated by the lack of low cost markets in low income neighborhoods. The Thrifty Food Plan, developed during the Great Depression as "a restricted diet for emergency use" and simply not sufficient to meet the nutritional needs of most low income families. We are grateful that Congress agreed to adjust the benefits in April of 2009 under ARRA. However, it is time for Congress to give serious consideration to an updated methodology that recognizes the costs of purchasing healthy fresh foods. We urge the 2012 Farm Bill embrace the Low Cost Food Budget, which budget would bring SNAP benefits more in line with what families are spending on food for their households.
- Eliminate the five year waiting period for adult legal permanent residents, immigrants granted humanitarian parole and battered immigrants so that they too may qualify with their eligible immigrant or U.S. citizen children. Clearly households with U.S. citizen, LPR or battered immigrant children suffer when their parents are denied SNAP benefits for a five year waiting period. In line with the 2002 Farm Bill changes, the 2012 Farm Bill presents an opportunity to restore SNAP to all eligible qualified immigrants.
- Allow individuals who turn age 18 to qualify for their own SNAP benefits if they purchase and prepare food separate from their parents. Current law requires such adult children to be part of the SNAP household until they turn age 22. Many older children are simply unable to afford to live on their own while they finish a training program or start a job. However, under the current SNAP program rules, they are required to be included in the SNAP assistance unit of remaining household members, even though they may not share food or income. This mandatory household inclusion rule harms younger siblings and parents who are denied SNAP benefits if the older adult child does not provide information on his or her income or meet other program rules.
- Increase the reimbursement rate to states for the administrative costs of processing SNAP applications and recertifications. Between March of 2005 and March of 2010, Massachusetts has had an increase in SNAP participation of

over 108%. However, DTA's front line SNAP workers continue to be overwhelmed by the growing demand for benefits. Since 2002, the Massachusetts SNAP caseload has almost tripled, yet the front line SNAP workforce has decreased by 30%—including key clerical staff involved in data entry, document management and phone/office reception. In February, 2009 the *Boston Globe* reported more than 20,000 applicants now seeking benefits each month, with DTA caseworkers overwhelmed by the requests. *http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2009/02/26/food_aid_sign_ups_flooding_mass.*

The Food SNAP Coalition is very concerned that DTA has reached a breaking point in handling additional SNAP applications, especially as many more households seek benefits due to the faltering economy. We urge Members of Congress to increase the federal reimbursement for state administrative expenses in order to recognize the expense of administering this program and ensuring timely and accurate benefits.

- Allow states flexibility in verification of disability for SNAP program purposes. Under the SNAP program rules, elder and disabled households may receive higher SNAP benefits if they can claim out of pocket medical expenses or higher shelter costs. However, to qualify as disabled, a household member must receive or be certified to receive a federal or state "disability-based benefit". The Social Security Administration has increasing delays in processing SSI benefits, and many states have eliminated or severely narrowed state General Assistance program benefits. These two factors are making it increasingly difficult for persons with disabilities to qualify for a disability-based benefit that confers disability status for SNAP purposes. Congress should include language in the 2012 Farm Bill to permit USDA to allow for other routes to confer disability in order to allow persons with disabilities to qualify for the maximum SNAP benefits they would otherwise be entitled to receive.

Thank you for considering our recommendations. We are grateful for the opportunity to provide these recommendations. We are grateful for all the work you and your staff are doing to respond to the needs of all residents of this great country during such difficult economic times.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA BAKER,
Chair, Food SNAP Improvement Coalition.

COMMENT OF VALERIE BALDISSEROTTO, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Valerie Baldisserotto.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Registered Dietitian.
Comment: Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals, environmental quality, and reduction of green house gases. Federal Government programs should meet increased demand for fresh, locally grown, reasonably priced fruit and vegetables by expanding access, facilitating purchases, expanding local production facilities, and supporting farmers markets. Organic standards should be protected from threats by bioengineered crops. Food safety should be bolstered by strict monitoring of feed lots and meat and poultry processing.

It is critical that increased production of and access to local, healthy food is paired with helping small and mid size farmers remain profitable.

A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food and fiber and to maintain national security. Sustainable farming should be supported to reduce inputs and to close the loop on waste and environmental degradation.

COMMENT OF TODD BALDWIN, ALEDO, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Todd Baldwin.
City, State: Aledo, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent.

Comment: Please reinstate CLU data into section 1619. As you know, there is no compliance, CRP, wetlands, or other personal information in the CLU data. The CLU data is very valuable to me in my occupation . . . it allows me to be better at my job and helps me add value for my farmer-clients and ensure that their crops are insured properly.

Thank you,

TODD BALDWIN.

COMMENT OF GARY L. BALKE, CLAYTON, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 5:36 p.m.
Name: Gary L. Balke.
City, State: Clayton, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: Please reinstate the CLU data in section 1619 of the new farm bill. This information is very helpful to producers and those that serve producers.

Thank you,

GARY L. BALKE.

COMMENT OF KATHY BALL, MILILANI, HI

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Kathy Ball.
City, State: Mililani, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Teacher, Artist.
Comment: As a former teacher we need good food for our schools. please support this bill.

COMMENT OF JERRAD BALLANTYNE, WESTHOPE, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Jerrad Ballantyne.
City, State: Westhope, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619.

Thank you,

J. BALLANTYNE.

COMMENT OF MELISSA BAND, PARK CITY, UT

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Melissa Band.
City, State: Park City, UT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate and Property Management.
Comment: I really think it is time for the U.S. Government to stop subsidizing these huge corn and soy factories. Or, at least match the funds for small farmers. Make it worthwhile for small community minded farms to feed the local population. The U.S. consumer wants healthy food from a place we can trust. We want to see farmers in our community. We want to buy food that is produced locally, sustainably and responsibly. Thanks to shows like "Food Inc." and Michael Pollan's book, and groups like Slow Food, the tide is turning. Don't be on the wrong side of this issue! Local Food, Slow Food, Responsible Food, Sustainable Food and Healthy Food for all. Fast/processed food should not cost less than fruits and veggies forcing low income people into expensive health problems.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

MELISSA BAND.

COMMENT OF VIC BANDINI, PLAINFIELD, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Vic Bandini.
City, State: Plainfield, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Applicator—Midwest corn and soybeans.
Comment: Accurate and timely field data is essential to the farm and air ag business. Field data is required for new technology airborne/aerial application. Current field boundary and descriptions are required to deliver accurate aerial application.

COMMENT OF GIANNA BANDUCCI, DIXON, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Gianna Banducci.
City, State: Dixon, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: The Farm Bill should be viewed as a Food Bill. The policies established through this bill have the power to affect the food available for the entire world, considering its influence on market prices for products such as grain and corn. Due to this, it is vital that the Farm Bill support the small landowners/farmers worldwide instead of furthering the interests of the corporate food industry. In order to ensure food security in the world, we must provide a market for small farmers through fair prices. The detrimental cycle in existence of high input costs and low product prices destroys the livelihoods of farmers, thus inflicting a loss of biodiversity and sustainability. Stop placing the profits of the agriculture industry above the environment and human lives!

COMMENT OF DAVID BANKS, DAVID, MO

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: David Banks.
City, State: David, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I think the CLU Data ought to be reinstated into Section 1619.This is a very handy tool for all of Agriculture.

Thanks,

DAVE BANKS.

COMMENT OF BRIAN D. BARBER, PHILLIPS, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 7:35 a.m.
Name: Brian D. Barber.
City, State: Phillips, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I am a farmer and also a real estate appraiser. Not having the current FSA info. really costs me and the FSA office considerable time and money. As a producer I have no problem with appraisers, and others to have access to this info.

BRIAN D. BARBER.

COMMENT OF LAWRENCE BARMANN, RED OAK, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Lawrence Barmann.
City, State: Red Oak, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Information Management Services.
Comment: I support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. Businesses that have access to CLU data are able to provide producers with more timely, accurate and cost-effective services.

I also want to send the reminder that there is no compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data.

COMMENT OF LESLIE BARNETT, SHERBORN, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Leslie Barnett.
City, State: Sherborn, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nutrition Consultant.
Comment: Please support producers of local, organic fruits and vegetables!!!!!
It helps the environment, the local economy and the health of our citizens.

LESLIE BARNETT.

COMMENT OF EMILY BATES, FALLSTON, MD

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 10:06 a.m.
Name: Emily Bates.
City, State: Fallston, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: University Student.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

- Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.
- Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.
- Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.
  - Label GE/GM content in all products sold to the public.
  - Ban the production and sales of Genetically Engineered/Genetically Modified crops—we don't want to be eating them, and they damage the planet and the health of our generation and future generations.

COMMENT OF DEAN BATIE, KEARNEY, NE

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Dean Batie.
City, State: Kearney, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager/Appraiser.
Comment: Restrictions on acreage information for fields, both current and historical has been a major hindrance in carrying out our work. FSA offices even refuse to provide planted acre maps to land owners on their own farms unless they have a share rent lease. Heirs to a property also are not able to gain historical acreage information if they didn't have an interest during those years. Financial and personal information should be protected, but the burden to the agricultural industry has been significant in withholding acreage unit data.

COMMENT OF BRANDON BAUMAN, STUTTGART, AR

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 02, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Brandon Bauman.
City, State: Stuttgart, AR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment:

Dear Committee,

I am 37 and farm 2,200 acres of rice, soybeans and wheat in Eastern Arkansas. Most of which is operated on a share-crop basis with several landowners. Nearly half of my production is in rice. My wife and I are partners in this business. As farmers retire, and we have opportunities to expand, I am concerned with the uncertainty of the structure of current farm policy and how we will be required to adapt to these complicated and ambiguous programs. Payment limits on participation of these programs will continue to "limit" our ability to operate under our partnership as we continue to make our living in this high input, labor intense occupation. With the prices of combines and tractors at nearly $400,000 and the soaring cost of fertilizers we need a safety net in this next farm bill that will continue to allow us to help feed the world. Oh, and not to mention the recent volatility in the futures market! We export roughly half of the rice produced in the U.S. and this industry is a vital part of our local as well as state economies. This is the first year that I have purchased a crop revenue insurance policy. If these policies can be tailored and somewhat affordable to all types of farms, then this could be a vital risk management tool for all producers.

One other issue that concerns me is the conservation programs. I have recently enrolled a few acres in CRP with the intent to restore hardwoods on some rather "marginal" land. I have been very pleased with the program, especially the knowledge and support that I have received from my county FSA and NRCS office. As an avid outdoorsman, I hope to see a continued support for such programs. I believe that the best use of these "marginal" lands are in protecting our environment by reducing harmful gasses and enhancing wildlife habitat.

Thanks,

BRANDON BAUMAN,
Stuttgart, AR.
[Redacted].

COMMENTS OF GENE BAUR, COLLEGE PARK, MD

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:35 a.m.
Name: Gene Baur.
City, State: College Park, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: President of nonprofit.
Comment: I'm writing to encourage you to promote more local, plant based agriculture systems and to discourage industrialized animal farming systems. Those who grow and market fruits and vegetables and other "specialty crops" should be supported, and their produce made more widely available, especially in communities with poor access to healthy foods. We have subsidized industrial commodity production for too long, and we're now seeing the negative impacts (human health problems, environmental degradation, animal cruelty). It is time for change.

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Gene Baur.
City, State: College Park, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: President of nonprofit.
Comment: I'm writing on behalf of Farm Sanctuary and our more than 230,000 members and supporters to urge Committee Members to produce a Farm Bill that does not support industrialized animal farming, commonly referred to as "factory farming," and instead to promote the production and consumption of plant foods. Farmers should be encouraged to produce and market fruits, vegetables, grains and legumes to consumers, and these foods should be made more readily available through federal food programs.

The Farm Bill is a critically important piece of legislation that has profound impacts on both rural and urban citizens in the U.S. Unfortunately, Farm Bill policies over the years have favored commodity production systems that have contributed to serious health problems, which are now painfully evident. Farm Bill policies have supported industrial animal farming operations that subject animals to extreme cruelty, pollute the environment, and threaten the well being of residents in rural communities.

There is a growing awareness and recognition of the impacts of agricultural policy, and the Farm Bill should reflect the interests of all parties affected, not just those of production agriculture.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

COMMENT OF ELAINE BAYLESS, GLEN RIDGE, NJ

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Elaine Bayless.
City, State: Glen Ridge, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: The health of our citizens, particularly our children, is in rapid decline. By supporting local, organic, and small-scale farmers, the House Agriculture Committee can help reverse this trend. The next Farm Bill will have a huge impact on the lives of millions of children. Please think beyond what will please the lobbyists to what will benefit the most people.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF BIANCA BEADLING, MIAMI, FL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:06 p.m.
Name: Bianca Beadling.
City, State: Miami, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Architect.
Comment: I appreciate this opportunity to voice my thoughts on the upcoming Farm Bill. Granted, I am a layperson with regards to agriculture, but I do feel strongly that some things should change for the better. I think that the government should subsidize less grains/corn and more wholesome choices such as fruits and vegetables. I think that we would be a healthier nation if fruits and vegetables were as affordable to us as processed foods containing corn manufactured some 30 ways. I think many people would benefit from a comeback of small, family farmers *versus* these industrial, factory farms. Our environment would be better for it, our local communities would be better for it and the many farmers who are currently indebted to producers like Perdue or Tyson would be better for it. I don't know the answers (you guys are the experts), but can we do something to encourage smaller scale production over favoring the big businesses that are currently controlling our food supply? Lets work towards a healthier, more sustainable future by empowering the small-time farmers and communities all over our country. Lets help make fruits and vegetables the more affordable option so that families on a budget don't have to cut out such an important part of their diets. Lets work for the people and not for the corporations that we're currently enslaved to.

COMMENT OF IDA BEAR, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Ida Bear.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: More money for TEFAP and SNAP needed.

COMMENT OF RONNIE BECK, ST. PETE, FL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Ronnie Beck.
City, State: St. Pete, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Steel Detailer.
Comment: We need more inspectors . . . there are too many cases of food poisoning each year in the news . . . a safe food system is essential and our food supply needs to be protected from unscrupulous producers . . .why should anyone get *Salmonella* from spinach . . . doesn't make sense unless you look at how the factory farm system works . . . we need more ORGANICS to protect our food and environment

---

COMMENT OF BEVERLY BECKER, OAKLAND, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Beverly Becker.

City, State: Oakland, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: A simple request: keep sustainable alternatives in mind for research and incentives. Big Ag corporations don't have long-term answers, and our food & environment are increasingly contaminated with dangerous chemicals. Thanks.

COMMENT OF KELLY BECKER, PEARL CITY, HI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:05 a.m.
Name: Kelly Becker.
City, State: Pearl City, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chef.
Comment: I probably can't say it best, but I just want to put out there what I'm for and what I'm against. I think we should stop subsidizing corn and soybean crops. It makes no sense, people should pay what it costs to make food. It also makes non-nutritious food cheap and plentiful, and I don't need to tell you that there are too many fat people in this country. I want GMOs to be labeled on all packages, and I want the producers of GMOs to be financially responsible for contaminating non-GMO crops. I want battery cages for chickens banned, and a hefty fine or jail time for those that use them. I want organic certification to be cheaper for those who wish to obtain it.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER BECKWITH, LEWIS CENTER, OH

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:37 a.m.
Name: Jennifer Beckwith.
City, State: Lewis Center, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: COO.
Comment: I request a Farm Bill that curbs factory farms and large food corporations. I demand a Farm Bill that provides fresh, wholesome food in our cities' schools. I insist on a Farm Bill that allows farms to make a transition to organic, sustainable growing methods for the sake of a cleaner environment for our children and grandchildren. I demand the cruel and inhumane practices towards animals on factory farms in all farming industries to be stopped and more humane practices implemented.

COMMENT OF DOUGLAS BEIER, INDEPENDENCE, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Douglas Beier.
City, State: Independence, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Realtor & Insurance Agent.
Comment: Crop unit data is very important to a large number of people including appraisers, realtors, bankers, as well as operators and producers. This information should be available as public information.

COMMENT OF NIK BELANGER, DANVILLE, VA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Nik Belanger.
City, State: Danville, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nonprofit.
Comment: Please support subsidy/tax incentives that will encourage crop diversification, a return to local food economies and remove incentives to produce the least healthy crops. I've heard too many statistics and seen too many unhealthy children and adults in my own community not to speak out against disastrous subsidies that not only hurt our economy but also hurt our children's future. No more subsidies for single-crop corporate mega-farms. Let's focus instead on growing a variety of local crops, encouraging nutritious GROWING and EATING and set ourselves up for a better future. Thank you.

COMMENT OF GLENN BENDER, FARGO, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Glenn Bender.
City, State: Fargo, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Property Manager.
Comment: As a North Dakota land owner and manager I would ask that you please reinstate CLU Data Section 1619. I need the updated information to do my job. It takes way to much time and paper work to get some of the information I need from FSA/USDA.

Also the 2008 Farm Bill limits outside income and thus requires those who have that problem to take land out of the CRP program. I believe this to be a problem. I will be involved in putting 5000 acres back in production. Some of this land (CRP 23) should not be put back in production. This program is forcing people who can afford to leave the land in CRP to take it out or receive 0 income.

COMMENT OF HILLARY BENDER, WALTHAM, MA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 1:36 a.m.
Name: Hillary Bender.
City, State: Waltham, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: Please get rid of farm bill subsidies.

COMMENT OF ROBERT BENDICK, ARLINGTON, VA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Robert Bendick.
City, State: Arlington, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer
Comment:

July 27, 2010

Chairman Peterson, Ranking Member Lucas and members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to provide recommendations from The Nature Conservancy to you as you begin the process of shaping the 2012 Farm Bill. At this time, the Conservancy is making broad recommendations. The Conservancy priorities are to: (1) maintain habitat friendly agriculture and forestry; (2) increase funding for easements on working agricultural and private non-industrial forest lands; (3) remove incentives to break native prairie; (4) focus conservation programs to achieve local and landscape scale environmental benefits via partnership agreements; (5) improve water quality and flow regimes in watersheds affected by agriculture and forest management; (6) promote energy markets for biomass supporting conservation practices on agricultural and private forest lands while meeting other objectives including replacing oil imports and reducing greenhouse gas emissions; (7) create incentives for farmers to adapt to climate change; and (8) measure outcomes and direct conservation programs using science based assessment methods. We will be making more specific programmatic recommendations as you progress through your deliberations.

The Nature Conservancy is an international, nonprofit conservation organization working around the world to protect ecologically important lands and waters for nature and people. Our mission is to preserve the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. We are best known for our science-based, collaborative approach to developing creative solutions to conservation challenges. Our on-the-ground conservation work is carried out in all 50 states and more than 30 foreign countries and is supported by approximately one million individual members. We have helped conserve nearly 15 million acres of land in the United States and Canada and more than 102 million acres with local partner organizations globally.

The Farm Bill is an extremely important piece of legislation for the future of America's lands and waters, providing a critical opportunity to conserve private lands. The 2008 Farm Bill provided nearly $55 billion over 10 years in funding for conservation programs in Title II as well as $45 million for forestry in Title VIII. The Conservancy recommends maintaining these funding levels in the 2012 Farm Bill and if possible increasing them. We recognize the current federal budget deficit

will make this difficult especially so since neither the Wetlands Reserve or the Grasslands Reserve program have baseline funding once they reach their acreage caps under the 2008 Farm Bill. We recommend Wetland Reserve Program acreage be increased to a minimum of a 4 million acre limit and Grassland Reserve Program acreage be increased by at least another 3 million acres.

In addition, further progress could be made in using Farm Bill programs to support forest conservation, as well as building a stronger relationship between conservation programs and payments for ecosystem services. The 2008 Farm bill provided innovative provisions that allowed for the acquisition of industrial timber lands on large scale. These should be continued. The 2008 Farm Bill also started the process of focusing USDA to begin to foster an ecosystem service market. The 2012 Farm Bill should build on these efforts.

Moreover, the Conservancy supports a workable and enforceable Sod Saver provision to remove incentives that continue the breaking of our Nation's remaining native prairie. Data from the USDA National Resources Inventory indicate more than seven million acres of rangeland have been converted to other uses, primarily cropland, from 1997–2007 (USDA–NRI 2007). In the Dakotas and Montana, USDA data indicate that more than 500,000 acres of native prairie were converted to cropland from 2002–2007. Conversion of native prairie creates marginal cropland at best and contributes to the continued steep decline in grassland birds, which are one of the most significantly declining groups of species in North America.

The Conservancy supports the Natural Resource Conservation Service focus on special initiatives such as the Sage Grouse, Migratory Bird Habitat, Mississippi River Basin and Chesapeake Bay Initiatives. We believe a concerted effort should be made to focus Farm Bill conservation programs and resources to conservation at the landscape and watershed scale, thus maximizing conservation results. In order to achieve water quality and ecosystem improvements, we recommend that USDA continue to focus its relevant conservation programs to produce watershed scale impacts. Moreover, the Conservancy supports implementing these initiatives via the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Program. This program leverages federal funds with partner funding. A partnership approach recognizes the need for many actors to achieve landscape scale change.

USDA has started the process of focusing on watershed scale impacts with Chesapeake Bay, Mississippi River Basin Initiatives and in the northern Everglades. Many USDA conservation programs and practices are focused by necessity and design at the individual field scale levels; the programs and practices while needing to be implemented at the field level must also fit within larger coordinated efforts to attain needed watershed improvements. Priority should be given to practices, bundles of practices and focused efforts that produce watershed scale improvements. In addition, individual farm planning should incorporate programs and practices with the goal of improving overall watershed health. Technical assistance must be expanded and improved to move from a field based approach to the watershed scale.

Energy markets for biomass material may provide significant new income for the farm and forestry sectors of our economy. Income from energy markets for biomass can support conservation practices (*i.e.,*, restoration of wildlife habitat) on agriculture and private forest lands while meeting other objectives including replacing oil imports and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Full utilization of biomass to meet these objectives will require new investment in supply chain infrastructure. Biomass can be used to produce transportation fuels, electricity and energy to heat and cool buildings; current policies often fall short of putting biomass to its highest and best use. Policies that encourage community-scale utilization of biomass in systems such as combined heat and power that maximize thermal efficiency can promote rural development while also meeting energy independence and climate change objectives. Because energy markets for biomass may change agricultural and forestry practices, farm, forest and energy policy must assure accountability by both biomass producers and consumers to maintain environmental values including the protection of threatened species, wildlife habitat and water quality. Incentives and mandates for biomass production must not result in the loss of native forests or grassland or undermine the environmental achievements of farm programs including CRP.

Despite the diversity of regions and microclimates in which U.S. crops and livestock are grown, the cultural and business foundation of U.S. agriculture assumes dynamic weather but a stable climate. Yet, the rapidity of observable climate changes is impacting the nation's agricultural traditions and the water, land, biodiversity resources on which it depends. Climate changes from higher average temperatures and temperature extremes to the timing and intensity of precipitation will directly or indirectly impact the resilience and viability of plants, pasture, range, and stock. The 2012 Farm Bill presents an opportunity to include climate consider-

ations and prepare U.S. growers to better manage climate change. From administrative provisions requiring the consideration of anticipated impacts to identifying and modifying key elements of programs like the Environmental Benefits Index of the Conservation Reserve Program to calling for periodic assessment of likely impacts with a report to the Committee detailing those impacts and the sector's capacity to and strategies for responding to change, the 2012 Farm Bill can be instrumental in helping farmers adapt to an uncertain climate future.

Finally, greater attention to quantifying the environmental benefits and measuring the effectiveness of conservation programs would be valuable. A well developed Farm Bill can play a critical role in the conservation of America's working and forested lands, providing lasting benefits to our society. USDA is at the beginning stages of using scientific assessments with geospatial data such as the Conservation Effects Assessment Program and other reputable scientific information to focus and adjust conservation programs to greater impacts for long term success. We believe this scientific approach should be used in all of USDA's conservation programs. Flexibility in using the science should be both at the national and state level for program implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. The Conservancy looks forward to working with the Committee as it begins its deliberations for the 2012 Farm Bill.

Sincerely,

ROBERT BENDICK,
Director,
U.S. Government Relations,
The Nature Conservancy,
Arlington, VA.

COMMENT OF BETH BENJAMIN, BOULDER CREEK, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Beth Benjamin.
City, State: Boulder Creek, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

Dear House Agriculture Committee,

I am an organic farmer/gardener in northern California and President of Camp Joy Gardens (CA 501(c)(3)) organization and a demonstration garden and teaching center for small scale sustainable ecologically sound agriculture that has been teaching new farmers and gardeners and our community at large since 1971. I am writing to urge your Committee to designate development of the organic industry as a top priority for not only the 2012 Farm Bill but also for all future agricultural policy.

The organic industry is responding to the heightened demand from consumers for pure and local food grown sustainably in a way that's good for our land over the long term. As a result over the last 10–15 years organic sales are booming. Yet ag programs aimed at developing organic farming—research and extension activities, conservation programs, tailored crop insurance and help for farmers transitioning to organic production lag far behind from where we should be due to inadequate funding over past decades.

While we are heartened that many good traditional organic practices such as soil building, crop rotation and cover cropping are receiving attention by NRCS and others, and are being incorporated into best management practices of conventional farms, there is a critical need for increased research to sustain and support necessary organic development.

In crop agriculture, we are facing a looming crisis over the steady decline of public seed breeding programs in the United States. Advances in public seed breeding have been the leader in our country's agricultural progress and we must reinvest in seed research now to maintain future agricultural progress. Tomato production illustrates this point. The focus of tomato seed breeding is currently aimed at large scale California production. Yet tomatoes are one of the most important high value crops to many thousands of organic family farmers across all 50 states. The conditions these organic farmers face are dramatically different from those in California. For example, last summer a devastating widespread Tomato Late Blight situation was encountered by northeastern states. As a result there is now renewed interest in

developing great tasting Late Blight resistant tomatoes for the East. Public seed development is a long term good for both society and agriculture and deserves strong multi-year funding support from Congress.

OSGATA urges the House Agriculture Committee to effectively invest in the future of American agriculture by increasing funding for the development of organic production.

Sincerely,

BETH BENJAMIN, *President,*
Camp Joy Garden, Inc.
Boulder Creek, CA
www.campjoygardens.org

COMMENT OF CAROL BENNETT, TEMPE, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Carol Bennett.
City, State: Tempe, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chef/Registered Dietitian.
Comment: I would like to see the farm bill support small, independent farmers. Please provide subsidies for farmers employing organic methods of fertilizing and pest control. Make it less expensive for organic certification.

Provide incentives for school districts to use local produce in school lunches.

Create scholarships for students studying sustainable agriculture in our land grant colleges.

Encourage county extension agencies to HIRE agents trained in sustainable agricultural practice.

Create grants for creating a distribution system friendly to growers and consumers.

Create incentives for large food corporations to locally source foods supplied in their chain stores.

Provide funds for public health education on the nutritional benefits of eating locally grown, seasonal foods.

Please do not continue to pay farmers NOT to grow food, and to dump low quality agricultural surplus foods on seniors, children and the poor.

COMMENT OF ALAN BENSON, ALAN, MI

Date Submitted: Thursday, September 02, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Alan Benson.
City, State: Alan, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: When the 2008 Farm Bill was passed their was intentions to better service the small farmer so he could participate in the taxpayer funded farm programs. However with the 2008 Farm Bill now in place my crop insurance premium has gone up at least 10 fold forcing me to cancel crop insurance due to the premiums are close to 50% of my farm income their for disqualifying me from 90% of the farm programs. What happened to the farm bill that was to reduce crop insurance premiums, make crop insurance more viable. What happened to the newly created (office of advocacy and out reach) that was to assist small farmers from being priced out of these tax payer funded programs.

Thank you,

ALAN BENSON.

COMMENT OF JOEL BERG, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 27, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Joel Berg.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Director, New York City Coalition Against Hunger.
Comment: As recently as 2008 (before the worst of the economic downturn), 49.1 million Americans, including 16.6 million children, lived in households that suffered

from food insecurity or hunger—unable to fully afford the food their families needed. This number exceeded the combined populations of the states of Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, Iowa, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Wisconsin. Combating hunger and food insecurity is an important goal in itself. But it is also a sound investment. Voluminous data proves that hungry children learn less effectively, hungry workers work less productively, and food insecurity costs the nation tens of billions of dollars annually in health care costs. A 2007 study by the Harvard School of Public Health found that domestic hunger and food insecurity cost the American economy $90 billion annually. Given the massive increase in food insecurity since then, I calculate that the cost of domestic hunger to our economy now likely exceeds $124 billion. The price we pay for food insecurity in children alone is at least $28 billion.

The assertion that hunger is no longer a problem in America simply because we have obesity is flat-out wrong. Hunger and obesity are flip sides of the same malnutrition coin.

A top priority for any Farm Bill should be to enact a plan to end hunger in America by expanding, simplifying, and better coordinating federal nutrition assistance programs. The Farm Bill should increase and expand benefits combine the existing SNAP Program with most of the existing other federal nutrition assistance programs. My colleague Tom Freedman has suggested that such a new program could be called the "American Family Food, Opportunity, and Responsibility" (AFFORd) program. More low-income Americans would be eligible for this program than the existing, separate, programs—and eligibility determination and application processes would be dramatically simplified. Under current federal law, families must usually earn below 130 percent of the poverty line to get SNAP benefits and free school meals, but they must live below 185 percent of the poverty line to obtain WIC benefits and reduced-price school meals. These conflicting guidelines result in both increased government bureaucracy at the federal, state, and local levels and decreased access to food. Eligibility for all these programs under the new AFFORd program should be set at 185 percent of the poverty line. There should be no asset limit. There should be one short, universal federal application for AFFORd benefits, which Americans could complete easily online or during an office visit. Not only would this reduce government paperwork and bureaucracy, it would dramatically increase the amount of nutrition provided to low-income families, particularly working families. Benefits should be large enough for families to afford the USDA Liberal Food Plan and should be available to all legal immigrants otherwise eligible by income.

In addition, we fervently oppose any attempt to restrict what SNAP recipients can obtain with their benefits. Such policy change would be a big mistake—both patronizing and a waste of time and money. With billions of dollars at stake, the battle to define junk food would be epic, with nutrition experts pitted against food-industry lobbyists, slugging it out one food item at a time. Are Raisinets junk food or fruit? Junk food, you say? Then how about a caramel apple? What about a Fig Newton? Banana chocolate chip muffins? There would be protracted battles every year as new products are introduced and as the ingredients of existing products changed, requiring a massive government bureaucracy to continuously make such determinations.

If such a concept is just applied just to sugary drinks, it would still face similar problems. Would it only apply to "added sugars" or include any juices or milks with natural sugars? Would it include chocolate milks or other flavored milks? How about sports drinks? At what level of sugar would the tax kick-in?

Given that the wealthiest Americans spend three times as much money on food as the lowest income Americans, the reality is that such restrictions will only negatively impact low and middle income families. There is no evidence at all that SNAP recipients obtain food that is less nutritious than equally low-income people who don't receive SNAP

Moreover, micromanaging the lives of poor people—or anybody, for that matter—is patronizing and usually backfires. After all, when the nation banned alcohol, that only increased alcohol consumption. Besides, unlike artificial trans fats or cigarettes (which are bad for you no matter the amount), occasional sugary drinks, as part of overall balanced diet, can be just fine for you. While I rarely drink non-diet soda anymore, I still have an occasional Coke with Chinese food, which I think is a particularly delicious combination. Even the health food writer Michael Pollan admits eating an occasional meal with his children at McDonald's, including a sugared soda, as a rare guilty pleasure. Do we really want to send the message that non-poor people can enjoy such guilty pleasures whenever we want, that but low-income Americans can't?

Such attempts are based on a faulty understanding of nutrition science and human behavior. It assumes that if we just eliminate a few "bad foods" from our

diets, we will all be healthier. That's bunk. Good nutrition and healthy weight are all about balance, and adopting improved eating habits for a lifetime. Decades ago, weight loss programs such as Weight Watchers outright banned certain foods, and gave participants strict guidelines for how much of certain healthy (but usually horribly tasting) food they had to eat. People on such programs would often lose weight rapidly, but then gain it all back rapidly. In contrast, the most effective weight control programs today use points systems in which no food is "banned," but in which, if participants have a high calorie food one time, they simply have to make up for it by eating fewer points in the rest of the week. Such an approach is far more in line with actual human nature and thus allows people to change their entire lifestyles for life, still enjoying occasional guilty pleasures while improving eating habits for life. But most importantly, people can only eat healthier food if it is affordable and available.

For a community to have good nutrition, three things need to happen: food must be affordable; food must be physically available; and individuals and families must have enough education to know how to eat better and regularly choose to perform the extra work necessary to do so. If you don't have all three legs of this table, the table will collapse. Yet all too often projects only focus on one of the three. Many provide nutrition education, lecturing people that they should eat better, but neither make food more available nor more affordable and are therefore destined to fail. Sometimes, food is brought into low-income neighborhoods, but at prices too high for most people to afford. That won't work either. The only way to succeed is to focus on all three aspects of this problem at once, as well as to promote strong regional food systems and bolster community food security.

COMMENT OF MADALYN BERG, TIBURON, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Madalyn Berg.
City, State: Tiburon, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: I think it is incredibly important that our farm bill reflect the needs of our citizens. Rather than subsidize commodity crops, please subsidize row and orchard crops instead. The health of the community would really benefit from the reduction in cost of fruits and vegetables. people in search of cheap calories should be able to live off really, local , seasonal fresh fruits and vegetables, rather than finding it more cost effective to live on a diet of sodas and hamburgers, a diet reliant on the cheap corn of today. If we want our country to be healthy tomorrow, its citizens, economy and environment must also be prosperous. By subsidizing small local farmers instead of agribusiness, and particularly crops that are nutritious and organic, and by supporting small humane grass fed meat producers, we could have stronger people, a smaller carbon footprint, and healthier local and national economies.

Thank you,

MADALYN BERG.

COMMENT OF BRETT BERGER, ALBION, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Brett Berger.
City, State: Albion, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser & Consultant.
Comment: Please, support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. I work closely with farmers and this information is vital to providing timely and cost effective services. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information. This data is used by farmers, appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation, tilling installers, and aerial, chemical, and fertilizer and manure applicators.

BOTTOM LINE: Without this information I must charge higher fees and it takes much longer for me to provide information to Illinois farmers and landowners.

COMMENT OF JOHN BERGESON, RUNNELLS, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: John Bergeson.
City, State: Runnells, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: The survey maps are very helpful in knowing acres and keeping spray records.

COMMENT OF SANFORD BERNAN, MONTOURSVILLE, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Sanford Bernan.
City, State: Montoursville, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Marketing.
Comment: Sell all farm exports to oil producing countries 1 pound of grain for 1 barrel of oil; stop giving away food produced here except for catastrophes. We use gasoline and diesel in our equipment to produce farm products. How about a food for oil program?

COMMENT OF RODNEY BERTSCH, CHAMPAIGN, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Rodney Bertsch.
City, State: Champaign, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment:

Dear Sirs,

The CLU Data that I get from a company like AgriData is absolutely a great feature for my business as I am a Farmer and an Insurance a Real estate Broker. This data would still be available but at a greater cost and less effective manner. I think that this is a service that make Agriculture in the U.S. more cost effective. They are not giving out data that can not be found, but at grater cost. Get a life and don't be foolish and cancel this access.

ROD BERTSCH.

COMMENT OF ERIC BESWICK, KENNEWICK, WA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Eric Beswick.
City, State: Kennewick, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: I would like to request that the FSA field maps be made public again. These maps assist professional appraisers in completing accurate and current appraisals for loan purposes on a variety of agricultural properties.

COMMENT OF HUGH BETCHA, SOUTHAMPTON, NJ

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Hugh Betcha.
City, State: Southampton, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: End subsidies completely please, build a farm bill that supports small/local/sustainable farmers.

COMMENT OF SARA BHAKTI, KIRKLAND, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:07 p.m.
Name: Sara Bhakti.
City, State: Kirkland, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired psychologist and organic produce consumer.
Comment: Organic agriculture is one of the best options for healthy food grown in an environmentally-sustainable way: improving soil quality and conserving water.

Organic agriculture is the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Your support for the programs listed below will be especially helpful to organic farmers:

- Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers;
- Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation;
- Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

COMMENT OF BARBARA BINGNEAR, MELBOURNE, FL

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Barbara Bingnear.
City, State: Melbourne, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Membership Director.
Comment: If you care at all about the world as we know it, vote to stop supporting factory farms. Support should be given to local, organic, plant-based farming systems. Anything else is hypocritical and we who vote will remember.

COMMENT OF VAN BITNER, MASON CITY, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Van Bitner.
City, State: Mason City, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Make FSA data available to appraisers.

COMMENT OF JOHN BLACK, WEST BRANCH, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 7:36 p.m.
Name: John Black.
City, State: West Branch, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: FSA CLU data should continue to be public record. There is nothing that can not be seen from a plane that these images don't show. When we apply foliar fungicide we need these maps. They are also a big help with soil types and crop planning. I find it hard to believe someone is considering blocking these useful maps access. Please help us on your vote.

Thank you,

JOHN BLACK.

COMMENT OF PAM BLAIR, CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Pam Blair.

City, State: Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professional Dog Walker/Pet Sitter.
Comment: Hi. I am writing to request that Congress please stop supporting factory farms in the Farm Bill, and instead support local, organic, plant-based farming systems. For the animals, the planet, and the people.

Thank you.

PAM BLAIR,
Chicago, Illinois.

COMMENT OF BRENDA BLAKELY, EUPORA, MS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Brenda Blakely.
City, State: Eupora, MS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Grant Writer-Project Development.
Comment: I work with numerous Main Street Communities that are addressing the issues of historic preservation and heritage tourism economic and community development. This is an important development for rural America. It develops a renewed sense of place for those who live in the communities that are being affected. It also brings important economic development to communities that have become discouraged. Many don't want to give up their small town rural community values but want a chance for a better life for their children. Historic preservation brings together the best of all worlds. It is the greenest product there is and opens potential to economic and community development in the best sense of the words. Thank you for your help in building a vital rural America with dollars for historic preservation and help in developing the potential of heritage tourism to pass on values and provide educational opportunities combined with the economic development that comes with the building of heritage tourism in rural areas.

COMMENT OF BRETT BLANCHFIELD, DES MOINES, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Brett Blanchfield.
City, State: Des Moines, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: In my occupations as both a farm and farm appraiser I have utilized farm information that was previously available at the Farm Service Agencies across Iowa. Specifically, I used the public CLU data. I hope that this CLU data can be reinstated into Section 1619.

According to *AgriData.com*, the website that I primarily use for calculating farm acres and quality of farmland, this CLU data "there is no compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data."

Having public the information that is required to measure the market is vitally important for markets to remain fair and open. If this information is allowed to be skewed, either by mistake or otherwise, by the closed door policy of the local government offices, both the public and the land market are at risk.

We are all painfully aware of the damage that hidden and confusing information can have on markets especially when compounded with lack of confidence in the markets and valuation. Aiding transparency by giving back the CLU data is an important step.

Please call or e-mail me with any other questions you have that you feel I could shed some light upon.

BRETT BLANCHFIELD,
Blanchfield Appraisal,
Certified General Real Property Appraiser,
Active grain and cattle farmer,
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF MICHAEL BLEAN, MORRISON, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:05 p.m.

Name: Michael Blean.
City, State: Morrison, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am writing to support reinstatement of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway. As an appraiser of farm properties in 2 states, it is essential to have information available in order to develop accurate sales data. My profession is state licensed and federally regulated, and I take my work seriously. The inability to readily obtain this information makes my work much more difficult and less accurate.

COMMENT OF ARTHUR BLISS, SOMIS, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Arthur Bliss.
City, State: Somis, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: The current Farm Bill provided funds to support specialty crops under the Specialty Crop Block Grant program which has been administered by each state. Having sat on the subcommittee that recommends the awarding of these grants I can assure you that in California, this has been a huge success. It has aided producers, researchers, marketers and teachers in various phases of the industry. It has allowed us to tell our story, increase our production and educate the public regarding healthy choices.

In the past California producers have received relatively little from previous farm bills, while contributing their treasure to national farm policy. I urge that the upcoming Farm Bill include and expand funding for specialty crops, especially with a new national emphasis on health and nutrition throughout this nation.

Thank you for considering this request.

COMMENT OF KATHY BOCHONKO, CUMMING, GA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Kathy Bochonko.
City, State: Cumming, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Stay at Home Mom.
Comment: I am very concerned about how current farm subsidies are promoting the production of cheap processed food over healthy fruits and vegetables. The subsidizing of corn and soy may have made sense decades ago but today they are killing our children. This is most apparent in the poorest communities where these subsidies make Sodas and dollar menu hamburgers the food of choice over more expensive fruits and vegetables. We are paying twice. We are paying to make people overweight and then we are paying the doctor bills that come from being overweight. America can not continue to subsidize these monocrop farms. Instead we should be encouraging biodiversity and sustainable farming. Please "tear down this wall" that separates health as something only the well to do can afford. It should not be cheaper to buy a cheese burger than a serving of vegetables. Cheap corn has to stop. I can not stand the fact that my child is expected to live a shorter less healthy life largely due to the abundance of High Fructose Corn Syrup and cheap highly saturated meat due to cheap feed crops. I am just a mom, not a farmer, not a politician, but I know that my kids school lunches are subsidized in a way that makes no sense. Meat is so cheap they get so much saturated fat yet no fresh fruit or vegetables. Please consider subsidizing sustainable farming operations instead of monocrop factory farms.

Sincerely,

KATHY BOCHONKO.

COMMENT OF ALYSHA BODIEN, MT. PLEASANT, MI

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Alysha Bodien.
City, State: Mt. Pleasant, MI.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student, Babysitter and Promotion Director.
Comment: Now a days I see more and more fat kids, not a little over weight but a lot over weight. Kids need to eat for veggies, salads and fruits. This can only be done if we look at what products we give tax breaks to. rice, corn and wheat. Lets Do something about it and keep our gardens colorful!

COMMENT OF KATHEREINE BOGLI, GRANBY, CT

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 5:36 p.m.
Name: Kathereine Bogli.
City, State: Granby, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Poultry/poultry products, Vegetables.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Please protect our family farms by stopping corn and soy subsidies. Create legislation that will help family farms so that citizens of our great country can buy food from their neighbor farmers.

COMMENT OF JOHN BOHMAN, TROY, ID

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: John Bohman.
City, State: Troy, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dry Beans & Peas, Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Agricultural producers need regulation included in the next Farm Bill to protect us, just like consumers, against predatory practices. Provisions need to be included to mandate physical commodity inspections of storage warehouses and export facilities.

I have heard of many area warehouses being "short" many hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat without signed contracts from their producers. Without written consent from their customers, they are stealing the commodity and putting "free" wheat on the market. This "free" wheat changes the supply/demand dynamic of the free market system.

The next Farm Bill must provide for salaried inspectors whose job is to conduct random inspection of the crop stored in commercial elevators and compare that to what the warehouses says they have. Stiff financial penalties as well as suspension of the Federal Warehouse license must be used as a deterrent. This will keep the warehouses "honest" and keep them from selling crop they do not own. The more the grain companies complain, the more you need to include these provisions in the next Farm Bill.

Your Committee needs to include this provision in the next Farm Bill to parallel the new legislation that will be enacted to regulated the financial system.

Sincerely,

JOHN BOHMAN,
Ridgeview Farms,
Troy, ID.

COMMENT OF JULIA BOLIN, MIDDLEBOURNE, WV

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Julia Bolin.
City, State: Middlebourne, WV.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Poultry/poultry products, Specialty Crops, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: As a small farmer, I feel the farm bill needs to encourage more organic practices and/or assist with the transition from conventional to organic. Farm bill also needs to protect the small producers that sell via farmers markets and CSA's.

I also believe that the food stamp program should be more like the WIC program. It needs to be "spelled out" which foods they should be able use their foods stamp monies. Sodas, snack foods should be disallowed. Fresh vegetables, whole grain

foods, lean protein and whole fruits should be the only foods allowed. (I don't mean specific "brands" like WIC though—just using common sense to have people eat healthier so that less money is spent fighting their chronic illnesses brought on by their un-healthy eating habits.)

COMMENT OF A. BONVOULOIR, SUNNYVALE, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: A. Bonvouloir.
City, State: Sunnyvale, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Self-employed.
Comment:

- We must make sure that small organic farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar, and properly treated and labeled biomass.
- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy organic food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.
- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF JOEL BORJESSON, CORVALLIS, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Joel Borjesson.
City, State: Corvallis, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Assistant w/IT Focus.
Comment: Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

Pesticide use in conventional farming hurt the environment and threaten animals. Many species have already disappeared due to water pollution. Pesticides are found in higher levels in people who eat produce farmed conventional *versus* people who consume organic produce.

Please fund organic farming!

COMMENT OF MATTHEW BORUTA, DEARBORN, MI

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Matthew Boruta.
City, State: Dearborn, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Unemployed.
Comment:

- We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.

- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.
- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF SAM BOSCO, ITHACA, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Sam Bosco.
City, State: Ithaca, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graduate Research Assistant.
Comment: The United States needs to move forward with its agricultural priorities and show more strong support for sustainable and regenerative food systems that value the environment, healthy food, strong communities and worker's rights.

Giving more financial support to organic production systems in the 2012 Farm Bill would be a needed and welcomed improvement over the current subsidies

---

COMMENTS OF PATRICK BOSOLD, FAIRFIELD, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Patrick Bosold.
City, State: Fairfield, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Eater, Consumer of Food.
Comment: To use Michael Pollen's words, this is not a Farm bill, it's a Food Bill. This issue is so huge that it's hard to know where to begin. I'll try to keep this simple: write and enact a Farm Bill that's about feeding people and caring for the soil and the future of our planet. For more guidance on how to do this, please attend the follow meeting:

> "On June 8, 2010, NSAC (National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition) Farm Aid, Organic Valley, and Heifer International U.S. Country Program will host a Congressional briefing on *Agriculture of the Middle: New Strategies to Support America's Mid-sized Family Farmers.*
>
> "In recent decades, many mid-sized farmers and ranchers who rely on farming as a main source of income have been severely challenged in the marketplace. Too small to compete individually in international agricultural commodity markets, they are also not often well-positioned to market directly to local consumers. While the number of very small and very large farms and ranches has increased, mid-sized family farms continue to disappear. Arguably the backbone of America's rural communities and economies, this loss of mid-sized family farms has a detrimental impact that extends well beyond the farm.
>
> "The briefing will be free and open to the public and will feature four producer-entrepreneurs discussing innovative business models and marketing approaches that are succeeding in creating new opportunities for mid-sized farmers in many parts of the country. They will also discuss ways in which existing federal programs can support these efforts by providing the research, credit, and infrastructure investments necessary to scale up and expand their models."

After you attend the above meeting, please return to your offices and write a Farm Bill that supports sustainable agriculture and production of food for people, not a Farm Bill that is designed to continue subsidies and programs that benefit the profits of a small number of large corporations at the expense of the rest of us.

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Patrick Bosold.
City, State: Fairfield, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small scale gardener for food and soil building.
Comment:

(1) Buy Fresh, Buy Local. It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.

(2) Safety net, not subsidies, for farmers. We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF THOMAS BOSSERD, YPSILANTI, MI

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Thomas Bosserd.
City, State: Ypsilanti, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser and Farm Manager.
Comment: Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill has been unnecessarily restricting USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data that was readily available to appraisers, farm managers, and other agricultural service providers. The information being restricted pertains only to the land itself and does not contain any information that is confidential information related to the landowners or farm operators. This restriction creates additional steps and builds inefficiencies for those service providers who are crucial to those landowners and farm operators and their land and business. This inefficiency and series of extra steps consequently creates a cost and a burden to U.S. agriculture as a whole.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted into the final bill during the Conference Committee process. This "back door" change in the bill took place without any opportunity for public hearings or debate that could have provided better guidance to those voting on the final bill. I believe that if there was a better understanding of the facts, Section 1619 would not have been included as written.

Please bear in mind the consequences of section 1619 of the current farm bill and consider including language in the new farm bill that will once again allow access to CLU data for agricultural professionals and vital service businesses.

COMMENT OF MARILYN BOUSTEAD, WOODBINE, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Marilyn Boustead.
City, State: Woodbine, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified General Appraiser.
Comment: The access to FSA aerial and soil maps is an extremely efficient manner of obtaining and reviewing maps relative to appraisal assignments, and verifying the accuracy of field data with the clients at the time of the site visit. The fact that I can access these maps prior to the assignment gives me information regarding physical features, location, terrain, and configuration of the properties. A secondary point of efficiency is that I am not at the local Farm Service Agencies contacting the staff to obtain these maps for me. I am able to import these maps into my reports for documentation which supports the reliability of the data, and thus the accuracy of the findings.

I request that the farm bill provide those of us who perform these type services continued access to vital information that does not compromise individuals' personal data or confidential information.

As a real estate broker, the access to the data with respect to farms and possible sales listings, is also vital to the integrity of the information that is presented to sellers, buyers, lenders, and other real estate professionals.

I urge you to support the information that is necessary to maintain the access, and reliability of the maps with field borders and acreage information to allow ag-related professionals a reliable information source.

Respectfully,

MARILYN BOUSTEAD,
Iowa Certified General Appraiser (1991–present),
Iowa Licensed Real Estate Broker (1992–present).

COMMENT OF TYLER BOWMAN, HERMISTON, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Tyler Bowman.
City, State: Hermiston, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am a General Certified Appraiser that specializes in agricultural properties. Please change Section 1619 to reinstate the CLU data in the next farm bill. The accuracy of my appraisal products is significantly diminished without access to this information, which can have detrimental effects on the banks, estates, government agencies, *etc.,* that I complete work for.

COMMENT OF BRUCE A. BOYD, IDALOU, TX

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 3:05 a.m.
Name: Bruce A. Boyd.
City, State: Idalou, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Landman but still help raise cattle.
Comment: I think we need to give this professor at Texas Tech a chance. So many earmarks are for Woodstock memorials in NY. I believe sending some money to these scientists will benefit mankind.

Thomas L. Thompson, Ph.D.,
Professor and Department Chair,
Dept. of Plant and Soil Science,
Texas Tech University,
[Redacted],
Lubbock, TX.
Phone [Redacted].
E-mail: [Redacted].
Website: *http://www.pssc.ttu.edu.*

I had written him and asked if they were doing anything to replace cotton. Whole world seems to grow it and cheaper then we do.

His answer:

> One of our faculty members, a plant breeder, is working to improve several oilseed crops that may be promising for the High Plains. Some of these may be grown in winter, would require less water than cotton, and could provide new markets that we're not tapping into now. These new markets could include biodiesel, if this market develops sufficiently. This is all in the experimental stage and we aren't ready to release anything yet.

Can you believe what the Plant and Soil Science could do for us if they are successful. Small amounts of water. Crops grown in winter.

After this oil spill in Louisiana where our President seems to be more concerned about assigning blame and stopping all drilling instead of marshalling all think tanks, scientists, navy, any one with expertise should be flown out to the spill. But no. The President wants to stop all drilling and place blame. I am sure Bush will end up being the reason. Why is our President not acting efficiently. Is he working on kicking out the blue dogs for not voting for that monstrosity of a health care bill.

Do your best to send some funds TX Tech's way. It will be worth it.

Your supporter,

BRUCE A BOYD.

COMMENT OF WILLIAM BRANSGROVE, HEREFORD, TX

Date Submitted: Wednesday, August 18, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: William Bransgrove.
City, State: Hereford, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Son of producer.
Comment: My name is William Bransgrove. Recently, I made a trip with my mother, Eleanor L. Bransgrove, to check on the present CRP sign-up in Beaver County, Oklahoma.

I was very impressed with the personnel of the Beaver Co. Farm Service Agency and the Beaver Co. Natural Resources Conservation Service.

I was disappointed to learn that the potential cost of enrolling acreage into the CRP program is so poorly defined. No one in the local offices could tell us what would be considered to be an acceptable stand of grass until after we have already committed our acreage to the program. No one could tell us what the recommended remedies for an unacceptable stand of grass would be. No one could tell us what kind of cost sharing arrangement we could expect for establishing a stand of acceptable grass. However, FSA & NRCS are expecting us to pay 25% of the first year's payment as a penalty if the grass stand on the acreage that we enrolled was not acceptable to them and we thought it to be cost prohibitive to try to make the changes to the stand of grass that they required.

I feel like the penalty provisions of the present CRP sign-up are too costly to producers who are trying to re-enroll existing CRP into the new program. Why should the producer be penalized 25% of the first year's payment when he makes a cost-benefit analysis of the requirements and wants to back out of committing acreage to the present CRP sign-up because the NRCS requirements are too expensive to meet?

Respectfully,

WILLIAM BRANSGROVE,
[Redacted],
Hereford, Texas,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF SHELLEY BRANT, SPARKS, NV

Date Submitted: Friday, May 28, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Shelley Brant.
City, State: Sparks, NV.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Librarian; Local Food Advocate.
Comment: Farm Bill 2012 should reduce, or better yet, eliminate subsidies to farm owners with incomes of more than $1 million per year.

The bill should encourage heath regulations that recognize the difference between small farmers and industrial agriculture, and then craft and enforce laws that make sense for two very different business models with very different priorities. Small farmers need laws that allow them to grow healthy, real food while making a living wage. Citizens need laws that make industrial agriculture responsible for the effects of their product, in an arena where profit is the driving motivator.

Farmers who receive subsidies for commodity crops should be allowed to grow organic specialty crops on their property without losing the commodity subsidy.

Farmers producing on less than 400 acres and planting diverse and multiple crops should receive first priority.

Funding should go first to American farmers who produce for the domestic market.

The Farm Bill should include funding to rebuild the local food processing infrastructure, including a USDA inspector in each state.

The Farm Bill should include funding to help schools and farmers develop programs that bring fresh, locally grown food to school breakfast and lunch programs.

Include provisions for educating children about where food comes from and how it is grown. Hands-on experience would be ideal.

Farm Bill 2012 should include provisions that make it easier for people who want to buy abandoned or existing farm land to get a loan, without encouraging converting open space to farm land.

Develop programs that help local communities expand urban and suburban agricultural programs.

COMMENT OF LISA BREGITZER, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Lisa Bregitzer.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Office Manager.
Comment: Please change the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors! Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs. Our children need this!

COMMENT OF ELISA BREMNER, ARMONK, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:05 a.m.
Name: Elisa Bremner.
City, State: Armonk, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Registered Dietitian/Nutrition Educator.
Comment: It is important that the new farm bill support local and organic producers, both for the health of our children and the health of the planet. Good health (as supported by a plant-based whole foods diet) should be accessible to all. In fact, I would argue that we could reduce/eliminate many health care costs (Medicaid and Medicare) by finding financial incentives for people to buy fresh fruits and vegetables, thus averting the financial disaster. Subsidies for large agribusiness, mainly corn, should be transferred to the local farmer. The long term cost savings (preventing obesity) should justify further investment up front. I realize this is just one piece of the puzzle, but I think it is important to work on many fronts to promote wellness.

COMMENT OF CHANDLER BRIGGS, VASHON, WA

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 17, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Chandler Briggs.
City, State: Vashon, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dry Beans & Peas, Field Crops, Fruits, Livestock, Nuts, Poultry/poultry products, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please end agricultural subsidies that support large, industrial monoculture farms. They pollute the environment and produce commodities instead of real food. Please support organic agriculture & regional production on family farms.

COMMENT OF STEVEN BRINK, SACRAMENTO, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Steven Brink.
City, State: Sacramento, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: NGO.
Comment:

(1) Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP)—the importance of a stable, predictable, BCAP program cannot be overstated. Moving currently uneconomic wood waste to a bioenergy facility provides substantial direct benefits (offsetting fossil fuel fired power plants) and co-benefits (utilizing wood waste in a controlled combustion boiler reduces emissions compared to open field burning by 98%). We need the final Rule sooner rather than later so the Program can be restarted and we need BCAP in the next Farm Bill.

(2) Rebuilding the Economy of the Country is a necessity. Per $1 million invested, the forestry sector can produce nearly 40 good-paying jobs. That's practically twice as many jobs as the next closest sector in the economy (agriculture crops). Investing in our National Forests to return them to a healthy condition

will: reduce insects and disease; and reduce the size, number and intensity of wildfires while providing a much-needed boost in employment to rural America.

Legislative relief, similar to the Tom Daschle language of 2003 for the Black Hills National Forest, is needed to treat the condition of our National Forests as an "emergency" and put "emergency measures" in-place so the Forest Service can rapidly respond to ramping-up fuels reduction accomplishments. Legislative relief will allow the Forest Service to at least double their productivity with no increase in appropriations.

COMMENT OF JOSHUA BRISCOE, CHARLESTON, WV

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Joshua Briscoe.
City, State: Charleston, WV.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Medical Student.
Comment: Healthier food needs to be more readily available and cheaper. As it is now, there are so many subsidies that allow for unhealthy food to be obtained easily, it's no wonder obesity is rampant in America. We need more sustainable, healthier options, and along with that, we need to treat the land, crops, and animals better, so that the end product is higher quality.

I don't have any specific suggestions, but I think it's important to create an environment that is naturally adverse to obesity, heart disease, and pollution by changing agriculture legislation.

COMMENT OF KEVIN BRITTEN, RED OAK, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Kevin Britten.
City, State: Red Oak, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Software development for agricultural aviation.
Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

In 2007 I started a software company focused on developing solutions the make the agricultural aviation industry more efficient. One key component of that is the use of CLU data for accurate field mapping for aerial applicators. Since the removal of CLU data from the public domain in the 2008 Farm Bill, aerial applicators have had to resort to other means for accurate filed identification which has made them less efficient in delivering vital crop protection product to their customer base while leading to increased opportunity for errors. Removal of the CLU data has also hindered what my product can do for applicators and has hindered the growth of my company which is poised to make a significant contribution to the economy of southwest Iowa.

The following circumstances make this critical information needed for my use as well as for others in the public:

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Kind regards,

KEVIN BRITTEN,

AgriSmart Information Systems,
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF JUDD BROOKS, VAUGHN, MT

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Judd Brooks.
City, State: Vaughn, MT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: It would be extremely helpful in my line of work to have the CLU (FSA measured fields) data available to the public again. I do not see how having this information available creates any real threats to the privacy of producers or the FSA. Between Google Earth and other on-line sources a person can see just about any acre on the planet anyway. By have the CLU data public it would allow us professionals to do our job more efficiently and more accurately.

COMMENT OF ANDREW BRORSEN, KANKAKEE, IL

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Andrew Brorsen.
City, State: Kankakee, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Please reinstate the CLU data into Section 1619. It is vital to provided accurate FSA data into our analysis and reports. The data we use is not confidential and is needed to provide reliable value opinions. Thank you.

COMMENT OF AMY BRZUCHALSKI, FINDLAY, OH

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Amy Brzuchalski.
City, State: Findlay, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Our future must turn toward more environmentally friendly and sustainable practices. At our current pace we can feed the masses, plus many more. These practices however, are what will end our ability to thrive and live a healthy life. Downsizing our practices CAN actually create more field to table, ready to eat, doesn't need manipulated and over-processed food. Please consider the consumer and the future in this matter. Thank you!

COMMENT OF RENEE D. BUCK, HAYTI, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:06 a.m.
Name: Renee D. Buck.
City, State: Hayti, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Hamlin County Director of Equalization.
Comment: County Assessors in South Dakota have the specialized task of assigning an assessed value to each agricultural parcel for property taxation. We gather as many pieces of information as possible, at the lowest cost to the county, to estimate the most accurate productivity value possible.

One of the pieces of information that would assist us in this process is a Geographic Information System (GIS) crop field shape layer that was created by each local FSA office, and was reviewed for accuracy by each landowner. Unfortunately, the 2008 Farm Bill declared the bulk of this GIS layer confidential and will not release it to other government entities, including county assessor offices. We are unsure as to why it was declared confidential as it contains no personal information, no ownership information or actual crop production information. The FSA office will release a GIS layer with the shape, but all details regarding crop or non-crop designations have been purged from the file, rendering it virtually useless. This infor-

mation could be recreated from aerial photos and inspections, but the cost to taxpayers would be substantial.

The South Dakota Association of Assessing Officers respectfully requests that the next farm bill require that the unmodified GIS layer be available to county government officials, thereby saving substantial tax dollars and receiving a more accurate layer than can be reconstructed locally.

We realize that this is a relatively insignificant request when considering the magnitude of the entire farm bill, but making this information available to local government would produce more accurate assessments with no added cost to the local taxpayer.

We thank you for allowing our concerns to be heard and would welcome any questions Committee Members may have regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

RENEE D. BUCK, C.A.A.,
President,
South Dakota Association of Assessing Officers.

COMMENT OF MARIAN BUCKNER, SHEPHERDSTOWN, WV

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Marian Buckner.
City, State: Shepherdstown, WV.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker.
Comment: I strongly urge you to consider that organic farming must be a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill and all future agriculture policy.

It is important that we raise our awareness that organic farming has a significant role to play not only in the global food crisis, but in a top U.S. and international issue—global climate change.

Rodale Institute has presented convincing evidence that organic farming is destined to be an important part of the solution to combating global climate change. There are many reasons, but one is the unique ability of organic soils with organic matter to sequester carbon even better than conventional soils.

Certainly, we must acknowledge that organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Rodale Institute has also presented convincing evidence that organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

- Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
- Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
- Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
- Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Thank you for your attention to the important role of organic farming and action to ensure that it receives the support needed for the major contributions it can make to our major food and climate concerns.

COMMENT OF NANCY BUELL, TEMPE, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Nancy Buell.
City, State: Tempe, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired RN.
Comment: Please consider the effects of fertilizers and pesticides on the human body. Maybe factory farms are not a good idea, everything is contaminated. We

should encourage people to supplement their diets with home grown or shared produce. Maybe more and bigger of something is not always better.

COMMENT OF MIKE BUITENWERF, ALTOONA, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Mike Buitenwerf.
City, State: Altoona, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Agent.
Comment: I am an insurance agent working for a bank insurance agency. We have worked hard to build a customer base that relies on crop insurance as a safety net for production costs. Our bank is a significant ag lending bank and they use crop insurance to help guarantee a farmer can stay in business rather than sell off assets in case of a weather catastrophe. The independent insurance agency system has built a strong base. Why mess with something that works so well?

COMMENT OF GARY BULLER, SUTTON, NE

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Gary Buller.
City, State: Sutton, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: CLU data needs to be released again. A wide variety of people, including producers, use this information each day to help farmers. There are NO privacy concerns is having this data available. I use it as an overlay on geo-referenced satellite images to determine field acres and boundaries.

COMMENT OF VANCY BULLUCK, WINTON, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 06, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Vancy Bulluck.
City, State: Winton, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Nuts.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I am one of the few Black farmers left in California. With only 44 acres, I have found it very difficult to stay in the business. My primary problem has been a lack of funds to purchase more land. At 76 years old, I do not see myself staying in farming very long. Farming is the biggest business in California. The new farm bill must include provisions to bring more African Americans into the Business.

COMMENT OF THOMAS BULMAN, DECORAH, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Thomas Bulman.
City, State: Decorah, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Sales Representative.
Comment: Surety maps are very important to my customers and myself. Quality maps for cropping decisions are very valuable for everyone involved in agriculture. Thanks

---

COMMENT OF JAMES BULTSMA, HOT SPRINGS, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: James Bultsma.
City, State: Hot Springs, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: I am requesting that the CLU data be made available to appraisers working on valuing farm properties. Having this data available to the appraiser re-

sults in a higher quality work product that provides a more accurate value according to comparable properties. This data is currently unavailable without the permission of the landowner. Since we are helping to establish [*Editor's Note:* the comment was incomplete as submitted.]

COMMENT OF STEVE BUNNING, PLYMOUTH, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Steve Bunning.
City, State: Plymouth, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Owner/Farm Manager.
Comment: PLEASE reinstate access to CLU data (FSA Field information) to the public. I acquire and manage agricultural real estate, and the recent lack of availability of this information (as required by the 2008 Farm Bill) makes it extremely hard to accurately analyze and evaluate the value of agricultural real estate.

COMMENT OF MICHELLE BURGESS, OSWEGO, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Michelle Burgess.
City, State: Oswego, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Finance.
Comment: I am not sure what this bill suggests but I would like to see a more conscientious approach to agriculture. We NEED to consider the environmental impact of our farming habits. We NEED to acknowledge the research that shows how devastating some of our practices are and stop them immediately! By the time everyone is on board the eco-wagon, it will be too late . . . so please don't wait for our lands to be completely ruined by outdated, unsafe methods of farming.

COMMENT OF BARBARA K. BURKE, OLYMPIA, WA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 17, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Barbara K. Burke.
City, State: Olympia, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired R.N.
Comment: It is critical that we began to support healthy outcomes instead of soaring obesity and diabetes in our country with our farm subsidies. Our current system of paying farmers for overproduction of corn and other commodities has resulted in the poorest among us being unable to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables and over-dependence on fast food. I want my tax dollars to support local farmers getting varied food products to my table quickly. I do not want to eat animal products from massive feed lots. I want the farm bill to ultimately result in better eating and better health for our population.

COMMENT OF DERRICK BURKE, SNOHOMISH, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 18, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Derrick Burke.
City, State: Snohomish, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Internet Marketing.
Comment:

Dear House Committee on Agriculture,

Here is my feedback on current U.S. farm subsidy policy:
We have horribly skewed the farm 'relief' funds into subsidizing overproduction of corn and other commodities which has resulted in extremely unhealthy eating for our U.S. population. Our obesity and diabetic rates are escalating and the poorest in our communities cannot afford healthy food—it is far cheaper for them to eat fast foods than it is for them to purchase fresh produce and proteins at the grocery store.

Indeed, I saw a very upsetting TV documentary a few months ago where elementary school children were shown a large variety of fresh produce (celery, beets, tomatoes)—and they did not know what these things were!

Current farm subsidies have also hampered international trade relations. A major stumbling block at the last DOHA Round of Trade Talks were these same policies.

I would ask the Committee to update its thinking as concerns how to protect U.S. farms without risking our health, our environment, and our international relations.

COMMENT OF DAVID BURLEY, HAMMOND, LA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: David Burley.
City, State: Hammond, LA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professor.
Comment: Please dedicate significant funds to organic farming. Organic farming is very important to out country, land and communities. It empowers communities both economically and culturally.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL BURNSIDE, BAY CITY, TX

Date Submitted: Friday, May 07, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Michael Burnside.
City, State: Bay City, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment:

Gentlemen:

I have been a rice producer since 1971. We had allotment then until 1974, when we were given producer base. Everything was tied to the producer. I believe it was 1976 or 1977 we went to farm rice base. Most, at least 85–90% of us are tenants. At this time every thing got worse. Land rents went up, *etc.* After the 1996 freedom to farm bill was enacted, landowners kicked off many, many tenants and took DCP payments. These are absentee landowners, retired farmers, doctors, lawyers, dentists, 3rd and 4th generation landowners, *etc.* The decoupling of direct pmts. Are at fault. Millions of dollars are wasted each year in Texas. This is insane. Are direct payments an entitlement for current land owners?? I am well aware what is going on. I have been on the FSA–COC off and on for 12 years out of the last 20 years. We have 748 farms in Matagorda Co., TX. Out of 748 farms there may be rice planted on maybe 40 farms. I had a lawyer friend, who has been buying land, tell me the landowner is entitled to all payments, and he charges cash rent on land above his $40,000 pay limit. Folks, this is crazy. What us producers need is a fraud proof revenue based yield loss crop ins. Based on current yields, not yields set in 1983. If we have a loss, it be paid in the fall of that year, not like the sure program 2 years later.

Thank you,

MIKE BURNSIDE,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF PETE BURTON, DANVILLE, IN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Pete Burton.

City, State: Danville, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Environmental Field Technician.
Comment: Organic food production is less evasive and better for the environment than chemical agro-business. Organic food is safer to eat, it has better nutritional value. Organic food production should be a bigger part of our over all diet. Large agro-seed, chemical companies, and large corp. farming institutes are not in need tax payer subsidies. These companies are out for the bottom line and do business in that manner. Small farms are a better resource for quality food. They keep money in the areas where citizens will buy food and provide jobs for local people. Small farms also provide a safer food source, by giving the food a face and a voice. Please provide a vehicle for more organic food to be available to the masses. Thanks for your time.

COMMENT OF RUTH BUSCH, LAFAYETTE, AL

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 7:06 p.m.
Name: Ruth Busch.
City, State: Lafayette, AL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: We need better protection of genuinely organic farming and gardening. I do not grow commercially, but produce much of my own food organically. What I buy I have to buy on an often violated faith.

COMMENT OF BEVERLY BUSTIN-HATHEWAY, HALLOWELL, ME

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Beverly Bustin-Hatheway.
City, State: Hallowell, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Register of Deeds, Kennebec County.
Comment: Please support:

- An enhanced commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next farm bill, especially key infrastructure and business development programs that support the agricultural sector and the retention and attraction of new businesses. USDA Rural Development's programs for water/wastewater infrastructure, community facilities, broadband and business development are key ingredients for county economic development efforts.
  - The Administration's proposed Rural Innovation Initiative or similar rural development strategies which focus on making USDA's investments more efficient and effective by rewarding strategic regional approaches to rural development that allow counties and their regional partners to focus on their local economic assets, priorities and goals.
  - The enhanced funding for Renewable Energy development, especially programs that assist local governments in their efforts to develop renewable energy and increase energy efficiency.
  - Ensure that all farm programs recognize that youth play a vital role in sustaining American agriculture and rural communities. New programs and updates to old programs are needed so that it is possible for young and beginning farmers to survive and thrive in the modern agricultural economy.

COMMENT OF FRED BUTT, CRESCENT CITY, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Fred Butt.
City, State: Crescent City, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Input Supplier.
Comment:

Dear Congressman Johnson,

In my employment at Donovan Farmers Coop we are always using the FSA maps. That we download from AgriData to make sure our ground applicators and the contract pilots are better able to find and properly apply fertilizers and ag chemical in the right field of our growers. We also use the soil type layer to soil test by the soil type and write the different recommendations for sandy *versus* silt loams in the same field. I feel these are good stewardship uses to improve our growers yields and protect the environment with better management of the Ag Inputs we supply.

COMMENT OF ALAN BUTTS, BISMARCK, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Alan Butts.
City, State: Bismarck, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Land Owner & Real Estate Sales.
Comment: As a life long farmer and land owner and now involved in farm and ranch real estate sales, I know how important it is to have accurate information for making production decisions and for buy or selling land!

I urge you to allow the CLU data to be used again!

ALAN BUTTS.

COMMENT OF LINDA BYRD, SAINT JAMES, MO

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Linda Byrd.
City, State: Saint James, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Administrator.
Comment: Current funding of large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy should be scaled back, with increased funding of smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors which can be utilized by local school districts to improve the quality of child nutrition. The health of our children is declining, and subsidies of corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production is fueling this health travesty. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs. And it would enable people to buy locally, ensuring they receive food products when they are at their highest nutritional value.

COMMENT OF BRIAN CABLE, SUPERIOR, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Brian Cable.
City, State: Superior, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy Sales.
Comment: Please consider making FSA data public again because it really makes my job much more efficient and working with farmers easier.

COMMENT OF MATT CALLAGHAN, ROCKTON, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Matt Callaghan.
City, State: Rockton, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Finance.
Comment: This country needs to find a way to support local, organic agriculture and stop subsidizing big ag and thereby fast food. There IS a health crisis in this country and there IS demand for fresh fruits and vegetables grown locally. We need to recognize where our current policy has led us and put ourselves and our environment back on track to have a fighting chance for the future. The PEOPLE support and NEED this. I'm not sure about corporations and lobbyists, but it's clear cut to most people I talk with that big change needs to happen.

COMMENT OF SHARON CALLAHAN, EAST WINDSOR, NJ

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 26, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Sharon Callahan.
City, State: East Windsor, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Proposal Manager.
Comment:

Dear Committee Members:

Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

- Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.
- Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.
- Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

COMMENT OF GINETTE CALLAWAY, JONESBORO, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 19, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Ginette Callaway.
City, State: Jonesboro, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Self Employed Artist.
Comment: For this new century we must commit to transform farming away from animal production to human consumed grain productions. Right now Approximately 80% of grain produced is fed to animals raised for slaughter. About 7,000 pounds of grain is fed a stir from calves to slaughter. Animals farming is a major contributor to pollution and world wide food and water shortages. Stop subsidizing meat and dairy and start to support organic growers, support farms that grow a variety of grains, not only corn, soy and alfalfa.

Farming must be transformed for the sake of the planet, humans and the animals alike!

COMMENT OF MARK CANRIGHT, ASBURY, NJ

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Mark Canright.
City, State: Asbury, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

Dear Committee Members:

My wife and I own and operate a 44 acre organic farm in New Jersey. We greatly appreciate the additional support in the last Farm Bill for organic agriculture and encourage you to substantially increase that funding in the next Farm Bill.

We have a daughter, and believe that organic agriculture provides a healthier alternative to conventional farming. This is because organic agriculture has standards and certain materials are not allowed in order to become certified, or to really be organic. Organic practices help to renew and enrich soil, keep harmful pesticides, herbicides and fungicides out of our water and air supply, as well as out of our food supply. As important is the fact that organic products do not contain harmful pesticides, *etc.*

Another very important aspect of organic farming is its ability to help sequester carbon and decrease climate change. We urge you to read a very important report by the Rodale Institute at *http://www.rodaleinstitute.org/files/*

Rodale__Research__Paper-07__30__08.pdf entitled "Regenerative Organic Farming: A Solution to Global Warming." More organic farming must be encouraged and fully funded to support efforts to reduce climate change.*

Organic agriculture is the fastest growing food sector in the market right now and it has been for decades. In order to support more organic food supplies, more mandatory funding must be committed, so that additional research and organic practices are fully supported.

We are organic farmers, and we want to see more farmers transitioning to organic agriculture for reasons already mentioned above: healthier people, healthier food, healthier environment and a healthier future.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

MARK CANRIGHT and AMY HANSEN.

COMMENT OF JESSICA CAOUETTE, DENVER, CO

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Jessica Caouette.
City, State: Denver, CO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Bartender.
Comment: I am a simple city-dweller, trying to feed my family healthy, inexpensive food. How am I to do this when the subsidies for corn, soy, wheat and rice outweigh the subsidies for vegetables and fruit?

Big business farms have taken over our country. How can we support our local farmers when our government keeps feeding those pigs?

Please try to write in encouragement for local growers and diversified crops. If we aren't careful, this country's topsoil will become desert-land. Just look at Northeastern Brazil.

I am willing to pay the costs in my grocery bill for high-quality food from local, diversified sources. Are you willing to help?

COMMENT OF JANET CAPELLE, NORTH FAIRFIELD, OH

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Janet Capelle.
City, State: North Fairfield, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

I am a certified appraiser of agricultural properties as well as a farm owner, albeit small acreage. For all agricultural appraisers, it is CRUCIAL in the process of valuing land to comparing properties and to know the amount of tillable acres on sales as well as the subject property. Section 1619 stopped public access to USDA Farm Service Agency common land unit (CLU) data.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

As a comparison, courthouse records contain much more private information and are subject to public access. I do not see the need for the secrecy. Please reconsider Section 1619 and reinstate public access to the common land use data.

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

COMMENT OF J. CAPOZZELLI, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: J. Capozzelli.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Office Worker.
Comment: I am deeply concerned that so much of America's food is imported. We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.

COMMENTS OF LUNA CARL ISLE, WAILUKU, HI

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 3:35 a.m.
Name: Luna Carl Isle.
City, State: Wailuku, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: GMO and Monsanto must be stopped!!

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 6:05 a.m.
Name: Luna Carl Isle.
City, State: Wailuku, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Do not allow the poison profiteers to force us to use pesticides and sterilizing equipment and all of that. Move towards natural, organic foods! "Hey, Mr. farmer, I don't mind spots on my apples, just leave me the birds and the bees, pleee-ease . . . don't it always seem to go, that you don't know what you've got until it's gone? they paved paradise, and put up a parking lot"

The Food Modernization and Safety Act is anything but safe! Do not pass it!!

COMMENT OF CATHY CARLISI, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Cathy Carlisi.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Marketing.
Comment: I second my nutritionist's statement below.

> I (and many of my clients who will be writing, too) am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of the people, our nation, and the world as a whole.

COMMENT OF LISA CARNAHAN, FORTUNA, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Lisa Carnahan.
City, State: Fortuna, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Represent Producer's in an Organic Dairy Cooperative.
Comment: Organic farming is an imperative inclusion for the 2012 Farm Bill. Despite the continued efforts by Agribusiness and their high paid lobbyists to

marginalize organic farmers, research is continuing to prove that organic farming is sustainable, environmentally sound and a real-world solution to an existence without fossil fuels (*e.g.,* Cuba). California organic livestock farmers are becoming paralyzed by the environmental regulations in California that are designed to stem the environmental threat of CAFO operations but instead require farming practices that are counter to organic practices.

Your district includes some of the best organic livestock operations in the state. In addition, Humboldt and Del Norte Counties are economically dying . . . and would greatly benefit from more organic agriculture operations.

Please make sure that organic farming is an important part of the 2012 Farm Bill. Make sure that there is financial recognition for this industry, these farmers, and your district.

Thank you,

LISA CARNAHAN,
Organic Valley,
California Regional Manager,
Fortuna, CA,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF BOB CARNEL, CANNON FALLS, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Bob Carnel.
City, State: Cannon Falls, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser and Real Estate Broker.
Comment: I do not understand why appraisers and real estate people can not get the information such as tillable acres, aerial views *etc.* It is very help full in our appraisal of farm land for local lenders, and also Estate planning.

BOB CARNEL.

COMMENT OF ERIN CARNES, PORTLAND, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Erin Carnes.
City, State: Portland, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Supply Chain Analyst.
Comment: Please do right by the American people. I want my children to grow up knowing right from wrong, especially when it comes to food. We can make our food system better by encouraging healthy choices not just with education but with the appropriate subsidies to make fresh, healthy produce reasonably priced for everyone. It REALLY irritates me that people can eat at a fast food chain cheaper than that they can eat a balanced meal of local produce and meat/poultry. ONLY YOU CAN MAKE THIS RIGHT, and I urge you to do so.

COMMENT OF GEORGE CARPENTER, SOUTH BERWICK, ME

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: George Carpenter.
City, State: South Berwick, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: As a small producer of non-certified organic products in the northeast, the only benefits received from the last farm bill were in EQIP cost-shares, and the hope—but not actualized—assistance from the AMA program for high tunnel/hoop house funding for season extension and crop management. (approximately 1/60 of applicants were funded).

As a e-Cornell graduate of the GAPs food safety program,

I am completely against provisions contained in S. 510 and H.R. 2749, as I believe that the root-causes of our nations ills are not in-field contamination, but rather issues with the established packing house and slaughter practices of combining materials from various sources.

Deer walking through my fields, or ducks visiting my pond—are not the cause of widespread outbreaks. Nor is the composted and careful use of manure. Confinement feed lot operations, manure lagoons, both "Big Ag" practices, are the problem.

Further the contamination comes from greed, low wages and low standards for employee training, and this horrid practice of combining tainted product with clean product and making a small issue into a nationwide epidemic. Requiring a chlorine bath for all of my produce ignores the fact that my produce was cleanly raised to begin with. Regulation of small farms, with hands-on operations where the crops and animals are known, carefully monitored, and well cared-for due to the obscene practices of Big Ag? Is comparable to requiring all men over the age of 15 to be castrated, as it's been well-established that men perpetuate rape upon women. Neuter the men, remove the nationwide epidemic of rapists.

COMMENT OF KATHERINE CARROLL, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Katherine Carroll.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Baking and Pastry Cook.
Comment:

Dear Sirs,

I would like to respectfully request that you drastically decrease subsidies on factory farmed foods. Big corporate America is destroying our food systems, our health and our countries environment. It is wrong that unhealthy, unnatural and over processed foods are the most affordable foods available. By ending your subsidies on meat, poultry, dairy, GMO and other morally corrupt farming practices healthy foods can once again compete in the market place as God intended them to be.

Healthy food should not be only for the rich people in this country. I demand that you make healthy food available to everyone by ceasing your support of unnatural, non-sustainable, unethical farming practices.

COMMENT OF SUSAN CARROLL, LAKE ARIEL, PA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Susan Carroll.
City, State: Lake Ariel, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Greenhouse/nursery.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please enact all the Farm Bill propositions.

Scientists are reporting that we are at a critical stage for preventing environmental catastrophe. Nine billion inhabitants will place unsustainable pressure on the planet and there will be a collapse of the natural world including water animal and people.

Local and sustainable are the only solutions to a healthy economy and environment.

In my area dairy farms are closing because milk is processed and SUBSIDIZED in New Jersey. Solution: Local Creameries.

The list of errors continues and I will not go into the POLITICS of poor policy . . . except to mention Lawyers and Lobbyists. We the people know what is happening, but policy makers are perpetuating it.

Please help,

SUSAN CARROLL.

COMMENT OF RICHARD CARSTENS, FRESNO, CA

Date Submitted: Sunday, May 16, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Richard Carstens.
City, State: Fresno, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Nuts.
Size: 151–300 acres.

Comment: In the "DCP" program stop paying for "Base Acres". In Fresno County growers that have not grown cotton for 15 years still receive payments. Let them keep the Base just stop the payments. Saving in Fresno county $3m. We have dry land grain farmers in Fresno that make crop every 5 years. If they get a payment one year they are out of the program for the next 4 years. Make it grower and property so that it can't be traded back and forth. Saving to RMA and FSA about $4m.

COMMENT OF BOONE CARTER, LAS CRUCES, NM

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Boone Carter.
City, State: Las Cruces, NM.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I'd like to see ethanol support taken away, it is not environmentally sustainable and links all industries to oil prices which increases volatility in all related industries to the point that only big companies with lot of cash can survive.

COMMENT OF AMANDA CARVAJAL, MERCED, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Amanda Carvajal.
City, State: Merced, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Director of Merced County Farm Bureau.
Comment:

May 20, 2010

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman,
House Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Chairman Peterson:

The Merced County Farm Bureau represents one of the most productive agricultural counties in California and the United States. We have over 1,600 members in dairy and ranching industry as well as growers of almonds, tomatoes, and sweet potatoes crops. We are encouraged by the efforts of Chairman Collin Peterson (D–MN) to bring the full Committee to the Central Valley to discuss the 2012 Farm Bill.

California agricultural producers have typically not been deeply involved in Farm Bill issues, but in recent years the Farm Bill's focus has expanded to include new programs and provisions that benefit many of our members. The 2008 bill's historic inclusion of the first-ever specialty crop title has proved especially important to our growers of fruits, vegetables and nuts. Many producers also take advantage of conservation programs, including the popular EQIP, a program that recently was threatened for budget cuts. Research, nutrition, and other areas of agricultural policy also receive greater attention in the 2008 bill.

Looking to 2012, the Merced County Farm Bureau would like to work with the Congress to ensure that the Farm Bill continues to acknowledge the importance of promoting conservation programs like EQIP, preserving the specialty crops title, and strengthening other programs that ensure a safe and abundant domestic food supply. We are eager to share our thoughts, comments, and expertise in the crafting of a bill that works for our producers. Thank you for taking the opportunity to visit us in order to learn more about the challenges we face to farm and ranch in California.

Sincerely,

Board of Directors,
Merced County Farm Bureau,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
Merced, CA,
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH CASLER, FORT THOMAS, KY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Elizabeth Casler.
City, State: Fort Thomas, KY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Freelance Writer.
Comment: I'm very concerned over the state of our food industry. It seems that government policies help to make unhealthy food cheap and healthy food prohibitively expensive for many. Why are we subsidizing commodity crops at the expense of the nation's health and that of small farmers? Why is corn in everything? How can Mansantos be allowed to intimidate and put small farmers out of business when their patented gene contaminates the field of farmers who never wanted it in the first place? Why aren't we making it easier for everyone to buy locally-grown, healthier food? Please use the 2012 Farm Bill to move us toward sustainability and away from becoming a nation of diabetics.

COMMENT OF JASON CASTANEDA, SAN DIEGO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Jason Castaneda.
City, State: San Diego, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Provider of scientific informatics software.
Comment: Please reduce or end subsidies of corn and soy products by the federal government. Processed foods from these products are likely to be causing the obesity epidemic we are currently experiencing. Our bodies have not able to adjust to the flood of inexpensive calories we now have access to. For the first time in history obesity is a problem that affects the poor. No one would have ever imagined this in their wildest dreams. Previously, only the wealthy could afford to consume enough calories to be overweight. Now, it is the poor who find themselves with few alternatives to processed simple carbohydrate laden foods. This unthinkable scenario is only possible when the government artificially lowers the market price of grain and soy, which are used to create the vast majority of processed and fast foods.

Please do your part to lower the farming industry's reliance on government subsidies. Our future generations require it.

COMMENT OF DONALD CATANZARO, LOWELL, AR

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 27, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Donald Catanzaro.
City, State: Lowell, AR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Consultant.
Comment:

Good Day,

I recently tried to obtain statistics from the Farm Services Agency (FSA) regarding compliance rates of farmers enrolled in various FSA conservation programs (*i.e.,* CRP, WRP, GRP, CREP *etc.*).

I was literally astounded to learn that the FSA does not have any reports nor statistics available (see FOIA request below). I find this incredibly because some of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) dates to the 1980s and some of the conservation programs date to the 1950s (Soil Bank Program, the precursor to CRP).

I believe it is imperative to collect this information, without an understanding of compliance rates, how can we determine if these programs are effective?

DON CATANZARO.

ATTACHMENT

FOIA Response

FSA FOIA/PA 80–001–2010–000172

Mr. Donald Catanzaro:

This responds to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request (copy attached) dated May 5, 2010, control number 80–001–2010–000172.

In your request, you stated the following:

"I have been unsuccessful in finding any reports regarding compliance rates of farmers enrolled in various FSA conservation programs (*i.e.,* CRP, WRP, GRP, CREP *etc.*).

Do you have any reports and/or statistics that would show how often farmers are violating their conservation contracts? A U.S. based report that would show by State/County data such as ### acres of corn were planted in the CRP contracted area . . . or #.#% of farmers have been found to violate contracts of WRP . . . or $#,### fines have been assessed to CREP recipients.

I attempted to get the information from the FSA Online Knowledge Base (see *http://askfsa.custhelp.com/app/account/questions/detail/i__id/20450 http://askfsa.custhelp.com/app/account/questions/detail/i__id/20450.*)

I would also like to have a raw dataset which shows farmers that have been sent violation notices (name, address *etc.*), the status of the violation notice (resolved, renegotiated, incorrect, fine received etc), the action taken by FSA and any other data related to violations of FSA conservation contracts."

We have completed our search for responsive records in the Conservation & Environmental Programs Division (CEPD). FSA has no records responsive to your FOIA request because, as the CEPD office advised, they (1) do not have existing reports or readily generatable statistics regarding how often farmers are violating their conservation contracts, *etc.,* and (2) the information you asked to have included in a raw dataset is not captured in our electronic computer systems. (In order to locate it, we would need to search in every individual file of every producer participating in an FSA conservation program in every County office in the United States and Puerto Rico.) Under the FOIA, FSA is not required to review all of its existing conservation program records to compile the information you requested and create records in response to your FOIA request

However, if you believe that there are, in fact, records responsive to your request in files maintained by the FSA, in the format in which you request them, you may appeal this determination within forty-five (45) days of the date of this letter. In so doing, please provide us with the location of the responsive records, if it is known to you, or the reason why you believe that there are records responsive to your request in FSA files. Please include a copy of your initial request letter in your appeal package, and clearly mark both your letter and its envelope with the words "Freedom of Information Act Appeal." Mail your appeal package to the following address:

Administrator,
United States Department of Agriculture,
Farm Service Agency, Stop Code 0570,
1400 Independence Avenue, SW,
Washington, D.C. 20250–0570.

COMMENT OF CORTNEY CAYLOR, FORT WORTH, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 20, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Cortney Caylor.
City, State: Fort Worth, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

- Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.
- Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.
- Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

COMMENT OF CINDI CEVA, MONTAUK, AR

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Cindi Ceva.
City, State: Montauk, AR.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Hotelier.
Comment: Our kids need healthier school lunches.

COMMENT OF KATHERINE CHAPMAN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Katherine Chapman.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Accountant.
Comment: Invest in organic farming! I shop almost exclusively at my local farmers market so I can know more about the food coming to my plate and to support farmers directly. I would appreciate this being an option for people across the economic spectrum. One way would be to subsidize small farmers rather than large ag. Thank you.

COMMENT OF PAUL CHEK, VISTA, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Paul Chek.
City, State: Vista, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Holistic Health and Fitness Educator & Author.
Comment: I (and many of my clients who will be writing, too) am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of the people, our nation, and the world as a whole.

COMMENT OF THOMAS CHILDRESS, RUGBY, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, 9:36 a.m.
Name: Thomas Childress.
City, State: Rugby, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: The Farm Bill need some work. First thing would be to simplify all the programs. It seems that the Ag programs are made too complex, in order to frustrate farmers from participating! Crop Insurance has gotten to be the same way!

If cuts are going to be made in any Ag Program, then it should be accompanied by a definite simplification of the programs.

As far as Crop Insurance, there seems to be a move away from the optional unit, to enterprise units or whole farm units. This is a big mistake, as the optional unit has been the backbone of crop insurance for a few decades now. If this is the future, then farmers will simply drop out of crop insurance, then participation rates will come into question! Also, the value of agricultural land will drop!

Not a little either, but could easily drop in half!

This would stimulate land loan foreclosures similar to the 1980's, and we would be back to where we started!!

COMMENT OF CINDY CHRISTENSEN, SIOUX FALLS, SD

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 18, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Cindy Christensen.
City, State: Sioux Falls, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Division Manager Sioux Falls Chamber of Commerce.
Comment: I would encourage you to include in the farm bill, mechanisms to help young farmers become established in farming. They are the future to agriculture. Farming is a huge risk and many young farmers do not have the ability to survive those risks. Also, I feel ethanol is a big key to the future of agriculture. Please re-

member provisions for ethanol in your considerations. Thank you for the forum in Sioux Falls this morning. All points were well taken.

COMMENT OF KIM CHRISTMAN, WEST CHESTER, PA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 29, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Kim Christman.
City, State: West Chester, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Please consider changing farm policy to support small farmers and the production of diverse organic produce. I feel strongly that the industrialization of food based of the overproduction of corn and soy crops has lead to the epidemics of obesity and degenerative diseases in this country. Please do not subsidize these crops, especially when grown with conventional methods, using pesticides which pollute the food supply, in addition to our air and water supply.

Please provide incentives for farmers to grow a variety of crops organically, as this will lead to better nutrition sources for our entire nation. Find ways to reward sustainable farming methods that benefit the land, the farmer and the citizen consumer.

Please consider allowing those on food stamps to use their rations at Farmer's Markets and disallow them to buy foods that are unhealthy, like soda and foods with his concentrations of high-fructose corn syrup. If the government is providing funds to support low income families by helping them by food, shouldn't the government take responsibility for making sure they are eating life-sustaining, healthy foods?

Please find ways to help the small farmers who work hard to produce diverse, healthy crops that sustain the land they own and contribute to the health of their nation.

COMMENT OF CASSANDRA CHURCH, E. MONTPELIER, VT

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Cassandra Church.
City, State: E. Montpelier, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Artist.
Comment: I am writing today to ask that you improve the horrible plight of factory farmed animals. these animals are suffering because corporations are greedy. The treatment of these sentient creatures must be addressed, we must treat them with more respect, and end the barbaric conditions in factory farming, we must do better. We must not support factory farming. Organic farming, small farms, and plant based farms must be given a priority. If the government doesn't buy murdered animal from factory farms for school lunches, and gives the American child a a plant based alternative we can change the *status quo*. Let's fix this barbarism, put some strong protection rules in place for the animals.

COMMENT OF DEBBIE CHURCHILL, FREMONT, NE

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Debbie Churchill.
City, State: Fremont, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: County Assessor.
Comment: Our office uses AgriData as an invaluable tool for assessment purposes. The fact that one government agency cannot share information with another government agency is NOT the best use of government resources, but politics at its worst. Please approve the sharing of farming information with other agencies needing the data. Thank you!

COMMENT OF CIELUKOWSKI, COCOA BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Cielukowski.
City, State: Cocoa Beach, FL.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Please stop supporting factory farms. Instead, support local, organic, plant-based farming systems.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF PETER CLARE, TIBURON, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Peter Clare.
City, State: Tiburon, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired/Urban Homesteader.
Comment: These are my wishes and concerns for the future of our farms, our agriculture industry, and all the families that depend on you:
Please keep our food safe and healthy!
Please protect our rights as consumers!
Please stop Monsanto!!!
Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food . . .
Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products . . .
Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive . . .
Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future . . .
Please take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies!
Thank you for your efforts . . .

COMMENT OF ROSEMARY CLARK, MADISON, WI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 05, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Rosemary Clark.
City, State: Madison, WI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please roll back or redirect grain subsidies in the next Farm Bill. While agricultural subsidies are often justified in the name of food security, the current subsidy policy in the U.S. is an outmoded and unhealthy system for everyone but American grain producers. Not only does it harm international trade and betray producers in third world countries (leading to the lie of "food aid" whereby artificially cheap U.S. grains drive developing world farmers out of business), but it leads to distorted crop production in the U.S. Why do we need to have oceans of corn and soy in the Midwest? Vegetable production in this country is currently insufficient to fulfill our nation's dietary needs. Perhaps if our healthy fruit and vegetable producers experienced the production support that currently props up our bloated grain-fed meats and processed foods, we'd see the impact move from the supermarkets to our waistlines.

COMMENT OF SHAWN CLARK, PORTLAND, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Shawn Clark.
City, State: Portland, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dry Beans & Peas, Vegetables, Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: As a chef and small scale farmer, I believe organic farming principles to be at the forefront of 21st century agricultural needs. Please include funding for organic farming, including small scale, permaculture and conservation farming. Our seeds and foods are our legacy, and with more and more varieties of produce falling by the wayside, organic farming becomes a necessity to maintain biodiversity and a healthy food chain. Thanks for your time!

COMMENT OF STEVE CLAUSEN, CHATHAM, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Steve Clausen.
City, State: Chatham, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified General Appraiser.
Comment: I am a certified general appraiser in the State of Illinois. I specialize in appraisals of agricultural use properties, primarily land used for feed grain and oil seed production. The current policy of the USDA Farm Service Agency does not allow access to information that is critical to preparing credible reports. The most critical of that information that is not allowed is CLU data. The result is increased time spent by myself in attempts to prepare credible reports, which causes higher fees to the users of the reports for those appraisals. The users of those reports are primarily the farm operators.

COMMENT OF ROBERT CLEMENTS, ELMWOOD, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Robert Clements.
City, State: Elmwood, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Banker.
Comment: Federal Crop Insurance is vital to my ability to provide line of credit loans to farmers.

We have no irrigation, so we rely on rainfall to make a crop. About 3 out of 10 years there is a rain shortfall. With crop input expenses so high, most farmers rely on a large line of credit to plant and harvest crops. The bank relies heavily on the crop insurance guarantee when setting the farmers' credit limits.

Any restriction of Multiple Peril Crop Insurance will directly limit our farmers' operating funds and ability to produce income.

COMMENT OF JEFFREY CLOW, HARRISBURG, SD

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Jeffrey Clow.
City, State: Harrisburg, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Service Tech.
Comment: I want to thank the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture for providing this opportunity to submit comments on agricultural policy for the 2012 Farm Bill.

Farmers understand that conservation is key to agricultural production, rural economies, and future well-being. To meet the needs of the future, the 2012 Farm Bill must recognize, protect, and enhance the status of conservation policy in federal farm policy.

Research from USDA consistently shows that conservation practices and programs that support rural America's natural amenities also bolster the number of rural jobs and even farms. Furthermore, protection of our finite soil and water resources is essential if farms and ranches are to meet the challenge of feeding a growing population. Conversely, an extraction ethic in agriculture can at best serve only short term rewards at the expense of our future.

Success in the 2012 Farm Bill can be achieved without inflated spending, but conservation must be at the center of policy considerations. As you begin the process of re-authorizing our national farm policy, please include the following recommendations in your work:

1. Enact a robust and well-funded Conservation Title to support all conservation programs. Congress and the administration must enact a 2012 Farm Bill that provides the assistance and incentives necessary to ensure stewardship of agricultural lands.

2. Enact a federal Farm Bill that promotes payments for farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits rather than emphasizing payments for historical crop production.

3. Re-prioritize the existing conservation compliance regimen. Conservation compliance is a means for ensuring that where public money is invested, the public's interests are protected by requiring basic levels of protections for soil,

water and wetlands. Prioritizing conservation compliance will require no additional Farm Bill investment and, in fact, can result in saving federal dollars by withholding subsidies. Specific actions that should be taken include:

Require all crop land to have a conservation plan in order to be eligible for any USDA benefits. This would strongly encourage producers to create and follow that plan.

To remove the incentive to convert remaining grasslands to crops, make native sod and all land without a cropping history ineligible for federal crop insurance.

Require all existing or new crop and revenue insurance or other risk management programs to be subject to conservation compliance provisions. This is absolutely critical, particularly with respect to recent calls for making insurance a major component of the federal farm support system.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit these comments.

COMMENT OF CHRIS COCHENOUR, ST. MEINRAD, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Chris Cochenour.
City, State: St. Meinrad, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: As a producer and a commercial user sites that use CLU data, including Surety Maps help us decipher acres to apply on, and also allows us to double check the amount of acres. Without this our efficiencies would go down because of having excess chemical to spray out, or running short and having to wait on more to arrive.

COMMENT OF DEBORAH CODELLA, MURRELLS INLET, SC

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Deborah Codella.
City, State: Murrells Inlet, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market. Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

We want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Prohibit GMO's in all agricultural systems. Mandatory Labeling on all conventional food products which contain GMO's, including the ingredients which could possibly have GMO components.

Allow no patents on food crops!

COMMENT OF DICK COFFMAN, HINTON, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Dick Coffman.
City, State: Hinton, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I encourage continued support of the crop revenue insurance programs. If it is supported to the level that 70–80% coverage is affordable I would be

in favor of eliminating all other payments. You could have a minimum price below which the spring price would not fall to ensure an adequate safety net. That could be in place of loan deficiency and countercyclical payments.

I recommend that direct payments be eliminated. They are simply transfer payment and not needed if adequate crop revenue insurance protection is available.

I am not opposed to SURE, but if subsidized revenue insurance were available it would probably not be needed.

I believe that means testing is very unfair. Just because one may be successful in another business should not keep them from farming. If you cannot receive program benefits you are at a disadvantage to other producers and without some kind of safety net cannot take the risk of farming. I have a small farm management company with three employees. I have also acquired some land over time and farm part time. If the $250,000 non-farm income limit is approved I will not be eligible for farm program payments. Why should I not be eligible for benefits just because I have been successful in my other business? Under the present program if prices were to drop sharply and there were large countercyclical or loan deficiency payments I could not afford to farm my own land. Should I have to rent it out just because I have other income?

We manage farms for individuals and companies that have considerable non-farm income. Many of these farm owners have crop share arrangements with the tenants and share in the risk and rewards of farming. Means testing drives these farm owners to cash rent when they cannot have the benefits of income price support programs. This places greater risk in the tenant. I do not believe we should have programs that select who can and who cannot farm.

I am not completely opposed to payment limits if they are structured properly. I believe any limit should be on the individual and that entities with multiple ownership should qualify through the individuals. If we had only subsidized crop revenue insurance there could be a maximum amount of subsidy that a producer could receive. If you allowed up to $40,000 per producer for revenue insurance subsidy it would be much more beneficial than the direct payments. Very large producers should still be allowed to purchase revenue insurance, but the subsidy would not cover as much of their premium.

Please consider having subsidized revenue insurance be the centerpiece of the new farm bill and eliminate the means testing.

COMMENT OF DAVID COLLINS, CHEROKEE, OK

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:06 a.m.
Name: David Collins.
City, State: Cherokee, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment: I am hoping that Congress removes requirements shielding FSA acreage data from the public. It is taxpayer money providing the dollars for payments and the public should have access to this information. It has also added to the costs of appraisals completed on farm ground for servicing loans and new loans. Completely unnecessary to shield this information. AgriData has been a source of information for farm operations that utilized this information that is used in farming operations on a daily basis across the country.

COMMENT OF MARYBETH COLLINS, TROY, VA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Marybeth Collins.
City, State: Troy, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: Please require GMO foods be labeled for consumers! Law requires mere salt content to be labeled, yet we are currently buying unlabeled bioengineered foods in our supermarkets without our knowledge or consent. Unfathomable. I am especially concerned about the short- and long-term effects GM foods on the growing and developing bodies of our children. I am especially concerned that organic foods are threatened by the cross pollination that will surely occur if GM crops continue to get approved for planting in our fields.

Biotechnology is tampering with the DNA code that generates all life. In agriculture, there is great scientific uncertainty, health risks and environmental dangers associated with GM crops. There is a "no going back" factor to genetically engineered farming that warrants our most serious consideration. Intuition tells us:

Dogs don't mate with cats. Horses don't mate with petunias. Let us apply intelligent caution with these new technologies! Such caution will benefit our farmers as well as our consumers.

Let's take a lesson from recent history: the BP disaster. Big corporations of all types should not have so much power. Clearly, big corporations like Monsanto are concerned about profits over people, farmers and consumers alike. They have huge power. We citizens need our government to protect us and ensure our safety. It is too big for individual citizens or even grass root organizations to manage alone! Please act on our behalf.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF LINDLEY COMER, ELWOOD, IN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 7:36 p.m.
Name: Lindley Comer.
City, State: Elwood, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: I use the FSA maps almost daily in my appraisal business. This is one of the best tools I have ever had. They save me hours of work on my reports.

COMMENT OF DANIEL COMES, MAPLETON, IA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Daniel Comes.
City, State: Mapleton, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser/Farmer.
Comment: It is essential in my field of work as an appraiser that that CLU data be reinstated into Section 1619 of the farm bill.

COMMENT OF GLENN COMPTON, NOKOMIS, FL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 6:05 a.m.
Name: Glenn Compton.
City, State: Nokomis, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: The 2012 Farm Bill needs to support conservation orientated land management policies and not be dominated by special interest groups that view land stewardship only in terms of economic gain.

The Conservation Resource Program, the reorganization of sections of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Clean Water Act will provide for the center of attention for much of the Farm Bill debate.

The United States Department of Agriculture is intended to work with landowners and the various governmental agencies concerned with soil and water conservation. Yet, the USDA has repeatedly been criticized for not working in concert to achieve the goals of maintaining the economic and environmental integrity of agricultural lands.

Wetland destruction and inadequate runoff from farms have created "dead zones" in estuaries throughout the country. Florida has at least four estuaries that are highly polluted by farm runoff. 58 percent of Tampa Bay's nitrogen loading is a result of agriculture, and 41 percent for Charlotte Harbor.

The destruction of wetlands which act as a filter for nitrogen has allowed for an increase in fertilizers entering into the waterways.

Adequate use of Agricultural Best Management Practices (BMP) is an important aspect in protecting water resources and the environment, yet there is little information or oversight to verify that these practices are having water quality and environmental benefits or water quality and environmental impacts.

Many agricultural Best Management Practices are written by the United States Department of Agriculture or the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and are intended as management guidelines on a national or state level. The agricultural BMP's that many farmers have relied on are not specific enough to address the water quality and environmental concerns found locally. Best Management Practices are practices used to maximize the agricultural productivity of the land, not protect the environment.

Proper land management is an obligation to maintain the environmental integrity of the land for the protection of the natural resources. Priority should be given to the protection of native habitat, as native habitats are the lands that are in the most danger of being lost for the future.

The education of policy makers and landowners involved in setting priorities associated with the agricultural industry will be a critical factor in the protection of our natural resources. What truly is needed is policy, both on the national and local levels that will protect the environmental integrity of the land and encourage the rebuilding of that which has previously been destroyed.

COMMENT OF CYNTHIA COX, FOX, AR

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 a.m.
Name: Cynthia Cox.
City, State: Fox, AR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: It is vital on many fronts to have a farm bill that is inclusive of rights for small farmers: (1) local economy, (2) health benefits of eating regional foods, (3) national security. We must have regulations that make since for a small farm . . . please don't try to fit a small operation into the big box model. Small farm standards are usually higher than those regulated and we don't want to be forced to be mediocre like corporate farms.

COMMENT OF OONA COY, NORTHAMPTON, MA

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Oona Coy.
City, State: Northampton, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I believe the Farm Bill should be very much focused on supporting the next generation of farmers. It should also be focused on climate change.

COMMENT OF KEVIN CRADDUCK, SAVANNAH, GA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:05 a.m.
Name: Kevin Cradduck.
City, State: Savannah, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Credit Representative.
Comment: I strongly urge the next Farm Bill to take a closer look at sugar subsidies once again.

The protection program maintains sugar employment at about 20–35% above the natural level, meaning that it costs U.S. taxpayers somewhere between $200,000 and $500,000 per year to protect each sugar job. Not surprisingly, Fanjul Corp benefits significantly (their net profits average an additional $50 million to $100 million per year due solely to the quota and break-even program), and could afford to make about $2 million in campaign contributions in the 2000 and 2004 election cycles.

It makes no sense to add weight to the pockets of corporations such as Fanjul Corp, while significantly increasing sugar costs for consumers. The purpose of the subsidy has shifted from a protection in a volatile industry to a revenue stream for them. With $2.5 billion dollars in revenue, FLO–SUN can absorb risk losses as other industries due by utilizing hedging tools.

While I may not understand this issue as you do, it doesn't make a lick of sense that U.S. sugar prices have been as high or higher than world prices for half a century! The price protection portion of the subsidy, if not repealed, should be drastically reduced to a price more in line with world prices.

COMMENT OF LORIN CRANDALL, SAINT LOUIS, MO

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Lorin Crandall.

City, State: Saint Louis, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Missouri Coalition for the Environment—Clean Water Coordinator.
Comment:

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing on behalf of the Missouri Coalition for the Environment, a nonprofit organization that has worked to protect the open lands, waters, and air in Missouri for Missourians for over 40 years. In recent years we have begun to work more and more extensively on the agriculture issues that are most important to Independent Missouri Farmers and Missourians concerned about the water quality impacts of modern industrial agriculture. The issues that are of the most concern to our constituents are conservation compliance, voluntary program reform, agency transparency, and "whole farm" revenue insurance.

Conservation Compliance

Our first priority is for conservation compliance to be revived through the following policy changes:

Reopen all legacy HEL soil conservation plans (plans approved, applied, and maintained before 3 July 1996) and revise them to at least meet current planning standards on highly erodible cropland.

All land in production, HEL and non-HEL, should be required to have a conservation plan to be eligible for USDA benefits.

Require treatment and/or prevention of ephemeral gully erosion on all agricultural land participating in covered programs (highly erodible and non-highly erodible cropland).

Require a setback of row crop planting of 20 feet from waterways—producers who want to plant a buffer that meets technical standards can enroll in CRP or CREP and receive payment for those additional acres.

Non-cropland and native sod on which an agricultural commodity is planted for which a policy or plan of insurance is available shall be ineligible for those benefits.

All existing or new crop and revenue insurance or other risk management programs must be subject to conservation compliance provisions.

Funding for the technical assistance needed to complete plans and conduct status reviews should be provided from funds otherwise made available for covered programs.

Voluntary Program Reform

In regard to voluntary programs, we would like to see policy changes designed to enhance performance, including:

- Dramatically increase the scope of the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative:
- Include CRP in programs affected by CCPI.
- 60 percent of EQIP funds running through CCPI by 2017.
- Allow CCPI funding to support planning, outreach, and monitoring costs of the partner organization.
- Selected surgical reforms to EQIP, CSP, and CRP to enhance targeting.
- Reduce funding for waste treatment lagoons and increase funding for conversion to sustainable livestock production methods like rotational grazing.
- Balance CRP and EQIP funds to increase the acres of riparian buffer zone land in long-term conservation practices.
- Establish a Riparian Land Trust that absorbs the funds from unfulfilled EQIP contracts and uses them to purchase sensitive riparian buffer areas from farmers an place them under a permanent conservation easement.

Transparency

Often times citizens trying to find out what is going on in their communities with regard to farming practices and environmental quality protections for their homes, farms and communities are unable to gain access to meaningful documents such as Nutrient Management Plans. It is our belief that since this information is relevant to these communities and paid for with their tax dollars—they should have full access to all conservation practices documents.

Strike provisions that restrict access to geospatial information regarding voluntary conservation program funding and livestock production operations.

Increase access to growers' conservation compliance plan details.

Mandate at least 1 percent of funding for voluntary programs be set aside for monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of those programs.

Require that all Nutrient Management Plans be public record and available in common PDF, GIS and database formats for public review.

"Whole Farm" Revenue Insurance

The design of a "Whole Farm" revenue insurance program or suite of programs should not result in loophole incentives to undertake activities that pollute water or otherwise threaten natural resources and the environment. Insurance must not support increased production on marginal land or provide coverage to non-cropland converted to agricultural commodity production. Furthermore, all existing and new risk management programs must be subject to conservation compliance provisions.

Thank you for considering our comments, we look forward to reviewing the decisions that the Committee makes.

LORIN CRANDALL,
Clean Water Coordinator,
Missouri Coalition for the Environment.

COMMENT OF DANA CRAWFORD, FLOWER MOUND, TX

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Dana Crawford.
City, State: Flower Mound, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: IT.
Comment: I would like to see High Fructose Corn Syrup and Killer Fats outlawed in the U.S., like in other countries. Have you noticed how Corn Syrup is in nearly every food? Enough! We want healthy food.

I would also like to see an end to farmers, ranchers, and the American public getting bullied by huge corporations forcing genetically modified seeds to be used and not telling the public what their getting, gag orders on free speech and video documentation against unethical food and meat production, and other tactics. Let the truth be known. Let the people choose with their hard-earned dollars. The American people should not be treated like mushrooms.

COMMENT OF NICHOLAS CROCKETT, PARTRIDGE, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Nicholas Crockett.
City, State: Partridge, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retailer.
Comment: I support the re-instatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. It is crucial to have this data the people of Agriculture today.

COMMENT OF PAUL CROM, HOLDREGE, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Paul Crom.
City, State: Holdrege, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraisal & Sales.
Comment:

Dear Members,

I wish to respectfully ask you to consider reinstating the CLU data into Section 1619. Availability of this information is important to insure a timely and accurate evaluation of agricultural properties that we deal with on a daily basis. It simply gives us access to the most accurate evaluation services available, and does not in anyway disclose any proprietary financial information. We often find significant variations in the local government taxing information, which is often out of date. Please allow us to more efficiently operate our offices, so we may more accurately serve your constituents,

Sincerely,

PAUL CROM.

COMMENT OF JOYCE CROWLEY, MORTON, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Joyce Crowley.
City, State: Morton, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Secretary.
Comment: Please limit all GMO crops, pesticides, and herbicides. Also help the organic farmers.

Outlaw Monsanto GMO seeds & pesticides as well as Bayer pesticides & herbicides.

COMMENTS OF BRET CUDE, NASHVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Bret Cude.
City, State: Nashville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager.
Comment: I have a concern related to Section 1619 of the current farm bill:

1. Section 1619 needs to be adjusted. Currently, Appraisers cannot gain access to the FSA maps base and yield information and CRP information on comparable properties. This make an appraisal less accurate, as they cannot do the comparisons and analysis necessary, and this increases the time required to do the appraisal. Therefore, the Appraisals will take longer to complete, be more expensive (time is money) and be less accurate. None of these are good for agriculture. I would suggest making this information available to State Certified and/or Accredited Appraisers.

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Bret Cude.
City, State: Nashville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager.
Comment: Limiting Payment eligibility based on income of the recipient is pushing more and more farm land to CASH RENT, which the farm operators are bidding up, due to the government payments associated with the farm. MANY landlords may be willing to continue to share the risk of the farming operation, by using a Share type arrangement, but if they are not eligible for government program payments *i.e.,:* DCP or ACRE payments, SURE payments, and LDP payments, they will continue to use cash rent leases. These leases place 100% of the RISK on the farm operator, so in addition to the higher costs of production for seed, fertilizer, herbicide and fuel, equipment, labor and crop insurance they now have these progressively higher CASH RENTS, many of which are due before planting.

I represent clients that fall into this situation, and if the income levels for eligibility continue to go down, you are going to see 2 things: More farm operators will not qualify . . . and more absentee landowners will switch to cash rent, and this will add to the indebtedness of the farm producer. Agriculture has withstood this recent economic crisis fairly well, but a poor crop, or substantially lower prices, can change this picture quickly.

COMMENT OF DANNY CULBERTSON, ALACHUA, FL

Date Submitted: Monday, June 28, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Danny Culbertson.
City, State: Alachua, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Engineer.
Comment: Subsidize fruits and vegetables and stop subsidizing corn and soy. Encourage local food production by stopping subsidies on oil drilling/refining or by taxing rail, truck and air food transportation. Encourage organic vegetable and meat production and stop subsidizing GMO foods and Monsanto. Act like representatives of the people instead of representatives of big corporations and the meat and dairy lobby.

COMMENT OF PETE CZOSNYKA, CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Pete Czosnyka.
City, State: Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Engineer.
Comment: Industrial agriculture and industrial animal husbandry are spreading pesticides, herbicides and other poisons; destroying the fertility of the soil; spreading oil based fertilizers and other products; creating more run-off; altering negatively the pre-settlement hydrologic conditions of the land; causing harm to the "waters of the U.S." while claiming, without proof, that they are responsible stewards of the land that should not be bound by the pollution laws that other industries are bound by.

COMMENT OF PEGGY DA SILVA, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Peggy da Silva.
City, State: San Francisco, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Organic Produce Wholesale Distribution.
Comment: Two major comments for the upcoming 2012 Farm Bill:

(1) we must have strong focus on environmental quality and support for foods which support good nutrition in the U.S.

(2) we should separate the actual nutrition support programs out of the Farm Bill and into their own bill.

COMMENT OF PEGGY DA SILVA, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 17, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Peggy da Silva.
City, State: San Francisco, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Health Educator.
Comment: It is critically important that the Farm Bill change its direction from supporting unhealthy and ecologically unsound agricultural products and practices. We need a shift to funding and regulations that support Organic Farming. We need to recognize that the health of our children and the health of our ecosystem are much more important than agricultural industry profits—and within a NEW system they need not be mutually exclusive.

COMMENT OF VERONICA DA SILVA, DOVER PLAINS, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Veronica Da Silva.
City, State: Dover Plains, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: As a mother of two young children and former elementary school teacher I feel that nutrition is one of the struggles that is hampering this country. In this country the government subsidizes corn and soy, so many large scale farms only grow these two "cash crops." Many children eat corn or soy products for breakfast, lunch and dinner. There is high fructose corn syrup, which is made out of the corn, in almost all processed food. This is leading to an epidemic of diabetes and obesity. These epidemics have been caused by the government subsidies. Food safety is not being addressed if these subsidies continue.

Next if we look at the majority of cases of *Salmonella* and *E. coli*, they have originated at LARGE factory farms because of the lack of oversight these factory farms and slaughter houses have had in the past few years. When there are animals stuffed into pens and piled on top of each other there is a greater chance of spreading disease.

Small farms treat there animals with respect and care. These farmers will be negatively impacted by the food safety and farm bill. The government should protect small farmers and not attempt to dismantle them for the sake of large corporations.

Organic farmers are an integral part of creating a sustainable food system. These farmers deserve to be on an even playing field with farmers that use non organic means. Give some subsidies to organic farmers so that all people can afford to feed their families a healthy and nutritious diet.

Finally, encouraging and supporting individuals and families to plant and harvest their own gardens should be priority of the farm bill. We can eat healthy and use less fossil fuels if we learn to be our own farmers.

COMMENT OF RACHEL DABERKOW, LAKEFIELD, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:36 p.m.
Name: Rachel Daberkow.
City, State: Lakefield, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment:

Dear Committee Members:

I understand that Section 1619 of the 2008 "Farm" Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the House or the Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate. I recognize the Committee's purpose but I feel an open ear to the people who are most effected would have been beneficial.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information. CLU data is similar to information found in a plat book (which every rural person gets a free copy of their county) but CLU data is much more accurate. Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

As a crop producer myself and a rural real estate appraiser, I would have an extremely difficult time doing my day to day work without CLU data. I hope that you all take a closer look at how you decide these items for the next "Farm" Bill. Please consider listening to the users of information before you decide to take away their access to it and make their lives and jobs exceedingly difficult.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please feel free to contact me at [Redacted.] Thanks for your consideration to this important matter.

RACHEL DABERKOW.

COMMENT OF DARRELL DAHL, WALNUT, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Darrell Dahl.
City, State: Walnut, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: The lack of access to field information negatively impacts the accuracy of appraisal work as well as limits vital information needed for marketing land for farm owners and investors.

COMMENT OF JOANNE DARLING, WILLIS, MI

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Joanne Darling.
City, State: Willis, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Please try to streamline all the FARM SERVICE AGENCY paper work that the farmers have to fill out. All these programs just cause More and More paper work for everyone. It takes so much time to fill out and to get Landlord to

fill out papers all the time. It would be easier to just pay so much per acre no matter what instead of all the paper work.

Thank you,

JOANNE DARLING a Monroe County farmer . . .

COMMENT OF BEV DAU, WEST CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Bev Dau.
City, State: West Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Administrative Assistant.
Comment: I can't believe there is even a question about organic farming or not. It is so important to get the chemicals and medicines out of our food. They are killing us. We need to get to organic farming in order to stay healthy and thus cut back on our hospital stays, and prescribed medicines. Please give us our "food" back!!!

COMMENT OF AMELIA DAVIS, CHARLOTTE, VT

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Amelia Davis.
City, State: Charlotte, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Greenhouse/nursery, Poultry/poultry products, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please please please, big people of power, consider the local organic food movement and org. farming in your next bill. As a worker, lover, and believer in this; change must occur to create a solid agricultural standing in America. When food came from our local farmers, naturally, and on a small-scale, money was spread equally and came back in a cycle to our community. Now, huge-scale dairy farms are hurting because they are producing on such a large scale that they cannot afford, therefore harming our animals and not making money. With SMALLER local farms spread throughout the country, this problem would not arise, and food would be fresher. Not only would it make Americans happier, but it would fill in the ruts of our economy. Our money cannot keep funneling into the hands of huge, lying, and wasteful corporations. WAKE UP! I do not understand why America's ag. industry has not been put higher on the totem pole. Please explain to us at least . . .

AMELIA DAVIS,
[Redacted],
Charlotte, VT.

COMMENT OF MATTHEW DAVIS, DETROIT LAKES, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Matthew Davis.
City, State: Detroit Lakes, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Natural Resources Manager.
Comment: Here are my comments regarding proposed changes for the 2012 Farm Bill . . .

Conservation must be at the center of policy considerations for the next Farm Bill. There is still too much environmental damage caused by farming practices . . . I see this as I drive around Rep. Peterson's District in NW Minnesota. As you begin the process of re-authorizing our national farm policy, please include the following recommendations in your work:

1. Enact a robust and well-funded Conservation Title to support all conservation programs. Congress and the administration must enact a 2012 Farm Bill that provides the assistance and incentives necessary to ensure stewardship of agricultural lands.

2. Enact a federal Farm Bill that promotes payments for farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits rather than emphasizing payments for historical crop production. The era of outrageous commodity subsidies should be over and should be replaced by payments for doing the right thing by the environment.

3. Re-prioritize the existing conservation compliance regimen. Conservation compliance is a means for ensuring that where public money is invested, the public's interests are protected by requiring basic levels of protections for soil, water and wetlands. Prioritizing conservation compliance will require no additional Farm Bill investment and, in fact, can result in saving federal dollars by withholding subsidies. Specific actions that should be taken include:

- Require all crop land to have a conservation plan in order to be eligible for any USDA benefits.
- To remove the incentive to convert remaining grasslands to crops, make native sod and all land without a cropping history ineligible for federal crop insurance.
- Require all existing or new crop and revenue insurance or other risk management programs to be subject to conservation compliance provisions. This is absolutely critical, particularly with respect to recent calls for making insurance a major component of the federal farm support system.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit my comments.

COMMENT OF RUSSELL B. DAVIS, W. HARRISON, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Russell B. Davis.
City, State: W. Harrison, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Musician and Educator.
Comment: These are my wishes and concerns for the future of our farms, our agriculture industry, and all the families that depend on you:
Please keep our food safe and healthy!
Please protect our rights as consumers!
Please stop Monsanto!!!
Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food.
Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products . . .
Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive . . .
Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future . . .
Please take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies!
Thank you for your efforts . . .
Sincerely,

RUSSELL B. DAVIS.

COMMENT OF STEVE DAVIS, LOVELAND, OH

Date Submitted: Thursday, April 29, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Steve Davis.
City, State: Loveland, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Economics Teacher.
Comment: Farm bill no longer represents protective measures for the small farmer or the consumer. For one thing, the concept of the small farmer no longer exists. If a farm exceeds 5,000 acres then (in my opinion) they should not be able to participate in the countercyclical and subsidized price programs. In addition, our food industry subsidies are not necessary for corn, wheat, rice, soy, cotton and ESPECIALLY sugar (which is granted trade protection quotas as well). Cotton is another crop that should not have those special trade deals that favor growers and retailers that buy American cotton from foreign mills. One last thing about this outdated bill. Strip away the welfare funding of food stamps and such which links subsidized purchases with subsidized farming. Our food industry is in crisis with cheap processed foods being artificially cheap creating an epidemic of type II diabetes. No need to tax soda. Stop subsidizing it and let the market forces adjust.
If the House and Senate wish to fly the free market flag, then start here!!!

COMMENT OF CHUCK DAWES, SPRINGVILLE, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Chuck Dawes.
City, State: Springville, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Sales person.
Comment: The price restriction should be lifted from the farmers and let them produce milk and food before we put them out of business and have to depend on foreign countries. Which, we know we can not depend on or trust for good quality produces . . . I would not mind paying a buck or more for a gallon of milk and let them sell there goods to other countries so they can grow and stay in business . . . We need more farmers, not less . . .

Thanks,

CHUCK DAWES.

COMMENT OF DESDRA DAWNING, QUEEN CREEK, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Desdra Dawning.
City, State: Queen Creek, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: We have only to look at the many drug ads on TV these days to know that the health of our citizenry is greatly challenged. And the food that we eat contributes to our many health problems. Please recognize the value of organic farmers and the healthy food they produce and back them in any way that you can. We need your help!

COMMENT OF KATHLEEN DEATON, FAYETTEVILLE, AR

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Kathleen Deaton.
City, State: Fayetteville, AR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Greenhouse/nursery, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please make ORGANIC a top priority in the next farm bill. Organic agriculture systems have the potential to protect natural resources, produce abundant, healthy foods, and even remediate polluted areas. Farmers need support transitioning to organic systems, and organic farmers need protection from outside pollution sources.

COMMENT OF LISA DECARLO, FORT MYERS, FL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: Lisa DeCarlo.
City, State: Fort Myers, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: H.R. Manager.
Comment: The next farm bill should include a provision requiring the labeling of all food products that contain genetically modified ingredients. Consumers must be able to make informed food choices and without labeling of GMO's, consumers are unable to do so.

COMMENT OF GERALD DEE, BYRON, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Gerald Dee.
City, State: Byron, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I would like to recommend including the common land unit data available at Farm Service Agency offices to real estate appraisers. The information on the number of crop acres is vital to appraising farms accurately and to analyze

farms that have sold. In this period of tighter cash flows and changing land values, it is more important than ever to complete accurate appraisals with up to date field information from the maps.

COMMENT OF MARIANNA DELINCK MANLEY, MISHAWAKA, IN

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Marianna Delinck Manley.
City, State: Mishawaka, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graphic Designer.
Comment: Please support changing the farm subsidies programs to benefit high-quality, organic, fruit and vegetable farming instead of the current highly subsidized corn, wheat, and soy. We need to make real food accessible and affordable to all instead of making the raw materials for corporate powerhouses cheap.

The current programs benefit very few while locking farmers into an unending cycle of dependency on chemical and seed companies as well as the government. All the while, the corporate end products are making our entire nation and environment sick.

Please support good, clean, fair, nutritious, and accessible food by changing farm subsidies to benefit small organic and family farms growing real food.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF MELISSA DELZIO, PORTLAND, OR

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 7:06 p.m.
Name: Melissa Delzio.
City, State: Portland, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Designer.
Comment: For our own health and health of the natural environment, I urge you to demand that government farm subsidies are given only to ORGANIC farmers, producing a wider variety of crops. We must stop supporting the unhealthy cycle of processed food run by big corn and soy.

COMMENT OF LARRY DEN HARTOG, SHELDON, IA

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Larry Den Hartog.
City, State: Sheldon, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Advisor.
Comment: I use this service everyday to check out soil maps and use boundaries for soil sampling. This service helps me make proper fertilizer and tillage recommendations for the local farmers. Much needed service that does not effect any ones private business. Also used to make chemical and fertilizer application maps so the applicator does not get in the wrong field.

COMMENT OF DEBORAH DENENBERG, OMAHA, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Deborah Denenberg.
City, State: Omaha, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Marketing Consultant.
Comment: The diabetes epidemic is out of control, and we need help at the highest levels to reverse it or the next generation will also be lost. I have been working on wellness at my school level for four years, with few, slow results. Please help. If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support

for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF A.H. DENIS III, VANCOURT, TX

Date Submitted: Friday, July 02, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: A.H. Denis III.
City, State: Vancourt, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Greenhouse/nursery, Livestock.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: U.S. agriculture producers are expected to compete in the world market in spite of the fact that U.S. environmental laws, labor laws and government regulations increase our cost of production. Lack of protection from cheap imports and adverse WTO decisions put the American farmer/producer at a distinct disadvantage compared to importers.

COMMENT OF MARVIN DENLINGER, ARCANUM, OH

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Marvin Denlinger.
City, State: Arcanum, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Lender.
Comment: I am asking that the CLU data on the NRCS be available for me to provide excellent service to agricultural producers in the state of Ohio.

- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF ANTHONY DEREMER, LACEYVILLE, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Anthony DeRemer.
City, State: Laceyville, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Economy: I often see articles talking about how important the farm community is to the economy and I look at the Bill and there is a lot of money being spent, but has anyone actually looked at how this money will filter down to the local farmer and if it actually does? Currently with the prices being paid to local farmers, (I am familiar with dairy) the farmer does not have enough money to pay the cost of basic expenses, they certainly do not have anything left to spend on maintaining buildings, buying new equipment and even meeting basic expenses. It seems to me that someone should take the time to sit down with local farmers explain specifically how "you" think the farm bill will help them and allow them to see if it actually works.

Food Safety: I recently read an article in the *Lancaster Farming* newspaper and if I remember correctly it said around 1% of the imported food is inspected by USDA and in some cases 50% of what is imported from certain countries is unsafe! I don't know what the percent of U.S. food is inspected by the USDA but I am betting it is much higher than 1%, why shouldn't the same percentage of imported food be inspected and if there are continued issues with certain countries or certain foods why are we still importing it?

Alternative Energy is a great idea but it is not a necessity for farmers and if they don't have money to pay basic expenses they certainly do not have money for something they can do without.

The Bill talks about spending millions to purchase food overseas to feed local people, if we have such a surplus why don't we send some of our surplus to those countries? I am not sure I believe there is a surplus.

One of the goals of the bill is to provide inexpensive food, but at what cost? Once our local farmers are gone and we are dependent on other countries as is the case with energy do you really think we are going to have a cheap food supply?

I noticed it was mentioned that some parts of the bill provide public access to private lands for hunting and fishing if I understand correctly this is linked to a farmers participation in certain government programs. This certainly discourages farmers from participating and creates other issues, what about liability if someone is injured while hunting on a farmers land, how about safety, and individual who is given permission by the farmer is often local, knows the farm and where buildings and livestock is located. I highly doubt that Congressman or senators would be too big on the idea that I could use your backyard because you are paid with public funds!

Bottom line: Talk to the people who know, local farmers, lobbyists and others claim to have farmers interests at heart but we all know that money talks and the organizations, companies etc supporting that lobbyist is what he is going to be pushing.

Immigration Reform: Because of my job I have seen how the lack of an immigration policy has affected local farmers and their ability to get help and therefore plant and harvest crops.

One last comment: The policy of attaching amendments to Bills that are unrelated is ridiculous! Imagine my surprise when I found out there were changes in student and parent plus loans for college that were attached to the Health bill. I am still trying to get payments that were applied to the wrong loans straightened out all because the company they were transferred to did not have their system set up to receive payments when they accepted the first payments. I am left with phone calls and letters for past due loans that were paid on time just credited to the wrong loan. I also am a little confused as to how changes can be made to a loan agreement that was signed, imagine my surprise when my payments increased and upon contacting the company them not knowing why just telling me the loan was recalculated. I later learned the term of the loan was shortened.

COMMENT OF DENISE DERGARABEDIAN, CLEARWATER, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Denise DerGarabedian.
City, State: Clearwater, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Stop subsidizing corn!
Please keep our food safe and healthy!
Please protect our rights as consumers! . . . See More
Please stop Monsanto!!!
Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food . . .
Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products . . .
Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive . . .
Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future . . .
Please take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies!

COMMENT OF MARY DERSTINE, KINNELON, NJ

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Mary Derstine.
City, State: Kinnelon, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Administrative Assistant.
Comment: We must not just support "staple" crops through the Farm Bill subsidy program because it actually contributes to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup (just read the labels of most products—

they contain the killer high fructose corn syrup) industrial meat and dairy production. We need increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural to ensure that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs. As a family we try to buy organic and local food because we have read or watched the DVD: *Fast Food Nation, Omnivores Delimina, King Corn, Politics Of Food, Etc.* We also believe in what Alice Waters is trying to do to have school children grown, cook and eat wholesome food. Jamie Oliver from England cares about school children's food. Please support healthy food and not killer foods for our families.

COMMENT OF WOODY DERYCKX, CONCRETE, WA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Woody Deryckx.
City, State: Concrete, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I want to suggest that the next farm bill should be a transformational shift away from commodity crop support and toward supporting conservation, sustainability, and environmental sustainability. Organic farming is good for the land, good for the carbon economy of the planet, good for the consumer and good for business—let the next farm bill make history by supporting and encouraging organic farming and sustainable conservation policies.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF THOMAS DEVORAK, FARGO, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Thomas Devorak.
City, State: Fargo, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Banking.
Comment: I utilize AgriData maps for analyzing farm fields for production yields, topography, drainage, *etc.,* when dealing with our farm producers. This service is very valuable to our borrowers and the bank.

COMMENT OF TIFFINEY DICK, COURTENAY, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Tiffiney Dick.
City, State: Courtenay, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I am requesting that CLU data (FSA fields) information be made public information again.
Thanks.

COMMENT OF RANDY DICKHUT, OMAHA, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Randy Dickhut.
City, State: Omaha, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Management.
Comment: The next farm bill should allow public access to Common Land Unit shapefiles and FSA maps.

COMMENT OF KEN DIEHL, WAMEGO, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Ken Diehl.
City, State: Wamego, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Agriculture retailer.

Comment: I am not a producer but I work with producers everyday to lay out plans for each years cropping system. Access to field information is vital to what I do each day, from laying out what crops will be planted were, to soil sampling and tissue sampling information as well as making sure products are applied to the right fields using field maps. With out this information it makes my job more difficult to do a thorough job with my producers. Please make sure this information remains available not only to the producer but to someone like my self for improved accuracy with in agriculture.

COMMENT OF MARY DIMOCK, POUGHKEEPSIE, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 3:05 p.m.

Name: Mary Dimock.

City, State: Poughkeepsie, NY.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Administrator.

Comment: Please protect our farm and ranch land and aid our farmers and ranchers so that we might guarantee the American people a safe and abundant food supply, and protect the environment. This land (and water) is our most precious resource. America used to provide 60 percent of the world's food, now we import our food. This is not the right direction to secure America a strong, healthy and vibrant future. Much is at stake. Please help provide conservation measures that protect our farmers and ranchers.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF RENEE DIPPEL, ROLLING MEADOWS, IL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 2:35 p.m.

Name: Renee Dippel.

City, State: Rolling Meadows, IL.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Radiation Therapist.

Comment: Please stop supporting factory farms and support local, organic, family farming systems!!

COMMENT OF BRUCE DODSON, NORTH PLATTE, NE

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:05 p.m.

Name: Bruce Dodson.

City, State: North Platte, NE.

Producer/Non-producer: Producer.

Type: Field Crops.

Size: 301–500 acres.

Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers like myself and our wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in our professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF SUSANNAH DONAHUE, SUFFOLK, VA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Susannah Donahue.
City, State: Suffolk, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Work From Home Mother.
Comment: I am deeply concerned by the industrialization of our nation's food supply and by government regulations and Supreme Court decisions that support, promote and reward the monoculture farming and the widespread use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides as well as the factory-farming of livestock. As Americans we should all be free to make our own choices with regard to nourishment, and we look to you, our elected leaders, to protect our basic human right of feeding ourselves of obtaining wholesome food. The giants of food industry, such as Monsanto and Smithfield, are taking away that right and making it more and more difficult for the average American to feed themselves in a way that is truly promoting of health. I passionately urge you to draft a farm bill that promotes a farming business model that is small, local, diversified, humane, sustainable and unreliant on synthetic fertilizers and pesticides. Instead of subsidizing the crops and practices that are making our nation unhealthy and obese—soy and corn and their highly processed end-products, please consider instead farm policies and incentives that encourage small, local farmers and make the food that is truly nutritious (and will truly have an impact on the obesity problem—and therefore healthcare costs) more affordable for everyone and more readily available in every corner of the nation. Thank you for considering my comments.

COMMENT OF STACEY DONOVAN, WINDHAM, NH

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Stacey Donovan.
City, State: Windham, NH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: My common sense thoughts are: Ban all GMO produce & pour all of our $$'s in organic farming. It's better for farmers, the planet & most importantly human consumption. GMO's are NOT good common sense & going to kill us all, one way or another. Focus on putting Monsanto out of business before it's too late. I DEMAND THIS ACTION as an AMERICAN. There are NO alternatives. Stop your political BS & do something right for a change! Have a nice day

---

COMMENT OF CINDY DORSETT, LUBBOCK, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, May 23, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Cindy Dorsett.
City, State: Lubbock, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: System Analyst.
Comment: Keep in mind that as hearings are conducted across this great country to discuss the terms of farm policy, we need you to protect our rights to plant and grow food at home in our own back yards. Vote against Senate Bill S. 510 when it comes time to vote. As you are discussing agricultural food safety, remember to protect our right to grow, sell, purchase, and consume organic, non-genetically engineered fruits, vegetables, and grains.

COMMENT OF MARY DOUGLAS, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Mary Douglas.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Freelance artist—organic food eater.
Comment: Only give farm payments to SMALL farms with NO affiliation to GMO, Monsanto or agribusiness. Incentivize green farming, sustainability, natural resource conservation, organics and local "farm to consumer". Huge industrial ag operations do not need all the payments—you are creating inequality and monopolies that way—anyone could figure that out! I say they need NO payments—I don't want

my tax dollars putting small family farmers out of business. We need MAJOR change. Ag payments to Monsanto must be first to go.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL DOUGLAS, STEPHEN, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Michael Douglas.
City, State: Stephen, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: I would like to recommend that the ACRE program dollars as well as the SURE dollars be used to improve the current Crop Insurance program. Those programs are very slow at getting money into the hands of the farmer whereas Crop Insurance claim payments are made very quickly after the claim is processed. Waiting 12 to 15 months for ACRE or SURE payments is too long for most farmers.

The current Crop Insurance program is working well for the vast majority of farmers. It is truly a "risk management program" that works well for both farmers & lenders. It would be a good idea to expand crop insurance to cover more crops. The money used now for ACRE & SURE could be used to do that.

It is extremely important that Congress NOT cut any subsidy to the farmer for the purchase of crop insurance. Today's expenses on farms are great enough the way it is and it is important to keep crop insurance affordable for farmers.

Other savings that have currently been announced with the renewed SRA agreement could be used to subsidize the higher levels of coverage (75%, 80% & 85%). This would reduce the need for disaster payments.

Whole farm units do not generally work for me and my neighbors. There are too many variables with different crops, practices, non-farm income and farm sizes to make it viable. It would also be more difficult to arrange financing with whole farm units.

It is important that the next farm bill be able to respond quickly to changing weather patterns and different farming practices as related to crop insurance. Volatile weather has made crop insurance a very important part of my total farming plan.

COMMENT OF MAURA DOWLING, HANOVER, MA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:06 p.m.
Name: Maura Dowling.
City, State: Hanover, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Registered Nurse.
Comment: As you consider the new Farm Bill, please think about changing the decades old subsidies which now choke out small local and organic farmers while helping giant agribusiness. While I am sure the lobbies for these giants are strong, I hope you will be stronger for "the little guy" without leaving loopholes for the 3 or 4 conglomerates who control most of the food we eat in this country. By supporting small and local farms, which tend to grow more diverse offerings, and use less pesticides; we can improve the local economy, the environment, and our overall health.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MAURA DOWLING.

COMMENT OF CHAD DOXEY, ANN ARBOR, MI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Chad Doxey.
City, State: Ann Arbor, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Stay at home dad and part time retail.
Comment: I feel that we need to look at the subsidies for Corn. I have met people that talk about how to take advantage of this. I find this to be unacceptable. We should spread the subsidies between a variety of crops. Both conventional and or-

ganic. Please do not let me down. Food is a need not a want and as such we need to take care of the crops we can grow. Thanks for your time.

COMMENT OF BRELAND DRAPER, BOISE, ID; ON BEHALF OF IDAHO HUNGER RELIEF TASK FORCE AND IDAHO INTERFAITH ROUNDTABLE AGAINST HUNGER

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Breland Draper.
City, State: Boise, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: AmeriCorps VISTA.
Comment:

June 14, 2010 Statement re: 2012 Farm Bill

In order to address hunger in Idaho and the U.S., it is imperative that there be a strong representation of nutrition programs in the 2012 Farm Bill. In a state as abundant as Idaho, and a nation as affluent as the United States, there should be no one who is food insecure. Idaho hosted one of the first field hearings for the 2012 Farm Bill on May 1 in Nampa, Idaho. Nutrition programs were not discussed and we want to make sure that their continued importance is not underestimated.

The 2012 Farm Bill is an important asset to achieving President Obama's goal to eliminate childhood hunger by 2015. In order to achieve the President's goal, the Farm Bill must concentrate on:

- strengthening nutrition programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, known as the Food Stamp Program in Idaho),
- strengthening child nutrition programs, and
- guaranteeing convenient access to nutritional programs and affordable food for all Americans.

Hunger and food insecurity are serious issues in Idaho. In 2009 Idaho was ranked as the 29th most food insecure state in the nation. Idaho's first Congressional district, represented by Congressman Walt Minnick, had a food insecurity rate of 15.3% between 2008 and 2009. Idaho's second Congressional district, represented by Congressman Mike Simpson, had a food insecurity rate of 18% in the same time period. These numbers show that a noticeable population of Idaho residents is not able to purchase the food that they or their families needed.

Much of the hunger and food insecurity in Idaho can be attributed to a shaky economy. According to the Idaho Department of Labor, the state had a 9% unemployment rate in May 2010. And according to the United States Department of Labor, total unemployed, marginally attached workers, and total people employed part time for economic reasons is represented by 16.9% of Idaho's workforce.

Nutrition programs such as SNAP, The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) are the keystone programs needed to ensure support for the thousands of people struggling with food insecurity. There are more than 200,000 Idaho residents accepting food stamp (SNAP) benefits in Idaho. But the latest numbers we have for food stamp participation show that only 50% of those eligible are applying. This means there are another 200,000 who need assistance from Food Stamps/SNAP but are not accessing it.

SNAP is also an important sector of Idaho's economy. For each dollar of SNAP benefits spent in Idaho, $1.84 is generated in economic activity. The 2008 Farm Bill helped boost SNAP benefits for clients, helping to bolster economic improvement in Idaho. Future action is needed to ensure that food inflation does not hinder these extra benefits to SNAP clients and the local and national economy.

SNAP works well for those who use it, but there are gaps in access. Also, administrative regulations make it burdensome to apply and to verify eligibility. Recommendations for changes include:

- improve benefit adequacy by replacing the Thrifty Food Plan with the Low Cost Food plan as the basis for SNAP benefits;
- increase the minimum benefit (especially to help elderly, many of whom now only receive $16 a month);
- restore eligibility to legal immigrants;
- permanently suspend time limits on able-bodied adults (18–50) without dependents; and
- provide greater supports for states, including for SNAP administration and outreach.

SNAP is an important part of an anti-hunger and health agenda. SNAP allotments need to be raised to allow families to afford a nutritious diet on a regular basis. SNAP Nutrition Education as well as access to supermarkets and farmers' markets EBT contribute to good health outcomes.

Sincerely,

The Idaho Hunger Relief Task Force;
Idaho Interfaith Roundtable Against Hunger.

COMMENT OF DAVID DRAYTON, BERKELEY, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: David Drayton.
City, State: Berkeley, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Policy Researcher at ISEC.
Comment: The biggest thing concerning me in the farm bill is the large subsidies it gives to crops like corn, which are having enormous health, environmental, budget, and social implications. I apologize for the length of this list, but I hope this helps impress upon you the sheer number of good reasons we need to get rid of these subsidies. Here are SOME of them:

1. Budget

a. Costing the government more over time, since the increased yield each year lowers the real price of the food on the market (gov. pays the difference between floor price and market price).

b. The health care bill of America would be decreased DRAMATICALLY if ingredients like high fructose corn syrup weren't artificially cheap and finding their way into everything we eat instead of real ingredients.

2. The price floors result in the maximization of crop yields each year regardless of market signals

a. Environmental consequences

i. Subsidies are resulting in over-use of pesticides and fertilizers, which is poisoning our waterways (agric. is now the biggest polluter of waterways in the world, creating vast dead zones which hurt both wild life and our fisheries).

ii. The pesticides and fertilizers are petroleum products, and cutting their use back to efficient levels would improve air quality along with helping to stave off climate change.

iii. Subsidies on specific crops result in vast monoculture, decreasing biodiversity, increasing vulnerability to disasters, pests, and other shocks.

b. Cost to farmers

i. As the program gets more expensive, it puts pressures on law makers to levy more taxes and cut funding to other areas.

ii. Their land quality is degrading with such intensive use, further increasing need for petroleum products like fertilizers to off-set the reduced fertility.

iii. Most of the subsidy money goes to large industrial farms, giving them even more of an edge over small farmers, who are losing their jobs in droves.

iv. The increasing input costs (fertilizers, insecticides, GMO seeds, *etc.*) which farmers are using more and more as land quality degrades dramatically cuts down profitability of farms.

3. International considerations

a. The over-production is filling international markets with artificially cheap crops

i. Incredibly detrimental to developing countries, whose producers are getting pounded by our cheap exports. Remember, their economies are generally overwhelmingly agricultural. Result: huge increase in poverty and bigger pressures for international aid.

ii. Increases animosity toward U.S.

b. Fertilizer and insecticide are petroleum products, and thus their ever-increasing use is resulting is an enormous increase in our dependence on foreign oil.

Yes, these subsidies are keeping prices in the grocery store low, but the real costs are showing up in things like our health bills and taxes. Not to mention the social and environmental cost associated with these practices.

COMMENT OF JIM DROWN, PARKERS PRAIRIE, MN

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 17, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Jim Drown.
City, State: Parkers Prairie, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: We live on a farm that our family has owned for 64 years. We have rented our land out for the last 30 years and have lost our wonderful drinking water because of the pesticides and herbicides used. The soil has been depleted of it's natural ability to produce and it is way past time when someone needs to care and take action on stopping harmful practices. There surely must be someone that can come up with productive, non-harmful product and procedures that can be used in farming.

COMMENT OF JANE DUBERT, MAQUOKETA, IA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Jane Dubert.
City, State: Maquoketa, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: I would like to see some of the financial eligibility looked at in the next farm bill. I am a small female farmer who has to work full time off the farm in order to make ends meet. I would like to receive energy grants to assist with making my farm more energy efficient but because I earn more off the farm than gross income from the farm I am not eligible. I would like to think that this rule was put into place so people who are making a good deal off the farm can't get the grants but it catches me as well who only make $30,000 as a social worker but still make slightly less than that in gross farm income. I would like to think that there is some way the eligibility could be rewritten so there was consideration for me and all the other small farmers who are in similar situations.

JANE DUBERT.

COMMENT OF MICHELLE DUCRE, CARL JUNCTION, MO

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 05, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Michelle Ducre.
City, State: Carl Junction, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: *http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/dairy/*
Please watch this video investigation and help these cows.
I think you should be sensitive to banning the cruelty of dairy production. Baby calf starved to death, and cows forced to produce milk for consumption and PROFIT. Despite unsanitary and abusive conditions, and their shortened life spans because of our greed, why do we continue to ignore this situation? Please protect these precious cows?

COMMENT OF DANA DUGAN, HAILEY, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Dana DuGan.
City, State: Hailey, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Writer.

Comment: Family farming is one of the most important businesses/activities that U.S. residents can partake in. Farming helps the air, water, the planet, and our health and the health, sustainability and preservation of communities.

But this doesn't apply to the big-agriculture industry. Support organic, safe, sustainable farming. Stop subsidizing that which contributes the ruination of all of the above.

Please make our priorities the healthful choice not the big money choice.

COMMENT OF LUCILLE DUMBRILL, NEWCASTLE, WY

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 03, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Lucille Dumbrill.
City, State: Newcastle, WY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chair of Weston County Historic Preservation Bd.
Comment: I live in a rural area and the legislation proposed which will encourage and help finance rural historic preservation is extremely important to our community. My board strongly supports this type of preservation legislation.

COMMENT OF DANIEL DUNBAR, CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Daniel Dunbar.
City, State: Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Craftsman.
Comment: At times like these, when we are shown just how fragile our ecosystems can be, and when we learn how devastating the effects of pollution are on wildlife and our people, and considering that objective science and research has indicated that factory farming is one of the major contributors of greenhouse gases and a top contributor to polluting our nations' rivers, It is greatly important to provide incentives for locally supported agriculture, organic production, and small-scale family farming, and to stop providing factory farms with the support they have been receiving.

COMMENT OF GENE DUNBAR, SAN ANTONIO, TX

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Gene Dunbar.
City, State: San Antonio, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I am a farm manager with one of the larger firms in the country and have over forty years of experience in this field. One of the biggest misconceptions about the new bill is setting the limits for receiving payment at $250,000 of gross income. The investment and higher input prices required for a reasonable income from farming has progressed to a point that a $250,000 gross income is a pittance and even the smaller farmers quickly reach that level of gross income each year. I strongly recommend leaving the gross income level at $500,000 in order to be able to receive government assistance. In the real world today almost any family farm will reach or exceed $500,000 gross income.

COMMENT OF MOLLY DUNHAM, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, September 10, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Molly Dunham.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Lawyer.
Comment: I'm writing to express my support for the rules proposed by GIPSA reforming trade practices in the meat producing industry. I also support the proposed ban on use of antibiotics in meat animals except as needed to treat disease. I am in no way connected with the food industry, except that I eat what it produces,

but I'm watching these issues carefully to understand how small producers and consumers will be protected by the 2012 Farm Bill.

Thank you,

MOLLY DUNHAM.

COMMENT OF JIM DUNLAP, SIOUX FALLS, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Jim Dunlap.
City, State: Sioux Falls, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser & Farm Manager.
Comment: It is imperative that the CLU (Common Land Unit) be reinstated to the NRCS Data Gateway. It was available from 2004 to 2008 and provides much needed information for appraisers and land managers as well as other businesses needing field sizes and farming practices without having to have private data such as ownership or compliance with farm programs.

The data was available until the 2008 Farm Bill, but Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill restricts the availability of this data, and yet was not a part of bill passed by either the Senate or the House. Although the owner of a property can give NRCS permission to share this information, in an appraisal, this information will not be available on the properties being compared to the subject being appraised. It does not make sense to continue to restrict information that merely makes for more efficient and accurate appraisals. Continued restriction will continue to cost the taxpayer needing appraisal and other agricultural services that use this information, since they will be charged more for the extra research required as a result of Sec. 1619. THIS DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE, and can be easily changed which will protect the consumer from unneeded charges.

Please repeal the Section 1619 portion of the 2008 Farm Bill dealing with the Common Land Unit and it availability to the NRCS Data Gateway.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF ROGER DURENSKY, BARNESVILLE, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Roger Durensky.
City, State: Barnesville, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am writing in regards to Section 1619 of the Farm Bill. I am an agricultural real estate appraiser that works with farm properties on a daily basis. As an appraiser with a Certified General Real Estate Appraisal License, in the past I have had the ability to access FSA records in the areas of aerial photography, crop bases, and CRP contract information. With the changes in the last Farm Bill, my access to these records has effectively been eliminated. I fully understand the privacy concerns when it comes to FSA payments, but I have a hard time understanding why having open access to FSA aerial photography with field lines is a problem. While I have access to older photography, this information like any other will become outdated. The additional time that needs to be spent on gathering and analyzing information for accurate appraisal work will be charged to the client, either a farmer, lender, or other individual that has requested an appraisal. I fail to see where there is a confidentiality issue with allowing appraisers access to current FSA aerial photography. I would appreciate seeing an effort towards making current aerial photography and field line information be available to appraisers so that we can provide accurate, cost effective service to American agriculture.

COMMENT OF EVAN DVORSAK, TURTLE LAKE, WI

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 20, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Evan Dvorsak.
City, State: Turtle Lake, WI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Poultry/poultry products, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I am a smaller scale (approximately 1 acre) garlic producer, who markets through farmers markets and wholesale markets. Next year I will be certified

organic. I am also a beginning farmer, only in my second year of production. I am aware of the FSA New Farmer Loan program, but would like to see an extension of funding to new farmers. I hope to purchase land in the near future, but am frustrated by the lack of cooperation I can find from local lenders, despite the profitability of my business, and the strength of the organic/direct market as a whole. I believe the implementation of a matched savings (Individual Development Account) for new farmers could drastically improve the landscape for new producers. Even a few thousand dollars can make a huge difference for small-scale farmers, so grants that encourage savings and investment in capital improvements could really help out.

Thank you!

COMMENT OF THOMAS DYBING, LANESBORO, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Thomas Dybing.
City, State: Lanesboro, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment:

Tim Walz & Collin Peterson:

I'm the Agricultural Chairman for the Minnesota Association of Assessing Officers. I understand that today is the last day for feedback on public access of the CLU data. New Minnesota Statutes regarding Green Acres and the Rural Preserve lands has made it imperative for Minnesota Assessors to have access to the field boundaries to fairly determine the difference between productive and non-productive acres. With that data already in place, its use would create a more equitable property tax for the rural property owners. The data was previously available with no issues. Please reinstate access for multiple users in the next farm bill.

Thanks.

THOMAS DYBING,
Houston County Assessor,
Chairman of the MAAO Ag Committee.

COMMENT OF BRADLEY EARDLEY, BOXFORD, MA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Bradley Eardley.
City, State: Boxford, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Therapist.
Comment: Eight concepts:

(1) Enact a robust and well funded Conservation Title to support working lands. (2) Refocus federal farm program payments upon farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits and promote long-term food security. (3) Encourage and support the next generation of farmers and ranchers. (4) Increase resources for research that fosters sustainable agriculture systems. (5) Reinvigorate regional agricultural economies and local food systems. (6) Ensure fair and competitive agricultural markets. (7) Fully recognize the inherent value of sustainable and organic farming systems in addressing climate change. (8) Reform commodity payment programs.

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH EDMISTON, DURHAM, NC

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Elizabeth Edmiston.
City, State: Durham, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Internet consultant.
Comment:

- Please keep our food safe and healthy!
- Please protect our rights as consumers!
- Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products . . .
- Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive . . .

- Please stop Monsanto!!!
- Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food . . .
- Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
- Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future . . .
- Please take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies!

COMMENT OF STANLEY EDMUNDSON, COLBY, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 05, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Stanley Edmundson.
City, State: Colby, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Agent.
Comment: One major item that needs to be addressed is the way acres are being required to be reported. We are being required to report the acres down to the CLU including tract number and field number. This is the exact way it is reported to the Local FSA offices. Why are you requiring the agent to go to all the extra work doing the FSA's job? In the current SRA that they are negotiating now, they are trying to cut the A&O to the companies, this will result in a cut in commissions to the agent. They are requiring us to do the FSA reporting work, are they cutting the FSA payroll also? In a perfect world the producer could report to the FSA and then bring a copy of the paperwork to their agent and we could report the exact same things to the company but most reporting dates do not line up with crop insurance reporting dates. The wheat is required to be reported many months to the insurance company before they will let the producer certify at the FSA office. It seems we are working harder doing duplicate work for crop insurance. Why in a disaster year does the FSA has access to all the crop insurance information for disaster payments *etc.* Yet in a normal year the two agencies do not communicate? I think that the reporting of units down to the tract number and field number is getting carried away with the bureaucrats in the RMA.

Our office can be contacted through the above e-mail to discuss this or we can be reached by phone at [Redacted].

Thanks.

COMMENT OF AMY EHLERS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Amy Ehlers.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Policy Manager.
Comment:

Before the United States House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture
Hearing to review U.S. agriculture policy in advance of the 2012 Farm Bill

April 21, 2010

The Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) is pleased to provide this written testimony on the energy title of the 2012 Farm Bill. BIO thanks this Committee for its continuing leadership in stimulating biorefinery development with a strong energy title in the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 and for convening this hearing to discuss how we can further incentivize innovative biotechnologies which will lead the way to bolstering agricultural economies, lowering our dependence on foreign oil imports, lowering our greenhouse gas emissions and also create thousands of green jobs ensuring that the United States is a leader in the technologies of the future. We were pleased to see Secretary Vilsack, during the April 21 hearing, identify renewable energy and biofuels as one of the five key areas of focus for the next Farm Bill.

BIO's membership includes more than 1,200 biotechnology companies, academic institutions, state biotechnology centers, and related organizations in all 50 states. BIO members are involved in cutting edge research and development of health care, agricultural, industrial and environmental biotechnology products that are revolutionizing advanced biofuels and green products such as bioplastics and renewable specialty chemicals, all replacing petroleum based counterparts.

Background

Industrial biotechnology is the key enabling technology for producing biofuels and biobased products like bioplastics and renewable specialty chemicals from biomass feedstocks to aid in reducing our dependence on foreign sources of oil, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Industrial biotechnology is the application of life sciences to improve traditional manufacturing and chemical synthesis manufacturing processes by using micro-organisms like bacteria and fungi as well as enzymes to improve manufacturing processes and make new biobased products and materials, including biofuels, from renewable feedstocks. Our member companies are using this technology to improve the yield, efficiency and energy inputs in first generation biofuels production, develop new feedstocks such as purpose-grown energy crops, broaden the use of algae technologies, make advancements in end molecule diversification for fuels and commercialize advanced biofuels, renewable specialty chemicals and bioproducts.

During a press conference on February 3rd, 2010 with the White House Interagency Biofuels Working Group, Secretary Vilsack stated that USDA's Rural Development Department would take the lead in developing commercial scale biorefinery projects. USDA has authority over a variety of programs with the potential to greatly assist with commercialization of advanced biofuels and biobased products, but to date their impact has been limited by various factors. BIO would like to offer its assistance to help this Committee and USDA achieve its mission of accelerating the commercialization of these vital technologies, fulfilling the production goals of the federal Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS), and driving widespread adoption of biobased products.

The Biorefinery Assistance Program—Sec. 9003

BIO appreciates the work the Committee has done to support the loan guarantee program for biorefineries, and we are preparing written comments to the proposed rule for the program. The Biorefinery Assistance Program provides loan guarantees for the development, construction, and retrofitting of commercial-scale biorefineries and provides grants to help pay for the development and construction costs of demonstration-scale biorefineries. USDA has stated that it is the lead agency in commercializing advanced biofuels and biorefineries. Therefore, the Biorefinery Assistance Program needs continued mandatory funding, and the program needs to be administered in an effective manner in order to provide financing support to build biorefineries in the near term. Finalizing the regulatory rule for the program and administering the loans should also be expedited to the maximum extent possible. We would like to stress that loan guarantee applications for emerging technologies, such as advanced biofuels, should not be evaluated against more mature technologies. Loan guarantees should be evaluated based on the ability to introduce new crop and feedstock market opportunities for the ag industry, while also introducing a range of new bio-based products and co-products. As mentioned, BIO will submit detailed comments to USDA on the recently published proposed rule, and will seek strong dedicated funding for this program—both through the appropriations process and future farm and energy bills.

We also ask that USDA ensure support for the full range of biobased products under this program. While BIO understands that authorizing language for this program requires that advanced biofuel be a component at the biorefinery, a diversified product portfolio is vital to the future success of biorefineries, and we ask that USDA recognize this in making awards under this program.

Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP)

Feedstock production and delivery will prove to be a critical part of the advanced biofuels success story. We commend Congress for inclusion of this important program in the 2008 Farm Bill. The purpose of BCAP is to focus on the development of dedicated energy crops and other biomass feedstocks and the infrastructure needed to supply these feedstocks to the biofuels and biobased products industries. BIO members look forward to USDA's timely review and approval of BCAP projects, which are a key driver in developing purpose grown energy crops and adoption of biomass energy, fuels and chemicals. BIO has established a new cross-cutting task force on purpose grown energy crops and will be submitting substantial comments to the proposed rule of this program from both its Food and Agriculture and Industrial and Environmental Section member companies. We have submitted comments to the proposed rule for this program and we look forward to continuing to sharing our thoughts on the administration of this program.

BioPreferred Program

The BioPreferred Program at USDA is paramount in providing market pull for the biobased materials industry. We'd like to see timely implementation and eligibility of renewable chemical intermediates in USDA BioPreferred voluntary labeling and procurement programs. The USDA BioPreferred voluntary labeling and procurement programs have the potential to be major market drivers for biobased products. To drive innovation in this space, the programs must be extended to renewable chemical intermediates, as required by authorizing statute, and the programs must be implemented without further delay.

Strong Energy Title in Next Farm Bill Needed

Finally, as this Committee moves to draft language and schedule additional hearings related to authorization of a new energy title of the Farm Bill, BIO would like to offer itself as a resource to the Committee by providing witnesses and background information as needed. The programs authorized in the energy title in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 have been extremely valuable to the advanced biofuels and biobased products industries and as you consider expanding and/or extending those programs as well as creating new programs for biorefinery and feedstock development, BIO would like to be a resource for you.

Conclusion

In conclusion, BIO urges this Committee to continue to recognize that innovations such as these are some of the most promising sources of green jobs and economic growth for U.S. agriculture for the future. Ensuring that companies producing new technologies can access and secure government incentives and the investment capital necessary for success should be a high priority for the nation.

On behalf of its more than 1,200 members across the nation, BIO thanks you for the opportunity to submit this testimony and present our perspective on how the upcoming energy title of the Farm Bill legislation will influence the renewable energy industry and green job creation potential for industrial biotechnologies and products. We are ready to work with this Committee and be a resource to you.

COMMENT OF PHYLLIS ELLIOTT, SANTA MONICA, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Phyllis Elliott.
City, State: Santa Monica, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Business Administration.
Comment: We can no longer ignore the importance of preservation. The most important action Congress can take in the development of farm policy is to plan for the next 100 years. This means focusing resources on environmental protection, sustainability, and independent/regional farming operations. That may not be the source of your major campaign funding but is the source of the food on America's tables.

Please make choices that ensure a healthy food supply for your constituents. Your Plan should enact a Conservation title to protect farmlands, provide resources for small farmers, reforms commodity payments, and protects and encourages sustainable agriculture. Not one dollar of taxpayers' money should benefit industrialized farming or insurance companies masquerading as a farmers' organization.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please do the right thing. Reform of our food production is a component of health care reform, and it's in your hands.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL ELLIS, SPARTA, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:36 p.m.
Name: Michael Ellis.
City, State: Sparta, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified Crop Specialist.
Comment: We use this mapping program daily for our custom application services and we need the updated acres to make sure we apply the right amount of product and don't over apply or under apply. This is a great service to us and need accurate up to date info. I hope they overturn the policy and get the up dated info.

COMMENT OF STEVE ELLIS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Steve Ellis.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Budget Watchdog for All American Taxpayers.
Comment:

Dear Agriculture Committee,

Just over two years ago, Congress had an opportunity to draft and enact a farm bill that protects taxpayers and ends century old subsidies that do little for farmers. Taxpayers for Common Sense worked in a broad coalition to reform the nation's farm programs to be better for taxpayers and the vast majority of farmers. Unfortunately, Congress settled for the politics of the past and business as usual. The new law could just as well have been written by the farm commodity program lobby.

- Commodity loan rates and/or target prices were increased, thereby increasing payments for some subsidized crops, such as wheat, barley and oats.
- Previously unsubsidized crops were added to the subsidy list.
- Farm families earning up to $2.5 million in net income would remain eligible for farm commodity subsidies.
- A new so-called 'permanent disaster aid' program, costing nearly $4 billion, will provide a slush fund with routine handouts to farmers from a handful of states who already receive traditional commodity subsidies not to mention federally subsidized crop insurance designed to cover crop losses. And we have seen that the disaster title has not ended claims for *ad hoc* assistance.
- The optional Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program, which was touted as reform and a new direction for farm commodity programs, is not being pursued by large number of farmers because of complexity and other competing programs provide larger subsidies.
- 'Direct payment' subsidies, which are given to farmers even when their incomes are skyrocketing and could have been eliminated altogether in these times of record farm incomes, was cut by a miniscule two percent over five years.
- Continuation of trade distorting cotton subsidies that were ruled illegal by the World Trade Organization led USDA to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to not place punitive tariffs on U.S. goods.

As the Committee looks to drafting a new farm bill, we again urge you to fundamentally re-orient the program. The commitment to revise the cotton program obtained by Brazil should lead the Committee to rewrite the commodity title to be more balanced and truly only a safety net that puts the nation on a glide path to reduce agriculture subsidies.

COMMENT OF JONATHAN ELMORE, GROVE, OK

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Jonathan Elmore.
City, State: Grove, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Shop Owner.
Comment: I read about conglomerate farmers (Monsanto & ConAgra to name only two) getting subsidized for growing food that isn't necessarily good for us, but it fills us (and our livestock) up with minimal nutritional value creating more health problems than it's worth. It would be great to see grass fed beef producers being rewarded for doing what's right for the cattle and the consumer. Stop paying farmers to NOT grow crops that are in high surplus, but pay them TO grow things that we all would love to see in our supermarkets for less than it costs to buy a package of Snacky Cakes.

COMMENT OF BRADLEY ELTING, HEBRON, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Bradley Elting.
City, State: Hebron, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.

Type: Field Crops.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I would like to see FSA field boundaries and acres made available to producers and professional appraisers and farm managers in the future.

This data being made available to professionals in the field would not cause harm to land owners and producers.

Thank you for your time.

BRAD ELTING.

COMMENT OF TROY ENGSTROM, WATERTOWN, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Troy Engstrom.
City, State: Watertown, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified General Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Please reinstate public access to the CLU data. It is critically important in our business as ag real estate appraisers to have the correct and most current data to most accurately appraise the land.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF DEANNA ERICKSON, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Deanna Erickson.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Poultry/poultry products.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I want to see legislation that increases food security through decentralization and support for small, organic farms and regional food distribution systems. Decentralization and supporting small farms will increase organic seed diversity, which will in turn shore up or food security system. At present our industrial, centralized system is not nourishing us and it is not sustainable. A moratorium on GMO products and pesticide use is needed. I am passionately campaigning against companies and political actors that do not stand up against the use of GMO products and pesticides. Individual liberty and freedom must be respected so as to protect organic seed diversity and integrity. Lastly, I hope to see meaningful incentives for farmers to invest in sustainable energies to support their farming activities and to regionally distribute their farm products to local markets and processors.

DEANNA ERICKSON.

COMMENT OF PAMELA ERNEST, PLAINFIELD, CT

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:36 a.m.
Name: Pamela Ernest.
City, State: Plainfield, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Gaming Industry Worker.
Comment: I'd like a Farm Bill that curbs the power of factory farms and the influence of lobbyists for large food corporations. I care about the health and nutrition of children, please provide a Farm Bill that puts more fresh wholesome food in our cities' schools. I want my children and grandchildren to enjoy the benefits of a clean environment, please provide a Farm Bill that increases protection of our natural resources by helping farmers transition to organic and more sustainable growing methods.

COMMENT OF MAX EVANS, URBANDALE, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Max Evans.
City, State: Urbandale, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Property Appraiser.

Comment: I have been a professional farm appraiser for the past 27 years and rely upon Farm Service Agency maps to determine field layouts and acreages as I analyze a farm and compare one farm to another farm.

It would be very difficult to produce a reliable and accurate valuation of a property without this information. My clients are individuals, financial institutions and government agencies. I encourage you to make this information available so that we can produce a viable and accurate report for our clients.

COMMENT OF RICK EVANS, SPRINGVILLE, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Rick Evans.
City, State: Springville, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: Reinstate the CLU data into Section 1619 and the NRCS Data Gateway.

COMMENT OF SHAVAUN EVANS, NASHVILLE, TN

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:36 a.m.
Name: Shavaun Evans.
City, State: Nashville, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Program Coordinator for Community Food Advocates.
Comment: I am writing to ask that organic farming be a top priority for the next Farm Bill.

Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF ROXANNE FALKENSTEIN, CAVE JUNCTION, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Roxanne Falkenstein.
City, State: Cave Junction, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

Greetings,

I urge all of you to ensure safe guards are put in place protecting rights and freedoms (from all sides, in all these food bills) to;

- Small community gardens, Organic heritage vegetable seed protections, Freedom to seed bank for the general public, protections from GMO pollen drift, and clearly labeled GMO products.

- We need more small Organic farmers not less. We need more people providing work for themselves. We need to curb food shipping, what better way than small farms in as many places as possible?

  - As far as food safety goes . . . I want protections against over processed foods, made by huge company's. Small farmers need programs designed for there size. Bigger farms pay more, & tiny farms very little if anything. Labs need to be funded and made centralized. New equipment requirements should be given at least 5 years to comply, w/ government zero interest loans.

- GMO technology has the ability to destroy seed strains, and yet there developers are permitted to pollute with there dangerous pollens.

MORE SAFETY TESTING!

- Monsanto and other company's put the blame on the FDA for allowing them to plant these crops. They are in the business of selling, you are in the business of protecting our rights, freedoms & health.

Stop allowing Monsanto to write bills.

Sincerely,

R.S. FALKENSTEIN.

COMMENT OF JIM FASCHING, PLAINVIEW, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Jim Fasching.
City, State: Plainview, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Field Representative.
Comment: Please support the reinstatement of CLU (Common land unit) data into section 1619. This would ensure accurate and essential field boundary data for agricultural producers.

COMMENT OF PATRICIA F-DILLARD, BEAVERTON, OR

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 5:35 a.m.
Name: Patricia F-Dillard.
City, State: Beaverton, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: The impacts of BP on the economic communities is a tragedy, and economic chaos. For that reason, I believe you should consider, through your farm bill, creating an organic agricultural industry in all impacted states. This will stop also the high consumption of organics produced in places as far as South America, and the consumption of gas used in the transportation of these products.

COMMENT OF FEEDING AMERICA, FOOD BANK NETWORK, D.C. POLICY & RESEARCH DEPT., CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Feeding America, Food Bank Network, D.C. Policy & Research Dept.
City, State: Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Comments for House Agriculture website on issues for the next farm bill.

Even as the economy slowly recovers, economists predict unacceptably high long term unemployment for the next several years. Thankfully, the Nutrition title of the farm bill passed by the last Congress was able to mitigate some of the worst effects of the economic recession on low-income populations. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that more is not needed to help the millions of those who continue to struggle to feed their families. Hunger remains high, and very likely will grow along with long term joblessness. Greater food assistance will be needed. Seniors who have exhausted their savings and investment and retirement funds will find it hard to replace this lost income. Those without jobs for 2 years or more will find it difficult to reenter the job market, and hundreds of thousands of families will struggle to pay their housing and utility bills. It is therefore imperative that the

next farm bill continue to strengthen nutrition programs so that everyone in this nation is able to benefit from this nation's rich agricultural abundance.

The following identifies the broad themes and objectives that are essential to the achievement of a successful Nutrition title in the next Farm Bill and to an overall farm bill that serves the well-being of all Americans, and finally puts an end to hunger in this nation.

(1) TEFAP commodity supports. Provide critically needed food to emergency feeding agencies serving low income families, individuals, and households by: (1) raising the amount of mandatory funding for TEFAP commodity purchases and (2) placing a floor on annual indexing.

(2) TEFAP storage, transport and distribution grants. To help with rising state and local agency costs of handling commodities provide mandatory funding for transport, storage and distribution of commodities that is tied to the volume of commodities offered to TEFAP agencies

(3) Support Food Bank Infrastructure. Provide mandatory funding and permanent authority for Food Bank Infrastructure grants to help food banks build capacity for refrigeration and fresh storage, transportation, plant and other facilities needed to deliver healthy and safe foods to low-income populations.

(4) CSFP. Reauthorize the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) and expand eligibility and capacity for service to un-served and underserved populations of low-income seniors in need of nutrition assistance. Among other things, allow states and/or local areas to establish the same income eligibility standard for the elderly as for women and children; fund pilot projects to conduct senior outreach and statewide CSFP programs.

(5) Section 32. Eliminate the cap on Section 32 funding so that the Secretary can purchase surplus food commodities for distribution to nutrition programs when this is needed to support farm prices and to maintain commodity donation levels for agencies serving low-income populations.

(6) Commodity donations, bonus, *etc.* Establish a safeguard for sudden and dramatic declines in bonus commodity donations to TEFAP by setting a trigger mechanism for allowing USDA purchases when bonus donations fall below a specified 3 year average.

(6) Special Milk Program. Utilize the Special Milk Program to allow federal reimbursement of half-pints of shelf stable (UHT) milk used in weekend food packages provided to low-income school children to take home on weekends and holidays when school is not in session.

(7) SNAP—increase participation rates and benefits, among other things by:

- Adequate benefit levels including higher minimum benefits and improved standard deductions;
- Expanded and simplified eligibility criteria, application forms and processes;
- Equal treatment for all income eligible populations, including ABAWDS and legal immigrants;
- Improved Nutrition education;
- Simplified process for partnerships between state and local public agencies and private nonprofit agencies supporting outreach and application assistance, including simplified waiver processes to facilitate outreach;
- Monitored and standardized state and local program administration and procedures for application, eligibility and benefits and elimination of finger imaging and other participation barriers such as lack of IT support for submitting, processing and approving qualified applicants.

COMMENT OF ANNA FELDMAN, EAST LYME, CT

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 3:05 a.m.
Name: Anna Feldman.
City, State: East Lyme, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student at the moment, but used to be a vegetable producer.
Comment: The future of farm policy needs to favor small producers whose methods respect the environment and who grow fresh fruits and vegetables for local consumption. It also needs to help out the young farmers who have less easy access to land but who are absolutely necessary for the continuation of America's rural agricultural future.

COMMENT OF JODI FENLEY, CHARITON, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Jodi Fenley.
City, State: Chariton, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Administrative Assistant.
Comment: If this bill goes through my job will be at stake as I rely heavily on the CLU data to gather information. Not having this information will make my job obsolete.

COMMENT OF DANIEL FENSTER, BELLEROSE, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Daniel Fenster.
City, State: Bellerose, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: As a parent concerned with their nutritional value of the food choices presented in the schools, I would like to see legislation for increased financial support local organic farms to supply New York City schools.

Thank you,

DANIEL FENSTER.

COMMENT OF COLLEEN FERRO, PLANTATION, FL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Colleen Ferro.
City, State: Plantation, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Realtor.
Comment: Please do not support Factory Farming. We need to move towards sustainable farming, organic and plant based, for our own health and the health of the planet.

COMMENT OF ANN FICKENWIRTH, HINGHAM, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Ann Fickenwirth.
City, State: Hingham, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Stay at Home Mom.
Comment: We no longer need the subsidies to the large scale corn providers. PLEASE send this money to small scale organic farms. I am doing all I can to feed my children and family with healthy food, it is a daily struggle and it should not be in this country. We need to change direction and make this a priority!!

COMMENT OF DENNIS FIKE, WESTMORELAND, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Dennis Fike.
City, State: Westmoreland, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural financing and related services.
Comment: Lynn, I'm writing as an employee of a business that directly supports agriculture through financing, appraisal, insurance services, record keeping and tax planning services. I also own a small parcel of farmland in Pottawatomie County and grew up on a farm in central Kansas.

My concern is with section 1619 of the current farm bill that restricts information available to our appraisal staff. This restriction makes it much more onerous for our appraisers, all of whom are state certified-general appraisers, to obtain accurate information to document area real estate sales. The accuracy of sales documentation is critical to evaluating land values and performing their duties for our customers. Below are some specific points to help explain their issues with the current law. I'm hopeful this can be changed with the new farm bill to allow state-certified apprais-

ers appropriate access to the data they need to perform their job in a professional manner. Thank you.

Appraisal Concerns:

- It is not realistic for appraisers to go to recent buyers or sellers and expect to get access to their farm information via a consent for release request.
- Farmland appraisals for real estate transactions will suffer in accuracy. Farm specific geospatial information is widely used by professional appraisers. Boundaries, yield, soils, topographic information is commonly used to establish farmland value. Additionally, most appraisals require the appraiser to provide "recent comparable sales that establish the accuracy of the real estate transaction. In order to provide accurate" farm specific data is needed for all recent transactions.
- If appraisers are not able to get access to farm level information on the sales within an area, then the analysis may be faulty. Faulty analysis can lead to unreliable appraised values and over or undervalued real estate transactions. Lenders throughout the country as well as buyers, sellers, and others rely on appraisers to provide accurate appraisal reports that they can rely on for their own safety and soundness.

Appraisal Data Needed:

Information that is needed includes:

- CLU field boundaries.
- Acres.
- Maps (Aerial, Soils and Topographic) tied to FSA boundaries.
- FSA Yield information.
- Whether the property is enrolled in CRP, WRP or another easement or rental agreement or federal program and the specifics of the program on the property.

We are aware of the confidential nature of the information contained in the CLU data. We respect this and only need access to the limited information listed above. We would be using this information to carry out our professions. We note that the operator's name is not in our list of necessary information.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER FIKE, ANN ARBOR, MI

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Jennifer Fike.
City, State: Ann Arbor, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Economic Development Nonprofit Executive.
Comment: There should be funding of Farm to School programs in all 50 states by at least $50mm in the 2012 Farm Bill. There should be more funds allocated to the Specialty Crop Block Grants to encourage agricultural diversity. Commodity subsidies for farms earning more than $250k should be ceased. More funding should be allocated to increase the numbers of new/beginning farmers through the USDA Beginning Farmer & Rancher program.

COMMENT OF ANDREA FINK, KATONAH, NY

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 7:35 a.m.
Name: Andrea Fink.
City, State: Katonah, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Social Worker.
Comment: Pesticide free and genetically non altered crops should be priority.

COMMENT OF ALFRED FISCHER, ABERDEEN, MS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Alfred Fischer.
City, State: Aberdeen, MS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.

Comment: Please support the reinstatement of public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

Thank you,

ALFRED FISCHER,
Fischer Farm Services.

COMMENT OF JEROME FITZGERALD, SHOSHONE, ID

Date Submitted: Monday, May 10, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Jerome Fitzgerald.
City, State: Shoshone, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: The real problem in the dairy industry is the illegal powder imports. Our local factories are dumping third world powder in our cheese vats. Non grade a powder from China India Mexico and other sources. a non functioning USDA enforcement and a Chicago Syndicated cheese exchange allowing Davisco to raise the cheese price on their govt. contract and lowering the price when they were buying milk to fill it. There is no grade a in the third world so how can this ingredient be allowed in our factories. The Atlanta center for disease control has specific regulations for imports. When these products are smuggled or "NAFTA ed" across the border into California no one is watching. This is the reason for cheese that tastes like cardboard and is very dense this is dead cheese made from foreign old powder. India had a color problem recently. Close the Sen. Craig Mexican loophole, enforce the law.

Yours truly,

JEROME FITZGERALD.

COMMENT OF WESLEY FITZPATRICK III, CRYSTAL SPRINGS, MS

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Wesley Fitzpatrick III.
City, State: Crystal Springs, MS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Forestry, Fruits, Livestock, Vegetables, Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: First of all, thank you for the assistance for high tunnel construction that has been provided through NRCS and other funding sources.

This assistance made it possible for me to become the owner of a high tunnel and provide valuable input for future farmers as well as future funding projects.

Projects that provide assistance for all types of farming and agricultural research are the very beginning of all other commerce in the world.

Please guarantee that similar valuable funding is available in the future.

COMMENT OF KEVIN FLAHERTY, STORM LAKE, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Kevin Flaherty.
City, State: Storm Lake, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am writing to get attention drawn to the fact that CLU Data (Common Land Unit) and certain CRP information is not made available to real estate professionals from local FSA offices without written permission from the actual land owner. The past Farm Bill eliminated the ability for real estate professionals to access this information for sales analysis, appraisal, and consulting purposes. This information is critical to produce consistent and reliable appraisal reports to my clients. There are too often times that we are dealing with absentee landowners through their current tenants and even with the tenants permission we are not allowed access to current FSA data. This is a considerable hindrance to efficient business practice resulting in delays and higher costs of doing business for not only myself, but also our customers.

I strongly urge such data to be made available to certain real estate professionals as it was prior to the 2008 Farm Bill being implemented. The information which

was previously made available is subject to confidentiality rules already in place with USPAP regulations and does not put this type of information in the hands of the general public and is critical for Real Estate Professionals to provide efficient and credible services to clients.

I strongly urge that the next Farm Bill exclude Section 1619 wording which has impacted all real estate professionals, producers, landowners, and others negatively who utilized this data on a regular basis.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

KEVIN FLAHERTY,
Real Estate Appraiser—Farm Credit Services of America.

COMMENT OF GENA FLEMIGN, SAN MARCOS, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Gena Flemign.
City, State: San Marcos, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Healthcare provider.
Comment: I would like to urge the House Agriculture Committee to give special consideration to the value of small, regional organic farms. These farms are not only the best option for providing healthy produce, their proliferation would offer our best guarantee for resilience in the face of adversity.

Small organic farms that use heirloom seeds are able to save seeds for replanting from season to season. The diversity of crops grown means their farms are naturally more resistant to invasion by pests. Because they are small and regional, any problems with contamination are quickly identified and limited in scope. From a food security perspective, a profuse and diversified network of family organic farms would mean people would not starve as a consequence of an oil and gas crisis.

It is time for us to introduce local produce to the schools. We can not continue fight so many wars: on obesity, on diabetes, on drugs, *etc*. We are in need of a healthier vision that empowers and inspires people to manifest health within their own communities.

Thanks and best wishes.

COMMENT OF ARJAN FLORA, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Arjan Flora.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Medical Student.
Comment: I do not support the fact that the subsidies in the Farm Bill will not only positively affect producers out in middle America, but will negatively effect the patients of hospitals in New York City. If artificially cheapened high fructose corn syrup were to even get out of largely consumed and seemingly harmless foods such as Gatorade (it's not just colored sugar water with some electrolytes), the children of Brooklyn won't be as obese as they are now. In fact, Diabetes is so rampant in Brooklyn, there is a subset of the disease known as 'Flatbush Diabetes'. This is not to mention the countless other detrimental aspects of the bill not only economically, but socially and environmentally. Corn should not be easily cheapened only to fatten up our citizens and destroy the fertile fields of America's Heartland.

COMMENT OF JOSHUA FOGT, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Joshua Fogt.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Northwest Harvest, Public Policy Manager.
Comment: Northwest Harvest is a statewide hunger relief agency in the State of Washington. We secure and distribute food to over 300 partner programs around the state including food pantries, hot meal programs, and elementary schools. We are on the front-lines of hunger relief, and our comments on the 2012 Farm Bill will focus on strengthening and modernizing SNAP and creating strong farm to food bank connections.

We know that many people who rely on food pantries and hot meal programs also rely on SNAP benefits to help meet their most basic need: food. SNAP is an excellent program for numerous reasons. In terms of policy, SNAP is the most effecting hunger relief tool we have in our arsenal at the moment. SNAP allows families to make choices that best serve their dietary needs and cultural preferences. SNAP is also a boon to local economies, with the most widely reported statistic showing that for every $1 spent on benefits, $1.80 is generated in local economies. This is because beneficiaries are free to spend their limited resources on other needs like shelter, clothing and health care, while SNAP dollars help the bottom line at local grocery stores where SNAP is accepted.

Northwest Harvest strongly recommends that Congress strengthen SNAP by increasing access and eligibility, particularly in the summer months when families with children no longer receive the benefit of free and low-cost meals provided through the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. We suggest increasing benefits to low-income families with school-age children over the summer months to help meet the gap in feeding children over the summer. We would also like to see the enrollment and administration of SNAP modernized and streamlined through improved use of technology, direct certification and categorical eligibility. States who have utilized these options have seen a greater effectiveness in fighting hunger by helping more people become eligible and participate in SNAP.

Northwest Harvest would also like to see Congress find new incentives for formers, particularly local and small farmers, to donate to their local food banks, pantries and kitchens. We hope Congress can find ways to encourage more local farmers to connect to their local hunger relief agencies, especially in rural, agricultural areas where food may be abundant but often leaves the local area for commercial distribution.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the upcoming Farm Bill. If you have any additional questions please do not hesitate to contact the Northwest Harvest Public Policy Manager, Josh Fogt, at [Redacted] or [Redacted].

COMMENT OF RANDY FOLLMAN, INVER GROVE HEIGHTS, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, August 17, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Randy Follman.
City, State: Inver Grove Heights, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agriculture Account Manager.
Comment: I support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF DAWN FORCELLI, YONKERS, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Dawn Forcelli.
City, State: Yonkers, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Assistant.
Comment: Please keep our food safe and healthy!
Please protect our rights as consumers! . . . See More
Please stop Monsanto!!!
Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food . . .
Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products . . .
Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive . . .
Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future . . .
Please take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies!

COMMENT OF NANCY FORD, OLYMPIA, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 18, 2010, 1:05 a.m.
Name: Nancy Ford.
City, State: Olympia, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.

Comment: I am fortunate to be able to afford to read labels and avoid products with corn syrup and corn by products as well a highly processed soy products, artificial sweeteners, preservatives and food dyes that I believe are detrimental to everyone's health. I started avoiding these food when I was diagnosed with an immune system illness. It was not a cure but I enjoyed feeling better soon after the change. I believe these things lead to immune diseases including diabetes, lupus, arthritis, and others. Healthy food should be affordable and the norm.

COMMENT OF STEVEN FOUREZ, FAIRMOUNT, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, May 14, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Steven Fourez.
City, State: Fairmount, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: Recent discussion of shifting funding from commodity titles to rural development could best be characterized as the Mega Farm Enhancement Act. The best way to accelerate the disappearance of the single family unit farming operation is to further dismantle the already inadequate safety net. Razor thin margins, and onerous regulations make the viability of the traditional family farm even more precarious.

The current ACRE program option is a step in the right direction but it needs considerable fine tuning to make it more attractive to farm operators. It needs to reflect the structure of federal crop insurance, based on county or regional multi-county districts rather than on state averages. The variability of agricultural production based on differing soil types and the vagaries of localized weather is not accounted for under the current system.

Another drawback is the inflexibility of the program. Once land is enrolled in the program it can not be rescinded, regardless of the land changing ownership or tenants. It would be better to bind landowners or operators to the program rather than the individual parcels themselves. This would allow for land to change hands without the encumbrance of being tied to a particular program.

Reducing support for federal crop insurance programs is a backhanded way of forcing operators into the less desirable ACRE program. A better way to reduce expenditures in this area would be to make the insurance programs more actuarially sound. This would more accurately reflect the risk of growing a given crop in a given area.

More than anything I would prefer to be rewarded for my efforts by the marketplace and not the taxpayer. We need to be subsidizing consumption rather than production. Since the FDR Administration governmental support for agriculture has been tied to production which has resulted in over-production in order to maximize benefits. This approach is kind of like trying to push a rope.

Continued support for biofuels, exports and developing new uses for farm commodities is crucial. To use the rope analogy it is much easier to pull production through the system than it is to push it through. If we can encourage consumption and increase demand for the production I raise the marketplace will see to my economic needs, not the taxpayer.

Rural development is inextricably tied to agriculture. William Jennings Bryan once said something to the effect that we could destroy our cities but leave the farms untouched and the cities would spring back up as if by magic, but if we destroy agriculture grass would grow down the middle of every Main Street within a generation.

COMMENT OF JEAN FOX, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Jean Fox.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Need to end farm subsidies, but in the meantime we need . . .

(1) subsidies for fruits and vegetables and fewer subsidies for commodity crops.

(2) support for sustainable farming practices.

(3) more money for TEFAP.

(4) $4 billion more per year for Child Nutrition programs.

(5) support for FAMILY FARMS, not corporate farms.

COMMENT OF DARLENE FRANCO, WALESKA, GA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Darlene Franco.
City, State: Waleska, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother/Teacher.
Comment: I am writing to support parts of the Farm Bill. I do not support increasing aid to foreign countries when our own national debt is so high.

However, I do support mandatory country of origin labeling, increased assistance for small farmers and producers, and protections against industrialized meat and poultry production.

Please do all you can to support Georgia's small farms, organic farms, and farm to consumer markets. We deserve to have the support of our Congressmen when it comes to having the freshest local food we can. It is good for our families, our communities, and ultimately our entire health care system.

Thank you,

DARLENE FRANCO.

COMMENT OF TAMARA FRANICH, CHATTANOOGA, TN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Tamara Franich.
City, State: Chattanooga, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Office Manager.
Comment: As a mother and consumer I am all for a newer, healthier way to feed our children and ourselves. Paying subsidies to farms to NOT GROW FOOD is as stupid as it sounds. Let's really try to make changes that are good for our environment, our economy and our health. There is no reason why we can't come up with policies that make sense.

Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF BOBBIE K. FRANK, CHEYENNE, WY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Bobbie Frank.
City, State: Cheyenne, WY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Conservation Districts of Wyoming; Executive Director, Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts.
Comment:

Comments submitted for the U.S. House Agriculture Committee record on Farm Bill

June 14, 2010

- Support a greater emphasis on working lands conservation programs.
- Support maintaining a strong locally led implementation process for all Farm Bill conservation programs. Working lands conservation programs must be accessible for all private working lands. WACD believes in the overarching goals of improved air, water and soil quality, and improved habitat, but techniques for reaching those goals are specific to localized conditions. Efforts to expand the goals of conservation programs, such as providing increased endangered species habitat, should also be left to the decision of local work groups. We do not support bonus funding for states that undertake specific national standards that are program specific. The emphasis of the programs to stabilize and enhance agriculture production in harmony with the environment must be maintained.
- The delivery of technical assistance is the most critical element to the adoption of conservation practices and participation in Farm Bill conservation programs. The implementation of the conservation programs should be fully reimbursed

with program dollars. This will allow non-Farm bill technical assistance to be available to producers and communities.

- Support streamlining conservation programs and ensure that landowners have a full range of program options to meet their conservation and resource needs. If the alteration of a conservation program results in a cost savings, that funding must remain within the overall conservation title allocation.
- The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) remains a priority program to Wyoming. It is important that all private landowners and operators be able to access funding to address environmental resource concerns. Localized priorities and practices should be identified by the local work groups and addressed by the state technical committees supporting the locally led process that is the foundation of conservation districts across the country. The role of the local workgroups has been diminished greatly. Consideration should be given to enhanced input and responsibilities of the workgroups.
- WACD does not support the retention of program dollars at the federal level to be awarded as "bonus" allocations to states. This puts an undue burden on the field technical staff to allocate funds and develop conservation plans in a short period of time.
- Support the continued flexibility of the use of Technical Service Providers (TSP) or third party vendors in the delivery of conservation technical assistance and Farm Bill conservation programs.

Conservation Program Consolidation Recommendations

- Create an Enhanced Environmental Qualities Incentives Program that combines the working lands programs including Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, Forest Land Enhancement Program, Agricultural Management Assistance and Grasslands Reserve Program.
- Maintain an independent Conservation Reserve Program.
- Maintain an independent Wetlands Reserve Program.
- Restructure the easement programs into one program including Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program and the Healthy Forest Reserve Program.

COMMENT OF CHRISTINE FRY, OAKLAND, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Christine Fry.
City, State: Oakland, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Health Policy Analyst.
Comment:

Dear Chairman Peterson,

Public Health Law & Policy (PHLP) is pleased to provide input to the House Committee on Agriculture as you and your colleagues begin to develop the next Farm Bill. As a nonprofit organization dedicated to creating healthy communities through policy and environmental change, we want to ensure that federal agriculture and nutrition policy supports community-level efforts to improve the food system.

We strongly recommend that Agriculture Committee continue to take health into consideration as you contemplate the 2012 Farm Bill. At the most basic level, the Farm Bill is about the American economy and the health of our population. Agriculture and food production are an important part of the U.S. economy. And health is strongly affected by nutrition, which is ultimately driven by the foods that are affordable and accessible in neighborhoods around the country. The 2012 Farm Bill reauthorization presents the Committee with an opportunity to align federal agriculture policy with public health and economic development goals. This shift in agriculture policy began with the 2008 Farm Bill, which included money for community food projects, farmers' market promotion and nutrition programs, and increased benefits for many Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) participants.

Child and adult obesity rates in the United States are at record levels, particularly among people of color and low-income people. Obesity brings with it the potential for numerous chronic diseases, including diabetes and heart disease. The private and public sectors spend billions of dollars every year treating these preventable obesity-related diseases. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) have invested millions of dollars to change the food and physical activity environments in communities around the country, with the goal of reducing obesity rates and improving health. These efforts

would be amplified by a Farm Bill that supports the production, distribution, and sale of healthy foods across the country.

The health and well-being of our nation's children require us to shift from a centralized food system to regional food systems. The ultimate goal of a regional food system model is to provide people in every part of the country with the opportunity to purchase a substantial portion of their grocery basket from local and regional food producers. Regional food systems, which supply fresher, less processed, local food, offer many benefits. First, it will stimulate rural and urban economies, as more capacity for food production, processing, and distribution will be needed to meet demand. Second, it will improve health as more people will gain access to fresher, less processed foods. Third, it will lower the risk of foodborne illnesses by creating more transparency and accountability ("know your farmer, know your food") and reducing the amount of time food spends in transit or storage. And finally, it will reduce the environmental impact of food production by reducing the number of miles that food must travel from farm to fork. In order to reap these benefits, the federal government should continue to support regional food system development by providing seed money for infrastructure, marketing support for farmers who contribute to regional food systems, and incentives for healthy food purchases for federal food assistance program participants.

In this difficult economy, pundits often frame federal policy decisions as "either-or" choices: either we protect public health or we protect the economy. At PHLP, we believe that you can do both by increasing production of healthy foods and supporting regional food systems. To develop a Farm Bill that promotes public health and the economy, we recommend that the Agriculture Committee consider the following actions:

1. Hold at least one Committee hearing that focuses on the health aspects of the Farm Bill. Invite public health leaders from government agencies (local, state, and federal), as well as academia, nonprofits, and the private sector, to provide diverse perspectives on the bill's public health impact.

2. Expand the definition of nutrition education that is allowed by the SNAP-Ed program. Traditional nutrition education can only go so far to improve the diets of low-income people if they don't have access to healthy foods in their neighborhoods. SNAP-Ed funding could be used to support environmental change efforts, such as healthy corner store conversions and farmers' market start-up costs, that expand healthy food access in underserved neighborhoods.

3. Look at the innovations and lessons learned from community- and state-level efforts to support regional food systems.

The federal government and philanthropies have provided seed money to communities and states for innovative nutrition policy change and programmatic work. These efforts offer numerous ideas for pilot programs and other ways that the federal government can support healthier food systems. For example:

a. New York City, a CDC Communities Putting Prevention to Work grantee, recently implemented a "green carts" program that makes it easier for fresh produce mobile vendors to start up in neighborhoods with limited bricks-and-mortar food retail.

b. The MoBucks program in Detroit doubles SNAP participants' purchasing power when they spend money at farmers' markets. Similar so-called "double SNAP" programs are typically funded by private foundations and exist around the country, including in San Diego, Boston, and New York City. The Wholesome Wave Foundation, one of the primary sponsors of these programs, currently works with 60 farmers markets in 12 states. These programs increase food security, improve diet quality, boost purchasing power, and foster local economic development.

c. Loyola University in New Orleans received a USDA Community Food Project grant to develop a digital portal to connect local farmers with local schools that want to serve fresh, healthy food. This project improves the health of school children and the economy of New Orleans.

4. Develop policies that boost supply and demand for fruits and vegetables.

Americans do not currently consume the USDA's recommended levels of fruits and vegetables. According to the USDA Economic Research Service, the U.S. would need to put 13 million acres of land into production of fruits and vegetables in order to produce enough crops to satisfy the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

a. Incorporate policies into the next Farm Bill that provide greater risk management and marketing support to fruit and vegetable growers. These policies will make it easier for existing farmers to become fruit and vegetable growers and for new farmers to enter the market.

b. Direct more funding towards research into fruit and vegetable production, processing, and marketing techniques.

c. Develop and continue to support policies and programs that increase access to and demand for fruits and vegetables, including policies that support innovative farmers' market incentive programs for low-income consumers and technical assistance to farmers and institutions that want to participate in farm-to-cafeteria programs.

Thank you for your consideration, and we look forward to future opportunities to inform the Agriculture Committee about public health and food systems.

Sincerely,

MARICE ASHE, J.D., M.P.H.,
Executive Director,
Public Health Law & Policy;

CHRISTINE FRY, M.P.P.,
Policy Associate,
Public Health Law & Policy.

COMMENT OF KENT FUNK, HILLSBORO, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Kent Funk.
City, State: Hillsboro, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Service Center.
Comment: It is critical that we reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway, especially due to the following circumstances:

1. The USDA, Farm Service Agency, CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the summer of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

2. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

3. CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation, tilling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

4. Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

5. The rapid adoption of precision agriculture methods (GPS/GIS) has rapidly progressed throughout the U.S. over the past decade. Reliable and accurate CLU data is essential for us to reap the most significant benefits of this important technology.

COMMENT OF JEFF GAINES, PACIFIC, MO

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Jeff Gaines.
City, State: Pacific, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I am relatively new to farming and I am at a real disadvantage, compared to my older farm neighbors, because the USDA/FSA has not updated "base acres" in 10 years.

The Base acre records are outdated. I report my crops planted every year to the FSA so they have the information required to update base acres.

Please insure the new 2012 Farm Bill requires that base acre records get updated/ or eliminate the DCP/ACRE payments all together.

I need a level playing field if I am going to survive as a farmer.

Thank you,

JEFF GAINES,
Pacific, MO.

COMMENT OF MARC GALATI, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 28, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Marc Galati.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graduate Student.
Comment:

Hello,

I have been very encouraged about the rising interest in sustainably farmed and local organic food that is happening in our nation. However, I would like to voice my concerns regarding conventional agricultural methods as well as factory farming.

It is obvious to many consumers, the House Committee on Agriculture, and various other government related branches that factory farming and conventional farming has many dangers. The cruel conditions in factory farms need to be changed. Overcrowded conditions, antibiotics, and hormones that contaminate our meat and dairy products as well as our environment need to be stopped immediately. The use of pesticides and GMO technology that is destroying our health and environment need to be stopped immediately.

Not only does this need to happen to fix the rising health problems in our country, but it needs to happen in order to save the remaining resources needed for our survival. In addition to that, the cruel slaughtering methods and factory farm conditions need to be changed for animals as well as employees. Massive illegal immigration promoted and directed by large agricultural companies and factory farms are not only hurting our economy and creating crime, but are putting illegal immigrants in harmful situations that are worse than the environment that they originally came from.

The House Committee on Agriculture needs to take a stand against the powerful conventional agricultural companies, factory farms, pharmaceutical companies, pesticide companies, *etc.,* that other government officials are ignoring. Lobbying needs to stop. Revolving doors involving agricultural corporate big shots and political leaders need to stop. It is up to you, the House Committee on Agriculture, to take a big stance in the next farm bill to eliminate factory farms, pesticides, GMOs, hormones, and cruel conditions that are ultimately responsible for the destruction of our health, environment, economy, and safety. I have already personally supported this stance by primarily purchasing only sustainably farmed, organic, and local foods. I hope that you, the House Committee on Agriculture, will join my efforts as well as millions of other concerned consumers efforts to start heading in the right direction regarding farms and agriculture in this nation.

COMMENT OF HADLEY GALBRAITH, TOPEKA, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Hadley Galbraith.
City, State: Topeka, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment:

To the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture,

I am writing as a citizen concerned about the Farm Bill. I hope that you will take action to change our food system so that it produces better food, provides a more viable career to small farmers, and puts less strain on foreign markets.

The subsidies that currently support the incredible production of corn have lead to a system which is backwards in so many ways. It necessitates the use of harmful pesticides and herbicides which would be much less ubiquitous if we simply allowed crops to grow in the number and density that they should.

We are also now a part of a food system which stocks grocery shelves with foods that are processed and have low nutritional value but can be bought at a much lower cost than fresh, local produce. People with less money buy cheaper products, which can effect health. This is not acceptable. Efforts would be better spent trying to provide healthy food at a lower cost than subsidizing one crop which becomes products that are probably connected to the increasing rates of diabetes and obesity in the U.S.

I could go on about corn subsidies, but I do not have time. What I truly hope for is a Farm Bill that supports food systems that function locally, and preferably with controls on pesticide and herbicide usage. This is connected to so many other issues in our own areas as well as globally. I am aware, as are many other people, of the downfalls of our current system. I hope you will consider the health of your citizens and the land we live on and make true reform to the Farm Bill.

Thank you,

HADLEY GALBRAITH.

COMMENT OF MARC GALBRAITH, TOPEKA, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Marc Galbraith.
City, State: Topeka, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Librarian.
Comment: I hope the Committee will give consideration to encouraging more locally grown and sold agricultural products. I hope the Committee will give positive consideration to encouraging greater diversification of crops and livestock on farms. I hope the Committee will give positive consideration to encouraging family farms and will use less of the Farm Bill appropriation to support large corporate farms. I am not opposed to large corporate farms, but I believe individuals are more likely to know the source of what they eat if they can purchase it from local farmers. I believe it is time for federal agriculture subsidies to be used to support local farmers. I also hope the Committee will give consideration to limiting the use of genetically modified crops. I support agricultural research and advances in plant science, but I am concerned that we do not know the full extent of the ramifications of genetically modified crops. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

COMMENT OF V. GAMMINO, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 3:35 a.m.
Name: V. Gammino.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Scientist.
Comment: I am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill should support local farmers and support subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains such as corn and wheat. The bill should restrict the commercial use of pesticides, and establish a firm, science-based stance against GMOs, the long-term effects of which, both upon other agricultural products and humans, remains to be seen. This short-sighted technology has the capacity to infiltrate our ecosystems and as such, potentially the larger food supply and ultimately the livelihoods of all our farmers. Economically sound and evidenced-based policies and laws are necessary to support food equity and better nutritional access for citizens at every income level. Poor dietary habits as a result of food inequity is the single largest primary contributor to health care costs in this nation. A healthier and more accessible food supply will lower health care costs and ensure the health of all Americans.

COMMENT OF DAVID GANUN, LEBANON, NJ

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: David GaNun.
City, State: Lebanon, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

Dear Chairman Peterson and Committee Members:

On behalf of the membership of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers and other rural appraisers throughout the country, I am writing to express concerns with Section 1619 of the current Farm Bill in the hopes that if we cannot work-out a solution to our concerns sooner, we can reach a resolution in the upcoming Farm Bill.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill contains language that restricts access to geospatial data known as Common Land Units (CLU) that prior to this were available from the Farm Service Agency. As appraisers of rural properties, this has been a cause for concern and time delays since its inception as well as a threat to the overall accuracy of appraised values due to the lack of access to this information in many cases.

We understand that the section allows for release of the information that we need to complete accurate appraisals given the consent of owners or operators through a release of information form. This requires the operator and owner to physically travel to the county office to obtain this information. It can then be shared with others. When we are working directly with the owner or operator, this is not overly cumbersome, but is a cause for time delays if the operator cannot immediately obtain this information. However, for the most part on a subject property, we have a cooperative customer whom we are working with. The major concerns, delays and lack of information typically involve the collection of comparable sales data.

Farm specific geospatial information is widely used by professional appraisers. We know this is required information sought after by prospective buyers. These factors all have impact on value. Boundaries, yields, soils, topographic information, and details of any enrolled government program on the property are necessary for the proper analysis of not just the subject of the appraisal but all comparable sales used within the appraisal. In order to provide accurate comparable sales information farm specific data is needed for all recent transactions in order to provide an accurate reflection of market value.

For proper analysis, the appraiser must be able to collect information on comparable farm sales from the area. It is not realistic for appraisers to go to recent buyers and sellers and expect to get access to their farm information via a consent for release form. Most typically the buyer and seller are not clients or acquaintances of the appraiser and therefore obtaining permission for access to this information is difficult, if not impossible, to say nothing of the time constraints. However, this information is market based evidence of comparable values for the area. If we cannot gain access to this information, or only limited information, our analysis could be faulty and impact another, buyer, seller and financial institution. Farmland appraisals for real estate transactions will suffer in accuracy if this information cannot be obtained. We note that the information that we seek is specific to the land and not operator specific information.

The USDA–FSA recognizes the importance of this information to complete reliable farm appraisals. If we complete contract appraisal work for the USDA they allow us access to all of this information as they know it needs to be considered in both the subject property as well as the comparable sales. This is an exclusion that was written into Section 1619 but is only allowed for USDA contract work. We feel that the fact that the USDA recognizes this information as critical to proper analysis and appraisal technique offers strong support to the need for this information for the other users of our appraisal services. As currently interpreted, 1619 does not allow this. We believe that the information that we need for analysis is not personal information but information that is critical to proper analysis of sales and value conclusions.

Appraisal Data Needed:

The information that is needed includes:

- CLU field boundaries.
- Acres.
- Maps (aerial, soils, topographic) tied to FSA boundaries.
- FSA yield information on the property.
- Whether the property is enrolled in CRP, WRP or another easement or rental agreement or federal program and the specifics of the program on the property.

This information is not available anywhere else. We cannot seek this out in county courthouses when we are searching deed transactions. It is information that is only kept with FSA.

We are aware of the confidential nature of the information contained in the CLU data. We respect the confidentiality and only need access to the limited information

listed above. We are professionals that serve the public, and we are bound by strict confidentiality requirements contained in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, which is the law in all 50 states. We have a need to know this information for the proper analysis and valuation of rural property in order to carry out our professional duties, and we would only be using this information to carry out our professional duties. We are not asking that this information be made available to the public, but rather be made available only to professional, certified real estate appraisers.

As professional appraisers we would be using this information to carry out our profession while providing a service to prospective buyers, sellers, lenders and investors. Our accuracy is vital to the safety and soundness of all parties involved. We specifically note that the operator's name is not in our list of necessary information.

In a time when the safety and soundness of lending institutions is of critical concern to all we are very concerned that, without access to the key attributes that affect value, analysis and resulting values could be faulty and lead to a safety and soundness dilemma for agricultural lending and agriculture as a whole. In this case we believe safety and soundness far outweighs any minor privacy intrusion.

Our recommendation: Allow professional real estate appraisers (only State Certified General Real Estate Appraisers) access to this FSA data without the cumbersome and time consuming requirements of the consent for release request. We have previously asked for a technical correction to the current Farm Bill in order to rectify this problem. If this is not possible, we strongly urge that this be corrected for the upcoming Farm Bill.

We thank you for your time and consideration. We would be happy to discuss this issue further with you in the hopes of resolving this critical issue. Please contact us through Stephen Frerichs of AgVantage, LLC [Redacted].

Yours Truly,

DAVID W. GANUN, A.R.A.,
ASFMRA, *Co-Chair of Government Relations Committee,*
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF DIANA GARCIA-PADILLA, HARLINGEN, TX

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 22, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Diana Garcia-Padilla.
City, State: Harlingen, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Greenhouse/nursery, Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I am sorry I missed the June 14 deadline. But if it counts here are my comments.

We are a small group of farmers trying to make a difference in our community and our environment chemical and pesticide free for our future children's and older persons. Please keep small farms under 50acres in your commitment to Agriculture concerns.

Organic or just chemical free and herbicide free for our future generations health.

Concerned Farmer,
DIANA GARCIA-PADILLA,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF SCOTT GARDNER, CLINTON, MO

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Scott Gardner.
City, State: Clinton, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: I am a certified general real estate appraiser that specializes in agricultural/recreational appraisals throughout the Midwest. The CLU data that was historically available, prior to the 2008 Farm Bill, provided essential information in analyzing and reporting agricultural appraisals, while improving the quality and accuracy of data. I strongly support this non-personal information to be reinstated in the consideration of the upcoming Farm Bill.

COMMENTS OF LYDIA GARVEY, CLINTON, OK

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:05 a.m.
Name: Lydia Garvey.
City, State: Clinton, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Health Nurse.
Comment: Promote Organic & demote big Ag fossil fuel! Protect Our lands, waters, wildlife & health! Do your job—Work for citizens, Not corporations!

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Lydia Garvey.
City, State: Clinton, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Health Nurse.
Comment: Invest/Support organic, family, non-GMO farming!!! Stop using our tax $ to subsidize factory/industrial/toxic farming!

It would be much appreciated by all present & future generations of species, our water, wildlife & health!

LYDIA GARVEY.

COMMENT OF BRIANNE GATES, LOS ANGELES, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Brianne Gates.
City, State: Los Angeles, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment:

Dear House Committee on Agriculture,

At the same time that our Surgeon General has declared we have an epidemic of obesity, our government is using our tax dollars to cater to special interests and to subsidize the very foods that are making us fat. Thanks to lobbying, Congress chooses to subsidize foods that we're supposed to eat less of.

Take a look at these numbers which tell how the percentage of federal food subsidies spending is allocated:

- Meat/Dairy—73.8 percent.
- Grains—13.2 percent.
- Sugar/Oil/Starch/Alcohol—10.7 percent.
- Nuts/Legumes—1.9 percent.
- Vegetables/Fruits—0.4 percent.

Please stop giving subsidies to BIG AGRICULTURE CORPORATIONS at the expense of people's health and well being. IF we want to spend less on Health Care we should start by making healthy food cheaper and more accessible.

Another point is the giant pollutant that is Factory Farms and huge Monoculture farms. The pesticide, herbicide and fungicide is polluting our rivers, streams and oceans. Not to mention drinking water!! One-third of greenhouse gases come from factory farm pollution.

The Gulf of Mexico (even before the oil spill) was a dead zone at the mouth of the Mississippi River due to pesticide residues coming from farms along the river.

This practice of giving money to these horrible polluters must stop.

I urge you to have a heart and stop this madness. Not only is it an outrage to the treatment of animals but its an outrage to the land, water and air that is polluted by these factory farms.

ORGANIC AGRICULTURE should be supported and subsidized. Small family farms with biodiversity should be subsidized. To create healthy soil and healthy families all over the country. Imagine the money our country will save on healthcare. And all the farmers markets that will pop up!

Thank you for your concern,

BRIANNE GATES,
Los Angeles CA,
[Redacted].

COMMENTS OF MICHAEL GAUDZELS, NASHVILLE, IL/MARTINSVILLE, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:07 p.m.
Name: Michael Gaudzels.
City, State: Nashville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: There are serious issues caused by heavily subsidizing grain production while at the same time giving little or no subsidies to hay/pasture production.

(1) Favors intensive (factory farm) livestock production over other more environmentally sound and socially acceptable livestock production practices. By subsidizing grains that are the primary feedstock of factory farm CAFOs, it stifles non-CAFO competition and the ability of producers to raise livestock in pasture-based systems.

(2) Subsidizes unnecessary soil erosion, especially on land classified as HEL (Highly Erodible Land). Row crops like corn & beans produce MUCH more erosion than does hay, especially on HEL. Year-after-year production of row crops leaves ground bare with limited root structures to hold the soil, unlike perennial hay crops & pasture which develop root systems and have good ground cover for all/majority of the year. Soil erosion is up to 20 times higher with row crops than with hay or pasture. Our nation's topsoil is a tremendous natural resource that helps farmers continue to provide food for the world. It should not be taken for granted because once it is gone it is very difficult, if not impossible to get back.

(3) Causes more chemical contamination of land & water. It is no secret, although not widely understood, that row crops require far more chemicals than does hay and pasture.

MIKE GAUDZELS,
Nashville, IL.

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Michael Gaudzels.
City, State: Martinsville, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Vegetables.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment:

- There are serious consequences to heavily subsidizing grain production while at the same time providing very few subsidies to hay & pasture production, such as:
  - ➢ Favors intensive CAFO livestock production over pasture-based livestock systems. By subsidizing grains that are the primary feed source on factory farm CAFOs, non-CAFO competition is stifled and the ability of producers to raise livestock in pasture-based systems is diminished.
  - ➢ Subsidizes unnecessary and excessive soil erosion—especially on land classified as HEL (Highly Erodible Land). Row crops like corn & beans produce MUCH more erosion than does hay, especially on HEL. Year-after-year production of row crops leaves ground bare with limited root structures to hold the soil, unlike perennial hay crops & pasture which develop root systems and have good ground cover for majority of the year. Soil erosion is up to 20 times higher with row crops than with hay or pasture. Our nation's topsoil is a tremendous natural resource that helps farmers continue to provide food for the world. It should not be taken for granted because once it is gone it is very difficult, if not impossible to get back.
  - ➢ Causes more chemical contamination of land & water. It is no secret, although not widely understood, that row crops require far more chemicals than does hay and pasture. The more chemicals that are applied, the greater the threat to chemical contamination of soil & rivers.
  - ➢ The solution: Either eliminate crop subsidies altogether or create hay subsidies that are more in line with other crops so that they are more competitive with grain crops—especially on Highly Erodible Land, which is where the biggest threats of erosion and chemical runoff occur.
- Biofuels from Corn and Soy are a HORRIBLE idea . . .

- ➢ The energy efficiency we get from corn ethanol is around 1:1. Corn ethanol is CLEARLY not any magical or necessary source of energy, but basically serves to compete with the food supply. By subsidizing small grain biofuels we subsidize intensive agriculture, putting our land at further risk for excess soil erosion and contamination.
- ➢ Cellulosic ethanol still does not provide a huge energy efficiency ratio and takes valuable organic material from the land year after year. Over time the tilth of fields will severely decline without fertilizers made primarily from fossil fuels.
- ➢ The solution: Eliminate subsidies to ethanol & biodiesel production.

• Other issues

- ➢ Place LIMITS on the amount of subsidies that an individual farmer can earn, AND actively protect from loopholes (such as setting up multiple companies to maintain subsidy payments).
- ➢ Consider the size of the operation when distributing subsidy payments. Large farms should not be receiving proportionally similar payments as small-scale farmers.
- ➢ Implement programs to promote sustainability in agriculture. Presently our system of agriculture is heavily dependent on fossil fuels and also GMO & chemical technology to manage pests and weeds. We need to support research & development of sustainable farming methods such as agricultural systems of perennials in polycultures (*i.e.,* Wes Jackson's research @ The Land Institute) that are closer to how natural ecological systems maintain themselves.

Thanks,

MIKE GAUDZELS.

COMMENT OF SUZANNE GEDDES, CUMMING, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Suzanne Geddes.
City, State: Cumming, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Backyard Gardener, Mother.
Comment: I would like more help for Organic Farmers so that they can succeed.
I would like more restrictions on pesticides and fertilizers for all farmers.
I would like support to all new organic fertilizer companies starting their business, so that they can work with current GA farmers to help grow healthier produce.

COMMENT OF DAVID GEHRKE, NEW ULM, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: David Gehrke.
City, State: New Ulm, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Rural Appraiser.
Comment: As a rural appraiser it is extremely important that we have access to aerial photos and FSA (farm service admin.) information in order to proved accurate appraisals at a reasonable cost.
I would be glad to visit with anyone regarding this issue and it's importance. [Redacted].

COMMENT OF DOUG GEORGE, SUTTON, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Doug George.
City, State: Sutton, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Chemical Dealer.
Comment: I use FSA maps everyday in our business. Many growers like it because they do not have to roundup their maps and bring them into me. It also helps to have the GPS lat. and long. on the with misapplications. We enter both into our

GPS systems to make sure we are in the right fields. Please continue to make these maps available to us.

Thanks,

DOUG GEORGE,
George Bros. Propane and Fert. Corp.,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
Sutton, NE,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF OLIVIA GERI, VINELAND, NJ

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 19, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Olivia Geri.
City, State: Vineland, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Senior Food Service Handler.
Comment: I feel strongly about supporting farm markets and local farms, the fruit and vegetables are fresh, the taste is out of this world and local farms provide jobs and help the economy. I go out of my way for fresh fruit and I'll drive out my way to go to the local farm market where the fresh fruit is. I don't like factory grown synthetic fruit or how it tastes and it's not good for you. Please continue to help out the farms, farmers and employee's and the fresh fruit and vegetable markets.

Thank you.

COMMENTS OF JIM GERRITSEN, BRIDGEWATER, ME

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:36 a.m.
Name: Jim Gerritsen.
City, State: Bridgewater, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Nuts.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment:

Dear House Agriculture Committee,

I am an organic farmer in northern Maine and President of Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association, based in Portland OR. OSGATA is a national membership trade organization. It's mission is to develop, protect and promote the organic seed trade and its growers, and to assure that the organic community has access to excellent quality seed, free of contaminants and adapted to the diverse needs of local organic agriculture. I am writing to urge your Committee to designate development of the organic industry as a top priority for not only the 2012 Farm Bill but also for all future agricultural policy.

The organic industry is responding to the heightened demand from consumers for pure and local food grown sustainably in a way that's good for our land over the long term. As a result over the last 10–15 years organic sales are booming. Yet ag programs aimed at developing organic farming—research and extension activities, conservation programs, tailored crop insurance and help for farmers transitioning to organic production lag far behind from where we should be due to inadequate funding over past decades.

While we are heartened that many good traditional organic practices such as soil building, crop rotation and cover cropping are receiving attention by NRCS and others, and are being incorporated into best management practices of conventional farms, there is a critical need for increased research to sustain and support necessary organic development.

In crop agriculture, we are facing a looming crisis over the steady decline of public seed breeding programs in the United States. Advances in public seed breeding have been the leader in our country's agricultural progress and we must reinvest in seed research now to maintain future agricultural progress. Tomato production illustrates this point. The focus of tomato seed breeding is currently aimed at large scale California production. Yet tomatoes are one of the most important high value crops to many thousands of organic family farmers across all 50 states. The conditions these organic farmers face are dramatically different from those in California. For example, last summer a devastating widespread Tomato Late Blight situation was

encountered by northeastern states. As a result there is now renewed interest in developing great tasting Late Blight resistant tomatoes for the East. Public seed development is a long term good for both society and agriculture and deserves strong multi-year funding support from Congress.

OSGATA urges the House Agriculture Committee to effectively invest in the future of American agriculture by increasing funding for the development of organic production.

Sincerely,

JIM GERRITSEN, *President,*
Organic Seed Growers and Trade Assn.,
Portland, OR,
www.osgata.org.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:06 a.m.
Name: Jim Gerritsen.
City, State: Bridgewater, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment:

Dear House Agriculture Committee,

We are American farmers. Our family raises certified organic seed potatoes in northern Maine and we have been farming organically for almost 35 years.

I am writing to request that you increase funding that supports organic farm production. Organic sales are increasing dramatically because organic farmers are responding to the demands of the American consumer for organic food that tastes good and is nutritious and comes from local organic farms that are treating the land well for the long term.

Well designed organic farm systems improve the land and produce excellent quality food and seed. Productive organic farms succeed at simultaneous crop production and land conservation and they can serve as a model for all producers. But it costs money to farm for the future. Since society benefits from the good of conserved and enhanced farmland it is reasonable to reward farmers for the conservation efforts that the market does not.

It is critical to invest in research and extension to facilitate continued development of organic farming. Crop insurance needs to be reformed so that our organic crops can be insured at real world organic crop values, not at unrealistic conventional prices. And if the country is to make continued conservation progress we need to help farmers transition into organic production so that they can afford to shift their production practices to follow organic models.

American agriculture has a remarkable history of progress but that progress was the result of investments made for the future good. Organic farming is the future of American agriculture and needs research and development investment now so that it's growth may continue. And this current organic investment by Congress must increase to make up for decades worth of inadequate funding. Organic farm systems are sophisticated and long term. So it follows that research that will help develop organic production must also work on the long term and that means secure multi-year funding is the wisest investment that will bring the best results.

Thank you.

JIM GERRITSEN,
[Redacted],
Wood Prairie Farm,
Bridgewater, ME

COMMENT OF ELLIOTT GETZ, LUBBOCK, TX

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Elliott Getz.
City, State: Lubbock, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I hope the new bill will continue to help keep lands in the CRP; we have enough dirt in the air as it is, and definitely not enough water to go around irrigating more farmland. On that note, I think the bill should address farmers in the driest areas across the country (like here around Lubbock) that are planting corn and other water-intensive crops. Lubbock simply does NOT have the water resources to support crops like that, and they shouldn't be allowed to plant them, they

should at least face stiff tax increases if the bill can't bar them from planting it altogether.

COMMENT OF STEPHANIE GILLESPIE, REDFORD, MI

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Stephanie Gillespie.
City, State: Redford, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Farm bill must be centered around environmental sustainability.

COMMENT OF WILLIAM GILLISON, LAKE VILLAGE, AR

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: William Gillison.
City, State: Lake Village, AR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I appreciate the efforts and monies that have been directed towards conservation cost share programs (*i.e.,* EQIP, CRP, WRP) but cannot understand why these type of payments would be subject to Average Gross Income restrictions or Foreign citizenship. The payments are spent on U.S. land to conserve U.S. water and U.S. soil resources and since they are cost share they require contribution from whomever participates. I feel there should be no restrictions as to who receives cost share assistance for all soil and water conservation programs and feel strongly that most if not all normal thinking people would support such a modification.

COMMENT OF LUKE GILSON, LOS ANGELES, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 17, 2010, 5:05 a.m.
Name: Luke Gilson.
City, State: Los Angeles, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Audio Engineer.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF KATY GIOMBOLINI, SALEM, OR

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 17, 2010, 3:05 a.m.
Name: Katy Giombolini.
City, State: Salem, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Advocate.
Comment: Please support sustainable farm initiatives as well as support for local processing facilities that rely on transparency rather than stringent regulations that keep smaller producers from being unable to compete in the market. Also support for young organic farmers!

COMMENT OF DAVID GLENN, HILLSBOROUGH, NJ

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: David Glenn.
City, State: Hillsborough, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Director, Farming Nonprofit.
Comment: I want to encourage budget allocations funding research—both academic and on-farm—for organic production. Organic is the fastest growing sector in the USA, yet receives very little attention or funding, compared to commodity based crops. If the kind of funding is put forth for organics, like was done during the 1970–1980s, there would be tremendous growth and improvement.

We are losing farmers everyday, new initiatives need to be funded to encourage new, organic and sustainable farmers to be trained and establish farming businesses.

Please support organic production!!!

COMMENT OF BRUCE GOLDSMITH, GALT, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Bruce Goldsmith.
City, State: Galt, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Dairy Facility Owner; Environmental Compliance Consultant.
Comment: The dairy industry has suffered through 1½ years of economic collapse. We can not wait another two years, until the 2012 Farm Bill, for a solution to the industry problems. Thousands of dairies, from all over this country, will suffer financial failure by that time. And the rural communities from all across this country will continue to suffer the negative effects of a dairy industry that is going broke. We need a solution from the Congress this year!

COMMENT OF MARIA GONZALEZ, TULARE, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, April 29, 2010, 6:36 p.m.
Name: Maria Gonzalez.
City, State: Tulare, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Dairy Milker.
Comment: I am commenting because I live in Tulare, Ca. and work as a milker in one of the area dairy's. I support farmers and dairy men because there are thousands of hundreds of people that support their families with work that is provided by farmers and dairies. What would our families do if it was not for them? How would we support our families if it was not that they provide work? Where would all of America including your families get your milk and other food ingredients from if it was not for the work that I and my co-workers do in milking cows? What country would we have to buy our food and food source from? As it is in California, due to some endangered fish, farmers are not planting crops that would provide jobs to provide for our families. If the economy is to really turn around—which it has not done so—then support this Farm Bill so that jobs can be provided and our families can survive. We are not asking for a hand-out, we ask for government to support America's working families. Working Americans cannot continue on this path. We are tired of the prices that are so high. I beg of you listen to our farmers and dairy men. We need our jobs so that we support our families. PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK AND THE ECONOMY WILL TAKE CARE OF ITSELF!

COMMENT OF MICHELLE GONZALEZ, PROVIDENCE, RI

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Michelle Gonzalez.
City, State: Providence, RI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Business Consultant.
Comment: Please, take the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous.

COMMENT OF DEANY GOODE, KANSAS CITY, MO

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Deany Goode.
City, State: Kansas City, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: I want no genetically modified seed or food allowed on American soil, especially not in American school meals. I want no Posilac in my milk. I want corn and soy out of all my food that is not corn or soy. I want to stop tax subsidizing corn and soy. I want everyone who has ever worked for Monsanto out of Washington and out of the EPA, FDA and USDA. I want you to give power to the FDA and the USDA to protect Americans from toxins and genetic modification in our food and punish those who poison us. If you cannot to that then I at least want genetically modified ingredients listed as genetically modified on the list of ingredients on the label of a product. I want people in government to stop taking money from Monsanto. I want you to give power back to farmers to keep their own seed. Lastly, I'd like you to take away the right to patent nature and life, namely genes.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF KATHERINE GOODRICH, DOYLESTOWN, OH

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Katherine Goodrich.
City, State: Doylestown, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator and Mother of four young children.
Comment: As a voting citizen, an educator and a mother of 4 young children, I am very worried about the safety of our food. I am concerned about the regulations in place regarding the use of pesticides, growth hormones, meat processing and the condition of animal farms.
I find it discouraging that in this day and age, I can't trust the food that I buy at the local grocery store will be safe for my children to eat. We do not live in a third world country, yet our food is starting to feel as if we need to take precautions as if we ARE in a third world country.
The United States of America can do better and we need your leadership to make decisions to push farmers and farming corporations to grow and produce food that is healthy for our children. Thank you for your time and I will be watching to see if decisions are made to move our country into a safer food market.

COMMENT OF LYNETTE GOODSON, LONGVIEW, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, June 07, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Lynette Goodson.
City, State: Longview, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nonprofit.
Comment: I've worked for a year to help put a Farmers Market together to represent all Texas farm products. There are significant expenses that producers incur when bringing many products to market. In Texas, eggs have to be refrigerated during transport and while at the market. Meat packaged at a USDA packing house still requires the same hand washing facilities for storage as a full service restaurant.
We need grants for these producers so they can meet the health code requirements so we can make local farm products accessible for all.
For those of us who strike out to make a difference, we need grants that are accessible to help us make local products available in our communities.
Thank you,

LYNETTE GOODSON.

COMMENT OF LARRY GOOLSBY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Larry Goolsby.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Director of Legislative Affairs.
Comment:

June 14, 2010

Hon. COLLIN C. PETERSON,
Chairman,
House Agriculture Committee,
Washington, D.C.;

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,
Ranking Minority Member,
House Agriculture Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Peterson and Ranking Member Lucas:

I write today on behalf of the American Public Human Services Association, which represents the state cabinet-level public health and human service departments as well as many local agencies. Our members administer all the major safety net programs including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program as well other vital assistance such as Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, child welfare, child care, and child support. Our mission is to develop and promote policies and practices that improve the health and well-being of America's children, families, and adults.

We are pleased that the House Agriculture Committee is already focusing attention on the 2012 Farm Bill, which as you know is a critical piece of legislation not only for the nation's agricultural community but also for the many millions of individuals who rely on federal nutrition assistance programs. The importance of the largest nutrition program, SNAP, has only grown as the current economic downturn has hit with full force. We are proud that as SNAP caseloads set new records monthly (and have grown over 40 percent in the last two years), we continue to serve SNAP recipients' needs effectively at a time when state and local budgets are in severe crisis. Most of our member agencies have had to reduce staff and other resources, yet we are maintaining a historically high degree of program integrity and are providing timely service to the overwhelming majority of applicants.

This combination of unprecedented demand and declining state and local capacity further highlights the need for program improvements that APHSA has advocated for many years. While Congress and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have made many significant SNAP reforms in recent years, we strongly recommend additional program simplification and removal of access barriers; additional administrative support, such as that provided last year in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the Department of Defense appropriations measure; additional linkages with and coordination among other federal assistance programs; stronger support for nutritious food choices and nutrition education; and far greater encouragement of program innovations.

Our recommendations for your consideration are attached to this letter. While they are grouped into categories, many serve multiple purposes; for example, changes that reduce administrative barriers both improve program access and streamline the workload for program administrators. We also believe that simplified program rules and less red tape will help families access more of the benefits to which they are entitled and thus choose costlier but more nutritious foods, something that will help in the fight against childhood obesity.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments and recommendations. If we can answer any question or assist you in any way, please contact me or Larry Goolsby, APHSA's Director of Legislative Affairs, at [Redacted] or [Redacted].

Sincerely,

CARI DESANTIS,
Interim Executive Director.

ATTACHMENT

[*Editor's Note:* the comment was incomplete as submitted.]

COMMENT OF SABRINA GORBETT, FAIRVIEW PARK, OH

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Sabrina Gorbett.
City, State: Fairview Park, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Comment: The policy you decide in this bill will have far reaching effects. Subsidized wheat and corn become heavy parts of the USDA food programs, including feeding our kids in school food programs. Please step back from the over-reliance on staple crops to fund more fruit and vegetable growers and increase the USDA work on urban small plot farming.

Please take into consideration the health of our children over the health of large agriculture businesses.

COMMENT OF RAWSON GORDON II, SUWANEE, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 07, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Rawson Gordon II.
City, State: Suwanee, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: Mr. Linder, so much needs to change. Federal subsidies that force farmers to produce corn, the fundamental building block of factory farm-produced meat and unhealthy, processed food, must be rerouted. Farmers need incentives to diversify their crops, so that a wide range of fruits and vegetables may be had at reasonable prices. It is not right that making a salad costs so much more than making a hamburger.

COMMENTS OF BRYAN GOTHAM, HERMON, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, May 10, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Bryan Gotham.
City, State: Hermon, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I have been an active participant in finding solutions to the current dairy crisis. I have traveled to Washington 3 times in the last 12 months; spoke at dairy meetings, DOJ hearings, and an official NYS Senate Agriculture Committee hearing.

I have looked long and hard at the answers to this crisis that threatens this nations long term food safety, food quantity and food sovereignty. Farmers have been told free market will provide for us and it will provide us a fair price. Milk buyers have merged into giants and our Dairy Co-ops. with the power of Capper Volstead claim they can't truly bargain for milk prices based off cost of production or increases in standard of living because they will be in violation of anti trust. We are told that we have to take this 30 year old price and a whole generation of the few farmers left today have been brainwashed into this mindset. This mindset affects our ability to find adequate solutions to this crisis because we have been trained to be "price takers".

Why can't we run our dairy business like every other market oriented business where we set our product price based upon our production costs? Other business have this power, but dairy farmers do not with our daily perishable product and the Government setting minimum prices off the CME influenced NASS survey. I have become a strong supporter of S. 1645 The Milk Market Improvement Act of 2009 because this bill fits this philosophy in doing business off our basic costs. It doesn't guarantee a profit it only covers the minimum costs of producing milk in the U.S.A. with price discovery calculated by the researchers at the USDA Economic Research Service. Consumers also want farmers to be paid fairly because they understand the importance of food sovereignty.

Our dairy media, Co-ops and academia have all misrepresented or failed to understand the real potential behind the ideas in S. 1645. First of all the bill is market oriented. The ERS numbers for our costs are variable economic models from markets like oil, fuel, labor, insurance, feed, *etc.* In fact one could argue this price discovery is a lot more market oriented because it is broader and more diversified than what we have today compared to the CME trading surplus cheese which is less than 1% of the cheese marketed. This type of pricing would get us off the perpetual treadmill of playing catch up, taking on long-term debt and always having to milk more cows to try to get out of the hole. Some believe this is growth, but others think this treadmill is insanity. The other distortion of the bill comes from the belief that the bill will flood the market with milk. I say yes that may be true in the short term but the bill has two great mechanisms for supply management. The first program assesses all milk up to 2.5% of production to fund the Commodity Credit Corp. in

order to buy product off the market. However, if the oversupply grows worse 100% of all extra milk could be paid zero dollars in order to fund the CCC sufficiently. I also believe that it will take some time, but all good businessmen or women will make intelligent decisions and dry cows off, sell some cows, or reduce grain levels instead of producing something with a zero return. The best part of this whole idea is that it is 100% percent farmer funded with no more handouts from Washington and our taxpayers. To me that means less Government involved not more. The School lunch program, food banks and the needy benefit from this program of supply management.

Let's support this great idea that will revitalize rural America 's small businesses instead of starving it. Large milk buying conglomerates have hoarded the wealth from milk for far too long. I have heard politicians claim they want to "spread the wealth around this country" through taxes but I say it is time for rural America's small business to do this in an economically efficient way.

Concerned Dairy Farmer and Consumer,
BRYAN GOTHAM,
Gotham Family Farm LLC,
Hermon, NY,
[Redacted].

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Bryan Gotham.
City, State: Edwards, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Dairy Policy thinking needs to change dramatically. Today we have a pricing system that favors processors and retailers. Today our pricing system allows processors to get there cost of production through the make allowance and that is acceptable by the industry. It is set up wrong! Processors never get signals that there is too much product because they always break even on every lb of milk processed. This creates a guaranteed market that some dairyman feel the are entitled too. The CME cash cheese market is not a market with only 1–2 trades a day of surplus cheese controlled by few buyers and sellers. Developing a fair market to price milk has been a constant failure. The NASS survey and the CME have very tight correlation. Its time to remove this guaranteed market from the dairy industry and give farmers cost of production on their milk so increased costs burdened on the farmer can be passed through the supply chain. That way when processors get signals that there is too much product. Farmers can either pay to remove this product from the market place with supply management ideas proposed in S. 1645 Specter-Casey or processors can work directly with coops and individual farmers to reduce milk supplies coming into their plants. This is how the system should work. No guaranteed market and a fair price to the farmers so they have the potential to break even. Farmers need to be paid for all costs incurred on there farms including unpaid family labor. The numbers developed by the ERS are good representation of what it costs to produce milk in today's economic times. Dairy farmers do not want any more band aids or subsidies from taxpayers to fund insurance programs or costs need to be covered from the marketplace. The ERS cost of production figures are market oriented and do vary monthly to changing market patterns. It is the best way to value a perishable precious commodity.

COMMENT OF NATALIE GRACE, NEW HOPE, MN

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Natalie Grace.
City, State: New Hope, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Patent Agent.
Comment:

(1) end crop subsidies, which are narrowing the scope of American diets and causing severe health problems.

(2) encourage seed cleaning, because this preserves heirloom crops, widening our variety of diet.

(3) ban steroids and antibiotics added to livestock feed.

(4) demand labeling of GMO product, or allow a "non-GMO" label.

(5) stop corn ethanol subsidies/development. Farm land should not be wasted to create fuel and plastics.

(6) impose stricter animal cruelty regulations on livestock.

COMMENT OF LORIJAYNE M. GRAHN, PELICAN RAPIDS, MN

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 08, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: LoriJayne M. Grahn.
City, State: Pelican Rapids, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Enough of low milk prices, the corruption, and policies or programs where we keep paying more for less.

Enough of giving us pennies instead of the dollars we justly earned.

We need a cost of production and no less.

We cannot continue on year after year with the same problems.

Good farmers and many families are being forced out of business and losing everything.

We need a solution and that solution is Dairy Bill S. 1645 The Federal Milk Marketing Improvement Act of 2009. It was written by farmers for farmers.

The Bill, S. 1645 is a solution to fix a broken pricing system that fails us over and over again, leaving us with welfare subsidies and programs that don't work. This Bill S. 1645 is a chance and answer to save our farms now and not later.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL stabilize farm raw milk prices and WILL give all dairy producers the average national cost of production determined by the Economic Research Service (ERS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The price would be adjusted quarterly.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL create transparency and the S1645 bill eliminates any reference to the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) for determining milk prices paid to dairy farmers. S. 1645 creates official transparency to report on import/export volume, milk displacement, and dollar value, and create accountability in the Federal Order amendment process. The crime of price manipulation and corruption have been proven that the CME is prone to this abuse.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL balance milk production and supply as the bill mandates that the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture must be sure that the imports of dairy products do not exceed the amount of dairy exports before he can use the inventory management program. In other words, dairy farmers will not be required to balance the national oversupply of milk if the displacement of U.S. milk is caused by import increases; this includes imported Milk Protein Concentrate (MPC) and Casein. Under Bill S. 1645 importation of foreign dairy products will no longer be allowed to destroy dairy farmer raw milk prices.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL provide a Supply Management program to be implemented only when dairy exports exceed dairy imports by both the amount of milk represented and by dollar value. Bill S. 1645 Supply Management first phase—would affect all dairy producers by reducing the Class II price by up to 50 percent on up to five percent of their production. U.S. dairy farmers would always maintain at least a 95 percent national cost of production during this process. It would also give farmers a signal to hold production down as well. The intent of Bill 1645 is not to tell dairy farmers how much milk they can produce, however, overproduction and supply are addressed in the Inventory Management Program of S1645, that is necessary to prevent a small amount of milk forcing all milk down in price per hundredweight. Bill S. 1645 second phase—if necessary under which when the Secretary of Agriculture would announce a reduced price for producers who have increased production on all milk that is excess of the dairy producers preceding years production. The funds collected from the supply management assessment would be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) to be used to remove excess products from the market.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL be burden FREE from the tax payers as the bill will be funded by farmers where the cost is paid through supply management provisions. Bill S. 1645 cost would be minimal as it uses existing entities such as ERS, Market Administrators, Farm Service Agency (FSA), Foreign Agriculture Service (FAS), where the required data is already being done, or could be done with little additional expense. S. 1645 IS a solution addressing the same roller coaster problems in the industry. Plus the MILC program or price support program, or tax payer dollars government spending.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL be able to be implemented immediately as stand alone legislation upon being voted on and passed by Congress (both the Senate and House of Representatives) and will not require the Farm Bill to be reopened to be put into effect.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL NOT interfere with existing federal and state marketing orders which remain intact and be responsible for determining the component value of milk.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL protect the continuation of the Federal Milk Marketing Orders (FMMO) from being terminated by a negative vote during the referendum process.

Senate Bill S. 1645 WILL eliminate Make Allowances, which are any cost of manufacturing plants, to be levied on dairy farmers.

To make dairy farmers pay for insurance plans does not solve the problems and only allows a farmers debt to increase. Dairy Bill S. 1645 is a solution to save our dairy farmers with a cost of production, provide a supply management program if needed, address the imports of Milk Protein Concentrates (MPC's) that displace our U.S. dairy farmer's milk and creates an oversupply, plus threatens the safety and quality of our food supply, plus it is an ideal bill that will not affect our national debt or cost the taxpayers any money.

In conclusion, the farmer's paycheck is what is left over after everyone else profits or takes their cost first. The roller coaster price system is destructive. Farmers have sacrificed everything and can't recover their debt-load or losses when the checks that they receive is always below cost of production. The corruption, consolidation, and corporate world has been able to control the dairy industry and it's path. This needs to stop now. Our Senators and Representatives need to change this path. Other destructive policies and anti-trust abuses can not be tolerated and are not acceptable. Our country needs it farmers, and the health of our economy and rural America depends on them. U.S. dairy farmers, consumers, and the dairy industry as a whole need Dairy Bill S. 1645, The Federal Milk Marketing Improvement Act of 2009. This is a solution NO MORE BAND-AIDS. There is no excuse for anything less. Our dedicated, good family farmers who provide us with a quality fresh local food supply are going out of business and losing everything. I know . . . for I am one of those dedicated farmers.

To Colin Peterson: If you can take $50 million from the Farm Bill Budget and give it to Fargo, North Dakota for flood projects, there is no excuse for not passing Dairy Bill S. 1645 which would save our family farms by giving a cost of production to our farmers, save our taxpayers money, eliminate government subsidies and spending that is a win-win situation for our national debt and dairy industry.

COMMENT OF PHILIP GRANDIN, GRAFTON, MA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Philip Grandin.
City, State: Grafton, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Please focus efforts on giving the non-industrialized farming community the resources it needs to produce locally-distributed and ecologically conscious foods for a public and society increasingly in need of healthy, environmentally sound, and sustainable crops.

COMMENT OF BENNIE GRAVES, ABILENE, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, September 06, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Bennie Graves.
City, State: Abilene, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Why did Congress cut $16 billion from the farm bills not yet in effect. My expenses have risen about 200% in last few years. Taxes have also increased about 200%. I live in the 19th district, but my farm is in another. I am a senior citizen, veteran and feel like there is 3 strikes against me now. My meds through VA are $9 each. Most can be bought at Wal-Mart for $4. Does Wal-Mart have greater buying power than VA?

COMMENT OF TAMMY GRAVES, RICHFIELD SPRINGS, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Tammy Graves.
City, State: Richfield Springs, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consumer, Mom.
Comment: An adequate, stable price paid to our dairy farmers is critical for my community's livelihood and the wholesomeness of the milk and cheese that I want to eat and be assured it is made in USA.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF WHISPER GRAY, MANTECA, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 05, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Whisper Gray.
City, State: Manteca, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Dog Breeder.
Comment: I have an issue that is not directly related to what is about to be voted on. My issue is related to farm dumping, when migrant workers leave and dump their garbage and sometimes DOGS on the side of the road on their way home to Mexico. I also have issues with people in track homes coming to our farms and dumping couches and tires out on farm land. There is no respect for farmers and peoples land anymore. When I was growing up in the Stockton school district I remember there being a "Litter bug" education, we need it again!! Its a major pet peeve of mine to see anyone drop their garbage anywhere except in a trash can.
Is it possible to add signs for Farmers to prosecute those caught dumping on their property? Fines or something, Not just trespassing. And Farmers should warn their workers from other countries not to get dogs and then dump them when they go home . . . our shelters are full enough!

COMMENT OF FRED GREDER, MASON CITY, IA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Fred Greder.
City, State: Mason City, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: SECTION 1619: This firm specializes primarily in the practice of farm and rural property appraisals. Since the implementation of Section 1619, we have devised a "written release" form that all of the local Farm Service Agency offices are accepting. We have taken this approach because it has been our opinion that appraising a farm without the actual USDA information by subscribing to another vendor is a compromise. However, this process slows down the appraisal process by anywhere from one to several days (in one instance it stalled the process entirely) and it consumes a lot of man hours from my office staff.
Consequently, we immediately raised our fees as soon as Section 1619 was enforced. In other words, Section 1619 has resulted in a regulatory imposed tax on our customers.
As a partial solution, I would like to respectfully request that the local FSA offices at least be allowed to release the field measurements and field delineations on the aerial photos without needing written authorization from the owners or operators.
I can understand how the CRP contract terms, NRCS determinations and base & yield information is confidential business information. But, there are many other ways to recreate the field measurement information. There is nothing to be gained by withholding the "official" measurements of the FSA.
Finally, the impact of the enforcement of Section 1619 is particularly frustrating in light of the fact that the Environmental Working Group still seems to be able to get their hands on much more confidential information than a typical farm real estate professional needs.
Thanks for the opportunity to share my observations.

FRED GREDER, A.R.A.,
Benchmark Agribusiness, Inc.
[Redacted],
Mason City, IA,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF TABITA GREEN, BROOKFIELD, WI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 19, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Tabita Green.
City, State: Brookfield, WI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: VP, Product Management.
Comment: Support local, organic farmers! They are the future. If we can get lots of healthy, local foods into our schools, we may be able to reverse the current trend of obesity, diabetes, and all the other health problems that our country faces today. Please listen to your hearts and do what's right.

COMMENT OF MAYA GREENE, AUSTERLITZ, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:36 p.m.
Name: Maya Greene.
City, State: Austerlitz, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professor.
Comment: I firmly believe that our government needs to support 2 things in this farm bill: Diversification of crops, and organic practices. From a perspective of health for both our bodies and our planet, supporting organic farming & biodynamic practices is a smart move. Furthermore, I have concerns about our focus on growing corn in this country. Supporting diversification of crops is a smart way to ensure the health of our land for years to come.

COMMENT OF KAREN GRIGGS, STOCKTON, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 07, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Karen Griggs.
City, State: Stockton, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired family ranching.
Comment: Unless you turn on the water in the San Joaquin Valley, the money for subsidies is pointless. My family farmed and ranched all of my life. We got farm subsidies for not growing things that we never had grown. Those subsidies began with the program after the war and ended in 1989 when my grandmother died. The land was a feed lot/dairy/slaughter house before my grandfather's death. After his death, the land was leased to truck farmer's who grew produce. But I cashed the last check just before my grandmother's death in 1989 for not growing millet among other things, crops which had never been considered for planting. I have to assume that no one monitors the program and that type of waste is common place. What we want to see is water for the farmer's and to pay off the debt.

COMMENT OF ROBERT GRILLO, CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 10:36 a.m.
Name: Robert Grillo.
City, State: Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Marketing Consultant, Writer.
Comment: How about we start by "democratizing" the farm subsidy program and stop funding the wealthiest corporations that control most of the agriculture in our country? Why not make livestock producers pay for the costs that they have externalized to the taxpayers, such as environmental degradation and human health epidemics (Swine flu for example)? How about addressing the contamination of our waters and land caused by the widespread use of pesticides? How about subsidizing organic producers and assisting them in making organic food more accessible and affordable to consumers?

COMMENT OF JANICE GRIMES, WEBSTER, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Janice Grimes.
City, State: Webster, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.

Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: My husband and I own a dairy farm and have nearly gone bankrupt due to the dairy crisis. We cannot trust our coops or other people that represent "big milk".

We can only voice our opinions to this Committee in the hopes that someone will help us before the American dairy farm becomes extinct. Please consider these options when forming the new farm bill:

New price discovery rather than Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) driven. The CME only sells surplus cheese. Why is the average cheese price based off the surplus?

- Provide a milk price that is adequate and supports the "Average" sized farm. Without this, any policy is not sustainable without extreme government subsidies, such as those we have today. With adequacy, the MILC program can be eliminated.
- The USDA inspects 1% of imported food for quality, but 100% of domestic food is tested and sampled for quality. Imported food needs to meet the same standards and regulation as domestic food. If imported dairy products cannot meet domestic standards, they should not be put into our food.
- Provide quality incentives in the federal formulas.
- Class I fluid prices need to be paid on regional cost of production factors to truly reflect the real value of producing fresh, local milk.
- Reporting of cheese inventory needs to be mandatory.
- The value of cheese needs to be determined by the entire market from high value to low value cheese. The value needs to be broad based and electronically driven.
- All dairy products wholesaled need to be included in the pricing of manufactured dairy products for dairy farmers.
- If the burden for the oversupply is completely placed onto the farmer through a supply management system, then a financial allowance for this financial burden needs to be in the federal formulas for farmers. This would remove the taxpayers' financial responsibility today.

COMMENT OF MARIAN GRIMES, DUDLEY, MA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Marian Grimes.
City, State: Dudley, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I am most concerned about the future of the USA dairy industry. Indeed, if the Federal Government is going to use their antiquated formula to continue to determine pricing, our dairy industry is doomed to failure. I believe a rate setting commission should be established to determine a fair price for milk. The Federal Government has rate setting commissions for other industries it controls, why not the dairy industry?

If we continue to lose dairy farms the production of food in this country will go the way of manufactured goods, *i.e.,* in the hands of other countries. I don't know about you, but I DO NOT want other countries to control the production of food in the USA.

COMMENT OF DICK GROEN, GEORGE, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Dick Groen.
City, State: George, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I would like to urge you to make the FSA field data available to public again. This information is very useful in helping us serve our farmer customers.

COMMENT OF CHRISTOPHER GROTEGUT, HEREFORD, TX

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 18, 2010, 10:05 a.m.

Name: Christopher Grotegut.
City, State: Hereford, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I support the removal of USDA payment limit in terms of amount.

I support strengthening the definition of actively engaged in farming. USDA should only support actively engaged farmers. Actively engaged should be those people working on a farm or ranch greater than 20 hours per week.

Greater emphasis needs to be placed on the preservation or managed stability of our underground water aquifers. Mining water is not good for our communities or country from a long term basis. It is in reality a form of deficit spending. Farm policy striving for local area financial and ecological sustainability is a must. USDA funds should not be used to increase under ground water usage unless it prevents flooding in areas prone to flooding.

I support organic and local food efforts. The elimination of pesticide use has had only beneficial results on our ability to manage our farms. Employee satisfaction and compensation have both benefited significantly from the removal of pesticides. Additionally, our local equipment suppliers have also benefited through our quicker ability to adopt newer technology as a result of improved income streams. This has allowed us to buy more American.

Continue to work to make inroads easier for small food processing companies including meat harvesting facilities. We need to be thankful for the strong infrastructure we have in our commodity buyers, but we also need to make sure that there is room for new ideas and new companies to create free market competition.

I support national animal ID programs. The USDA 840 RFID tags used in cattle have been very useful in our business.

COMMENT OF DEBRA GUENTHER, DURANGO, CO

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 26, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Debra Guenther.
City, State: Durango, CO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I am writing in strong support of organic farming programs and research. The field of organics is a growing one and the need for technical assistance and information is strong.

- We need Research and Extension Programs, Conservation Programs, Transition Programs, and
- Crop Insurance Programs that are aimed towards organic farmers specifically.

Please support a Farm Bill that will make these things possible.

COMMENT OF DAVID GUITH, ATWATER, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: David Guith.
City, State: Atwater, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: No more farm subsidies!! No other business gets them nor should they. Make it or let someone else do it better.

COMMENT OF RANDALL GUSTAFSON, PHILLIPS, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Randall Gustafson.
City, State: Phillips, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As an agricultural real estate appraiser, I support the reinstatement of CLU data into Section 1619 of the farm bill. This information was available and easily accessible prior to 2008. The CLU data provides important benefits for businesses that work closely with agricultural producers giving producers more timely,

accurate, and cost efficient services. CLU data does not contain any compliance information, personal information, wetland information, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) information, or ownership information. CLU data only contains field boundary information. Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF TERRY GUTTORMSON, HENDRUM, MN

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 08, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Terry Guttormson.
City, State: Hendrum, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: My list of things that must be in the farm bill:

1. $500,000 million for water retention and storage in the Red River Basin. (or more)
2. Save or improve the "no cost to government" sugar bill.
3. Raise commodity loan rates:

- wheat $5.50.
- soybeans $7.50.
- corn $3.50.

4. Improve crop insurance.
5. Keep round up ready technology in sugar beets.

COMMENT OF LAURA GUTTRIDGE, VERO BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:36 a.m.
Name: Laura Guttridge.
City, State: Vero Beach, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Housewife.
Comment: Please stop supporting factory farming. The government is subsidizing the wrong end of the food chain. Fruits, and vegetables are very expensive, and unhealthy meat is cheap. This is wrong and one of the reason Americans are so over-weight, and unhealthy.

COMMENT OF TRACI GUYNUP, LANCASTER, PA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Traci Guynup.
City, State: Lancaster, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support home-grown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.

I live in Lancaster, PA where the Amish used to produce their own electricity. We need to help farmers obtain solar panels and to make their own biodiesel (griesel) from dead animals.

A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.

We are losing too much farm land to development. We need to encourage current farmers not to sell out.

It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty

crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.

We have several excellent farm markets in Lancaster.

We need to encourage black and Hispanic youth to purchase from farm markets. We also need to have cooking classes so that youth know how to prepare the food.

COMMENT OF FRANK HAGAN, EVERETT, WA

Date Submitted: Thursday, August 19, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Frank Hagan.
City, State: Everett, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Commercial Airplane Process Engineer.
Comment:

To: The Honorable Agriculture Committee:

Just a general comment about studies of Biotechnology or Engineered foods. While reading a recent report on a genetically altered Atlantic Salmon species which is being reviewed by the FDA, and grows to maturity at a much faster rate to reduce time to market, has a Congressional Oversight Committee (FDA *etc.*) thought about the impact to the resources that feed these products? Specifically the impact of changing the life cycle on resource depletion. Example; if a normal species takes several years to mature along with it's food source, then you change the growth rate (Bio Engineer) of the species without altering the speed of growth of the food source (or the growth rate of all the components that support each links life cycle chain), is there a potential for resource depletion? Not sure if this aspect is considered in Bio Engineering studies or not. Thanks for your time and consideration.

Regards,

FRANK HAGAN,
Everett, WA,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF DAVID HAGERT, EMERADO, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: David Hagert.
City, State: Emerado, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Software Development.
Comment: In our software development the CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation, tilling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures. The CLU data was available from 2004 until the signing of the 2008 Farm Bill and should be placed back into public domain.

COMMENT OF LEAH HAGMAN, ARLINGTON, TX

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Leah Hagman.
City, State: Arlington, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified Public Accountant.
Comment: Please end subsidies for big Agricultural business, especially for Corn and Soy. It is time to promote biodiversity to save our land, water and our bodies. End Monsanto's monopoly. Promote the small farmer, especially organic and non-GMO crops. Outlaw genetically engineered crops. Promote the labeling of our food sources. Protect the consumers of agriculture as well.

COMMENT OF BARBARA HAINES, LOUISVILLE, KY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Barbara Haines.
City, State: Louisville, KY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Comment: I'm a farm product consumer, and lived in farming communities for over a decade. My neighbors raised beef cattle, ran dairies, raised horses and sheep. I could drop by unannounced at any time of the day or night and find them hard at work.

In fact, they were up hours before I was, and it wasn't unusual to see them high-tailing it across a field late at night if an animal had gotten itself into trouble or gone through a fence to get into another neighbor's crops.

These were men and women who broke their backs all day, every day and never got a vacation because there's no such thing as a 'cow sitter' for a 250 head dairy farm.

The amazing thing is these folks all took fantastic care of their animals, and often risked their own lives in bad weather or other dangerous situations to tend or rescue their stock. The idea of mistreating an animal is ludicrous to them, because that animal is their livelihood and means the difference between being able to feed their family and keep their farm, or lose everything.

While human nature would seem to have a rule that there's always a bad apple or two trying to spoil the whole bushel, my direct experience in over a decade of daily contact with independent farmers and producers is that any such bad apples are ostracized by the rest; and underhanded practices are not the norm in the agricultural industry.

I remember when I was growing up we were taught the greatest danger our nation faced was Communism. It's a sad day in America to think we've replaced that military threat with our own hard-working farmers.

America's farmers have provided me and my entire family with the world's best, safest and most affordable produce for over fifty years. I'm proud to know that the United States can afford to help feed needy people in other countries because of the sweat on Darrell White's brow and the dust on the seat of Ray Casey's jeans.

If you want to cripple this great nation of ours and destroy what's left of our economy, the fastest way to do it is to make it more difficult for our farmers to make a living. If you do so, you'll have accomplished what no terrorist organization or military power outside our borders has ever been able to accomplish.

I say we give them all a medal for doing an exhausting and dangerous job most of us couldn't last half a day at, but which every one of us desperately depends upon; and give thanks we still have enough farmers willing and able to keep the rest of us alive.

Thanks for caring enough to listen.

BARBARA HAINES.

COMMENT OF JUDY HALL, LIVINGSTON MANOR, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Judy Hall.
City, State: Livingston Manor, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chef.
Comment: I would support all efforts, legislation and dollars that improve local rural economies especially farms and farmers. Dairy Farms in NY need help.

COMMENT OF RICHARD HALL, SCOTLAND, SD

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Richard Hall.
City, State: Scotland, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Applicator.
Comment: Please leave the CLU data [as it is presently shared] alone! The field boundary data is of huge importance to ag users such as myself in the Aerial Ag Spraying trade and to my customers for verification work and historical data.

COMMENT OF BETTY DUBOSE HAMILTON, BROWNFIELD, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, May 03, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Betty DuBose Hamilton.
City, State: Brownfield, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Retired Educator—Teacher, Librarian.

Comment: I hope that if subsidies must continue that they go to fund fruits and vegetables—foods that we need. Farmers will grow those items that they can afford to grow (with subsidies). When our tax dollars go to subsidize crops that are already overproduced and that we have to ship overseas to be utilized, we are selling our WATER too cheaply. When farmers water their crops with our precious water, they need to be growing crops that bring the most cost efficient produce and that does NOT mean foods and produce (cotton) that we are practically GIVING away.

I would also like to see food stamps be removed from the Dept. of Agriculture and moved to the Department of Health. School meals should become a part of the Department of Education so nutrition and meals eaten at school can become a part of our youngsters' curricula.

We need MAJOR changes in how our tax dollars are used.

COMMENT OF DEBORAH M. HAMLIN, FALLS CHURCH, VA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Deborah M. Hamlin.
City, State: Falls Church, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Director, Irrigation Association.
Comment:

Deborah M. Hamlin, Executive Director, Irrigation Association

House Committee on Agriculture

June 14, 2010

Chairman Peterson, Ranking Member Lucas, Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit feedback comments relating to U.S. agricultural policy in preparation of the 2012 Farm Bill.

My name is Deborah Hamlin and I am the executive director of the Irrigation Association. The Irrigation Association is a trade association representing more than 2,000 member companies in the irrigation industry. Our members include irrigation product manufacturers, dealers, distributors, contractors and end users in the agricultural and landscape industries. The mission of the Irrigation Association is to promote efficient irrigation and our expertise lies in ensuring every drop of water applied to a crop is done so in an efficient manner; creating more agricultural output per unit of inputs, and thereby cutting down on water waste, runoff, *etc.*

Environmental Quality Incentives Program

Because we highly value the variety of benefits achieved with efficient on-farm water use, the Irrigation Association works collaboratively with various government agencies. One of the most notable and successful collaborations is with the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service on the Environmental Quality Incentives Program.

As you know, irrigation is an important lever of agricultural productivity, so it is no surprise that irrigation comprises a significant proportion of the country's overall water use (37 percent of total water withdrawals according to the U.S. Geological Survey 2005 Water Use Report). As more farmers seek to leverage the productivity benefits of irrigation, irrigated acreage in the United States continues to grow. In fact, irrigated acreage in the United States has more than doubled from 25 million acres in 1950 to more than 60 million acres in 2005. At the same time farmers are irrigating more acres, they are using less water for irrigation. In fact, water use for irrigation has dropped back to 1970 levels (Source: NRCS Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey 2009). The Irrigation Association joins the USGS and the Department of the Interior in attributing these decreases in irrigation water use to significant increases in on-farm irrigation efficiency. As our nation's farmers continue their global leadership in terms of both agricultural productivity and resource stewardship, efficient irrigation is a critical component of their success

EQIP plays a significant role in enabling farmers to invest in efficient irrigation technologies, by offering financial and technical assistance to eligible participants. In FY 2008 alone, $1.18 billion was allocated throughout all 50 states for more than 48,000 EQIP approved projects. However, nearly 24,000 projects went unfunded in the same fiscal year due to several reasons, including lack of funds available for the projects. The Irrigation Association is very appreciative of both Congress and the Administration for the continued support of EQIP and requests that the original

2008 Farm Bill mandatory spending amounts be preserved and that funding for EQIP in the 2012 Farm Bill further increase to meet unmet demand.

Additionally, in order to be eligible for funding, the EQIP Interim Final Rule currently requires that land must have been irrigated two out of the past five years. The Irrigation Association finds this requirement problematic for growers, as it results in the development and encouragement of inefficient practices at the grower's point of investment. To maximize the full potential of the EQIP program and to fully realize the benefits of efficient irrigation, the Irrigation Association recommends removal of this provision in the 2012 Farm Bill.

Finally, the program currently grants priority to projects resulting in a net reduction of water use on a producer's entire operation. The program currently does not reward producers using water efficiently by allowing them to utilize conserved water efficiently on other segments of their operation. We believe that this program is a disincentive and should be removed in the next Farm Bill in order to maximize food production for our country's growing population.

Agricultural Water Enhancement Program

In addition to the historic primary functions of EQIP, the 2008 Farm Bill also created the Agricultural Water Enhancement Program, which is funded through EQIP. AWEP is a voluntary conservation initiative that provides financial and technical assistance to agricultural producers to implement agricultural water enhancement activities on agricultural land for the purposes of conserving surface and ground water and improving water quality.

The Irrigation Association recognizes that without an increased focus on water quality, we run the risk of significantly affecting the water available for human health and sanitation as well as efficient irrigation. The agricultural community assists in this effort by promoting water quality through the reduction of runoff and using the water applied to their crops efficiently. The new AWEP strives to promote water quality and continuation of this program into the 2012 Farm Bill will allow the USDA to promote water quality successfully.

The Irrigation Association is a Resource for Policy Makers

The Irrigation Association has created an internal working group on the 2012 Farm Bill and will be developing further analysis and recommendations over the coming months. We will update the Committee regarding these recommendations on a regular basis. If you have any questions regarding EQIP, AWEP, or any other irrigation-related issue, please contact IA's Agricultural Affairs Director Erin Huston at [Redacted] or [Redacted] or IA's Federal Affairs Director John Farner at [Redacted] or [Redacted].

COMMENT OF JANET HAMMER, CAMBRIDGE, MA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Janet Hammer.
City, State: Cambridge, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Physician Assistant.
Comment:

Dear Congressmen:

Moderate size organic farms are the safest way to produce food for our nation without relying on petrochemicals. We must reduce our dependence on oil. Supporting organic farming means providing incentives and government support to organic farms and to even the playing field so smaller farmers can compete with large agribusiness. Especially while the Gulf of Mexico has become and ecological disaster, it is important to promote ecological advances by supporting the growth of organic farms. It is my hope that small farms and regional farms will be able to thrive as well as larger operations. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JANET HAMMER.

COMMENT OF GARY J. HANSEN, ALEDO, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Gary J. Hansen.
City, State: Aledo, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Retail Sales for Farm Supply Cooperative.
Comment: would like the FSA Fields to made public. This information is critical to proper application of fertilizers and pesticides.

G. JAY HANSEN.

COMMENT OF LYNN HANSEN, ANITA, IA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Lynn Hansen.
City, State: Anita, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment:

Hon. LEONARD L. BOSWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Third District, Iowa.

I have farmed and been in agriculture for most of my life and after reading and hearing the testimony of Professor Bruce Babcock I feel that a reasonable person who has been through the difficulties of farming in the 1980's it was necessary for me to relate my experience and thoughts in regards to his testimony today and the Farm Bill hearing in preparation for the 2012 Farm Bill. Please read my thoughts and I would be happy to answer any questions you or your staff might have and why I am as passionate about my experience and thoughts.

I hope that you will read and record my message as part of the comments in regards to the farm bill hearing and that they will seriously considered.

I would very much appreciate a response and your thoughts in regards to my comments.

There are several fallacies on the Babcock theory that ACRE moving to a county yield plan should be the safety net of choice and sustain agriculture.

The thought process that FSA can provide payments more efficiently through the use of ACRE program by moving to a county rather than a state wide program is unrealistic. The problem with even a county yield, the individual farmers that need the help, are not helped at all or not helped enough by a county yield plan, which is why the individual yield plan was developed in the late 1980's by the private sector. County yield payments only pay the farmers that raise significantly below the county average. Even then the payments are not large enough to pay off last year's operating note, and provide the equity to borrow for the next year. The farmers with better land, have higher yields, but in a low yield year, the better land, has a slightly reduced yield, which could be half the county. So the best land farmers, yields are slightly lower, but the poorer land in the county has drastically reduced yield. So the farmers with the best land get paid, when they did not really have much of a financial loss, and the farmers that need it most get very little or no payment, exactly the reverse of what needs to happen for the farmers with a disaster on their hands in their operation. Crop insurance pays the producers with larger losses to sustain them in their business.

With a county yield plan, managed by FSA, how will the lending community react. Most Ag loans now are based on crop insurance guarantees. Without that safety need, we will be driving banking out of agriculture, and go back to farmers being forced back to FMHA. With move government loans and over site needed will create more bureaucracy, at FSA, through FMHA. Babcock has not addressed in his theory of FSA managing the crop payments through FSA how much that agency will have to grow. His theory seems to be FSA can do the work they already do now, plus all the crop insurance payments with the same staffing or just the help of the RMA staff. Lack of Ag credit available through the private sector by Banks or Farm Credit will create the need for the government to come in to do more loan guarantees through FMHA, which in turn also creates more bureaucracy. This will drive us back to the farm crisis era of the 1980's. Money and financial assistance arriving one or two years after the fact does not sustain agriculture. The Ag banks and Farm Credit, made it through this farm crisis without a bail out, primarily due to crop insurance payments and crop guarantees either carrying the producer through the credit crunch, or giving the lender confidence to continue to loan. Without the crop revenue payments from crop insurance to pay off operating loans many producers would no longer be in business. Lenders made loans in 2007, 2008, and 2009, based on crop revenue guarantees so there was no glut of land or Machinery on the market as there was in the 1980's. Land prices and ag sector jobs have been sustained

through the current credit crisis, due to the flow of money created by crop insurance payment. The crop insurance revenue stream and guarantees provide lenders with staying power unlike what ACRE or SURE programs could not have done.

The crop insurance program of today, avoided a farm crisis of the magnitude of the 1980's. With the high expense for putting in a crop in 2007, 2008, a crisis was avoided as the crop insurance payments safety net, kept pace with the economy, as a county yield plan would not sustain the producer. Also the crop insurance payments come immediately when the farmers need them, to pay off the past years operating notes, not 12–18 months later, as the ACRE an SURE payments do. Babcock's theory that the farmers double dipped in 2007, 2008, 2009 by getting high price for the crop and a crop insurance payment comes from someone who has no idea of the cost of operating a farm or putting in a crop. The cost of putting in a crop, land payments cash rent payments and bank notes, machinery payments that are all due timely not to mention the cost to replace machinery equipment seed and chemicals are not addressed in the Babcock theory. A farmer getting a small payment 18 months after the fact, does not keep him in business for the next year. This would again drive many producers back to FMHA loans and to the government bureaucracy to little and too late as it did in the 1980s, or simply put them out of business and devastate the farm economy.

Babcock does not seem to realize when agriculture prospers so does the rest of the economy. When farmers make money, the city people benefit. The farmers spend money, new pickups, John Deere tractors, the farm wives and kids get new vehicles. They build things, new homes, machine sheds, garages, home additions, *etc.*, the construction industry benefits. These items in turn benefit the schools, county and state as property taxes bases increase. The restaurants, clothing stores, the appliance stores all prosper. Last but not least the state and federal government benefits as the insured pays a lot of taxes, even on his crop insurance payment, as it takes him out of the red and in the green. The crop insurance industry does much much more than just sell and service crop insurance. It generates a lot of commerce, much more than an FSA program payment.

Babcock is not looking at the big picture. The cost of crop insurance delivery is not only sustaining the Ag community, but the entire community. Crop insurance payments enable the farm sector to maintain the same moderate standard of living, which in turn, sustains the rest of the economy. I lived through the farm crisis of the 1980's it was not fun. If we would have had crop insurance as we know it today in the 79–83, the whole face of agriculture, and the country would be different. What happened to the Ag community in the 1980's has taken 25 years to recover. If we had not had crop insurance as we know it today, in the last 5 years, and Babcock's system had been in place we would have had a Ag Depression like the 1930's, much worse than the 1980's. If we are pushed back to a farm program payment system that is 25–30 years old, the Ag economy will be devastated.

The puny payments that ACRE would provide through FSA would do nothing to sustain the Ag economy compared to what crop insurance has done for the whole community not just agriculture.

Thank you for your consideration and response.

LYNN HANSEN,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
Anita, IA,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF ANN HANUS, SALEM, OR

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 27, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Ann Hanus.
City, State: Salem, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Association of Oregon Counties, Policy Manager.
Comment: From the Association of Oregon Counties. We urge Members to:

(1) Support an enhanced commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next farm bill, especially key infrastructure and business development programs that support the agricultural sector and the retention and attraction of new businesses. USDA Rural Development's programs for water/wastewater infrastructure, community facilities, broadband and business development are key ingredients for county economic development efforts.

(2) Support the Administration's proposed Rural Innovation Initiative or similar rural development strategies which focus on making USDA's investments more efficient and effective by rewarding strategic regional approaches to rural development that allow counties and their regional partners to focus on their local economic assets, priorities and goals.

(3) Support enhanced funding for Renewable Energy development, especially programs that assist local governments in their efforts to develop renewable energy and increase energy efficiency.

(4) Ensure that all farm programs recognize that youth play a vital role in sustaining American agriculture and rural communities. New programs and updates to old programs are needed so that it is possible for young and beginning farmers to survive and thrive in the modern agricultural economy.

COMMENT OF DONNA HARGROVE, ST. PETERSBURG, FL

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 18, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Donna Hargrove.
City, State: St. Petersburg, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Physician.
Comment: Please stop Monsanto's control on seed and farmers. If Round-Up Ready fields are to be allowed, have the fields labeled and separated from non-Round-Up Ready fields by a distant safe enough to reduce cross-pollination.

Do not allow Monsanto to control and fine farmers who's crops are affected by cross pollination of Monsanto's crops when they did not plant any GMO seeds. Please help protect our organic farmers.

Mandate labeling of all crops coming from GMO seed so the consumer knows and can make an informed decision on what food they choose to consume.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER HARMS, ORLANDO, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Jennifer Harms.
City, State: Orlando, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Business Owner/Mother of 2 Children.
Comment:

To whom it may concern,

I am very concerned with the quality and safety of the food my family and I purchase and consume. As a consumer and a taxpayer, I would prefer to pay a little more for food that is high quality, non genetically modified and non corn based. If we are going to subsidize food, let it be for smaller organic and local farmers and the slow food movement. The health problems of this country could be greatly reduced by stopping the subsidy for corn and eliminating the use of corn as animal feed.

I also strongly protest genetically modified crops which can contaminate the crops of smaller organic farmers. Pesticides and artificial fertilizers also need to be monitored. I for one, would like to know what pesticide was used on any fresh vegetables I am about to buy. Transparency is vital. American Consumers need to have this information in order to make healthy food choices; whether the food is grown in the U.S. or overseas.

Please pass a bill which encourages full disclosure labeling, humane practices for animals and the workers in the slaughterhouses, no antibiotics or added hormones, no genetically modified crops or at the very least labeling of any use of a GMO ingredient.

All we want is clean, healthy, sustainable food.

Thank you.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF TIM HARPSTER, WAPAKONETA, OH

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Tim Harpster.
City, State: Wapakoneta, OH.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Property Appraiser.
Comment: CLU acres and other information should be made available to appraisers so that the landowners can be better served. That is important information, and if it is not available, then it is more difficult to do ag appraisals and the appraiser has to make some assumptions.

COMMENT OF BOYD HARRIS, CENTRALIA, MO

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Boyd Harris.
City, State: Centralia, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

Greetings,

I am writing with regard to the new Farm Bill, both as a producer and as a non-producer. From the real estate professional perspective, Section 1619 created an unreasonably difficult situation for the performance of a farm appraisals and professional farm management services. The prohibition on access to the data greatly impacted the ability to have all the information we need to correctly analyze a farm properly and prepare a complete appraisal report. While we can get written permission from the owner of the farm we are appraising, there is necessary data for the comparable sales which is critical to have to analyze the market; any limitation on this can negatively impact the proper preparation of an appraisal. Then, with the lack of the best data available, we can run into issues with completing a report. As we all know, in this current economic environment, anything we can do to shore up an analytical position when it comes to lending is a great aide. Generally, as an appraiser, we are simply concerned with accurate field measurements. The only financial data would be any CRP payments on those types of farm. Quite honestly, this information gets used in the analysis, goes in a file, and is basically forgotten. I know of no farm manager or appraiser who would have any reason to retain the data specific to a property; basically it is part of an analysis and then we move on to the next project. No need to retain or use the information for any other purpose.

With my farm operator hat on, I would argue that for an appraiser or manager, someone with a legitimate reason to have the data, I would see no consequence to a professional having that information. In the long run, the Environmental Working Group did more damage to farmers from a public perception standpoint than any appraiser or manager would ever do, and EWG was granted access to much more information than legitimate professionals would need.

I would strongly encourage the House to rescind Section 1619, or at the very least, allow access to this information to professional farm managers and General Certified Real Estate Appraisers, legitimate professionals for whom this information is critical to be able to continue to provide services to America's farm and ranch land owners.

COMMENT OF PATRICIA HARRIS, RALEIGH, NC

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 21, 2010, 7:35 a.m.
Name: Patricia Harris.
City, State: Raleigh, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: State Government.
Comment: As director for the state Division of Soil & Water Conservation, I value our partnership with the NRCS and the 96 local conservation districts in North Carolina. To continue this strong and successful partnership, I support full funding of the current 2008 Farm Bill conservation programs, including EQIP, WHIP, CSP, FRPP and WRP, for the upcoming 2012 Farm Bill.

I support increased funding of the NRCS Conservation Technical Assistance budget to enable NRCS to better address local resource concerns as well as Farm Bill program priorities.

Finally, I support and urge you to continue the administration of Farm Bill conservation programs through the NRCS because:

1. It will increase efficiency and accountability by charging one agency to manage all aspects of the programs;

2. It will increase time spent by NRCS staff in the field directly assisting customers while at the same time improving overall administration and delivery of programs;

3. Of the mutual belief in the locally-led conservation process that enables the conservation districts to have significant input into the implementation of programs to address local resource concerns;

4. The established relationship between NRCS, the State Soil & Water Conservation Commission and the State Division of Soil & Water Conservation to promote effective leveraging of state and federal dollars, through conservation districts, to address local resources needs;

5. NRCS is recognized as the national leader for conservation programs due to its science-based technical knowledge to develop rules and processes for successful implementation of conservation programs.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICIA K. HARRIS, *Director,*
Division of Soil & Water Conservation,
NC Department of Environment & Natural Resources.

COMMENT OF BETH HARRISON, WOODBURN, OR

Date Submitted: Monday, June 21, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Beth Harrison.
City, State: Woodburn, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Housewife/Volunteer.
Comment: I have been following this issue for several years. So far I have not seen a reasonable approach to tracking livestock suggested. Having been a small farm owner in the past this issue is of interest to me.

Please do not pass this bill in any form. It needs a complete revisit with input by small farm owners being involved not excluded.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF JAY HARTER, SUSQUEHANNA, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Jay Harter.
City, State: Susquehanna, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Biologist.
Comment: How can you be protecting farming when your allowing Gas drill to take place in PA with for all practical purposes NO regulation. These companies drilling for GAS have already destroyed wells and had numerous spills. Farming needs Clean Water what does this do to protect it. Also you have allowed chemical companies such as Monsanto to patent genes which also threatens farming This is also outrageous NO one should have a patent on genes that nature produced. But I guess it's like everything else in this country including Congress it's for Sale to the highest bidder. You people in Congress keep proving that over and over.

COMMENT OF NATHANIAL HARTWAY, ALBION, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Nathanial Hartway.
City, State: Albion, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I am very against farm subsidies that artificially prop up the price of grains. These subsidies unfairly favor large farms, are inefficient and make no economic sense.

COMMENT OF KRISTEN HASKELL, LOVELL, ME

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Kristen Haskell.

City, State: Lovell, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Business Owner.
Comment: I am deeply concerned over the proliferation of GMO's and the power & control of Monsanto over the food supply. Monsanto has one goal and one vision, the goal is profit and the vision is world food domination. It is unacceptable that we have former employees working for the FDA. The FDA is supposed to be protecting people not corporate profits. With recent animal studies proving that reproductive damage is occurring, by the third generation of animals eating GMO products, they are rendered sterile, with a clear progression of fertility and infant mortality issues. I disagree with the fact that all of these foods are entering the general food supply without warning or labeling. It is clear that the intensive herbicide and pesticide processes used to germinate and maintain these crops are damaging the soil and environment. I am very upset that I can do nothing but sit by and poison myself with "conventional" food since I cannot afford organics, while those of you that are our elected officials do nothing but make back room deals with this shameful organization. I remember what they tried to do to our local dairy farmers at Oakhurst, and I am aware of the tactics that they have used all over the country & Canada bullying farmers that don't bow down to their ways.

In conclusion, it is my feeling that protecting the American public from & the American environment from GMO's that have no long term studied of the outcomes on human health and the ecology is your job. I simply cannot understand why like the EU, we have not ban these products. Does this not affect our GDP since we cannot export any items containing GMO's to the EU? These practices should be stopped before it is too late. We are already on the way to irreversible damage.

Sincerely,

KRISTEN HASKELL,
Human Lab Rat, being unwillingly experimented on through our public food supply.

COMMENT OF KURT HASLETT, MODESTO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Kurt Haslett.
City, State: Modesto, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Health Care/Finance.
Comment: I don't mind subsidizing crop insurance. I don't mind subsidizing water. I just don't agree with direct crop subsidies for crops grown or crops not grown. It distorts the market.

COMMENT OF BRENDA HASTINGS, BURTON, OH

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 29, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Brenda Hastings.
City, State: Burton, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: As a dairy producer, I recommend you look at Senate Bill 1645 "Federal Milk Marketing Improvement Act of 2009" and implement everything from that bill into the next Farm Bill. S. 1645 addresses stabilizing farm milk prices at a level that will provide dairy farmers with sufficient income to cover their cost of production by simplifying the milk pricing system. This proposal consolidates four classes into two; Class I and Class II. Class I differentials would remain the same in all federal orders and Class II would include all manufactured dairy products with a minimum farm price of the national average cost of production.

The current milk pricing system is outdated and easily manipulated by a small number of buyers. Any new dairy policy must include a revised milk pricing system which is based on the dairyman's cost of production. A new milk pricing system is the only meaningful change that can stabilize the future of dairy in the U.S.

COMMENT OF CAROLINE HASTY, DENVER, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Caroline Hasty.

City, State: Denver, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Book Keeper/Home Maker.
Comment: Please make organic farming a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill. Organic farming is an opportunity to not only produce healthier food, but to move towards more sustainable agriculture, and decrease the negative environmental impact of conventional ag. I live by some of the most valuable farmland in the State of Iowa. Increasingly I am distressed by the unsustainable farming practices I observe, and the agricultural policies that created and support these practices. Please invest in programs that will support conservation and help farmers transition to more organic practices. Thank you.

COMMENT OF DEBBIE HAUFF, HARVEY, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Debbie Hauff.
City, State: Harvey, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Specialty Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: The crop insurance program is working for farmers. Please don't allow Congress to Cut any Subsidy to the farmer for the purchase of Crop Insurance. The farmer needs to purchase crop insurance for Ag loans.

COMMENT OF CHRIS HAUSERMAN, CLAY CENTER, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Chris Hauserman.
City, State: Clay Center, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment: Crop insurance is the program that works the best, you could subsidize the higher levels more and require everyone to use it. On our farm it is an invaluable tool because we use it to market our bushels ahead of harvest. Any type of county plan that has been talked about would not be useful to many producers.

COMMENT OF ROBERT HAYS, MALVERN, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Robert Hays.
City, State: Malvern, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I urge you to reinstate the use of the CLU data into Section 1619. As a producer and also a custom applicator, the ability to use this information for producers reports as to where and when I have applied pesticides is crucial. It allows the ability for giving us all a more timely, accurate and cost effective method of reporting information. As a producer I see nothing wrong with having that information available as there is not any personal information as to ownership, wetland or CRP program payments or compliance information. The CLU information is used by a wide range of support businesses and will make the ability for them to get this kind of information very difficult if you choose to not reinstate the use of the CLU data. Again I urge you to reinstate the use of the CLU data.

COMMENT OF DOUGLAS HEALY, NORRIS CITY, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Douglas Healy.
City, State: Norris City, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I would like to ask for your support in the reinstatement of public access to Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway especially due to the following circumstances:

USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

As I see it as a farmland appraiser, this lack of access hurts the very ones whom I believe this action was meant to protect which is the farmer producers. By denying this access to nothing more than field boundaries and acreages to the many individuals and businesses who work with farmers it has created time delays and additional cost that are not necessary.

Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

COMMENT OF DANA HEDBERG, ATWATER, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Dana Hedberg.
City, State: Atwater, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I would like to have the CLU borders reinstated as public download, because with all things we do on the farm with GPS technology it is nice to go get field data right from a third party website, we also do custom application work using VRA technology it is necessary to have all the field data in the GPS equipment to make the VRA work correctly it is every ones best interest to make this info public again it will cost everyone a lot less money in the future by implementing GPS tech in there farming operations and with out the CLU data it make use the GPS tech we have much harder and more time consuming. Thank you for your time.

COMMENT OF MELANIE HEDLUND, LEXINGTON, MA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Melanie Hedlund.
City, State: Lexington, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Charitable Trust Administrator.
Comment: Please stop Monsanto!!!

Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food.

Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!

Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products.

Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive.

Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future.

Help educate consumers about nutrition and ways to buy and cook healthy food their families.

Thank you for your efforts . . .

COMMENT OF R. BRUCE HEIDEN, BUCKEYE, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, May 07, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: R. Bruce Heiden.
City, State: Buckeye, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Farm Crop Consultant, Crop Insurance Agent.

Comment: The farm bill as it was written in 2008 needs to stay intact. The safety net as currently provided by federal crop insurance works.

It provides collateral security to lenders who finance production agriculture all across the United States. A number of farmers would not be able to borrow money from lending institutions in adequate amounts to farm at a profitable level without this crop insurance and an assignment of funds for security to lenders in place. In certain situations, a number of farmers would not be able to borrow any crop financing at all without it.

I keep hearing and reading of the ACRE program. It certainly does not cost as much as current coverages, but it also does not provide nearly the same coverage and amount of benefits in event of a loss, either to the farmer, or to his bankers and financing people.

The bottom line is the system as it is structured has been working very well for a long time. If it is not broken, why apply a series of unneeded fixes?

It appears to me at times that there is more interest at some levels in balancing the federal budget at any cost, and funding social programs, than providing a farm bill that is functional to the farmers who have been depending on it so heavily. Agriculture depends on this. Please do not let politics muddy this water.

Look at what the prevented planting provision has accomplished recently in the state of California during the severe water shortage, and also in Texas during the extended dry periods with little rainfall.

Federal crop insurance also responded very responsibly in the past couple of years when the Midwest suffered from too much rainfall and flooding. In certain areas, farmers had grown a crop, complete with all the needed financial inputs, but were unable to harvest portions of the crop, and in some instances, none of it at all. In some cases, quality was adversely affected because of all the excess moisture. Federal crop insurance was their salvation.

My business cell phone is [Redacted] if further and more in depth discussion is desired.

R. BRUCE HEIDEN,
Buckeye, Arizona.

COMMENT OF LANCE HEIKENS, LAKE PARK, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Lance Heikens.
City, State: Lake Park, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: We urge you to support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. The CLU data provides a huge benefit for businesses like ours who work closely with producers to estimate inputs needs and cost along with accurate yield information which we provide to both crop insurance companies and the local Farm Service office. Should you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact my office. (Iowa's only remaining alfalfa dehydrating plant).

COMMENT OF SCOTT HEIMES, WORTHING, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Scott Heimes.
City, State: Worthing, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I understand the need for privacy policies, however I can see no issues with allowing the public to see CLU data. This has created a great inefficiency to a number of professions including, crop insurers, appraisers, banks, managers, producers, and irrigation info.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL HEINE, CHASE, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Michael Heine.

City, State: Chase, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Our family farm (My wife and I) have no off farm income, strictly ag income. We are no-till (100%) and diversified growing alfalfa, wheat, corn, soybeans, grain sorghum, and sunflowers. We have both irrigation and dryland. We start harvest in early May and harvest until Thanksgiving. Neither Acre nor Sure work on this farm. We have wasted considerable amounts in NAP payments to verify the failings of the Sure program. Acre has little value outside of a monoculture. Direct payments are so outdated that in 2009 they amounted to only .16% (.0016) of our gross income. This leaves Crop Insurance. Because we constantly have crops at risk to the weather extremes here in Kansas, Crop Insurance is the only risk management tool available to me in the present farm bill. If I was only allowed one portion of the farm bill to be carried over to the next bill it would have to be crop insurance, with direct payments a distant second. Thank you.

COMMENT OF PAULE HELLAND, MAPLETON, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Paule Helland.
City, State: Mapleton, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment:

Greetings:

Need to have public access (CLU) Common Land Unit.
Daily duties in servicing customers require having access. Used in record-keeping, recommendations, servicing customers and their farm units.
Regards,

PCH.

COMMENT OF ROGER HELLER, OLIVIA, MN

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Roger Heller.
City, State: Olivia, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dry Beans & Peas, Field Crops, Specialty Crops, Other.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment:

Congressman:

Please permit ag. professionals to access FSA information such as aerial photos, tillable acres and other data on farms so they can do their job. When the Environmental Working Group can access personal data such as the amount of direct payments on my farm but the local agland broker cannot obtain basic information on farmland so he can properly market the land, obviously the ag policy is wrong. Please correct this problem in the next farm bill.

COMMENT OF DELORIS HEMINGER, DANNEBROG, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Deloris Heminger.
City, State: Dannebrog, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: County Assessor.
Comment: I support reinstatement of public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway, especially due to the following circumstances:
USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis

---

COMMENT OF ROBERT HENDRICKS, CHARLESTON, SC

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 7:35 a.m.
Name: Robert Hendricks.
City, State: Charleston, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Sales.
Comment: Get rid of the Monsanto monopoly and end genetic engineering of foods. Support the small farmer. Don't allow anyone who has ever had a connection to big agriculture (Monsanto) to serve in any high level government agriculture position. End the subsidies and stop flooding the markets with our subsidized grain.

COMMENT OF MAGGIE HENRY, BESSEMER, PA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Maggie Henry.
City, State: Bessemer, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Stop using tax dollars to subsidize huge farms growing corn and soybeans so that even bigger food conglomerates and process the grain into something no one should be eating anyway. Organic fruits and vegetables is what you should be subsidizing! America's health depends on it!

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH HERNBERG, MECHANICVILLE, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Elizabeth Hernberg.
City, State: Mechanicville, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Stay at Home Mom.
Comment: If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF LINDA HEZEL, KEARNEY, MO

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Linda Hezel.
City, State: Kearney, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.

Type: Fruits, Nuts, Poultry/poultry products, Specialty Crops, Vegetables, Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Consumers want un-poisoned, nutrient dense food to eat. Consequently, organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food.

In order to increase the U.S. organic sector you must invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth and depth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to farmers and consumers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits (to agriculture as well as their communities) of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices.

Crop Insurance Programs that compensate organic farmers for GMO contamination and restore organic capability. They should be funded by the bioscience industries who are contaminating agricultural systems with genetically engineered substances.

COMMENT OF RICH HICKMAN, PAPILLION, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Rich Hickman.
City, State: Papillion, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: This information is very helpful in my profession as a farm manager for clients and other producers. I look forward to the CLU information being updated and available to services such as AgriData.

Thanks for your consideration of this request.

COMMENT OF SARA HIGNITE, DALLAS, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Sara Hignite.
City, State: Dallas, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Museum Professional.
Comment: I believe the current allocations of funding are outdated and desperately need to be changed.

If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF JAQUE HILL, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Jaque Hill.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker.

Comment: I am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of the people, our nation, and the world as a whole.

COMMENT OF SARAH HIMES, LANSING, MI

Date Submitted: Monday, July 12, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Sarah Himes.
City, State: Lansing, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Not for profit Project Director.
Comment:

Good morning,

I would like to add some feedback as the 2012 Farm Bill moves forward; please protect and strengthen SNAP. I live in Michigan, and as the director of a SNAP outreach project, I see first-hand how important SNAP benefits are to our state. The increase in benefits that the ARRA provided has made the difference between an empty cupboard and a full stomach for thousands of people in Michigan. Please do not roll back benefits provided under the ARRA. Instead, make SNAP benefits adequate enough to obtain a healthy diet consistently.

Thank you,

SARAH HIMES,
Lansing, MI.

COMMENT OF DIXON HITCH, MALTA, MT

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Dixon Hitch.
City, State: Malta, MT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Chemical sales and custom application.
Comment: Please fix the Section 1619 problem of the 2008 Farm Bill. This section restricted access to CLU Data from the public, and has been a burden to producers and all of us who work for the producers.

- CLU data only contains field boundary information and DOES NOT contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Thank you,

DIXON HITCH.

COMMENT OF BILL HOAG, BEALLSVILLE, OH

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 01, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Bill Hoag.
City, State: Beallsville, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I raise and develop sheep, particularly the hair sheep class. I am full time professional over 15 years in Utah, Texas and now Ohio. USDA AMS has done nothing to promote the fastest growth in the sheep business the past 15+ years, which is hair sheep production, per Dr. Charles Parker Emeritus Ohio State Univer-

sity. Benefits of hair sheep, never the need to shear or dock these class, the grow a longer winter coat in the fall like cattle and then shed it off in the Spring. The meat is a sweet mild flavored meat. Hair sheep can out produce wool types in terms of number of lambs over the lifespan of the ewe. Leather the U.S. Military needs over 2 million feet of this fine leather for such things as U.S. Fighter helmet linings, gloves *etc.* . . . most of these skins go in the landfills from the packing houses. Since hair sheep can produce lambs all year around *versus* wool sheep which cannot, the largest emerging markets such as ethnic buyers hair sheep fit the demand and allow a large window of marketability. The American Lamb Board, they have the cart before the horse . . . the demand for lamb has exceeded the supply in this country for 50 years, not enough producers, thus they promote Australian Lamb and New Zealand Lamb since the U.S. doesn't produce enough. The sheep industry biggest problem is dependency on taxpayer money *versus* diversification and promoting such diversification along with USDA AMS due to lobbying. You may want to read *Trends in the U.S. Sheep Industry*, (*http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/ers/sheeptrends/aib787.pdf*) USDA ERS (Agriculture Economic Research Service)* publication "Trends in the U.S. Sheep Industry", that is if you can find a copy as the Senator Bennett, Utah was lobbied and did not allow the publication to be produced in hardcopy. The author of the said publication told me it was the most scrutinized publication ERS had ever produced. Barry Carpenter USDA AMS ex Deputy told me the first time I talked to him, that hair sheep was a great idea, never heard a word back from him.

PS: Why should the producers who have undervalued costs to graze their sheep on public lands where the majority of sheep producers need to graze them on private lands? Feed costs are the largest expense in production. Final note: If the sheep industry and USDA AMS would have encouraged diversification in the sheep industry from wool to hair sheep production 15 years ago instead of blackball hair sheep producers things today would have happened a lot earlier and the supply of lamb would be much greater, also what happened to all the sheep producers the past 20 years? They quit, died or got out of it due to failure to promote a less labor and more cost effective type of sheep production plus a more consumer friendly lamb meat.

COMMENT OF LOUISE HODGES, HANFORD, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Louise Hodges.
City, State: Hanford, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Civil Servant.
Comment: As a Kings County resident I understand the value of agriculture to our economy both local and national. I vigorously disapprove of the subsidies provided to large agribusiness. Subsidies encourage leaving land fallow so as to ration the amount of a given product or to grow so much that the overabundance then must be stored and we have to pay for storage. I have friends who farm on a large scale and I know how very well they live. And as much as they complain about the difficulties and uncertainty of farming they insist they would never do anything else. It is quite normal to see large, very expensive SUVs in our area with license plates bearing some variation to indicate that dairies have been very good to the owner. I recall reading in the paper last year that the Farm Bureau was honoring the Family Farmer of the Year. He farms 9,000, that is right, 9 thousand, acres. Does the Dept. of Agriculture even have a definition of what is a "Family" farm? Recently there has been a great deal of moaning from local dairymen about the abysmal price of milk. This from people who in this area, for the most part have at least 1,000 or more cows. For artificial insemination they also learned to distinguish sperm that would produce female calves and were eagerly breeding just females. Now they complain about over production and a few months ago were slaughtering cows as a way to cut production and support prices. Despite this there was a very recent article in the *Hanford Sentinel* about a dairyman wanting permission to enlarge his facility so he could house more cows. That's illogical. And by the way, all those Happy Cows From California commercials we see are, if not outright lies, they are certainly misleading. The only cows I've ever seen in pastures have been in Northern California and not too many there. If we must have subsidies why aren't they going to smaller farms to encourage them? Of course there is an argument to be made that if you cannot make a living at a particular profession, you

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

should change jobs. Agribusiness is good for BUSINESS. It produces a lot of cheap food and all too often despoils the environment. Industrialized hog, and chicken farms are terrible for the environment and are dreadfully inhumane. And while the food is cheap it often is not as healthy as that grown in a conventional (traditional) manner without so many chemicals. Resistance to antibiotics has become a health hazard because most of our beef is fed antibiotics as a way to protect the animals against disease and shorten the time it takes to make a calf ready for slaughter. Living here amongst this abundance and seeing how it is produced I am very concerned.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF ROBERT HODGETTS, CARNEGIE, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 03, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Robert Hodgetts.
City, State: Carnegie, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Bioenergy.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I cannot express enough the importance of the Alternative Fuels Mixture Tax Credit. The prohibition of the black liquor tax credit was a step in the right direction. However, there are legitimate uses for alternative fuel mixtures in providing clean energy and lessening our reliance on fossil fuels. As you discuss the biodiesel tax credit please do not overlook the Alternative Fuel Mixture Credit. A five year extension of both the Alternative Fuels Mixture Credit and the Biodiesel Tax Credit will provide green jobs, reduce our carbon emissions and reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

COMMENT OF BILL HOEKSTRA, OAKDALE, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 06, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Bill Hoekstra.
City, State: Oakdale, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: The dairy farmers share of the dairy foods dollar has declined greatly over the last few years with record profits by large food processors and retailers. The price received by the dairy farmer at present is not adequate for a sustainable industry.

COMMENT OF BUD HOEKSTRA, SAN ANDREAS, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Bud Hoekstra.
City, State: San Andreas, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Research into biocontrols, BMP's, varieties of cover crops, *etc.*

Organic sector of the economy is fast-growing.

Organic agriculture is cleaner on the environment, and less burdensome on the resources.

Organic methods are under-researched. Example: what is the best perimeter trap crop for cucumbers? What is the best variety of rose for commercial rose hips (processed into syrup)? What is the best cover crop for organic no-till operations?

COMMENT OF STEVE HOESLI, DELPHOS, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Steve Hoesli.
City, State: Delphos, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy Dept. Manager.

Comment: Maps are very useful for application accuracy in our business. updating them is very important to doing our job.

COMMENTS OF QUINT HOFER, HURON, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, May 10, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Quint Hofer.
City, State: Huron, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Business Banker.
Comment: Currently negotiations are ongoing with Risk Management Agency (RMA) in regards to cutting back the government's reimbursement to Crop Insurance Companies. It has been stated that if these cuts happen then current Crop Insurance Agents will be earning 8% which is over half of what is earned now. Do you feel that these cuts are in the best interest of the crop insurance program and won't affect the administration of it? They are also proposing caps for commissions. Are there floor limits as well? Are there proposed cuts within RMA as well?

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Quint Hofer.
City, State: Huron, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Business Banker/Crop Insurance Manager.
Comment: I am writing concerning the 2012 proposed farm bill. My son (11 yrs. old) and I attended the meeting in Sioux Falls. As we sat a heard the testimonies of the presenters it was brought from many Representatives of how we can get the next generation into agriculture opportunities. As I thought about this I thought of a topic that was not brought up. Inheritance Taxes. It was not brought up and I believe it is a big part of helping the next generation in agriculture. Raising Estate tax for farm families is not the answer and should be taken seriously.

Also during the testimonies most were the same. The current farm bill is too complex which is evident only 18% of SD producers signed up for it. Crop insurance was also brought up as and important part of risk management each producer uses in their operation. Even as I write this the new SRA is being negotiated which includes further cuts back to crop insurance companies. If the current proposal happens crop insurance agents will earn half of what they currently are receiving. If that becomes true I believe it will affect the future success of the program because there will not be much incentive to continue in the business based on the liability, responsibility for the agents. It is unfair to compare crop insurance to other lines of insurance since it is not comparing apples to apples. The workload and time involvement are not the same! So I trust when the new farm bill is looked at these things will be considered so maybe my son can be involved in agriculture in some way!

COMMENT OF BRIAN HOFF, WYKOFF, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Brian Hoff.
City, State: Wykoff, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser & Assessor.
Comment: It is imperative that you support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. The services provided to farmers/producers need to TIMELY, ACCURATE, & COST-EFFECTIVE.

CLU data is used by producers & a wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation & tiling installers, & aerial, chemical fertilizer & manure applicators for accurate & timely records & procedures.

The CLU data only contains field boundary information and DOES NOT contain compliance info, wetland, CRP or ownership information.

Please support reinstating public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway!

COMMENT OF SID HOLDERLY, REYNOLDS, IN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Sid Holderly.

City, State: Reynolds, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: The field boundary and yield data is very useful is providing good farm land appraisals with good comparable properties. The accurate measurements of field area (those acres actually farmed) provides better and more consistent data across county and state lines. Many counties still do not have electronically accessible soil and field data or any data at all. Some counties still use the bead method of measuring acres and not modern plotting methods. Many new land slits or combinations of tracts do not get accurately posted to property cards or on-line sources for many months, sometimes up to 2 years. Ag land tracts often sell by fields and with the AgriData field based information these (split/combined) transactions can be more accurately estimated on a timely basis. The FSA data increases accuracy and viability of Farm appraisal reports.

COMMENT OF TAMMY HOLLOWAY, VALE, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Tammy Holloway.
City, State: Vale, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraisal Service Representative.
Comment: Please reinstate the CLU data which contains field boundary and acreage information. We use this information on a daily basis to help identify land classes and land use for appraisals and on comparable sales. Accurate acreages help provide accurate appraisals and analysis of sales. Many appraisals are used to obtain loans for those in the agriculture industry. Easy access to this information speeds up time and reduces cost of appraisals, which benefits the agricultural producers. Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF SHELDON HOLSINGER, FLORA, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Sheldon Holsinger.
City, State: Flora, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As real estate appraiser, I need access re-instated to up-to-date CLU data/field boundary information in Section 1619. Note:

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis

---

COMMENT OF JEFFREY HONAS, AURORA, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Jeffrey Honas.
City, State: Aurora, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 50–150 acres.

Comment: As well as being a cow/calf producer I am also a real estate appraiser. I would like the new farm bill to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway. This information provide accurate up to date information with regards to ag land appraisals.

COMMENT OF GARY HOOTS, FARGO, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Gary Hoots.
City, State: Fargo, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway. We as ag lenders utilize this data to evaluate RE values, which saves our customers from unnecessary fees to purchase or refinance smaller parcels of farm real estate.

COMMENT OF RUTH HOPKINS, LE GRAND, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 05, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Ruth Hopkins.
City, State: Le Grand, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Full-Time Student.
Comment: I feel that the farm bill is a great thing for the San Joaquin Valley because today Americans are attempting to improve in healthy eating and prevent life-threatening illnesses, *i.e.,* cancer. This valley produces vegetables and fruits high in certain nutrients which are necessary to healthy bodies. The American people desire longevity and healthy foods today. This Valley has always strived to please the American people, and needs the resources to continue producing for the United States.

COMMENT OF FRED HORIHAN, SPRING GROVE, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Fred Horihan.
City, State: Spring Grove, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser in Assessor's Office and Farmer.
Comment: I would strongly encourage the reinstatement of the CLU data. We used it extensively here in the assessor's office. Land mapping is big with us. We're definitely are not out to divulge information that's sensitive. It's a major portion of our job. We have a heck of a time just getting statements out and being able to get people to respond as it is. This is complicated by the fact we've got several thousand ag parcels, and to get in contact with every one we need is overwhelming time wise when it was available at the click of a button. The public comes in and they get very annoyed too, when it's all govt. work and we can't share info. It just doesn't make sense that we can't get the CLU info without all the hoops. Time is money.

COMMENT OF BRIAN HOUSER, NEW ALBANY, OH

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Brian Houser.
City, State: New Albany, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Transportation.
Comment: I support more funding for pesticide reduction efforts as well as fertilizer use reduction. We need to make faring more organic and sustainable.

COMMENT OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE COUNCIL (HAC), WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Housing Assistance Council (HAC).
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Rural housing support organization.

Comment: The Housing Assistance Council is strongly supportive of the Farm Bill and U.S. agricultural policy. HAC supports continuation of a robust and wide-ranging rural development title in the bill. Rural economic and community development are vital to agriculture and to the non-farm areas of rural life. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has very important programs for rural development, which we feel should be continued and possibly expanded (both in the Farm Bill and in other legislative authorizing arenas).

COMMENT OF JAMMIE HOWARD, TRAER, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Jammie Howard.
City, State: Traer, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified Appraiser.
Comment: I'm a Certified General Real Estate Appraiser in the State of Iowa and I cover the eastern ⅔ of the state doing farm appraisals. I starting appraising farms in 1993 and have been very active in the occupation ever since. When appraising farms we rely heavily on the land uses. In order to determine the land use on the subject property and the comparable sales I rely on aerial maps and owners statements. When talking with the producers they state what they feel they are farming, but sometimes that can be bias because they are either wanting a higher or lower value. To get an unbiased idea of acres I use the aerial maps. If these maps are not released to me and are not updated on my aerial map program I do not always have an accurate number to work with. I hope you change the farm bill to once again allow us to get aerial maps that show the actual amount of acres in production. This information is very helpful in having an accurate appraisal. I appreciate your time in this matter.

COMMENT OF PRISCILLA HUANG, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Priscilla Huang.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Assoc. Policy Director.
Comment: As an organization dedicated to improving the health and well-being of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum (APIAHF) seeks to ensure that the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill of 2012) removes barriers to the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) that prevent lawfully-residing immigrants and their family members from enrolling in this vital anti-hunger program. We believe that the Farm Bill of 2012 must include the following provisions to mitigate these harmful barriers.

1. Fairness for legal immigrants. Eliminate the five year waiting period imposed on immigrant adults under current law. Hunger does not wait five years, nor should lawfully-residing families have to wait before gaining access to SNAP. Households headed by immigrants work at the same rate as U.S. citizens, but are twice as likely to be poor. Approximately 12% of Asian Americans and 16% of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders live in poverty, and almost 2-in-3 Asian Americans is foreign-born. In these challenging economic times, no U.S. household should have to suffer from food insecurity due to arbitrary waiting periods.

2. Clarify eligibility for immigrant families with children. Eliminate sponsor deeming rules for SNAP households that include children. Over half of young, low-income children of immigrants live in households that experience hunger or other food-related problems. Most of these children (80%) are U.S. citizens. The existing eligibility rules are confusing and complex. Although lawfully-residing immigrant children are exempt from waiting periods and deeming rules, many households with mixed-immigration status individuals do not participate in the program even though they are eligible. In fact, U.S. citizen children in noncitizen households experienced the greatest drop in participation rates in SNAP/food stamps from 1994–2004 among all eligible participants.

3. Simplify administrative reporting. The Department of Homeland Security's requirement that SNAP agencies collect data on sponsored immigrants who would go hungry or homeless without assistance (the "indigence" exemption

from deeming) should take the form of an aggregate report that omits individual names. This alternative would meet federal statistical needs while ensuring that eligible hungry families are able to secure assistance without fear.

We urge Congress to reauthorize the Farm Bill and strengthen the SNAP program to meet the needs of hungry families and promote program participation.

COMMENT OF GREGG HUBNER, AVON, SD

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Gregg Hubner.
City, State: Avon, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I urge you to support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. The data provided from the maps is paramount to the work I do in appraising agricultural land. Without that data, my work becomes less accurate and the client I work for receives a poorer product. We need access to the CLU data.

Thanks,

GREGG HUBNER.

COMMENT OF DALE HUDSON, BREWSTER, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Dale Hudson.
City, State: Brewster, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I am an agricultural producer and a certified real estate appraiser who works almost exclusively with farmers and farm managers. It would be extremely helpful to both me and to my clients, farmers if the CLU acres were made available again to us appraisers. Often times I have to request the client to obtain information from FSA office for his benefit. This usually requires a trip to the office which they dislike doing during busy times. So I would ask that you give this serious consideration, as there is no breech of privacy contained within the CLU acres.

COMMENT OF JULIE HUDSON, WAYMART, PA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Julie Hudson.
City, State: Waymart, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Thank you for taking comments about the next farm bill. Everyone eats, but not everyone realizes how the farm bill affects the food system. As a farmer, local food activist, and an eater, I truly hope that the next farm bill encourages more of the type of agriculture people all over the U.S. have been clamoring for during the past decade.

The public has realized that the overproduction of commodity crops such as corn and soybeans has been detrimental to our health (cheap source of sweeteners and fillers that show up in all processed foods), our environment (run-off into waterways creates problems for wildlife and fisherman), and to reducing hunger around the world (cheap commodities are dumped in developing countries, which puts those farmers out of business and creates food insecurity).

We need more healthy foods (more fruits & veg. need to be grown in our country to meet the food pyramid, strive for five and Let's Move-type public health goals of our nation) and we need to reduce agricultural pollution and address hunger here and abroad.

I urge you to stop subsidizing row crops and help farmers transition to more vegetable production (allow for planting flexibility, encourage organic transition, make crop insurance fair for veg. and organic producers); transition to grass-based livestock production, which is better for health and environment (increase funding for Conservation Stewardship Program and consider green payments program more like what they have in Europe); and support the development of more local markets. We

need more competition in the marketplace, so we need to level the playing field for small farmers and especially "agriculture of the middle." Also, there are many young farmers who want to either stay on the family farm or enter into farming, but they will need help to get a good start with a profitable operation. Beginning farmer programs are very important if we want to continue feeding ourselves.

I appreciate your attention to these details. Let's take advantage of all the excitement around food and help farmers transition to different ways of production that will meet the demands of consumers while helping to keep farmers on their land and creating environmental benefits.

Thank you!

JULIE HUDSON.

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH HUMSTONE, CHARLOTTE, VT

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 02, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Elizabeth Humstone.
City, State: Charlotte, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: City Planner.
Comment:

Dear Committee,

I support an enhanced commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next Farm Bill, especially programs that support downtown revitalization with a focus on business development and retention, rehabilitation of community facilities, heritage tourism, and housing. These programs foster sustainable rural development and job creation.

I support the Obama Administration's proposed Rural Innovation Initiative (RII) or similar rural development strategies which focus on making USDA's investments more efficient and effective by rewarding strategic regional approaches to rural development that allow regions to build on their unique assets, including their heritage and culture. Rural development strategies could be a source of support for regional, "heritage-based" projects that incorporate initiatives such as Main Street revitalization, heritage tourism, farm building preservation, and agricultural conservation. I am from a rural state—Vermont. I have seen these programs work. We need your support for this to continue.

I support funding for the Historic Barn Preservation Program. Barns are not only important historic structures of rural America, they are also practical, functional buildings that can be rehabilitated to meet modern agricultural needs. This program is designed to help document and rehabilitate them for productive use. My sister started the Barn Again! program that has proven that these buildings can be adapted to contemporary farming practices.

COMMENT OF ELAINE HURSEN, CHARLESTON, SC

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Elaine Hursen.
City, State: Charleston, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Freelance Personal Trainer.
Comment: Factory farms are destroying our health, as well as the welfare of animals.

Consumer choice regarding food is almost nonexistent, as 97% of the food produced comes from only a handful of industrial farms that confine animals to densely that they can't even turn around or escape their own waste.

Speaking of waste, the environment is also being destroyed by Factory farm runoff.

Family farms that treat their animals well and understand organic and sustainable farming are being run OUT of business by these factory farms. These small businesses are being run into the ground because they can't compete with the large-scale production methods—nor do they want to, because those methods are cruel, inhumane, and unhealthy. Family farms actually care about their animals and their customers, and welcome anti-cruelty legislation because it will make the market more fair and ethical.

PLEASE support ANIMALS, PUBLIC SAFETY and SMALL BUSINESS by voting for a Farm Bill that lessens the influence of Big Agribusiness lobbyists, improves

the quality of school lunches, respects consumer choice, protects animals, and supports small business.

Thank you,

ELAINE HURSEN.

COMMENT OF DAVID HURSH, LEWISBURG, PA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: David Hursh.
City, State: Lewisburg, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Editor.
Comment: I am not an expert on agricultural policy. I am simply a citizen who is very concerned about agriculture-related issues such good nutrition and land and water conservation. I strongly urge the Committee to adopt policies that:

- promote the production of whole and healthy foods and discourage the overproduction of highly processed foods such as wheat flour and corn syrup.
- discourage the production of corn and other food crops for energy purposes and encourage the production of non-food energy crops.
- promote farming methods that protect our land, water and other natural resources.

Thank you very much for considering my views. I trust that you will take them into account.

COMMENT OF JENNY HUSTON, OAKLAND, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Jenny Huston.
City, State: Oakland, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chef.
Comment:

- Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.
- Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.
- If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:
  - Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

We need to support:

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF WILLIAM HUSTON, DRESDEN, OH

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 18, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: William Huston.
City, State: Dresden, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: 151–300 acres.

Comment: SURE and NAP need to be fixed. My suggestion is that for SURE NAP crops should not have the coverage election nor the price election reductions. We only have one choice for insurance and it is CAT level coverage. With NAP crops expected revenue is calculated two years in advance and is a 5 yr. Olympic average. The actual revenue is calculated using the National Average Market Price from that year. Can't the NAP guarantee prices be set using the previous year's NAMP?

Conservation programs should be administered by FSA not NRCS. In our county, CSP sign-up information was sent to only 20 producers, the EQIP specialty crop program is also administered by NRCS and no sign-up information was announced. If it were not for growers magazines I would have not known about it. NRCS is great at technical work but awful at administration. FSA is great at administration and they already have the personnel to handle general sign-ups. Let the Administrative Agency handle what they're good at and the technical agency handle the technical side of the conservation programs.

FSA could also be a clearing house for immigration issues. Vegetable/fruit and Dairy farmers could register how many employees they need, FSA could validate legal immigrants and provide lists to farmers. Current rules are too difficult for medium size farms to struggle through. Often documents that look okay to us are forged.

COMMENT OF CLARICE HUTCHENS, BALLWIN, MO

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Clarice Hutchens.
City, State: Ballwin, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Scientist.
Comment: Please include organic farming in the farm bill. This approach has a strong market demand and is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming goes with nature, which is good for people as well as replenishing the earth by conserving water, improving air quality, and build soil quality through the use of rich compost and not synthetic fertilizers.

To support organic farming, we need to include incentives in the farm bill such as:

(1) Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

(2) Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

(3) Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

(4) Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Thank you for your consideration.

CLARICE HUTCHENS.

COMMENT OF SANDRA HUTCHESON, SAINT AUGUSTINE, FL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Sandra Hutcheson.
City, State: Saint Augustine, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Writer.
Comment: I hope that Congress will move to pass a strong food bill supporting local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with dangerous, short-sighted technology.

COMMENT OF STEVE IBACH, BERTHOLD, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Steve Ibach.

City, State: Berthold, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy.
Comment: I help schedule and organize ground and aerial application of pesticides. Being able to access FSA Maps online greatly aids in timely application of our products. It gives the applicator the correct acres and also provides GPS coordinates, so the fields are easier to find and the correct application is made to the correct field.

STEVE IBACH.

COMMENT OF KRISTINA ICHWANTORO, SANDY SPRINGS, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Kristina Ichwantoro.
City, State: Sandy Springs, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I'd like to address the some changes to the Farm Bill that support child nutrition in 2012. First, if Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs. Malnutrition is having food with inadequate nutrients and we are seeing more and more of this.

We do our country a disservice by not assuring that our children are well nourished. It seems like a huge problem with our budgeting is that it fails to consider the long term. Save a dollar on kids lunch programs today and you might end up with many dollars in the future in health care costs. If you want a sound horse or a fit healthy show dog you feed them well—nutrient dense food. It is no less important to people, especially bodies still growing. These same bodies will eventually be in charge of the United States. Do we want well-nourished bodies and brains in charge or enfeebled, medication dependent people who have no stamina, no creativity, no health?

COMMENT OF SUAHD IDDRISSU, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Suahd Iddrissu.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: City Employee.
Comment: My issue is the over subsidization of U.S. products that should not be produced in the U.S. if we actually followed our own rules in the so called free-Market system.

Whatever happened to the Market Economy we praised so highly and letting the most able and cheapest producer make a particular product? I understand protecting our farmers and their livelihood but if we are not the most able to produce a particular products then we should not be making farming those products, especially when it has to be subsidized so highly in order for it to be economically viable (*i.e.,* corn and its related products such as high Fructose Corn Syrup).

Down with High Fructose Corn Syrup!

Most of us know that high fructose corn syrup is much more detrimental to our health than cane sugar and the production of corn which is then processed into high fructose corn syrup is heavily subsidized. So, it make little economic and health sense to have high fructose corn syrup be our predominant form of sweetener.

Correct me if I am wrong or not relevant.

COMMENT OF DAVID INGVALSON, SAUK RAPIDS, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:36 p.m.

Name: David Ingvalson.
City, State: Sauk Rapids, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am writing to let you know that public access to the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway should be reinstated. It is very important to have accurate and verifiable information for agricultural producers and for the professionals and businesses that provide goods and services to the farmer and other producers of agricultural products. This data is very important in my profession as an agricultural appraiser. Restricted access to this data will only make the appraisal process more expensive and time consuming which is ultimately affects the cost and timeliness to the producer who is the farmer. There is no logical reason why simply the number of acres in a field, pasture, woods, wetland or other area should not be public information. Also the taxpayer is paying for it and as a result information like this should be available to the public.

So I encourage that the public access be reinstated to the CLU Data Gateway so it is easily accessible by the public.

Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF MIKE INGVALSON, BLOOMING PRAIRIE, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Mike Ingvalson.
City, State: Blooming Prairie, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dry Beans & Peas, Field Crops, Vegetables.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: The government could save trillions of dollars by not continuing the farm program. If money is going to continue to support farming it should be used as subsidies for crop insurance payments, not these complicated programs we have now. Please continue to allow FSA Maps to be public data.

Thanks,

MIKE INGVALSON.

COMMENT OF TAYLOR INVERARITY, LAWRENCE, K

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 22, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Taylor Inverarity.
City, State: Lawrence, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: I am a 21 one year old female college student and I am writing today to find out what is being done about America's food industry, and to hopefully press my government to do more. From documentaries and my college courses I have learned a great deal in last year or so about our food industry. I am disturbed. It seems that capitalism has bred so much greed into the business of food that people have lost concern for healthy lives.

Forgive me, I have failed to properly organize all of my thoughts and arguments because I would like to make this message as brief as I think I can in the hope that it will actually be carefully read.

The practice of monoculture has been absolutely proven to be devastating for soil. If America wants to continue to be the most powerful country in the world, it needs to think more long term. I think the "think green" campaign is a little confusing. People do not understand that protecting the environment is a very selfish and smart idea. The agricultural methods we use in America are simply not sustainable. I went to a presentation last semester given by The Land Institute. [If you are interested visit this site, *http://www.landinstitute.org/*] Basically, out in Salina, KS they are developing a method of farming that would allow for future generations to have viable soil.

Another issue is without a doubt the meat industry. All animal cruelty arguments aside, it simply cannot be healthy for people to be eating such unnatural meat products! It is not natural to eat genetically altered, sunlight-deprived animals. I am a history major with a serious handicap in the area of science and math, but anyone can see that eating something so unnatural cannot lead to good and is likely a contributor to the rising cases of cancer and new diseases. In an area of the Gunnison National Forest there is a place named Union Park. Here cows live in open range

conditions. They have tons of land to roam and eat on. This is the kind of cow I would like to be in my hamburger, not a cow packed into manure soaked ground eating feed corn. Also, the meat industry is a huge contributor to water pollution. A *Frontline* documentary I watched showed me how much harm animal waste and fertilizers have on our water supplies.

I think focus needs to be turned immediately toward increased localization of the meat industry and ending the practice of monoculture. Also, there needs to be a much greater respect for the way things are naturally done; the saying "don't mess with Mother Nature" exists for a reason.

I know it is not a lack of intelligence, science, or technology, but the presence of the "getting the most as fast and as cheap as possible" mentality that America seems to revolve upon. [There I go ending a sentence with a preposition.] Things need to change and I think regulation and reformation of the food industry is a perfect place to start. If done properly, focusing on this issue could have a positive domino effect on America's main issues (unemployment and our economy in general, the rising rate of cancers and diseases, and the environment).

Please, any information that you can provide to educate me on what is being done and what more will be done, I would greatly appreciate.

COMMENT OF DEANNE IOVAN, FERNDALE, MI

Date Submitted: Tuesday, September 07, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Deanne Iovan.
City, State: Ferndale, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Secretary.
Comment: I am a supporter of small, local farms and my husband and I are members of an organic farm in Yale, Michigan. We eat a mostly vegetarian diet, similar to what the USDA recommendations are. I am also a member of the Environmental Working Group and they recently brought to my attention an article in the *Denver Post* regarding excessive subsidies for farmers that produce grains, meat and dairy. See article here: *http://www.denverpost.com/ci_15996357.**

I am confused as to why the USDA recommends food that does not get subsidized and then subsidizes commodities that are less healthy. I would love for my CSA organic farm, Maple Creek, to get subsidies. They have suffered through a very dry summer season here in Michigan. The reality for them is that there is no help from the U.S. Government for farmers in their situation. I credit my farmers with helping my family maintain a healthy diet, exposing us to vegetables and cuisine that I was unfamiliar with before I became a member five years ago.

The wind is blowing in another direction and it's time for the Agriculture Committee to get it's head out of the sand and it's time for corporate farms to get their hands out of taxpayers pockets. Real farmers in this country need real help. These are the small business people that politicians are always bragging about helping. Maybe you should actually help them. They make our country healthier and our economy stronger.

COMMENT OF ALEC IRWIN, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 22, 2010, 1:35 a.m.
Name: Alec Irwin.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Health.
Comment: We need to dramatically decrease subsidies to agribusinesses who grow corn and soybeans. The money should be directed toward support for organic farmers growing healthy produce, as well as an expanded Food Stamps program, conservation efforts, development of biofuels . . . *etc.*

We need to reshape the Farm Bill toward a sustainable and just food system, not continue it as an ATM for giant agribusinesses.

COMMENT OF ALISON IRWIN, DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Alison Irwin.

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

City, State: Desert Hot Springs, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Massage Therapist.
Comment: Stop supporting factory farming and start supporting people and animals. Grow sustainable food and sustainable jobs that are healthy for people and animals and the environment. You can change this. You can do the right thing. It is time. We are ready. The time is right now. You are empowered. You have our support. We can do this together. We can do the right thing. We have to. PLEASE! Don't let another opportunity be wasted.

COMMENT OF BURTON IVERSEN, AUSTIN, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Burton Iversen.
City, State: Austin, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: I am a Certified General Appraiser specializing in Large Agricultural Appraisals in MN ND SD. The Privacy section of the new farm bill prevents me from getting information that is essential in the performance of my work. It is not beneficial to the farmer or the professionals that work with them.

COMMENT OF JOHN J., IN

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:06 p.m.
Name: John J.
State: IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Computer Programmer.
Comment: The farm bill should support the production of food for the nation, not support large producers of raw materials for the processed, and fast food industries.

- Stop subsidizing the overproduction of corn and soy, and other grains.
- Protect and encourage farmers who produce real food.
- Allow, farmers who have taken subsidies to switch to growing other crops.

The farm bill shapes the food of this country. Your first priority should be to the people, not Monsanto.

COMMENT OF JON JAFFE, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Jon Jaffe.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Program Manager.
Comment: I urge you to adopt policies in the Farm Bill to promote healthy soils by promoting the right behaviors within in our agriculture supply chain. This includes have a roadmap to reduce dependencies on the use of petroleum products, reduce agricultural based pollutants, increase crop diversification and encourage sustainable farming methods. Our farm system is not sustainable as-is and action needs to be taken by the Dept. of Agriculture to correct the existing policies so they support the future of farming.

COMMENT OF MATTHEW JAGER, PHILOMATH, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 5:37 p.m.
Name: Matthew Jager.
City, State: Philomath, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Web Designer—Department of Horticulture at Oregon State University.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF SARAH JAMES, BERKELEY, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Sarah James.
City, State: Berkeley, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: Please focus on increasing support to small farmers, research for organic and sustainable agriculture, on increasing access to healthy food, especially in schools. Please do not continue to subsidize the excess amounts of corn and soy that we produce.

COMMENT OF STACY JAMES, CHAMPAIGN, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 04, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Stacy James.
City, State: Champaign, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Water Resources Scientist for nonprofit Prairie Rivers Network.
Comment: Agricultural pollution is a leading cause of impairment for our aquatic resources. Given that the federal Clean Water Act largely does not regulate pollution from agriculture/non-point sources, robust Conservation Compliance provisions are crucial for the health of America's rivers and lakes. Conservation Compliance requires producers to preserve soil and wetlands that might not otherwise be protected. Stronger and widely enforced Conservation Compliance provisions are needed because the Clean Water Act may no longer regulate certain isolated wetlands and intermittent/headwater streams. My suggestions for strengthening Conservation Compliance are:

1. All land in production (HEL and non-HEL) should be subject to Conservation Compliance to be eligible for USDA benefits.

2. All producers subject to Conservation Compliance should have to comply with a cropping setback from waterways.

3. Annual inspections for compliance should be increased to 5% of eligible tracts.

COMMENT OF JON JANOWSKI, MILWAUKEE, WI

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Jon Janowski.
City, State: Milwaukee, WI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nutrition Program Advocate.
Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the upcoming farm bill.

Programs like SNAP (we call it Food Share in Wisconsin), CSFP, TEFAP, and the Senior FMNP play a huge role in alleviating hunger in Milwaukee County and throughout the State of Wisconsin. The reauthorization of these programs through the farm bill process is an issue that is extremely important to our agency and its customers and donors.

Our agency is a private, nonprofit food bank headquartered in Milwaukee, WI. We provide emergency food to over 35,000 people each month through a network of food pantries in Milwaukee County. We also provide over 65,000 hot meals each month to a network of soup kitchens in the county. We have been doing this work since 1974.

The importance of the federal nutrition programs at stake in the reauthorization bill cannot be overstated. Every day we help people who are struggling to feed themselves and their families. We primarily provide emergency food to a community that has a high rate of "food hardship"; in fact, according to a recent Food Research and Action Center report, our primary service area (the Fourth Congressional District in Wisconsin) ranks 36th out of 435 Congressional districts in terms of "food hardship."

As further evidence of food hardship, Wisconsin's Food Share Program now serves over 726,000 people—a 30% increase in the last 12 months alone. Milwaukee County has seen a 16% increase in its FoodShare caseload in the last 12 months. The program has a significant economic impact—in April 2010, over $83 million in benefits were spent statewide, including $25 million in Milwaukee County alone.

Every day we help people who are trying to apply for and retain Food Share benefits. Almost ⅓ of the people we help are homeless, and others are elderly, disabled, or otherwise unable to work. We also see more and more people who are working part-time and full-time jobs yet still need federal help to put enough food on the table.

Interestingly, as our state has moved to an online benefits system, we see more low-income people able to use the online system each month. There is a misperception that low-income people do not know how to find or use computers and scanners. We assist about 75 people every day with our state's online ACCESS website, about ¾ of whom had never used the website before. Eight in ten ACCESS users tell us they are likely to use the website again to apply for or maintain their benefits. To that end, we would like to see more federal investment in "modernized" SNAP systems. Online benefit systems, development of systems whereby clients can scan verification paperwork directly to caseworkers, and technology for community-based organizations to help clients connect to benefits should be investment priorities within this farm bill's nutrition title. We believe that SNAP modernization is a more dignified way for clients to connect to the program as it allows people who need help to use the technology in places they feel comfortable.

SNAP benefit levels also need to be examined within SNAP reauthorization. The minimum benefit level is still too low, particularly for disabled and elderly households. We believe the minimum benefit level should be raised to $25 as a further incentive to participate in the program. In addition, the 2009 benefit increases were extremely helpful to thousands of families in our region, and we support the maintenance of this benefit increase within the farm bill legislation.

SNAP categorical eligibility also needs to be protected. One of the most significant steps our state took to increase SNAP caseloads was taking full advantage of federal categorical eligibility options. Ensuring that states like Wisconsin are able to continue taking advantage of this policy is extremely important to us.

We also believe that CAP (Combined Access Projects) should be expanded to increase participation among senior citizens and disabled populations. CAP pilot projects in 15 states have made all poor seniors categorically eligible for SNAP, thereby easing application requirements for less mobile individuals. Regarding CAP, the USDA reports that "the combination of standardized benefits, minimal need for independent verification, and normally no need to go to the local offices has produced significant increases in participation within the target population (elderly and disabled)." Expansion of CAP projects to more states is an additional step that Congress should take to alleviate hunger.

Another SNAP issue that should be addressed within the farm bill process is restoring permanent eligibility for Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependent Children (ABAWD's). We know this population of single men and women is extremely poor; we serve many of them every day at our Food Share satellite offices. Most of these people are homeless, disabled, or otherwise unable to work. Although Wisconsin has taken full advantage of the federal ABAWD waiver options, there should be no restrictions or time limits in terms of this population accessing SNAP. In our experience, this group of people is in dire need of SNAP benefits, and therefore we ask that the current time limits and benefit restrictions be completely repealed in the next farm bill.

The next farm bill should also fully restore eligibility to all legal immigrants. Policy changes enacted by the federal welfare reform law in 1996 made many legal immigrants ineligible for SNAP. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that "food insecurity rose significantly among immigrant-headed households most likely

to be subject to the restrictions while declining among most other households." While some eligibility restrictions have been rescinded since then, we ask that Congress finish the job and ensure that all legal immigrants have full access to SNAP benefits.

Regarding the CSFP program (we call it "StockBox" in Milwaukee County), we are now serving over 6,000 people per month and expect to be serving almost 10,000 per month by this September. About 97% of the boxes we deliver each month are for elderly individuals. Our StockBox recipients are predominantly female (80%), have high prescription drug costs that inhibit their ability to purchase food, and regularly experience a food shortage (47% of our recipients had a food shortage every month or most months within the last year).

As the agency that has operated CSFP in Milwaukee County since 2002, we see a need to align CSFP eligibility guidelines with WIC eligibility guidelines (*i.e.,* set CSFP eligibility limits at 185% of the FPL). It is needlessly complicated to have different eligibility criteria for two programs that are so similar. Also, CSFP inventory requirements are overly burdensome. Current regulations require that we inventory by the unit; for example, each 3.5 ounce pudding snack must be reported, whether it is in the original case as received from USDA or packed with three others in a box with different items. TEFAP reporting requirements are more reasonable and require inventory by the unopened case. This is much more manageable from a staffing standpoint while still maintaining accountability. Allowing us to inventory by the unpacked case and by the packed distribution package would relieve a portion of the program's administrative burden.

Regarding the Senior FMNP, our agency has been distributing the Senior FMNP coupons in Milwaukee County since 2004. Last year we distributed 3,200 coupons to needy seniors in Milwaukee County. We could easily triple the number of vouchers based on the demand we see. This is an extremely popular and attractive program to seniors as more than 80% of seniors fully redeem their vouchers in Milwaukee County. We urge Congress to provide more funding for this program. It is disheartening to tell low-income seniors they can only get $20 each year to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables at farmers markets—and to turn away thousands of additional seniors who cannot get a voucher at all because of the limited supply. Ensuring that low-income seniors have increased access to fresh, nutritious produce helps their diet and also puts money in the pocket of small farmers. Funding for the Senior FMNP has remained stagnant for many years while demand for the benefit has increased significantly. We ask that Congress dramatically expand the number of vouchers for each state so we can meet the demand in our local communities.

In summary, we ask that Congress use this legislative opportunity to authorize and fund policy options which alleviate hunger for the millions of people every day who struggle to feed themselves and their families. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the upcoming farm bill process.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL JENKS, WATFORD CITY, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Michael Jenks.
City, State: Watford City, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy MNGR.
Comment: I would like to request that common land unit data (CLU) be made public again

---

COMMENT OF NATHAN JENSEN, CONROE, TX

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 15, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Nathan Jensen.
City, State: Conroe, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Administrative Assistant.
Comment: I would like to see greater incentives (tax) to landowners who lease out or sell parts of their property to young farmers (under the age of 40) interested in utilizing sustainable and organic practices in agriculture.

I would also like to see a push for agricultural property tax exemption on a state level for smaller parcels of land dedicated to sustainable, organic agriculture.

COMMENT OF BROCK JERMARK, LOGAN, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Brock Jermark.
City, State: Logan, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy.
Comment: By having these maps public in our business it allows us to be sure that our business and producer are in the same field and on the same page when we can hand them a printed map. The availability of these maps has increased our efficiency and accuracy of herbicide applications.

COMMENT OF ERHARD JOERES, SANIBEL, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 18, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Erhard Joeres.
City, State: Sanibel, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professor Emeritus of Civil & Environmental Engineering.
Comment: We all know that our farm subsidy bill has created great distortions in our agricultural sector—we support corporate farmers rather than family farmers, we support the wrong crops such as corn that have led to an ethanol industry that is useless (distorts corn price and energy input per unit of ethanol energy out is almost a wash), we undercut third world farmers and keep them in poverty, we support a sugar industry in Florida for political reasons when sugar is cheaper elsewhere, we subsidize, often indirectly, the chemical industry at the expense of organic food, and on and on and on. Let's find a way to bring reason back to our farm sector.

COMMENT OF BRAD JOHNSON, CROSBY, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Brad Johnson.
City, State: Crosby, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Independent Insurance Agent.
Comment: I am an independent insurance agent in NW North Dakota. I have 24 years experience as a crop agent. I feel the present crop insurance program has developed over the years as a very good risk management tool for the farmer, and they consider it a crucial part of their overall farm management plan. As of now, in our area, farmers prefer optional units. I can see some interest in enterprise units, however, if subsidized coverage is available up to the 85% level. I think most farmers consider the purchase of crop insurance a good value with present subsidies, but I would be quite concerned that any subsidy cuts would cause a large percentage to drop the program, or drastically decrease coverage levels. The cost of farming is so high now due to huge costs of fertilizer, chemicals, machinery, and fuel that it is difficult for young people to consider continuing to farm.

Losses under the crop insurance program are processed and paid quickly, whereas we understand that the Acre and Sure programs are slow to get money to the farmer. The Crop Insurance Program is working, and farmers and ag lenders like it, and consider it the best management program available.

COMMENT OF DOUGLAS JOHNSON, WEST FARGO, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Douglas Johnson.
City, State: West Fargo, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent/Business Owner.
Comment: Crop Insurance works, it is effective, it is efficiently delivered and responds quickly to the various perils affecting today's farmers. I have spent a great deal of time working with farmers on both the ACRE and the SURE program, they both will pay in our area this year but those programs pay 12 to 30 months after the fact. Crop insurance is quick to respond, agents are experts, accessible and motivated to serve. In talking with our customers, the consensus is to move resources to crop insurance, allow 85% or higher coverage at regular subsidy rates. Move any

SURE administration to the crop companies as that is where the data is. Crop insurance is working, the government is making money with this program through the risk sharing and quota share. Further cuts to this program will hurt the reinsurance market which will kill this successful program.

Government subsidy will be a mute point if there is no reinsurance market available. Crop insurance is removing a great burden from the ag budget and further cutting this program will shift those dollars back to the tax rolls. This industry operates much more efficiently than other alternatives and our speed of business is a great asset to the American Farmer. Keep this program intact, continue to build on the success of this program rather than using it to fund other projects that fail.

COMMENT OF JAYSON L. JOHNSON, MOUND CITY, MO

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Jayson L. Johnson.
City, State: Mound City, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: Being a landowner and an insurance agent since 1986, I have insight from both a farmer and an insurance agent's perspective.

From an insurance agent's perspective, many of my clients rely on crop insurance in order to obtain there operating loans. In the 2008 crop year, my clients received over $6.2 million in indemnities. Without crop insurance, many farmers would have suffered devastating losses. The safety net it provides for our farmers is also extremely important to the survival of Rural America.

The crop insurance cuts sustained in the 2008 Farm Bill were, and currently are, difficult to absorb. Should an SRA Agreement in its current form be implemented, many companies will struggle to survive. This will create a situation where service to our farmers will not only suffer, but will make obtaining insurance more difficult.

Crop insurance is one of the primary, and most important, risk management tools available to our farmers. Many agents, such as myself, are lifelong residents of their communities and essentially become part of the farmers operation. By developing a strong relationship with the farmer and getting to know their risks and financial exposures, we as agents are able to provide sound advice in developing a plan best suited to meet their needs.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit this information to the Committee.

JAYSON L. JOHNSON,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF JULIA JOHNSON, SUNOL, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Julia Johnson.
City, State: Sunol, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: We need to support small-scale organic farmers because they have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber. Nutrient-rich, local food is what Americans need in order to live sustainably.

COMMENT OF KARLA JOHNSON, LA CRESCENTA, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: Karla Johnson.
City, State: La Crescenta, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: The farm bill need to include more monies for natural, organic fruits and vegetables. There is too much money being used for meat production—the NUMBER 1 polluter in all the U.S. We need healthy bodies and a healthy environment!

COMMENT OF KELLY JOHNSON, CAVALIER, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Kelly Johnson.
City, State: Cavalier, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: As a producer and a crop insurance agent I use AgriData a large amount to give myself and my clients accurate info regarding acreages and soil types. This program has proved to be very valuable also for the lenders I work with daily.

COMMENT OF LOUISE JOHNSON, MODESTO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Louise Johnson.
City, State: Modesto, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker and Social Justice Advocate.
Comment: As a person of faith, I find it important that I remind everyone who is making decisions concerning the Farm Bill that the Farm Bill mostly deals with moral issues. Decisions are made concerning small farmers (both here and abroad) who put food on our tables and risk a great deal financially to do so. The Farm Bill also determines whether many poor people who qualify for food assistance have enough healthy food on their tables. Again people are affected by the Farm Bill because so many very poor people live in our rural communities throughout the United States.

Living in the San Joaquin Valley of California, I find it very sad that there are so many people who live and work within the nation's fruit and vegetable basket who cannot afford to buy and eat the fruits of their labor. All human beings have the right to sufficient and nutritious food. It is the responsibility of our government (through the Farm Bill) to help all people, and especially children, to be able to grow to their fullest potential.

I urge you to remember the moral importance of the many decisions that are made in developing this most important bill. The lofty profession of farming should not require a vow of poverty and the necessity of multiple professions to guarantee one's financial stability. Food and all crops should be grown for the good of all and should not be a financially dangerous occupation for the private farmer.

Last but not least is the issue of land conservation. Farmers understand best the importance of proper land use and conservation. Our physical and emotional health requires care of our precious land.

Thank you for the work that you do and the decisions that you make that affect all people in our country and many people throughout the world. I trust that you will do so with proper concern for all.

COMMENT OF MARTI JOHNSON, CENTRAL COAST REGION OF CALIFORNIA, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Marti Johnson.
City, State: Central Coast Region of California, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Regional RCD Coordinator for the Agriculture Water Quality Alliance (*www.awqa.org*).
Comment: As the House Agriculture Committee prepares for the 2012 Farm Bill, the Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs) of the Central Coast of California request your consideration of the indispensable role that Conservation Districts have played for more than seventy years in preserving the natural resources on which United States agriculture depends. Through their unique and historic partnership with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), America's 3,000 Conservation Districts implement farm, ranch and forestland conservation practices across the nation to protect soil productivity, water quality and quantity, air quality and wildlife habitat. (National Association of Conservation Districts, "About Conservation Districts." *http://www.nacdnet.org/about/districts/index.phtml*)

On the Central Coast, growers have been known to say that NRCS is the best use of federal tax dollars they know of because of this agency's accountability to local community through Conservation Districts. The unique relationship between

Conservation Districts and NRCS stretches back more than seventy years. In the 1930's, when millions of acres of cropland were destroyed by drought and subsequent soil loss of the "Dust Bowl" crisis, the federal government established NRCS, then known as the Soil Conservation Service. Conservationists shortly realized that a centrally governed, Washington-based federal agency could not respond to local needs without input of local people. Consequently, with federal guidance, locally governed Conservation Districts began forming throughout the 48 states to facilitate the success of the SCS. (California Association of Resource Conservation Districts, "History of RCDs." *http://carcd.org/about.php*)

Today, many Conservation Districts have evolved into thriving and sophisticated purveyors of locally based conservation services in their own right. Nevertheless, the historic relationship with NRCS continues to be a hallmark function of Conservation Districts. NRCS draws on our inherent tie to local land managers and owners in order to tailor Farm Bill programs to the particular needs of the community. The regular operations of District Boards cultivate informed landowners who become intimately familiar with programs such as EQIP and provide meaningful input to NRCS staff about the most effective methods for delivering services. By virtue of that same familiarity with NRCS, Districts that employ staff are frequently able to leverage Farm Bill programs in order to develop a suite of complementary programs tailored to address gaps in conservation needs identified on local agricultural lands. In summary, this symbiotic relationship enables community-driven delivery of NRCS Farm Bill programs, facilitates the creation of corresponding local District programs, and provides farmers and ranchers with a meaningful voice in a broader discourse about how environmental stewardship is implemented on agricultural lands.

The role of Conservation Districts is unique among other organizations that provide assistance with conservation of natural resources on agricultural land. We administer locally based, voluntary programs geared toward helping people help the land. Because of our flexibility, size and agility with grant-funding, we share many characteristics with nonprofits. As such, we can adapt to the changing needs of the communities much more rapidly than our centrally governed partners. Simultaneously, we resemble government agencies in that we have statutory permanence, the authority to form interagency agreements and are subject to public accountability laws, making us uniquely attractive partners to other governmental entities who may benefit from our flexibility, our transparency and our deeply established relationship to local stakeholders.

Because of the unique combination of qualities that comprise Conservation Districts, NRCS staff in the Central Coast region of California consistently tell us that when assistance is needed to implement the Farm Bill workload, they have not found their most effective resource in outside entities, but in the historic partnership with local RCDs.

The RCDs of the Central Coast of California urge you to continue to support the longstanding alliance between NRCS and Conservation Districts throughout the country. This proven partnership adds enormous value to Farm Bill programs delivered through NRCS.

Respectfully,

Resource Conservation District of Santa Cruz County;
Resource Conservation District of Monterey County;
San Mateo County Resource Conservation District;
Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District (San Luis Obispo and southern Monterey Counties); and
San Benito Resource Conservation District (San Benito County).

COMMENT OF NADIA JOHNSON, FOREST HILLS, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Nadia Johnson.
City, State: Forest Hills, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Community Organizer.
Comment: Organic farming and expanding local markets must be a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF RODNEY JOHNSON, NORFOLK, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Rodney Johnson.
City, State: Norfolk, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager, Broker & Appraiser.
Comment: The acreage figures for fields on FSA maps is imperative to my profession to provide accurate data to clients. Neither the acreage figures nor base acres is violating an owner's rights. Other sensitive data should be kept private. I feel the FSA overstepped their authority in calling these acreage numbers private information. I ask that you consider allowing access to persons in the real estate profession access to these numbers for accuracy in reporting to clients. Thank you for your consideration to this important matter.

COMMENT OF ANDREW JOHNSTON, DECATUR, GA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:36 p.m.
Name: Andrew Johnston.
City, State: Decatur, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Exercise Kinesiologist.
Comment: I (and many of my clients who will be writing, too) am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of the people, our nation, and the world as a whole.

COMMENT OF CAROLE JOHNSTON, AVONDALE ESTATES, GA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Carole Johnston.
City, State: Avondale Estates, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Social Security Representative.
Comment: I just completed the book entitled *The Worst Hard Time,* which is about the dust bowl of the 1930's. One premise of the book is the effect that growing so much grain had on the land. I think we need to concentrate of locally grown and organically grown food, encourage family farms, and stop the spread of gargantuan agribusiness/corporations.

COMMENT OF LAURA JOHNSTON, MISHAWAKA, IN

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Laura Johnston.
City, State: Mishawaka, IN .
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher Assistant for Head Start.
Comment: We need Congress to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the

time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF JESSICA JONES, LOS ANGELES, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Jessica Jones.
City, State: Los Angeles, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Food Bank.
Comment: Greetings from the Los Angeles Regional Foodbank! The Los Angeles Regional Foodbank serves approximately 10% of Los Angeles County residents (approximately one million people). We have seen a 46% increase in people receiving food assistance over the past four years, and a 34% increase in the past year alone. The Foodbank is currently distributing 1 million pounds of food per week through our pantry network. That's 52 million pounds of food a year, and we're not meeting the need.

A significant portion of that amount is TEFAP commodities. The commodities that the Foodbank receives through The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) help stabilize hungry, struggling families and individuals in Los Angeles County. Currently the Farm Bill funds TEFAP at $350 million, breaking that into $250 million for food, and $100 million for administration needs. Food banks around the country, including the Los Angeles Regional Foodbank, are functioning at higher capacities than ever. A funding increase to $425 million—$300 million for food and $125 for administration—would allow food banks to better do their jobs, and would enable us to serve even more needy families in Los Angeles County.

Through the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), the Foodbank serves approximately ⅓ of the eligible seniors that live in Los Angeles County. Senior citizens are limited as to the programs they are eligible to participate in, and for many this program is their only chance at stability and accessing good nutrition. We would like to expand our program to be able to serve 50% of the seniors that need this program and are eligible for it.

Food stamps are also a continuing concern for Los Angeles County. Only about 50% of the people eligible for Food Stamps are actually able to participate in the program. We are making strides in addressing this low participation rate, but need assistance to make the changes that are necessary to modernize and streamline the program so it is more accessible to those who are eligible for it.

With increased poverty, unemployment and food insecurity rates, Los Angeles County has a tangible need to see these programs reauthorized and well-funded in the next Farm Bill.

All the best,

JESSICA JONES,
Los Angeles Regional Foodbank.

COMMENT OF A.J. JORDAN, PERU, IN

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: A.J. Jordan.
City, State: Peru, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am writing in support of reinstating public access to the Common Land Unit data to Section 1619 of the Farm Bill. The CLU data provides real estate appraisers more accurate data to work with and also allows lenders making direct loans to producers better information to make informed lending decisions in the agriculture industry. The CLU data does not give out any personal information or payment information. I appreciate your consideration of reinstating public access to the CLU data.

Kind regards,

A.J. JORDAN.

COMMENT OF BRET KAHRE, WOLSEY, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Bret Kahre.
City, State: Wolsey, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retailer.
Comment: We sell & custom apply crop protection products to area producers. The maps provided through surety mapping are a very useful tool in our business. We would be lost without them. The maps are used for several different things in our office. We use the maps for scouting, consulting, chemical recommendations, & for application records.

Thanks,

BRET KAHRE.

COMMENT OF HAYKY KALLENBERG, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Hayky Kallenberg.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: The farm bill is a cumbersome piece of legislation that touches a great number of issues, both domestic and international. Congress often approaches the farm bill with an attitude that does not represent the attention that this legislation deserves. As the impact that the farm bill has on the average American (as well as thousand of farmers worldwide) becomes more transparent, there will need to be more input from small farmers, low-income consumers, and those aware of the international impact that our current farm subsidies produce. By re-evaluating our current farm subsidies (which focus on the five crops that are often used in heavily processed foods) and making the effects that this subsidy system has on nutrition and the economy in general more clear we will being to make strides in the right direction. By increasing funding to SNAP and TEFAP we will increase the low income population's buying power and awareness of organic and pesticide-free food. By increasing availability of non-processed and organic foods we can begin to change the structure of the food purchasing process in the U.S.

COMMENT OF ANU KAMATH, BROOKLYN PARK, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 22, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Anu Kamath.
City, State: Brooklyn Park, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: This country spends the most amount of money on healthcare and the least amount on food than any other developed country in the world. One main reason for that is because Americans over-consume meat and under-consume vegetables and fruits which we are always told to eat more of. So, then I ask you (rhetorically) why is meat cheaper than fruits and vegetables? Bottom line is that government subsidies for corn are making meat cheap and in turn jeopardizing the health of people, the health of animals and the health of the environment. Anyone with a half a brain should know that a double cheeseburger should cost more than $1. Why does the government not subsidize fruits and vegetables? I would like to be able to go to the store and buy a head of broccoli for $1. I would like to buy some mushrooms for $1. I would like to buy a pound of brown rice for $1 and I would like to buy a pound of kidney beans for $1. Now for a little over $4 I can prepare my whole family a delicious, healthy meal at home instead of going to McDonald's and fattening them up with a $1 cheeseburger, fries and a super-sized high fructose corn syrup laced soft drink for about the same amount of money. Which is the better option? I urge you to take away the corn subsidies. Cows were meant to eat grass not corn. Pigs and chicken were not meant to be injected with antibiotics and kept in cages so small that they can't even turn around. Instead of spending all that money on the antibiotics and hormones, lets have the animals eat what they are meant to eat. Give them a little room to move around and let them be outdoors see the light of day. Let's pay a fair price for humanely raised meat instead of an artifi-

cially cheap price for inhumanely raised meat. The animals will be healthier, people will be healthier and the planet will be healthier.

Sincerely,

ANU KAMATH,
Brooklyn Park, MN.

COMMENT OF KRISTA KAMER, MERCED, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Krista Kamer.
City, State: Merced, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Marine Scientist.
Comment: Why do we still provide farm subsidies? Why do we pay farmers to grow crops, or in some cases, not grow crops? The money would be better spent investing in research to improve farming efficiency. People should pay what it costs to grow food.

End farm subsidies!

COMMENT OF JAMES KANABLE, PHILIP, SD

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: James Kanable.
City, State: Philip, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I would like to request that FSA fields be made public again.

COMMENT OF RICHARD KANAK, CHERRY VALLEY, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Richard Kanak.
City, State: Cherry Valley, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: I would hope that any future farm bill supports the small producer throughout the country who are a vital component of the food chain.

It appears to me that all past policies have been dictated by large agribusiness ventures to their benefit and to the detriment of the consumer. We now have corporations like banks deemed to large to fail since they control a vast segment of the food market and their failure would jeopardize the food supply.

COMMENT OF TOM KANE, HONESDALE, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 14, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Tom Kane.
City, State: Honesdale, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: News Reporter.
Comment: The situation with dairy farmers is not only critical but terminal if something isn't done to raise the price they get for their milk. Any farm bill must contain a clause that relates their cost of production to the price of their milk. Every other business has such a relationship. The formula for milk pricing is medieval and brutally unjust. The milk farmers of America are going out of existence. What will take their place? Milk from China? The present condition is intolerable. It has to change and the new Farm Bill is the proper time to change it.

COMMENT OF RUTH KATZ, POCANTICO HILLS, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 07, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Ruth Katz.
City, State: Pocantico Hills, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.

Comment:

Stone Barns Center for Food & Agriculture

Comments to House Senate Agriculture Committee on the 2012 Farm Bill

July 2010

I am writing on behalf of Stone Barns Center for Food and Agriculture, to provide comments on the next U.S. Farm Bill. Stone Barns Center is a working farm and educational center in Westchester County, New York. We provide educational programming to children, families and schools; and training—through technical, intensive workshops and apprenticeships—to the next generation of farmers. We also conduct innovative on-farm experimentation through partnerships with Cornell University and others, on seeds, breeds, soil health, land management and energy conservation and production.

We would like the next U.S. Farm Bill to represent values and principles that reflect the spirit of an entrepreneurial America, an ecological America, and a healthy America. These values and principles include fostering:

- An entrepreneurial spirit. We need to do all we can to foster innovative, productive American family farm businesses. We proudly display the independent family farmer as a great America icon; our policies must reflect this pride.
- Vibrant regional economies that directly link rural farm communities with urban and suburban ones.
- Agriculture programs that recognize and support the additional production capacities possible through urban farming.
- Agriculture programs that recognize and support the additional production and marketing capacities possible through Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) programs, farmer cooperatives, and other small and medium-sized farm operations. Currently smaller operations are sometimes being referred to as "hobby farms." Yet many are the sole source of family income, are more profitable than conventional operations, and—critically—reach communities in need of healthful, affordable food.
- Healthy people and communities that have better access to healthful food.
- A clean, restorative and resilient environment. This includes a too-often overlooked and critical point: the health of the soil that feeds us. It also includes stronger energy conservation measures, as well as innovations in producing clean energy without sacrificing land where food crops are needed.
- A supportive business and training climate for the next generation of American farmers.
- Supportive programming for "factory farm"/CAFO operators that want to transition to more sustainable practices and gain access to profitable markets.
- Better and more efficient use of our Farm Bill tax dollars. This means limiting subsidies (see below: Reform Commodity Payment Programs, item #8), and using that savings to support the notions mentioned herein.

We feel these values and principles are well represented by the statement provided below, a working draft provided by one of our affinity organizations. Stone Barns Center is a member of the National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition (NSAC), and is working on Farm Bill priority setting with NSAC and its approximately 80 additional members.

Finally, while it may not seem practical, ideally, we should craft a 50 Year—rather than a 5 Year—Farm Bill. Since we are unlikely to make such a monumental process change at this time, we should then at a minimum, craft our 5 Year Farm Bill as if it were part of a 50 Year one. In doing so, we demonstrate leadership and foresight, devising a bill that accounts for environmental, economic and social stewardship, preserving our farmland and heritage for future generations.

> . . . For 50 or 60 years, we have let ourselves believe that as long as we have money we will have food. That is a mistake. If we continue our offenses against the land and the labor by which we are fed, the food supply will decline, and we will have a problem far more complex than the failure of our paper economy. . . .
>
> . . . Any restorations will require, above all else, a substantial increase in the acreages of perennial plants. The most immediately practicable way of doing this is to [reinvent] crop rotations that include hay, pasture and grazing animals. . . .

> . . . research in Canada, Australia, China and the United States over the last 30 years suggests that perennialization of the major grain crops like wheat, rice, sorghum and sunflowers can be developed in the foreseeable future. By increasing the use of mixtures of grain-bearing perennials, we can better protect the soil and substantially reduce greenhouse gases, fossil-fuel use and toxic pollution. . . .
>
> . . . Carbon sequestration would increase, and the husbandry of water and soil nutrients would become much more efficient. And with an increase in the use of perennial plants and grazing animals would come more employment opportunities in agriculture—provided, of course, that farmers would be paid justly for their work and their goods.
>
> . . . Thoughtful farmers and consumers everywhere are already making many necessary changes in the production and marketing of food. But we also need a national agricultural policy that is based upon ecological principles. We need a 50 year farm bill that addresses forthrightly the problems of soil loss and degradation, toxic pollution, fossil-fuel dependency and the destruction of rural communities . . .
>
> (From Wes Jackson and Wendell Berry, *New York Times* Op-Ed, Jan. 4, 2009.) (*http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/05/opinion/05berry.html*)*

For more information on the concept of a 50 Year Farm Bill, please see the 50 Year Farm Bill booklet by The Land Institute at: *http://www.landinstitute.org/vnews/display.v/ART/2009/07/28/4a6f2187e3d1c.**

(Authors and contacts: Wes Jackson, The Land Institute: [Redacted], and Fred Kirschenmann, Stone Barns Center for Food and Agriculture and the Leopold Center: [Redacted])

Please see the 9 point statement below, and feel free to contact us for further input as you proceed in the development of the 2012 Farm Bill. Thank you.

> 1. Enact a robust and well funded Conservation Title to support working lands conservation programs, conservation easement programs, and sustainable and organic transition assistance.

Farms and ranches make up more than ½ of the land mass of the lower 48 states. Farm polices driving the industrialization of agriculture have created a system of agriculture on these lands that is productive in the short term, but polluting, energy gulping and unsustainable over the long term.

Agriculture is the largest source of pollution of rivers and streams, affecting roughly half of total stream miles. Over 100 million acres of cropland continue to erode at levels that are unsustainable despite decades of soil conservation efforts stemming back to the Dust Bowl of the 1930s. Nearly ⅔ of threatened and endangered species are listed due in some part to agriculture and agro-chemicals. Human health, ecosystem health, food security and even our long term economic well being are all tied to how well farmers and ranchers steward these resources.

We urge Congress and the Administration to enact a Conservation Title of the 2012 Farm Bill that provides the technical assistance, cost share, and financial incentives necessary to ensure the long term productivity and stewardship of agricultural lands.

Long term sustainable food production will require an increasing emphasis on the adoption of conservation practices on lands in active agricultural production. We must defend, strengthen, and extend conservation compliance, which requires that farmers receiving federal farm program payments adopt conservation plans. Conservation compliance must apply to federal subsidies for crop insurance as well as any new revenue insurance program that may be adopted. In addition, the survival of prime grasslands depends on the adoption of strong uniform Sodsaver protections.

Working lands conservation programs must actively assist farmers to transition to sustainable and organic farming systems by providing the necessary technical and financial assistance. A shift to organic production and sustainable and grass-based livestock systems will yield environmental, economic, and public health benefits.

As we move closer to enacting comprehensive energy and climate change legislation, policy makers must recognize that the best structure available for shaping agriculture's response to climate change is the Conservation Title of the next farm bill. Whether to help farmers cope with climate change or to reduce green house gas emissions attributable to agriculture the basic tools to accomplish climate change mitigation and farmer adaptation are already in place.

---

*The documents referred to are retained in Committee files.

Agriculture can make a substantial contribution to a shift toward renewable energy. That shift, however, must emphasize production of a new generation of cellulosic fuel stocks, strong sustainability criteria, and local and farmer ownership of production facilities.

Wetland, grassland, and farmland easement programs do much to protect America's fragile soils and critical ecosystems. These programs also offer opportunities for climate change mitigation, ecosystem regeneration, and refuge for wildlife. They need to be extended and strengthened in the next farm bill. The Conservation Reserve Program should include an easement option so that land that should be permanently retired from production has the appropriate conservation tool available. As other Conservation Reserve Program contracts expire it is essential that those lands come back into production under sustainable systems, which in most cases will be grass-based production.

2. Refocus federal farm program payments upon farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits and promote long-term food security.

Since the Great Depression, USDA has administered commodity programs for corn, wheat, rice, other grains, and cotton. For most of that time, the programs focused on reducing production and managing supplies to keep prices relatively constant. However, in the modern era, our federal farm programs have been transformed into pure production subsidies, encouraging overproduction of grain and cotton at tremendous cost to the environment and the family farmers they were intended to help.

The next farm bill may make some changes to the commodity programs. One simple-to-craft reform could be a re-allocation of a portion of current production subsidies to farmer conservation and farmer value-added business development. One obvious place for increased funding is the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP).

The CSP pays farmers for producing healthier soil, cleaner water, fewer greenhouse gases and greater biodiversity. It is the only program in the USDA tool kit that rewards sustainable farmers for the multiple and ongoing environmental benefits delivered by their farming practices.

This program can point the way forward for U.S. farm policy by providing a model for what the next generation of farm programs should look like. CSP rewards farmers for how they farm, not for what or how much they produce. CSP advances conservation practices on crop, pasture, range, and forested land and includes options that work for sustainable and organic operations, specialty crop farms, grazing operations, and diversified crop-livestock farms.

Feeding ourselves and future generations will demand the expansion of sustainable production practices on working agricultural lands. Programs that reward our best stewards and encourage other farmers to make the transition to more sustainable farming practices are crucial to our food security.

CSP is on track to sign up 25.6 million acres for 2009 and 2010, or over 50 million acres during this current farm bill cycle, and 115 million acres by 2017. We urge Congress and the Administration to significantly expand its commitment to this program by providing the funding necessary to reach a total enrollment of 230 million acres by the end of the next farm bill cycle in 2017.

3. Encourage and support the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

The future health and vitality of agriculture, the food system, and rural communities depends on the successful launch of a new generation of farmers and ranchers. Across the country, there is a groundswell of interest in agriculture among young people, farm raised or not who want to take up farming as a profession. Many new immigrants, women, and farm workers also aspire to becoming farmers.

Over the next two decades an estimated 400 million acres of U.S. agricultural land will be passed on to heirs or sold as farmers 65 and older retire (currently ⅓ of all farmland owners are retirement age). Transitions present opportunities for economic and social mobility. Given the opportunity, these new entrepreneurs can bring hope and capital to rural economies desperate for renewal.

Changes in farming practices also happen at the transition. This new generation of farmers has enthusiastically embraced sustainable and organic agriculture. These farming systems offer new market opportunities and oftentimes lower start up costs. And not incidentally, these systems produce more economic multipliers for their communities than raw commodities sold into the conventional market. Public policy needs to encourage and reward this generation's embrace of environmentally sound farming practices.

We urge Congress and the Administration to make a greater investment in beginning farmers and ranchers. The 2012 Farm Bill must ensure this new generation of farmers has the technical assistance, capital, access to markets and land it needs

to succeed. Federal assistance to beginning farmers should prioritize those establishing sustainable and organic farming operations.

4. Increase resources for research that fosters sustainable agriculture systems.

Agricultural research is a powerful and fundamental force that shapes our food and farming system. Publicly supported agricultural research has too often, and for far too long, produced technologies and tools that best serve industrial agriculture. This research fosters systems that strive for increased production at the expense of other important public values. The $2.5 billion USDA spends each year on food and agricultural research has produced a U.S. food system that is increasingly concentrated and focused on a narrowing base of crop and livestock breeds.

We urge Congress and the Administration to enact a Research Title that truly serves the interests of rural communities and our collective long-term food security. Our research, education and extension programs must focus on the full and diverse set of practical, economic and social challenges facing America. Environmental degradation, depopulation, the loss of mid-sized family farmers, the loss of biodiversity, and climate change all demand an expanded federal commitment to research that fosters sustainable and organic farming systems.

Publicly supported research should be aimed squarely at technologies and systems that support small and mid-sized farmers. It should examine food systems, sustainable renewable energy production and public health issues. Most importantly, the only competitive grants program in the entire USDA portfolio to involve farmers and ranchers directly in research, the Sustainable Agriculture, Research and Education (SARE) program must finally be funded at a level that begins to meet the demand.

A renewed public commitment to classical plant and animal breeding is critical to conserving our dwindling genetic diversity. Increased genetic diversity will be vital in addressing global climate change, increasing pest pressure and our own food security. Sustainable and organic agricultural systems can contribute to the development of a new generation of seeds and breeds that are well adapted to local conditions and changing environmental conditions.

5. Reinvigorate regional agricultural economies and local food systems

The surge in consumer demand for organically-produced food and agricultural products from local and regional markets offers a significant new opportunity for diversified rural development but we need to provide producers and their communities with the necessary tools to serve these new markets. Rising demand for these foods is an important incentive for farmers and ranchers, but many communities lack the processing and distribution infrastructure necessary for economically robust, sustainable food systems.

We urge Congress and the Administration to provide the capital and technical assistance necessary to rebuild the local and regional food infrastructure.

We applaud this Administration's commitment to the Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food Initiative. The grant and loan programs publicized through Know Your Farmer can provide the capital and technical assistance necessary for small and mid-sized farmers to respond to new market demand.

Mid-sized farms in particular are often too small to thrive in the international commodities markets but are well positioned to sell local and regional, organic and value added farm products directly to wholesale and institutional purchasers. Fostering these markets can help preserve those farms "in the middle," the farm size category that is shrinking the fastest, yet which is essential for the vitality of rural communities. Further, cultivating the growth of regional food systems can create jobs, retain more food dollars in rural economies and spark development opportunities.

Connecting food producers and consumers directly through existing USDA programs—when farmers sell directly to schools or when SNAP participants use their benefits to buy fresh, nutritious food at farmers markets—makes economic sense and ensures that the Nation's nutrition safety net is doing its job while also strengthening the bottom line for America's family farmers.

6. Ensure fair and competitive agricultural markets.

Large segments of the nation's food supply are dominated by a handful of corporations. Family farmers and ranchers are facing markets for the sale of their products that are increasingly concentrated in fewer and fewer firms. This is especially true in the livestock and poultry sectors. In an attempt to gain market access, farmers and ranchers enter into production or marketing contracts with corporations that have far greater bargaining and market power.

We urge Congress and the Administration to ensure more market channels, greater bargaining power, and strong rules that ensure fair contracts for producers. Fair contracts and competition will allow producers to provide consumers with a greater diversity of higher quality and fairly priced goods.

In addition, we are greatly concerned over consolidation and concentration in the seed industry. Increasingly, the seed industry limits our access to seed varieties; limits our ability to experiment and innovate new seed varieties; and forces more farmers into monoculture practices which deplete our soil and threaten our food security. We must develop policies and practices that counter this extremely risky trend.

7. Fully recognize the inherent value of sustainable and organic farming systems in addressing climate change

Conventional agriculture is a ravenous consumer of fossil fuels and producer of greenhouse gases. Yet, our federal farm and energy policies continue to reward intensive row-cropping, corn ethanol production and large-scale confined livestock production systems. These systems are all heavily dependent on mechanization, chemical fertilizers, and pesticides. These systems are specialized, brittle and susceptible to collapse under the weight of climate change.

To best address climate change, federal farm policy must emphasize farming systems that can best help farmers cope with climate change and reduce the overall level of green house gas emissions attributable to agriculture.

Research confirms that sustainable and organic farming methods when compared to conventional agriculture can result in the reduction of nitrogen use and pollution. Studies also show that over the long term, organic crop rotations show increased yield and steadily improved soil quality over conventional systems. These systems are diverse, resilient and best suited to coping with the variability of weather and pest pressures resulting from climate change. They consume less fossil fuel and sequester more carbon than conventional agriculture. They also offer the most sustainable means of producing on farm renewable energy.

8. Reform commodity payment programs.

Commodity programs offer farmers production subsidies for commodity crops like corn, rice, cotton, and soybeans. While some payments are made when commodity prices are low, a majority of payments are made regardless of whether prices are high or low, and can be made even when a crop is not grown. A disproportionate share of benefits goes to the largest farms, with the largest one percent of farms receiving about a quarter of total benefits. The result is farm consolidation as farm subsidies are used to buy more land. The subsidy allows large farms to bid up land prices well above market levels while mid-sized family farms disappear and farming opportunities diminish for a new generation of farmers.

Furthermore, commodity programs, as currently administered, encourage the intensive production of one or two commodities on the same fields year after year, resulting in polluted runoff, soil depletion and loss of biodiversity. Taxpayers, consumers, farmers and rural communities deserve better. We urge Congress and the Administration to enact farm subsidy reforms that serve a broader set of interests including public health, rural economic development, resource conservation, and economic opportunity and entry.

One starting place for reform would be to enact effective payment limitation reform to reduce program incentives to farm consolidation. In addition, farmers should be allowed to plant fruits and vegetables on at least a portion of their farm program acreage provided their payment is reduced accordingly. Re-invigorating the conservation compliance system is also overdue. If Congress takes the step of adding a more comprehensive revenue insurance option to the commodity program mix, it too should have effective payment limitations, full planting flexibility, and strong conservation requirements.

9. Reform Crop Insurance.

Farming is inherently a risky business. Weather, pests, variable costs for inputs, and wild fluctuations in market prices for farm products create a volatile business environment and can cause farm income to vary significantly from year to year. A healthy farm and food system depends on public policies that help farmers manage risk effectively.

Traditionally, farmers managed risk by growing multiple crops and raising a variety of livestock. If one crop failed or prices for cattle or hogs were low, then sales of other products would make up the difference. By contrast, current crop insurance policies are skewed in favor of less diverse crop production systems that are not only

more vulnerable to markets, weather, and pests, but that also have serious environmental impacts.

We urge Congress and the Administration to reform Crop insurance to ensure that it is structured in a manner that significantly rewards diversification in recognition of its high environmental and risk management value.

This farm bill should begin a transition toward an effective whole farm revenue insurance option.

Unjustified surcharges on insurance premiums for organic producers should be removed and insurance options implemented that take organic product price premiums into consideration. New insurance provisions should also be adopted to allow farmers who are engaged in direct and value-added markets to insure their production based on their higher value markets.

COMMENT OF ODILE KAYLOR, SAHUARITA, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Odile Kaylor.
City, State: Sahuarita, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teaching at community college and engineer.
Comment: No GMO please. WE don't need them, they are dangerous and have not been tested.

At the very least, have them listed as GMO in ingredient lists so people who don't want them (like me) don't buy them.

COMMENT OF JERRY KEETER, OLNEY, TX

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Jerry Keeter.
City, State: Olney, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Application (Crop Dusting).
Comment: Your support is needed to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway, especially due to the following circumstances:

USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF JOLEE KEIFER, HAMBURG, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 07, 2010, 10:36 p.m.
Name: Jolee Keifer.
City, State: Hamburg, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.

Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.

Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

COMMENT OF WAYNE KELLER, STEELEVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Wayne Keller.
City, State: Steeleville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate.
Comment:

Good morning,

Please, we need to be able to access FSA data. I hear from angry customers weekly because of the delays caused by not being able to access data they have asked for. Much of the time for their own properties and with their permission FSA will not or will delay releasing the data.

Thank you,

WAYNE KELLER.

COMMENT OF SHARRON KELLEY, GLENEDEN BEACH, OR

Date Submitted: Monday, June 21, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Sharron Kelley.
City, State: Gleneden Beach, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I have spent over two years growing and contributing all my fresh vegetables to the local food bank. The food system in this country has to be changed. I'm doing my part. Please do yours!

COMMENT OF LORELEI KELLOGG, SANTA FE, NM

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:36 p.m.
Name: Lorelei Kellogg.
City, State: Santa Fe, NM.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Home maker.
Comment: As someone who is on a very fixed food budget, I find it frustrating that fresh fruits and vegetables are so expensive when processed foods manufactured from subsidized items are so cheap.

Most of the ingredients in processed food are manufactured from corn or soy, two of the most subsidized crops in this country. High Fructose Corn Syrup is too prevalent, being used in things like bread as a cheap filler to allow for inexpensive food. Many of these crops are genetically modified and there is no substantial evidence to indicate that these GMO crops are safe. Many other nations refuse to grow them, however we subsidize them with billions of dollars, ultimately guaranteeing they flood the food supply of this country.

I urge the Committee on Agriculture to rethink the existing subsidies and look instead to subsidizing fruits and vegetables, crops that provide much more nutrition than the fillers manufactured and genetically engineered to fatten up cattle; which in turn appear to be fattening up our children.

COMMENT OF JEFF KELSEY, ALPENA, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Jeff Kelsey.
City, State: Alpena, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Protection Provider/Seed Sales.

Comment: It is my opinion and belief that section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis. The USDA, Farm Service Agency, CLU data had been available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the summer of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

This data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation, tilling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

COMMENT OF JAMES KENNEDY, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: James Kennedy.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: All food for human consumption should be produced without the use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, or genetic engineering. Trees, plants and grass in the wild grow that way because their soil is not depleted.

COMMENT OF MARK KENNETT, GRINNELL, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Mark Kennett.
City, State: Grinnell, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Specialty Crops, Vegetables, Other.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: CLU data has no privacy issues. It is imperative that support entities have access to this mapping information to allow for the accurate and timely transfer of information as to acres, locations, and physical nature of the land area. When an applicator can show up with a good map picture they are already more accurate. In comparison the most recent Google earth picture is approximately ten years old.

COMMENT OF PEGGY KENT, DAWSONVILLE, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, September 09, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Peggy Kent.
City, State: Dawsonville, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Poultry/poultry products.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I am pleading with Committee to stand by us and help us farmers who are struggling just to get by we desperately need the purposed rule by GIPSA/USDA to be put into place if a reform is not passed then many, many farmers will lose their farms I myself included don't just stand up for these large companies for we farmers are what makes up that company if we go down then what is going to happen to the companies? We have suffered abuse from them for many years nothing has ever been done to help us the ones who work everyday farmers are on call 24/7 all year we need help. And we need it quickly please stand up for us it is we the people who put you all in the position and you are suppose to help us for God sakes help America. We don't need anymore bankruptcies, and more jobless, and penniless people that would have to go on welfare we just have the funds for all of this . . . Please take this very serious and know it is very critical . . . Thank you.

COMMENT OF C. BRENT KERNS, BROWNSBURG, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 8:05 p.m.

Name: C. Brent Kerns.
City, State: Brownsburg, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager and Rural Appraiser and Farm Owner.
Comment: I am retired as the farm loan director for the Indiana Farm Service Agency. I now do farm appraisals and management.

The lose of current CLU's is very expensive to my customers. It limits my ability to research comparable sales and adds cost to my work. I do not work for free.

It is my understanding that this passed a few years ago because farm groups did not like the Environmental working group from looking at what they received from the government and being able to compare acreage's.

It is time farmers, like most public paid servants, had to deal with disclosure! If you drink at the trough guess what is exposed?

You or your staff may contact me at my e-mail address or my cell phone at [Redacted].

Please note that I am a farm advocate!

COMMENT OF WILLIAM KERR, WOODSTOCK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: William Kerr.
City, State: Woodstock, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Investor.
Comment: The U.S. needs a Farm Bill that curbs factory farms and large food corporations. We need a Farm Bill that provides fresh, wholesome food in our cities' schools. We need a Farm Bill that allows farms to make a transition to organic, sustainable growing methods for the sakes of a cleaner environment, for our children and grandchildren. We MUST stop subsidizing agribusiness that produces poor quality, unhealthy food for our population (including dairy). There are no subsidies for healthy foods. And thanks to the serious mismanagement of our Farm Bill, we now have an entire generation that, for the first time in history, is expected to live a shorter life than the generation before it.

COMMENT OF GLENN KEYES, CHARLESTON, SC

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 6:07 p.m.
Name: Glenn Keyes.
City, State: Charleston, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Preservation Architect.
Comment:

Dear Members of the House Agriculture Committee,

As a historic preservationist and architect, I strongly encourage you to support an enhanced commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next Farm Bill. These programs foster sustainable rural development and job creation. When businesses, and buildings, in small towns are preserved, pride in the community grows and creates opportunities for growth in the surrounding areas.

Additionally, the Rural Innovation Initiative, or similar rural development strategies, should be supported as a springboard for heritage-based projects that may incorporate Main Street revitalization, heritage tourism, farm building preservation and agricultural conservation.

Please also support the Historic Barn Preservation Program. This program is meant to assist in documenting and restoring barns. There are scores of barn structures that are abandoned or demolished. This is a shame as they are an important part of history and can be rehabilitated for modern use.

Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF PATRICK KILEY, OKEMOS, MI

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 9:36 a.m.
Name: Patrick Kiley.
City, State: Okemos, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.

Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I would like to see more funds committed to training and apprenticeship programs for youth in sustainable farming professions.

COMMENT OF LINDA KINMAN, DES MOINES, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 03, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Linda Kinman.
City, State: Des Moines, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Policy—IA Association of Water Agencies & Des Moines Water Works.
Comment:

May 2010

Iowa Association of Water Agencies,
Des Moines Water Works,
Des Moines, IA.

RE: 2012 Farm Bill Comments

The forthcoming Farm Bill provides significant opportunities and concerns for the Iowa Association of Water Agencies (IAWA) and Des Moines Water Works (DMWW). Water quality will only improve when we digress from a piecemeal approach and begin to move toward improving and protecting our water resources from a watershed, water management perspective. We all agree that the prosperity of Iowa farmers is important, but we also believe prosperity can be achieved while also protecting our water resources. A watershed-based approach provides the opportunity for both point and non-point sources to collaborate on water management projects that address water quality and quantity objectives holistically. A holistic approach also provides an opportunity to foster greater collaboration between urban and rural communities.

As you consider re-authorization of agricultural programs within the 2012 Farm Bill, IAWA and DMWW asks that you consider the following opportunities to address our water quality and quantity concerns:

1. Require environmental assessment and implementation of on-farm practices that protect water quality and minimize surface runoff and discharge from tile drained fields as a requirement to receiving any federal funding.

2. Disallow any federal funding to an absentee landowner (owning land in Iowa and living outside of Iowa), or land owned or managed by a corporation whose principle site of operation is outside of Iowa, unless they can demonstrate there are no water quality or quantity impairments attributable to their operation.

3. Require all rental contracts to include the use or implementation of conservation practices.

4. Require applicants requesting farm bill funds to be active participants in a comprehensive watershed plan that addresses multiple impairments and prioritizes needs within the watershed. Applicants should ensure that the practices being implemented, utilizing farm bill funding, is a priority in the watershed plan. Both urban and rural contributions should be assessed to provide a holistic approach.

5. Mitigate agricultural tile line drainage by funding and expeditious installation of natural and constructed wetlands that reduce sub-surface drainage directly to a water body and sequester and consume nutrients from farm fields. Wetlands should be sited strategically to ensure water quality is improved and drainage discharge is minimized. Agricultural tile lines act as direct conduits, discharging large quantities of water, chemicals (nitrates) and other contaminants (bacteria) directly to Iowa's rivers, streams and lakes.

6. Where appropriate, provide funding for research and installation of alternative technologies to mitigate agricultural tile discharge including, but not limited to installation of mechanical valves in agricultural tile lines and edge of field bio-reactors to manage the discharge of contaminants and water flow.

7. Do not allow funding of terraces or buffer strips that include installation of agricultural tile intakes and drainage lines. While preventing soil loss, the installation of an agricultural drainage system in terraces and buffers rapidly transports water from the field to a water source and diminishes the water quality benefits of the practice.

8. Provide funding for secondary containment structures of manure facilities and feedlots to eliminate discharges due to precipitation events.

9. Provide funding for innovative collaborations for such things as; composting, manure management technologies, or regional cooperative treatment project alternatives for manure management.

10. Conservation Security Program funding should reward producers based on collaboration, performance and outcomes of a comprehensive and holistic watershed plan.

11. Stimulate research to evaluate the effectiveness of current programs, practices and diversification of crops used in energy production, crops which may have the potential to impair a watershed.

The effectiveness of current farm bill programs and practices to both improve and protect water quality or in reducing flood risk is not readily evident. Current conservation programs operate within a system of income/commodity support programs, focused on maximizing production. The current approach distorts agriculture, distorts markets and hurts the environment. Rather than support commodity production, U.S. farm policy should support agricultural diversification to enhance ecosystems. Reward producers for environmental benefits. Generate policies that create options, provide safety nets if necessary, and offer incentives for innovative projects that could help restore vibrancy and diversity to Iowa's working landscape.

Cumulative impacts exist when upstream practices affect downstream resources. Integrating watershed approaches and policies across environmental goals will provide a more holistic approach that decreases contaminants threatening public health, susceptibility of flooding, and contributing to hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico.

The reauthorization of the Farm Bill provides an important opportunity to move in new directions that are innovative and challenging, but with greater efficiencies to ensure water quality and other environmental improvements can be achieved. Establishing mechanisms and strategies incorporating watershed based approaches that reduce barriers and promote collaborative partnerships. The Farm Bill must encourage, enable, and reward collaborative water quality improvement and protection performance outcomes from a watershed perspective. Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of current programs by consolidating programs and delivery mechanisms that share common purposes and incentives.

It is time to transition from the comfort of existing programs and move toward a more responsible, multifunctional agriculture that protects and improves water quality in Iowa and the United States. An agriculture that is economically viable for producers, without taking economic viability away from others by contaminating water resources. An agriculture that is economically viable for producers, while embracing the economic viability of communities through energy production, tourism, and quality of life. Water quality will only improve when we digress from a piecemeal approach and move toward management of the country's water resources. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2012 Farm Bill reauthorization. We look forward to contributing to the 2012 Farm Bill discussion and would be glad to provide any additional information if requested to do so.

Submitted by:

LINDA KINMAN,
Public Policy/Watershed Advocate
[Redacted],
[Redacted]

On behalf of:

JERALD LUKENSMEYER,
IAWA-*President;*

RANDY BEAVERS,
DMWW-*CEO and General Manager.*

COMMENT OF ERWIN E. KLAAS, AMES, IA

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 01, 2010, 10:07 p.m.
Name: Erwin E. Klaas.
City, State: Ames, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Research Ecologist.
Comment: I am a Soil and Water Conservation Commissioner in Story County, Iowa. Something needs to be done to provide our conservation districts with more trained personnel who can provide the necessary technical assistance to deliver con-

servation to our producers. More than a third of the conservation districts in Iowa are now sharing District Conservationists with neighboring counties. We also have a shortage of soil conservationists, resource specialists, and engineers. Our county has a two year backlog in filling applications from producers for cost-sharing conservation practices. I know from talking to other districts, this is the case all across the state. State budget cuts have greatly reduced the number of technicians and secretaries funded by the state. I am pleased that Representative Tim Holden's Subcommittee held public hearings today to discuss administration and delivery of conservation systems. This is a very important problem that needs to be solved in the next Farm Bill.

Spending more money does not necessarily mean greater conservation benefits. NRCS staff should be rewarded by the amount of improved natural resources/$/staff hour spent, or some other reward structure that is not based on spending money but based on improving the environment of agriculture systems.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Agriculture will consider technical assistance for conservation programs.

Thank you,

ERWIN E. KLAAS,
Commissioner,
Soil and Water Conservation District,
Story County Iowa.

COMMENT OF DAVID KLEIN, NORMAL, IL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: David Klein.
City, State: Normal, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: Please consider in the next farm bill our need to have Farm Acreage Data from USDA–FSA made public again. In my role as a farm realtor, manager and appraiser, we are currently using old data, which can be difficult to identify any farms that have been split, and their acreage sizes for performing appraisals and valuations. This changed during the last farm bill and we would request that it be considered to be allowed once again.

On another front I would ask that you support the amendment to H.R. 5297 introduced by Senators. Blanche Lincoln and Jon Kyl regarding estate tax relief. Having a moderated amount, such as this, will keep my family from being forced to sell the land we own to pay estate taxes, from the manner in which it reverts back to on January 1, 2011. Farm families reinvest their earnings into the business (land and machinery to operate it), and if we are forced to sell the land, in order to pay estate taxes this means that our small business shrinks rather than continuing to grow. As a result, larger operations that will pay higher rents on rented land to absentee landowners will continue to grow disproportionately. When too much concentration comes into too few hands we can have real problems in any industry. Hopefully, with wise guidance, this will not happen in row crop agriculture in Illinois. Yet, unless something is done—the middle sized farmer will start to disappear and we will have a country of large scale operations or part-time farmers with little in between.

Thank you for considering this request.

DAVID KLEIN.

COMMENT OF PAMELA KLEIN, SUNSET, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Pamela Klein.
City, State: Sunset, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I would like to see the House Agriculture Committee consider the same help for farms who want to grow using sustainable farming methods as described by ATTRA as those who are committed to the National Organic Program.

- We need the same programs as the participants in the "NOP" that will help us improve our lands and water courses while providing nutrient dense clean food to our communities.
- We support your efforts to include programs enhancing the National Organic Program but would like to see the same programs and funding for those who follow the sustainable farming methods as described by ATTRA. We feel this is the truest form of independence for our country and our food supply. Sustainable farming is the way to ensure that a select few don't continue to exploit our Nations most precious commodity. That all across the lands of America everyone profits from the economic benefits of growing our own local food.
- I challenge the House Agriculture Committee to be the first to take a step toward change that truly protects our lands, food and economic viability. A step that will attract all farmers to a sustainable or Organic method of growing.

You all have the power to make real changes that will protect our people and this beautiful country. Please help us clean up our land and our food.

Thank you,

PAMELA KLEIN.

COMMENTS OF FARRYL KLUIS, FARIBAULT, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Farryl Kluis.
City, State: Faribault, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: I marked producer because I do own farm land. I am an appraiser that works on farm appraisers. We need section 1619 changed. The farm crop base and yield are important information for buyer and seller. It must be important as if we are doing an FSA appraisal, we are provided the info on the comparable sales and the subject. This information goes with the land, not the owner or producer. It should be available to state licensed appraisers. We need it to make the best possible appraisal!

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Farryl Kluis.
City, State: Faribault, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Rural Appraiser.
Comment: The Common Land Units, current maps and information related to the parcel is very important information to arrive at a credible opinion of value. The section 1619 of the farm bill removed access to this information from appraisers. The information available from services such as AgriData, Inc and others is not as current as we would like it to be. Without allowing this information to be available to appraisers on comparable sales the appraisals maybe not as accurate. This is NOT Private information as it stays with the parcel and not the owner or tenant. It must be important because if we are doing the works for a government agency like FSA, the information is provided. Please correct this in the next farm bill.

I did discuss this with Rep. Peterson and he understands but others are not requesting a change. This is likely because it has not yet effected them. It likely will in the future when they need an appraisal and want it as current and accurate as they would like. We can be only as accurate as the information available to us.

COMMENT OF ANTHEA KNAPPER, WILDOMAR, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Anthea Knapper.
City, State: Wildomar, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Paralegal and Mother.
Comment: These are my wishes and concerns for the future of our farms, our agriculture industry, and all the families that depend on you:

First and foremost, stop selling out to corporations. They don't have the consumer's best interest in mind.

Please keep our food safe and healthy!

Please protect our rights as consumers!

Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food . . .
Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive . . .
Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future . . .
Please take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies!
This is not a fad and it will not go away! Thank you for your efforts . . .

COMMENT OF DAVE KOENIGSHOF, CUMMING, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Dave Koenigshof.
City, State: Cumming, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Appraiser.
Comment: I am certified general appraiser from Iowa. While we still have some older USDA farm service agency CLU data from some sources, this data is becoming older and less accurate. While in some cases we can obtain permission to receive CLU data, in most instances we are blocked from this information. This data is vital in maintaining the accuracy of appraisals and ultimately the collateralization of loans. I urge you to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

COMMENT OF JUSTIN KOENIGSHOF, SACRAMENTO, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Justin Koenigshof.
City, State: Sacramento, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Hi, I am a real estate appraiser who uses FSA records on a constant basis. I regularly use a program called AgriData to access FSA farmable acres to assess my properties. It has been inconvenient not having current FSA acreages since the passing of the Farm Bill and I ask that you reconsider allowing access to these records.

Thank you,

JUSTIN KOENIGSHOF.

COMMENT OF KENNETH KOLEVZON, OAKLAND, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 1:35 a.m.
Name: Kenneth Kolevzon.
City, State: Oakland, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please honor the First Lady's (and every parent and child's) wishes, and include in the farm bill:
Funds for farm to school programs, and better school lunch programs (more $) . . . children deserve better nutrition than what districts can buy for $2.70 per child, this should be a higher priority than subsidizing large producers of corn, soy, *etc.*

COMMENT OF KIM KONDRACKI, CRANBURY, NJ

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Kim Kondracki.
City, State: Cranbury, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Management Consultant.
Comment:

Dear House Committee on Agriculture:

As part of my research for a masters degree, I have studied how economic growth is stifled because entrenched interests fight efforts by others to take advantage of new options. Continued subsidizing of animal and other factory farming is just such an interest. We all know that the factory farmed food supply is unhealthy. You just need to have the courage to open up the opportunity for us to make new choices. We can do it, but you have to take the first step and end farm subsidies that provide an advantage/incentive for the worst kind of food production for our national health and well being. Just do it!!

COMMENT OF EDWARD J. KOPP, LEXINGTON, KY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Edward J. Kopp.
City, State: Lexington, KY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chef, Culinary Student.
Comment: Please read "Everything I Want to Do is Illegal" by Joel Salatin of Polyface Farms in Swoope, VA. It is clear, concise and to the point regarding the issues with our nations agricultural policies.

As a 20 year veteran of the food service industry and culinary student I am keenly aware of the issues regarding our food/agricultural policies. Stop subsidizing monocropping and large corporations. Promote locally raised food that keeps dollars in our communities. Stop restricting our freedom from buying healthy food from our friends and neighbors.

Respectfully,

EDWARD J. KOPP.

COMMENT OF WALTER KOTECKI, STOCKTON, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 05, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Walter Kotecki.
City, State: Stockton, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: In balancing the needs of farmers and other agricultural water interests, you have an opportunity to also save the Delta, a unique and valuable resource that mother nature has blessed us with. Please keep this in mind.

COMMENT OF DAVID KRAMER, MINDEN, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: David Kramer.
City, State: Minden, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Own and operate a retail farm supply business.
Comment: As a business which relies almost daily on the use of CLU data we strongly support public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

COMMENT OF DARRELL KRAUPIE, BRIDGEPORT, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Darrell Kraupie.
City, State: Bridgeport, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Broker.
Comment: Pleased allow more access to records which affect the transfer of property. Buyers must be informed with the best information possible to purchase land. This would require more transparency. As a Broker we have a fiducial and confidential relationship with the Seller. We are also required to have a specific Agency Relationship representing the Seller. We are also required by law to disclose adverse material facts.

It would make property transfers much easier for the Farm Service Agency if all new or existing producers knew the facts.

I have received permission from Sellers for 30 years (in writing) allowing us to get the pertinent information regarding the transfer of Agricultural lands.

I would strongly recommend re-instating CLU data into Section 1619. Please try to allow more co-operation with professionals who deal in Ag Land.

Thank You,

DARRELL KRAUPIE.

COMMENT OF ALLAN KRECH, ROLLA, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Allan Krech.
City, State: Rolla, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retailer.
Comment: The Survey maps are a great tool for us and the producer and would really hate to not have them available for our use.

COMMENT OF TIMOTHY KREFT, WILLISTON, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Timothy Kreft.
City, State: Williston, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I would greatly appreciate the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619 of the previous farm bill. Your support will reinforce the huge benefits that CLU data provides for businesses who work closely with producers, such as giving producers more timely, accurate and cost-effective services. Below are my reasons for reinstating public access to CLU data.

1. USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

2. Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

3. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

4. CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

5. Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF CHRIS KREUDER, INDIANOLA, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Chris Kreuder.
City, State: Indianola, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: The 2008 Farm Bill prohibited the public access of CLU data. CLU data is invaluable to me as a producer and the fact that it is no longer available outside of the FSA office is a major inconvenience for myself and other producers. It is very useful when collaborating with other producers, custom applicators, and real estate professionals. Please ensure that in the future CLU data will be made publicly available so that producers like myself can use it to more efficiently feed and fuel the world.

Also, as far as I am concerned, you can eliminate direct and counter cyclical subsidies for corn and soybeans as long as you maintain or increase the assistance in the form of crop insurance. The use of crop insurance to limit risk and more easily

obtain financing has been a major boon for the industry. Direct subsidies, in my opinion, only give more fuel to the anti-farmer anti-subsidy movement that seems to be growing in the media. I do support the move to reduce the payments to crop insurance agents, though, they make far too much money ($250k+) in some instances, which can be better spent on other ag programs.

Thank you,

CHRIS KREUDER.

COMMENT OF GREG KRIEGER, GALESBURG, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Greg Krieger.
City, State: Galesburg, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Consultant.
Comment: Please continue to make CLU data (FSA Fields) available for public access. As an agronomist, I find this information helpful as I help my producer customers manage their crop inputs.

COMMENT OF JOSEF KRIEGL, REDWOOD FALLS, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Josef Kriegl.
City, State: Redwood Falls, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retail Fert. & Chem. Dealer.
Comment: We need farm programs to support family farmers not industrial size operations—also we need FSA MAPS available to the public

---

COMMENT OF RICHARD KRIESE, MITCHELL, SD

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Richard Kriese.
City, State: Mitchell, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: Thank you for reading this. I work as an agronomist in the Mitchell, SD area and have done so for 25 years. I know a lot of the fields in the area very well. The field mapping programs that we use are very useful to us and help us to get accurate acres on each field we do work on. We treat every field confidentially and do not share any information with out the producer or land lord's consent. These resources help our producers with crop rotation decisions and plant population plans. I treat these services with high respect and would greatly miss having the use of them. I would encourage all efforts to allow us to have access to them. Thank You!

RICK KRIESE,
[Redacted],
Mitchell, SD.

COMMENT OF ELDON KRULL, MARSHALL, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Eldon Krull.
City, State: Marshall, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: As an appraiser who is charged with determining the most probable price for farm land, it is critical that we have access to information about all comparable sale and subject property soils maps, CRP info, wetland determination maps, and other pertinent information. If we are denied access to this information, any loss of accuracy and subsequent loan loss problems created by inaccurate information will rest with those who failed to allow we appraisers access to essential information.

COMMENT OF WENDY KRUPNICK, SANTA ROSA, CA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Wendy Krupnick.
City, State: Santa Rosa, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: It is clearly time to move human society away from fossil fuels to clean, renewable sources of both energy and fertility for our agriculture. Organic farming holds the answers to our future food production and climate change mitigation. Please invest in organic and truly sustainable methods in the next farm bill.

- Organic methods rely on building soil organic content, taking carbon from the atmosphere and holding it in the soil, where it increases fertility and water holding capacity. It is crucial that these techniques be implemented a large scale and that nitrogen fertilizer from fossil fuels be discontinued in the very near future.
- Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.
- Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.
- If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:
  - Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
  - Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
  - Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
  - Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

It's now or never for preserving at least some of the life on Earth we know now.

COMMENT OF MARY LOU KUGEL, SHAWANO, WI

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Mary Lou Kugel.
City, State: Shawano, WI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I am writing in regards to #1619—CLU on FSA aerial photos. CLU= common land unit. As a real estate appraiser and dairy producer, I have found the removal of the CLU on FSA aerial photos to be a burden. As an appraiser, I use the CLU to determine how many acres of the various classes of land base a farmer has. For example out of a 40 acre tract, 23 acres may be in crop, 10 may be in pasture and 7 may be in wooded. The CLU's no longer show up on the maps that I am able to obtain from the FSA office, so therefore I am "using a best estimate" as to the number of acres, whereas previously the CLU were mapped. It saved me time, which ultimately saved the farmer "cost" associated with preparing an appraisal.

COMMENT OF KEITH KUPER, ACKLEY, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Keith Kuper.
City, State: Ackley, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.

Comment: Unless there are much smaller and much tighter payment limitations applied to farm programs, such programs will only hasten the demise of smaller farms. As it is, farm payments are largely capitalized into higher land charges—both rents and land values.

COMMENT OF MATTHEW KUPSTAS, ELKINS, WV

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Matthew Kupstas.
City, State: Elkins, WV.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: AmeriCorps VISTA.
Comment: Thank you for taking the time to read comments about the next Farm Bill.

I want for our government to completely stop subsidizing corn and soybeans. While this would be a drastic change, it is causing drastic problems. With the debt of the U.S. skyrocketing daily and we need to tighten our belts. Our subsidization of corn has made Concentrated Animal Feedlot Operations the norm in beef production in the United States. CAFO's are inhumane, they produce much less healthy meat, and cause major environmental problems. The concentration of cow manure causes major water pollution and CARO's are causing the Ogallala Aquifer to dry up.

CAFO's also require exorbitant levels of antibiotics, which leads to an increasing amount of antibiotic resistant bacteria that will infect humans. The subsidization of corn and soybeans funnels tax dollars to fast food companies and junk food companies. Therefore, the poor eat the least healthy food available, get diabetes, heart disease, or both and then tax dollars are needed to cover their health care costs.

Our subsidization of corn is putting Mexican corn farmers out of work. They then come to the United States illegally so they can provide for their families. Who can blame them? Our Agriculture policies put them out of work.

The subsidization of corn and soybeans reduce quality & diversity of crops on farms. Small scale farming is more productive, more environmentally friendly, increases community solidarity and provides more jobs. Small farmers are model citizens, and I can't think of a better way to put people to work doing something truly valuable to the well being of our people, country, and environment. Subsidizing corn and soybeans hurts small scale farming economically.

We need policies that do not hinder local food systems. The more local food we eat, the less pollution and a higher quality of life for all.

We need soda to be off limits to those with food stamps just as tobacco and alcohol are.

Thanks again for your time.

COMMENT OF JON KVOLS, SIOUX CITY, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Jon Kvols.
City, State: Sioux City, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraisal.
Comment: Reconsider reinstating the CLU data back into section 1619 of the farm bill. This data does helps appraisers provide a better product to our clients. The CLU data does not include any personal information.

Thank you,

JON KVOLS,
Sioux City, IA.

COMMENT OF GWEN LAMBERT, DAYTON, OH

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Gwen Lambert.
City, State: Dayton, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Manager.
Comment: Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF KAITLYN LAMBERT, BROOKFIELD, MO

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Kaitlyn Lambert.
City, State: Brookfield, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: I request that CLU Data (Farm Borders) be again made public in the upcoming farm bill. I am a farm appraiser and it's very challenging to determine accurate values for properties when the acreage of sales cannot be verified. My issues are not with the subject property, because I Can have the owner sign over that information to me. However, if the comparable sales that I am using to estimate value for the property have not been analyzed accurately, it is impossible to know how accurate my estimations of value are.

Accurate appraisals are vital to the strength of not only the financial sector, but the agricultural sector as well. We do no favors to anyone by not allowing appraisers the information we need to ensure we are doing the best possible job at estimating a market value on these properties. It's already challenging enough to perform an accurate analysis in a state that does not provide any way to verify sale prices so we must at least ensure this measure is taken to stop inflation of appraised values.

COMMENT OF BRIAN LANDIS, LEBO, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Brian Landis.
City, State: Lebo, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As your Committee considers changes to the Farm Bill, I urge you to rescind Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill. As you know, Section 1619 restricts access to property specific information created by the FSA and maintained in a Geospatial Information System. The agricultural community relies on the FSA field measurements for a wide variety of management and decision making issues. The real estate markets trade tillable land based on the FSA field measurements. There is no alternate source for this data. In order for an appraiser to properly analyze both a subject property and the comparable sales, access to the following FSA information is required: aerial photography, CLU field boundaries and acreage, soils, yield information and enrollment terms in such programs as CRP, WRP and other easement programs. The information required is property specific and should not considered personal information of an owner or operator. It is not realistic for appraisers to contact recent buyers or sellers of farmland and expect to get written authorization for release of this information. A GIS has proven to be a very efficient method of managing and retrieving this type of data. Without this data, an appraiser's analysis of market data for agricultural land appraisals becomes incomplete and potentially flawed resulting in value conclusions with a lower confidence. Therefore, restricting appraisers' access to this GIS data results in a substantial decrease in market transparency and possible negative consequences to all intended users of our services and the public as a whole. Thank you for your consideration.

BRIAN LANDIS,
Staff Real Estate Appraiser,
Frontier Farm Credit.

COMMENT OF SAM LANG, STAR, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: Sam Lang.
City, State: Star, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Chef.
Comment: Please stop subsidizing GM foods. It's bad for our health, bad for the environment, and bad for farmers. WE WANT ORGANIC!!!!!

COMMENT OF LYNNE LANGEVIN-DORAN, GIRDWOOD, AR

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Lynne Langevin-Doran.
City, State: Girdwood, AR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Administrative Assistant.
Comment: I would like to see an increase in funding to support for local, organic diversified agricultural *versus* large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy. This would benefit the health of all Americans.

COMMENT OF SARAH LANTZ, MEDIA, PA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 8:36 p.m.
Name: Sarah Lantz.
City, State: Media, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Piano Teacher.
Comment: The Committee needs to focus on subsidizing healthier foods. Our country is the most overweight on the planet, and it needs to change if we want our children to live long and happy lives. How are we to pursue happiness if we can't walk from point A to point B without gasping for air? We are taking positive steps in helping to save planet and other species—it's time to save our own. Help the farmers produce higher yields of greens (mustard greens, spinach, watercress), instead of corn and soy. Cultivate farms based on the Polyface principle, if at all possible. Help our families get back to a healthier lifestyle, or the health care reform will be for naught.

COMMENT OF MAX LAPPIN, SAN DIEGO, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 19, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Max Lappin.
City, State: San Diego, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Engineer.
Comment: Please abolish the ethanol subsidies that's costing the taxpayers a lot of money without any benefit to the citizens other than giving the giant corporation money.
Thanks.

COMMENT OF LEE LARABEE, BURLINGTON JCT., MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:06 a.m.
Name: Lee Larabee.
City, State: Burlington Jct., MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Fertilizer and Ag Chem. Dealer.
Comment: We truly need to have access to the FSA field maps. This is very important in directing applicator to the right fields also gives us a way to measure fields when they are split for some reason. Even though maps are given to a farmer, they usually do not have them with them when they are giving us a order. We can go to the FSA office and get a aerial map but this is time consuming and is 20 miles

from here. I can not see a reason or concern for not allowing us access to these maps.

Sincerely,

LEE LARABEE,
Manager Farmers Supply,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF CHRIS LARSON, PARK RIVER, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Chris Larson.
City, State: Park River, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Appraiser.
Comment: I hope the Committee will take into consideration what the CLU data restriction means to the agricultural industry as a whole from appraising to fertilizer applicators. In order to do an accurate appraisal it is imperative to have prudent information available, with these restrictions in place that hinders our ability to do a good job as appraisers. I also don't understand how government contracts (CRP payments) to private citizens can be considered confidential considering it is tax payer money going to these farmers. I urge the Committee to reinstate the CLU data into Section 1619.

COMMENT OF JOHN LARSON, BUFFALO CENTER, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: John Larson.
City, State: Buffalo Center, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: We need this mapping information to be available to all producers. it is critical to application of all pesticides and crop protection chemicals.

COMMENT OF MIKE LARSON, PERHAM, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Mike Larson.
City, State: Perham, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Spraying.
Comment: My comments are directed to the section 1619, Data information field borders. For it is a valuable tool to be able to look up information on AgriData for our spraying needs.

Thank you for your time,

MIKE LARSON.

COMMENT OF BRYAN LAWRENCE, CHATHAM, NJ

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Bryan Lawrence.
City, State: Chatham, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Management Consultant.
Comment: Please consider the impact the 2012 bill will have on consumers and the price, diversity and nutrition of the food produced for them by farmers. This should be renamed the 'Food Bill' to reflect the fact that this legislation is about creating a farming environment that provides healthy affordable food for all Americans. Lets make sure fruits, nuts, vegetables and legumes can be sustainably produced and made affordable. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

COMMENT OF BOB LEBACKEN, REYNOLDS, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 3:22 p.m.

Name: Bob Lebacken.
City, State: Reynolds, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment: I am a farmer in ND. I see the damage CRP acres have done to my state, and would ask that this contract be changed to allowing no more than 10% of a land parcel, and no more than the same for a county. It has killed small towns and communities, as businesses have closed along with churches and schools. Of course the "tree huggers" are writing the farm bill, so I know my letter means little. This is a goal by many to depopulate the country side in favor of wildlife. The elected officials should be ashamed to what they have done to destroy rural America. Much the same can be said with the use of other resources in this country. Also the EPA is nuts, defund them. They will make it impossible to farm in our country, of course that is their intent.

BOB LEBACKEN,
[Redacted],
Reynolds ND.

COMMENT OF BARBARA LECHTENBERG, HUTCHINSON, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Barbara Lechtenberg.
City, State: Hutchinson, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: CLU data (FSA Field boundaries) needs to be made available again to appraisers, along with CRP contract information and GRP and WRP easements. Without this information, arriving at an appraised value for agricultural properties becomes much more expensive for the client (producer).

COMMENT OF ANN LECLERCQ, OSWEGO, IL

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Ann LeClercq.
City, State: Oswego, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker.
Comment: As our country and our planet face increasing challenges from climate change, farmland and agriculture become even more vitally important. As such, we must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.

Also, a strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation. Here in Kendall County, we have watched our farmland be literally swallowed whole by urban sprawl, and are now having to face unpleasant consequences.

It is critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets. In addition, local food requires less oil for transportation, which lowers greenhouse gas emissions as well as our dependence on foreign oil.

To help achieve these goals, we need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

ANN LECLERCQ.

COMMENT OF GREGORY LEDGERR, CHICAGO, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Gregory Ledgerr.
City, State: Chicago, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Artist.
Comment: I would like to see more subsidies for vegetables and fruits, and less for corn and soybeans. We need to make healthy eating as affordable as unhealthy eating.
Thanks.

COMMENT OF WILLIAM LEDUC, MANKATO, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: William LeDuc.
City, State: Mankato, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I would like Congressman Tim Walz to support the reinstatement of public access to the CLU data in Section 1619 of the Farm Bill.
I work closely and on behalf of farm producers/land owners and having this accurate data available helps me get projects completed in a more timely fashion and is more cost effective.
Here are some facts about Common Land Unit (CLU)

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Confidential information is not compromised in supporting this. Please do what you can.
Thanks,

BILL LEDUC,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF ADOLFO LEE, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Adolfo Lee.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Filmmaker.
Comment: I just read this article:
http://www.good.is/post/help-make-a-salad-cost-less-than-a-big-mac/
and I wish that healthier food was more affordable to more people and not a luxury for a few.*

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

COMMENT OF JOHN LEEZER, TOULON, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: John Leezer.
City, State: Toulon, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate agent.
Comment: I sell farm real estate and crop insurance. We frequently use the Farm Service Agency CLU's in our work to service our farm clients. Please consider making this part public information in the next farm bill. This does not violate the producers privacy and will help us service our clients much better.

JOHN LEEZER.

COMMENT OF DAN LEGNER, PRINCETON, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Dan Legner.
City, State: Princeton, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Land Appraiser.
Comment: I would respectfully ask that appraisers be allowed to obtain FSA maps for the use in land appraisals. When analyzing sales, of which the buyer or sellers are not clients of the appraiser, the appraiser is not able to obtain accurate information as they do not have the FSA maps. I can be reached at [Redacted] if you would like a further explanation.

DAN LEGNER.

COMMENT OF STEVE LERMAN, PLAINVIEW, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Steve Lerman.
City, State: Plainview, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I urge Congress to pass the Farm Bill to provide additional funding and support for organic farming. Organic farming is a rapidly growing trend in food production, and is no longer just for tree-huggers. In addition to ridding the eco-sphere of tons of pesticides annually, it also promotes sustainable agriculture and saves precious natural resources. We can't afford to be without it.

COMMENT OF EMMA LEVIN, WILSONVILLE, OR

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 3:38 p.m.
Name: Emma Levin.
City, State: Wilsonville, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Self Employed.
Comment: I would like to see healthy foods become more available to all people. We need a drastic change to our food culture and making it easy and affordable to get fresh, local, organic produce. It is important that the people who typically choose the cheaper "fast" foods that are available are made more aware of the implications on their health, and that they have other, just as affordable options. I think we are all aware of the frightening state our country is in with the rise in childhood obesity and diabetes. It is time now to start fixing the very heart of this problem instead of putting band aids on. The problem is so widespread, the habits so ingrained into our culture that it will now require government intervention and policy change. We have to stop pumping ourselves full of corn and start eating real meat and fresh produce again. The next generation, our children, are going to be left with an epidemic that is irreversible if we don't start towards change now. The truth is we are what we eat.

COMMENT OF STUART LEVITON, BALTIMORE, MD

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:06 a.m.
Name: Stuart Leviton.
City, State: Baltimore, MD.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Statistician.
Comment: Organic farming must be a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill and all future agriculture policy. Thank you.

COMMENT OF JAKE LEWIN, SANTA CRUZ, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Jake Lewin.
City, State: Santa Cruz, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Organic Certification.
Comment: Please support organic food and farming. At least please provide funding on parity with funding for non-organic Ag. This is important for farmers, the environment, and the U.S. generally.

COMMENT OF DEBRA LEWIS, BEARDSTOWN, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Debra Lewis.
City, State: Beardstown, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

Dear Honorable House Committee on Agriculture:

As a Real Estate Appraiser who serves the West Central Illinois counties of Cass, Schuyler, Brown, Morgan and Menard, I respectfully request that you support the reinstatement of public access of the CLU data into Section 1619 of the farm bill. In so doing, you will reinstate benefits that CLU data provides for individuals like myself who work closely with producers and land owners in providing real estate valuation services. It will help me to give more timely and accurate, and thus, cost-effective real estate appraisals to the people I serve in West Central Illinois.

Currently in Section 1619 there is no compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data. This is a vital part of the information needed by me in the appraisal valuation process.

Since the 2008 Farm Bill, I am required by the local USDA offices to have written permission from a land owner to get the information that I need for appraising their farmland. While this is not an insurmountable task, and on the surface would seem rather easy, this method does not adequately supply me with information needed for every assignment I encounter. It makes it very difficult for me to obtain much needed information in real estate appraisals for out of State and absentee land owners, or estate valuations for deceased owners.

When I do have the needed documentation signed to provide to the local USDA office, I would often encounter reluctance at giving me the information without further documentation. It was not a question of them knowing who I was, why I was getting the information, but rather making sure they weren't violating a law or rule within the 2008 Farm Bill. Initially, there was a lot of confusion as to what they could give out and to whom. I can completely understand. But even with all of the proper documentation, I would often encounter pleasant but VERY busy workers at the local USDA offices who were reluctant to wait on the person at the counter because they were busy doing their work on behalf of the land owners and producers of their county. Once again, I completely understand. But this is only part of the obstacle course for me. All of this is what what I must do to obtain information on the farm that I am actually appraising (the "subject property" in appraiser speak). I cannot obtain this much needed information from the USDA office on the comparable farmland sales that I use in the valuation process. For those properties, I must dig for the information otherwise from the best sources possible, and hope that it is reasonably correct. In short, if I were able to access the accurate information that I need on my own, I would glady do it! It would save all involved time, and be a whole lot more efficient.

After discussing this issue with other area appraisers, I came to the conclusion that it would be more time effective if I subscribed to a farm data site, such as AgriData. However, they, too, are limited in the information that they can provide because of the 2008 Farm Bill. Lack of public access hurts us all. In real estate appraising, I am very reliant on data, and the data must be as accurate as possible. Public trust and confidence is everything to me. The most accurate data is not read-

ily accessible to me because of Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill. Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural service professionals like myself, as well as producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

I respectfully request that you make the necessary changes to allow this information to be accessible to the public. It will benefit the agriculture community as a whole. And in West Central Illinois, agriculture is our economic backbone!

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my request.

As a courtesy, I am cc'ing my Congressman, the Honorable Aaron Schock with this request made to your Committee for his information.

Sincerely,

DEBRA LEWIS,
Debra N. Lewis Appraisals,
State Certified General Real Estate Appraiser,
[Redacted],
Beardstown, IL,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF JERRY LEWIS, WEST POINT, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Jerry Lewis.
City, State: West Point, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Acres need to be shown on the aerial photo maps that I obtain from the FSA in order to provide accurate farm appraisals. If the acres are not available, the cost of doing an appraisal will increase significantly since an appraiser will have to find another source for the data. The acres are needed in order to provide clients with accurate value estimates based upon the land use of the property.

COMMENT OF LAURA LEWIS, SHELTON, WA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Laura Lewis.
City, State: Shelton, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Business Owner—Custom Cakes.
Comment: I live in a small town in Western Washington, where it is completely normal for my neighbors to share their crops and eggs from their farm. It concerns me greatly to think that would be taken away from us! I do not believe any corporation has the right to impose on a person's farm! Don't forget that our country was founded on the principal by the people for the people. Not for the corporations!!! Do not make this country Monsanto's guinea pigs!!

COMMENT OF DARRELL LIMKEMAN, BLOOMFIELD, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Darrell Limkeman.
City, State: Bloomfield, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: As a State Certified General Appraiser in Iowa the restriction on allowing access to FSA data has been a real problem. The section 1619 of the last farm bill made access to this data all but impossible. We need the maps and information in order to do our jobs and I don't know of a single appraiser who abused the privilege. Please reinstate the benefit that allows certified appraisers access to this data.

COMMENT OF LINCOLN COUNTY WYOMING, BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, KEMMERER, WY

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Lincoln County Wyoming, Board of County Commissioners.
City, State: Kemmerer, WY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: County Government.
Comment: Enhancing efforts to protect communities, watersheds and address threats to forest and rangeland health are important to local governments like ours. We believe that management programs must provide for fuel load management that will prevent catastrophic events and provide for reduced fire potential. The "roadless" designation has effectively eliminated access for vegetative treatments, logging, and other tools to reduce the fire potential. The "roadless" area boundaries are completely arbitrary—there is no logic to how they were developed. The Forest and Cooperators have expressed a desire to amend the roadless map to what exists on the ground. However, this requires a review by the Secretary of Agriculture, who has a backlog of requests. We believe that the "roadless" area should to be determined at the local level as part of the forest planning process.

COMMENT OF T. LINEBERRY, CRESTVIEW, FL

Date Submitted: Monday, June 28, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: T. Lineberry.
City, State: Crestview, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I would like to see farm subsidies go to farmers who produce fruits and vegetables. Currently these basic foods are too expensive for many consumers—in particular the poor. Our food supply is over-run with nutrient poor "junk food" style processed foods due to below market subsidies of corn . . . *i.e.,:* vegetables need to be cheaper than fast food hamburgers!

Special consideration should be given to help farmers transition to organic farming. Currently the demand for organic is outstripping supply. This is causing organic to be too expensive for average middle income to poor households. We should make it a goal to give all consumers the ability to choose between organic or conventional or genetically modified. This includes allowing conventional farmers who grow non-genetically modified crops the ability to state on packaging that their product is non-GMO. Our labeling laws should also reflect this in order to give all producers/consumers equality in the marketplace.

More legislation should be passed to prevent cross contamination of non-GMO crops. Such contamination is a drawback to committing local farm funds to alternative methods of agriculture such as organic. Contamination also hurts conventional farmers who can lose an entire season's production and sales overseas. There need to be clear laws for compensating farmers hurt by contamination by GMO field trials and crops.

There should be laws which protect livestock producers from being bullied into covering up deplorable health conditions. Currently many farmers who try to blow-the-whistle on bad and dangerous practices lose their contracts. Such farmers should be fully compensated for the entirety of their contracts with the offending producers. Many farmers are forced into such practices by producers.

COMMENT OF MARY LISS, KEARNEY, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Mary Liss.
City, State: Kearney, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: General Certified Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am a rural appraiser in central Nebraska. Current aerial photographs are imperative to accurate appraisal analysis on agricultural land.

COMMENT OF TIMOTHY LITWILLER, HILLSBORO, KS

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Timothy Litwiller.
City, State: Hillsboro, KS.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Service.
Comment: I am concerned that the Common Land Use will remain available. This is invaluable to our industry in supporting growers. The main use I see is accuracy—Making sure spray operators get on the correct piece of land. having these outlines and don't have other information that could be a privacy concern helps us make sure we have the correct acres and get to the correct place and helps so we don't need to carry any more chemical than needed for each application.

COMMENT OF FRANK LIVINGOOD, POSTVILLE, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Frank Livingood.
City, State: Postville, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment: On the matter of Section 1619 CLU. Lets reinstate public access to Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway. This should be available to all.

COMMENT OF SARAH LLOYD, WISCONSIN DELLS, WI

Date Submitted: Thursday, April 29, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Sarah Lloyd.
City, State: Wisconsin Dells, WI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: It is very important that the producer check-off programs be reevaluated and opened up for changes. The dairy check-off is not helping producers. Dairy farmers are going bankrupt and on food stamps in some cases, meanwhile the check-off coffers are overflowing. Please make sure that the check-off programs, especially the dairy check-off is looked at with producer interests in mind. The idea that mandatory check-off dollars restricted to promotion of consumption would some how trickle down to benefit producers is an outdated economic model.

COMMENT OF DAVID LOCKER, SLIDELL, LA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: David Locker.
City, State: Slidell, LA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: The farm bill needs to point toward overhauling our food system. We need to subsidize local, small farms that can grow sustainable plants and animals organically. Eliminate the large feed lots that create pollution in the form of run off down our rivers and into the Mississippi River that ends up in the Gulf of Mexico. Legislate transparency into the laws that govern large industrial animal production regarding poultry, beef and pork. Move toward putting more information about blood sugar on high sugar foods in grocery stores. The bill should point toward less processed foods and more whole, natural foods with less scale and processing. Thanks for your attention.

COMMENT OF ROB LOE, COOPERSTOWN, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Rob Loe.
City, State: Cooperstown, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Real Estate, Property Management and Farm Land Appraisal.
Comment: I use AgriData on a daily basis to assist my agricultural clients.
It is important to access the CLU information.

COMMENT OF T. LOGAN, AUSTIN, TX

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 3:05 p.m.

Name: T. Logan.
City, State: Austin, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Citizen.
Comment:

- We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.
- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.
- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF THERESA LOGSDON, LAKEPORT, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Theresa Logsdon.
City, State: Lakeport, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: It sure would be nice if Farm Bill subsidies were switched to Specialty Crops from Commodities. Particularly to show under 100 acres; which tend to be closer to consumers.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL LONG, CAMRILLO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 07, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Michael Long.
City, State: Camrillo, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Independent Insurance Agent/Broker.
Comment: Ventura County is still heavy in agribusiness, a well as our neighbor Santa Barbara County. I sent you a letter regarding the need for a strong USDA. I pushed the private sector and our relationships to farmers. I offer the USDA RMA Programs and have really helped many keep a float. I hope there comes a time when the private sector can offer the USDA NAP Program to growers. There should be no emergency funds given to a grower who has not procured either FSA or RMA Programs.

Regards,

MICHAEL LONG.

COMMENT OF GARY LOOS, CLEAR LAKE, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Gary Loos.
City, State: Clear Lake, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professional Farm Manager.
Comment: As a farm manager, I am interested in maintaining a healthy Ag sector. In the big picture, we need to reduce the size and scope of government. That

must include Ag policy. It is unfortunate that we have developed a system that results in farmers depending on government for a significant portion of their income. This must be reduced and eventually eliminated even if it is painful in the near term.

COMMENT OF JOEL LOSEKE, CHAMBERLAIN, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Joel Loseke.
City, State: Chamberlain, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retail Application and Supplies.
Comment: Please reinstate the CLU portion of USDA as we find it very helpful in our business when dealing with our customers for services and supplies. This information helps us greatly by saving time and money in getting the right information for fulfilling our customers needs and passing these savings on to them. Thanks.

COMMENT OF MICHELLE LOURENCO, CORONA, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 06, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Michelle Lourenco.
City, State: Corona, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Please support S. 1645. We must receive at a minimum the cost of production. We are on the verge of losing our family dairy farm as this has been the most devastating year in dairy history. Something is drastically wrong when the producers can't even receive the cost of production for their milk. How are we to pay our employees? More people will be losing their jobs. Something must be done NOW!!! Please help.

COMMENT OF SARAH LOVAS, HILLSBORO, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Sarah Lovas.
City, State: Hillsboro, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment:

To Whom it May Concern:

My Husband, Jason, and I raise about 5,000 acres of corn and soybeans near Hillsboro, ND. I also work in Hillsboro as a Sales Agronomist for the Halstad Elevator Company where I crop monitor 24,000 acres on a weekly basis in the summertime. I also advise many other customers on how to use agriculture input products. One tool that I use on both my own farm and for my customers is the Common Land Unit Data (FSA Fields). Previously this has been public information and has allowed us to use it with farmers for many purposes such as Precision Agriculture Applications.

Furthermore, at this point, land ownership is public knowledge, and this Common Land Unit Data (FSA Maps) is paid for by our public tax dollars. Since both of these hold true, it would seem that this information should be free and public knowledge. As a farmer, I do not believe that it is in the best interest to be taxed once for the creation of this data and then charge me again to use it. As a Sales Agronomist working for a relatively small, local co-op, charging us for this data will negatively impact Halstad Elevator and my ability to provide my customers with the best agronomic information. This is especially true as I work with precision agriculture technologies.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

COMMENT OF CARI LUBINER, HIGHLAND MILLS, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Cari Lubiner.
City, State: Highland Mills, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Occupational Therapist.
Comment: Lack of nutritional food in the schools is effecting student's academic and physical performance. We need to ensure that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF TOBIAS LUNT, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Tobias Lunt.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retailer.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Supporting small-scale slaughterhouses and the decentralization of meat processing

Replacing, at least partially, the incentives for corn, soybeans, wheat and cotton with a more level financial playing field that encourages the production and consumption of a variety of vegetables and fruits.

The farm bill is the single most important piece of legislation for the health of our nation. Our nation is in a crisis of health, largely caused by diet. This needs to be solved NOW. Do not continue to allow processed food to be cheaper than a simple apple or carrot!

Sincerely and respectfully,

TOBIAS LUNT.

COMMENT OF JAY LUSE, LEBANON, IN

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Jay Luse.
City, State: Lebanon, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am an independent farm real estate appraiser who uses FSA acreage figures analysis of the farm I am appraising and other farms which have sold. These acreages are a basic building block in my analysis. My appraisals are used for many purposes including estates, loans, divorces, partitions and eminent domain. Having the accurate and widely accepted FSA acreage figures available for use makes my work more accurate and generally eliminates the number of acres as a point of argument. It also eliminates my time in calculating acres, which tends to reduce the fee I must charge.

My report is confidential to my client, and I do not use the information outside the appraisal analysis.

Please modify Section 1619 to make the FSA acreage figures available to me and other qualified appraisers.

COMMENT OF JOSEPH LUTTER, ZELL, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Joseph Lutter.
City, State: Zell, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment: The Farm Service Agency CLU data should be reinstated into Section 1619. This data should be readily available to agricultural producers and professionals helping making informed decisions impacting agriculture today.

COMMENT OF KRISTIE LYON, ST. LOUIS, MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 16, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: Kristie Lyon.
City, State: St. Louis, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consumer, Housekeeper.
Comment: Monsanto is out of control. You have let them patent a seed, which is serious trouble. They have power to only have their seed used and if they use GMO seed we could all die. GMO causes organ failure, it is also very unhealthy. Please do not let Monsanto have all this power, please stop them. Please as it affects you too.

COMMENT OF SHARI LYON, MESA, AZ

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Shari Lyon.
City, State: Mesa, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Health Coach.
Comment: If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER M., POMPANO BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Jennifer M.
City, State: Pompano Beach, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Horticulturist.
Comment: Please stop supporting Factory Farms/CAFOs and start helping local plant based farms instead. Animal agriculture is cruel, unnecessary and pollutes our planet more than anything else.

COMMENT OF LUP MA, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Lup Ma.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Systems Developer.
Comment: Please diversify the food we eat. Thank you.

COMMENT OF DAVID MACIEWSKI, WORCESTER, MA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: David Maciewski.
City, State: Worcester, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I've worked for several seasons as a part-time organic farm hand, raising mixed vegetables on farms varying in size from a couple of acres in active cultivation (other land being fallow as part of good sustainable practice) to ten plus acres in active cultivation. I also have volunteered at a couple of different consumer-operated natural food coops so am familiar with a part of the reality of both producers and consumers of these foods.

For consumers, if there is any way to make organic less expensive, especially for low-income folks. I've just been reading a book "The One-Straw Revolution: An Introduction To Natural Farming" by Masanobu Fukuoka, and in it he makes the common sense point that if a truly organic method requires less inputs, it should be less expensive.

As a man in my mid-30's desiring at some point to work a farm on my own, and not knowing all of the politics (I will educate myself more and I appreciate all of the hard work of legislators and their aides), I ask these questions in ignorance: What is being done to help new growers access land; learn to grow the desired or needed crops and learn sustainable soil management; develop a successful business plan; and foster opportunities for growers to support one another and work collaboratively? For Mother Earth, and healthy communities both now and in the future, thank you for taking the time to read this.

COMMENT OF CATRIONA MACMILLAN, SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Catriona MacMillan.
City, State: Sydney, Australia.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Australian Food Advocate.
Comment: Lead the way, show support to the soil and the soul of your society your farmers . . . Please consider that decisions you make will effect the world. your agricultural policies influence many other nations. Please also note that lack of support of family farms and support of global corporate businesses like Monsanto have a negative effect on the standing of your food. why allowing GMO canola and corn contaminate your crops you have disadvantaged USA. Others countries do not want GMO USA and you have been reduced to giving it away free as AID.

Most of all please protect your farmers who farm and support families your agricultural workers, your rural towns and communities. they are the backbone of America. You can produce the food you need from your great vast land, each community that is lost to global homogensiation, to a massive factory farm, is a loss to humanity. in the great depression thousands of farmers committed suicide. suicide rates of farmers is increasing around the world as farm and farmers are replaced by massive factory farms and families lose their place in society

---

COMMENT OF JODY MADEIRA, BLOOMINGTON, IN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Jody Madeira.
City, State: Bloomington, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professor.
Comment: As a mother of four, I am very concerned about the safety of our food, in particular the effects of toxic pesticides and hormones being used in U.S. food. Few studies exist of how many of the substances that are applied to our crops and injected into animals affect the human body in the long term, although research suggests correlations such as that between pesticides and ADHD. More detailed research—and much more caution—is needed.

COMMENT OF SCOTT MAGNESON, CRESSEY, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, April 29, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Scott Magneson.
City, State: Cressey, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I feel strongly that we need a supply management system with mandatory basis. Our price for quota milk should return at minimum the cost of production, we need to do away with end-product pricing. End-product pricing discourages plants from being market oriented, causing surpluses that degrade product values which intern lower dairymen's prices.

NMPF is promoting programs that benefit 1–2% of the largest producers along with the processing industry, all you have to do is look at the state of our industry to see where their leadership has gotten us. It's time for the House leadership to follow a different path before we loose all of our family farms and rural communities. NMPF and IDFA are working together to keep a policy of cheap milk where producers pay for all market development and all the risk that is associated with it.

COMMENT OF GRETCHEN MAINE, WATERVILLE, NY

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Gretchen Maine.
City, State: Waterville, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: We are dairy farmers in central NY state. We have farmed it for 43 years and last year was the worst year of our lives. Our income from milk was down $58,000 from 2008. We had to sell off our woodlot at 50% less than it would have brought the year before to make it through the summer. That woodlot was supposed to be our retirement fund.

It is my opinion that the Specter-Casey bill needs to be passed. It is the only plan out there that stands even a chance to save us. We have to have a cost of production. Specter-Casey does that. The processors all have a cost of production in their make allowance. We have all the risk, do all the work, put our blood, sweat, and tears into it, and right now the processors are the only ones getting rich—off of us. Imports of MPC's should be outlawed or at least kept in check. Specter-Casey does that. There has to be some kind of growth management. Specter-Casey does that.

The one thing that we absolutely do not need is more insurance. We can't pay for all the insurance that we have now! From what I hear, that insurance would cover some of our losses, but not all of them. So, what good would that be?

As a proud member of Progressive Agriculture Organization, I can say that this whole farm bill deal has not been fair right from the start. We have been shut out of all the hearings. The so-called North East Dairy Leaders are shutting us out of their hearings as did Sen. Gillibrand from her hearings and the PA people in Harrisburg. We have not had a chance to be heard, and I feel that we have been discriminated against. Therefore, you MUST take into consideration all the aspects of Specter-Casey, and not let the major players who don't want to see anything change rule.

COMMENT OF STEVEN MANDZIK, ARLINGTON, VA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Steven Mandzik.
City, State: Arlington, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Director, Green IT.
Comment: Farm Bill Feedback—I do not understand this bill at all. My grandma just passed away from obesity. She was too poor to get good food around her. I was once obese, my friends are. So why does this bill subsidize corn, soy, sorghum to such enormous effect?

Is that because we need more cows or fast food?

Why oh why is a fruit or vegetable a specialty crop?

U think that has anything to do with obesity or healthcare!

Uggh!

COMMENT OF KEVIN MANION, SANGERFIELD, NY

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Kevin Manion.
City, State: Sangerfield, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: AgriData mapping is a great tool and the information available ag field acreage totals and soil descriptions does not violate any private ownership issues. USDA should take time to fully understand that the information should remain in the public domain.

COMMENT OF J. RIVES "JUDGE" MANNING, JR., ROANOKE RAPIDS, NC

Date Submitted: Friday, May 14, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: J. Rives "Judge" Manning, Jr.
City, State: Roanoke Rapids, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Former Farmer/Current Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment:

McCoy Hackney Insurance Agency, Inc.

J. RIVES "JUDGE" MANNING, JR.,
Producing Agent,
[Redacted],
Roanoke Rapids, NC
[Redacted].

May 14, 2010

U.S. House Agriculture Committee

RE: Response to Testimony of Dr. Bruce A. Babcock

Dear Honorable Representatives:

I do not have the academic laurels that Dr. Babcock displays, but I do think that you should know someone who is different than one of your presenters at the Agriculture Committee hearing on Thursday, May 13, 2010.

I am J. Rives Manning, Jr. and I was born and raised now reside in Halifax County, NC. I attained a BS degree in Animal Science from NC State College. I farmed (row crops and livestock) for several years, then I was employed as Field Supervisor with the USDA/Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for five years. I trained and became an insurance agent in 1972, concentrating on Farm insurance. In 1981, I opened my own Independent Insurance agency and I signed up to sell and service Federal Crop Insurance. This was the first year that anyone, other than Federal Crop Insurance employees, was allowed to sell Federal Crop Insurance.

I have written, sold and serviced Federal Crop Insurance and the re-insured product, Multi-Peril Crop Insurance and have seen it evolve into what we now have. I have written coverage on Cotton, Corn, Peanuts, Soybeans, Flue Cured Tobacco, Wheat and Peaches here in eastern North Carolina. I have been active with the Independent Insurance Agents of North Carolina and the Independent Insurance Agents of America, where I have served on the IIABA Crop Insurance Task Force for several years.

Many of my insureds are insureds that I first wrote in 1981. They have received excellent service and are satisfied with the coverage and service provided by me and the company I represent. I have a relatively small "book of business," with policy size (Gross Premium) running from $240 up to $54,000 last year. The spread of my earned commission on these policies runs from $35.00 on the smallest up to $7,700.00 on the largest policy.

I give you this information about myself and my business, not to try to impress you with my academic credentials but to let you know that I have the knowledge, experience and credibility to provide you with some knowledge and insight into the Crop Insurance issue. I have been a client and purchaser of Federal Crop Insurance, when I was farming. I know the benefits of adequate protection for all lines of insurance for my insureds. I know the types of coverages that benefit the farmers in Halifax County and in Eastern North Carolina.

Farmers need to have protection for the money they put into their crops, whether they furnish it from their own savings or borrow it. Without Crop Insurance most of the farmers cannot borrow their "operating" money. The financial "lender" wants a guarantee that they will get their money back. Also the farmer needs to know that he will receive X Dollars from his crop at the end of the year, even if there is a drought, excessive water, hail storm, insect damage, wildlife damage, floods, or other natural disasters. They also need to know that they will receive a fair price for their production at harvest time.

I notice that Dr. Bruce A. Babcock has a very impressive list of academic credits. I even see he had a short stint at NC State University.

The information that I was most impressed with is found in his Disclosure Form. In his response to Item #1 I found his list on the back of the form to be very interesting. It seems that he has received over $1,400,000 from USDA since October 1, 2007. This is almost like the "old robber barons and their hired guns". Is that what Dr. Babcock is, a "Hired Gun" for RMA.

I sincerely hope that any cuts that you make do not make it so that an agent cannot afford to serve the American farmers.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

J. RIVES MANNING, JR.

COMMENT OF GERARDO MARIN, OAKLAND, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:06 p.m.
Name: Gerardo Marin.
City, State: Oakland, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

July 28, 2010

Dear House Agriculture Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments as part of this 2012 Farm Bill Field Hearing series. We are a coalition called REAL (Respect. Eat. Act. Live.), a group of youth, youth organizers, and adult mentors working to change our food system to one in which the healthy and ethical choice is the easy choice for all Americans—regardless of age, income level or geographic location.

We feel that it is our responsibility and our right to achieve this goal. We strongly hope that during the farm bill hearing process, we will have the opportunity to offer our testimony and feedback to help shape this important legislation that impacts all of us. Below, we have included our preliminary list of recommendations for inclusion in the reauthorized Farm Bill:

1. Youth Engagement: More than any other demographic, young people from low-income communities face the most risk resulting from today's current food system. Childhood obesity rates are skyrocketing, and diet-related chronic disease remains the leading cause of death for families living in low-income neighborhoods across the U.S. We urge Congress to invest in community based programs that teach youth about food and agriculture, provide employment opportunities for youth, and develop their capacity to lead their own communities and shape the food system of the future.

2. Urban Food Systems: In recognition of the role land use and planning has on impacting the experience of community space, we need federal support to develop model zoning codes for urban agriculture to flourish and become and meaningful part of the civic landscape.

- Increase incentives for sustainable urban food system development, including investment in community-owned healthy food retail, urban food processing and distribution centers, and access to and policies that encourage using and for urban food production.
- Expand the Healthy Food Financing Initiative to ensure that it benefits low-income urban consumers by providing access to affordable, nutritious, culturally appropriate foods, job creation, and economic ownership opportunities, and that this initiative supports existing growers and programs already providing these benefits for their communities.

3. Local Food Systems: The average American spends over $1,200 per year on 20 basic food items, including meat, dairy, and bread, while an average meal travels 1,500 miles from field to table. Invest in local food systems, including incentives for local, small-scale fruit and vegetable production, processing infrastructure for meat and produce, and local distribution infrastructure, to help keep consumer dollars circulating in local communities, supporting small-scale growers, preserving open space, creating local jobs, reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while increasing the freshness and nutritional quality of food consumed. Expand and invest in Community Food Projects to help achieve this goal.

4. Labor: America's food system workers continue to face abuse, often earning less than minimum wage or being forced to work overtime without compensation. These workers are also exposed to harsh and sometimes toxic working conditions, including chemical pesticide application, extended hours in the sun, and minimal water, shade, or bathroom breaks. Channel resources to ensure oversight of working conditions and contractual agreements that abolish human rights abuses in the field. Incentivize provision of housing and healthcare for farm workers. Ensure safe, humane, and fairly compensated working conditions in all sectors of the food system, including the field, the meat processing industry, and the restaurant industry.

5. [*Editor's Note:* the comment was incomplete as submitted.]

Whole Child Approach: Numerous studies have documented the impact of inadequate nutrition on school performance and physical health.

- Increase funding for schools to purchase more fruits and vegetables, and increase flexibility for schools and the Department of Defense Fresh program to purchase local and regional foods to support local growers.
- Continue to support free, reduced, summer lunch and after-school programs for low-income communities. Direct dollars to support kitchen construction for school districts to prepare fresh food for meal programs.

7. The Environment: In many ways, farmers are, more than any of us, stewards of the land, air, water, and wildlife habitat.

- Increase incentives for growers to implement environmental quality programs, including programs that increase wildlife habitat, protect our water quality through the creation of tailwater ponds and the use of recycled water, reduce the runoff of nitrogen and chemical inputs and conserve the health of our soil for generations to come through conservation tillage practices.
- Incentivize conversion to organic or beyond organic farming techniques to minimize the consumption of fossil fuels in the development and use of chemical inputs, to protect the soil, and to protect wildlife (including pollinators) from the harmful impacts of synthetic chemicals. The Institute of Science and Society estimates that by switching to locally-based organic agriculture we could cut global warming pollution by 30% and save ⅙ on energy use.
- Reward farmers who demonstrate stewardship of land, air, water, and wildlife through these and other practices, by expanding and streamlining the EQIP program

8. Beginning Farmers, Ranchers, and Retailers: The average age of the farmer in the United States is 57, yet the largest growing population of farmers is under 30.

- Provide infrastructure, entrepreneurship training, and technical assistance for beginning farmers to acquire land, access to markets, and other resources to become successful farmers.
- Simultaneously, provide entrepreneurship training, tax incentives, and technical assistance for consumers, particularly low-income consumers, to establish health local food retail stores within their own communities.

9. Global Food System: U.S. commodity programs, coupled with international trade agreements, including NAFTA and U.S. global aid policy, negatively impact the livelihood of small growers around the world, particularly in the global south, resulting in urban and transnational migration. Work in concert with the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Development to ensure that our agricultural and trade policies support the well-being of small farmers around the world.

10. [*Editor's Note:* the comment was incomplete as submitted.]

11. Nutrition Assistance Programs:

- Create new and expand existing programs that encourage the use of WIC and food stamp dollars at farmers markets and on locally produced fruits and vegetables.
- Simultaneously invest in incentives for farmers markets and local retail stores to promote the purchase of fruits and vegetables at these venues by WIC and food stamp recipients.

12. Commodity Reform: Our outdated commodity system is hurting all Americans. Corn subsidies, in particular, which result in cheaply priced products containing high fructose corn syrup, are contributing to high rates of obesity and diabetes in our communities, and to the skyrocketing costs of healthcare for all Americans. Low grain prices also result in cheap animal feed, incentivizing inhumane, industrial production of livestock, In addition to hurting Americans, U.S. commodity programs compromise the livelihood of small farmers around the world, resulting in poverty, hunger, and urban migration. Create new policies that limit and phase out commodity payments for large farms while protecting and supporting small and mid-size farmers that are growing real food that nourishes people.

We thank you again for the opportunity to submit our comments as part of this hearing process, and look forward to the opportunity to engage further in planning for the reauthorization of the 2012 Farm Bill.

Sincerely,

NAVINA KHANNA,
On behalf of:
REAL Executive Team
ANIM STEEL,
BRETT RAMEY,
GERARDO MARIN,
LLOYD NADAL,
SAM LIPSCHULTZ,
SIENA CHRISMAN,
TIM GALARNEAU,
KATE CASALE.

COMMENT OF TARA MARKS, PITTSBURGH, PA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Tara Marks.
City, State: Pittsburgh, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Co-Director for Policy and Communication.
Comment: Just Harvest is a regional nonprofit focusing on eliminating hunger and poverty in Allegheny County. We advocate for policy change and provide direct service, helping families with tax preparation, applying for SNAP benefits and accessing other safety net programs. In the last year we helped more than 2,200 families receive $4.3 million dollars in tax refunds; we also completed over 1,500 SNAP applications for families in Allegheny County, up more than 400% from the previous year.

Many people are struggling against hunger during challenging economic times. Unemployment and underemployment are serious problems. The BLS estimate of unemployment/underemployment in Pennsylvania for the period April 2009 through March 2010 is 14.3%. Over the past year we have helped many families and individuals access public benefits for the first time.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly Food Stamps), The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) provide important food supports to people struggling with food insecurity.

Hunger and food insecurity are serious problems in our community. 17.8 percent of residents of the 14th Congressional district of Pennsylvania reported that there had been times in the past 12 months when they did not have enough money to buy food that they or their family needed.

SNAP is important to recipients and the economy. Each dollar in federal SNAP benefits generates $1.84 in economic activity. We applaud steps Congress took in the 2008 Farm Bill, the 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, and the

FY 2010 Department of Defense Appropriations Act to boost SNAP benefits for clients and administration supports to states. Future action is needed to ensure that the value of the ARRA benefit boosts do not erode with food inflation.

SNAP is effective but its reach is undermined by gaps in access and adequacy of benefits as well as by administrative burdens. Even with the ARRA boosts, the average SNAP benefit per person per day is only about $4.50.

Recommendations for changes include: improve benefit adequacy by replacing the Thrifty Food Plan with the Low Cost Food plan as the basis for SNAP benefits; increase the minimum benefit (especially to help elderly many of whom now only receive $16 a month); restore eligibility to legal immigrants; permanently suspend time limits on able-bodied adults (18–50) without dependents; and provide greater supports for states, including for SNAP administration and outreach.

SNAP is an important part of an anti-hunger and anti-poverty agenda. SNAP allotments need to be raised to allow families to afford a nutritious diet on a regular basis. SNAP Nutrition Education and access to supermarkets and farmers' markets EBT contribute to good health outcomes.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please contact me to speak about the realities of hunger and poverty facing our families in Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

TARA MARKS, *Co-Director,*
Just Harvest,
[Redacted],
Pittsburgh, PA,
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF AMANDA MARSHFIELD, MARCELLUS, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 10:36 a.m.
Name: Amanda Marshfield.
City, State: Marcellus, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: Something NEEDS to be done about the current milk pricing system. There needs to be some way that the price farmers receives correlates to the price milk is sold for in the supermarket. We are tired of hearing how all of these milk processors are making billions while farmers are pinching pennies grasping to save the farm and their way of life. The American farm is under financial attack and it's about time somebody started realizing that without our Farms our Country is headed towards major disaster!

COMMENT OF CAROL MARTIN, ASHLAND, ME

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Carol Martin.
City, State: Ashland, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Office Assistant/Appraiser Assistant.
Comment: In my work, we do mostly farm properties, we need assess to these maps.

COMMENT OF KENT MARTIN, KAHOKA, MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Kent Martin.
City, State: Kahoka, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

Sir:

I am a real estate appraiser trying to do my job. Since you have stop us appraisers from receiving information from the USDA offices on FSA Maps especially, you have cost the consumer for us to spend more time than you can believe, having the

customer to pay more. You all have carried the restrictions to far and creating a mess. It does severely limit the information to the lenders on what is out there. There is no other source. Please provide us appraisers to the USDA for information on maps and production records including CRP Payments.

We just can not do a good job without this information.

KENT MARTIN.

COMMENT OF NICOLE MARTIN, BATON ROUGE, LA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Nicole Martin.
City, State: Baton Rouge, LA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nutrition and Lifestyle Coach.
Comment: Our future health depends on good, clean, WHOLE foods not tainted with chemicals and genetic modifications. We can prevent much disease and enhance many lives by simply growing healthy food.

I strongly urge you to support quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology.

Thank you,

NICOLE MARTIN.

COMMENT OF PATRICE MARTIN, HOMEWOOD, IL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Patrice Martin.
City, State: Homewood, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Social Worker.
Comment: I have made many efforts in the last two years to eat more locally—by growing my own garden, going to the local farmers market and recently joined a CSA for meat. I believe that by eating locally grown food that I am contributing to many causes: me and daughter's health, supporting small businesses, helping the environment by reducing all the energy costs/waste it takes to transport food and enjoyment of food that is fresh and tastier.

I am most frustrated by the school lunches provided by the schools—I believe our children deserve better than eating processed food. As a single mother that works full-time, I often depend on the school lunch program. So, I would love to see aggressive efforts to incorporate fresh, local foods into the school lunches. Maybe offering subsides for farmers that grow fresh fruits and vegetables would help the costs go down so that school districts could afford this.

Thank you for interest in our opinions!!

COMMENT OF ROBERT MARTIN, MODESTO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Robert Martin.
City, State: Modesto, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Nuts.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: If you are for the ag community, why is the Administration cutting back on supporting the crop insurance programs and funding. You are causing a greater demand for government control by eliminating the private crop insurance programs.

COMMENT OF RON MARTIN, STEELE, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Ron Martin.
City, State: Steele, ND.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment: From the comments I get from farmers is that the ACRE and SURE programs are a lot of work and red tape and then you have to wait so long for your money. Please take the monies designated for those programs and stick them in the crop insurance program to improve it. Claim checks get to farmers a lot quicker than the program monies. Please do not let Congress cut any subsidy to farmers to help buy crop insurance. The subsidy goes a long way in helping a farmer with buy-up coverage to increase protection. Remember the government does get premiums back from the farmers for their insurance protection which helps cover the cost of the insurance. There are no premiums collected for the ACRE and SURE programs.

COMMENT OF CHAD MARTINSEN, ELGIN, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Chad Martinsen.
City, State: Elgin, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified General Appraiser.
Comment:

Dear Congressman Adrian Smith,

Please ask for the CLU data (FSA Fields) to be made public again. I am an Ag Appraiser, this information is crucial for analyzing sales for accurate appraisals. This information gives the reader/lending institution a good grasp of the market conditions for solid lending practices. This information is used to make an informed lending decision. We must have this information reinstated.

Thank you,

CHAD MARTINSEN.

COMMENT OF JUDITH C. MARVIN, LEWISBURG, PA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 5:03 p.m.
Name: Judith C. Marvin.
City, State: Lewisburg, PA.
Comment:

Dear Representatives,

I am writing in support of a comprehensive 2012 Farm Bill.

America needs its small farms. Please help ensure their continued existence. American farmers are basic to the American identity.

People in large cities who have had no connection with farms are flocking to farmers' markets to BUY FRESH LOCAL FOOD.

PEOPLE DO NOT WANT TO EAT FOOD FROM CHINA AND OTHER COUNTRIES WHERE FRAUD AND CONTAMINATION ARE COMMON.

I support the use of renewable energy on farms, and the using of waste products, such as wheat chaff, for biofuels.

I support increased conservation measures, to ensure buffers that clean our water, habitat for wildlife, a diversified landscape. Farmers need to provide homes for native pollinators and creatures that eat pests.

Thank you,

JUDITH C. MARVIN,
[Redacted],
Lewisburg, PA.

COMMENT OF PAUL MARX, CORNING, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Paul Marx.
City, State: Corning, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Director—Nonprofit Organization.

Comment: Funds for food distributed through community food banks and funds for food stamps are important avenues to assure that all of our citizens receive their daily food needs.

Please consider adding/increasing funding of community garden project and community garden schools as a way of getting the whole of our population to begin to use the gift of fertile soil in their back yards and community properties. There is a need to re-teach Americans how to grow food that will lead to healthier lives and have some of their daily food needs met by local sources.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL MASLEY, MANVILLE, NJ

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Michael Masley.
City, State: Manville, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support home-grown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.

- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.
- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF JEFF MASON, JEFFERSON, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Jeff Mason.
City, State: Jefferson, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy Retail.
Comment: I support to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway, especially due to the following circumstances:

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF DAVID MASTEN, GREENCASTLE, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: David Masten.
City, State: Greencastle, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: Please reinstate CLU data back into Section 1619. As a farm appraiser, this data helps provide accurate, up-to-date information on land characteristics, which allows for better, more accurate, well-supported appraisals, which can in turn limit potential losses due to incorrect appraisals. Thank you very much for your consideration.

COMMENT OF LOY MATTHES, RAPID CITY, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Loy Matthes.
City, State: Rapid City, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ranch/Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

July 26, 2010

RE: Common Land Units should be available to the general public.

Dear House Agriculture Committee,

USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

I urge you to allow public access to the CLU (Common Land Unit). I provide written appraisal reports for landowners, lenders, and estates. Not having the CLU information available only hinders the accuracy of the report for my client(s).

Sincerely,

Loy Matthes, A.R.A.,
State Certified General Appraiser:

South Dakota
Nebraska
Wyoming

d.b.a. MATTHES LAND COMPANY, LLC,
[Redacted],
Rapid City, SD
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF JUDITH MATTSON, TUCSON, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Judith Mattson.
City, State: Tucson, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Writer/Consultant to Local Producers.
Comment: Something must be done to separate rules and regs created to address "big ag" that have frequent unintended consequences for "little ag"—the forefront of the "back-to-real-food", know your farmer/know your food, return to all things

local and small supplier preferences of many Americans today? It's not just a matter of preference any more; it's an issue of the food and health sustainability of all communities! It shouldn't be necessary to fight this fight over and over every time the USDA, FDA and others have new or revised legislation and regulations! Please find a way to address this re-localization and small producer issue within the next Farm Bill—once and for all! Thank you for listening.

COMMENT OF JENIFER MAY, YONKERS, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Jenifer May.
City, State: Yonkers, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Restaurant Employee.
Comment: Please help the farmers. lets get back to eating real food, and not chemically processed garbage. this stuff is going to kill our kids!! All this *Salmonella* and *E. coli* . . . its gross!!!!

This shouldn't be happening . . . we need reform!!!!!!!

COMMENT OF GABRIELE MAYER, OKEMOS, MI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Gabriele Mayer.
City, State: Okemos, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: My husband is from North Dakota where his brothers farm 8,000 acres. When I met my husband 23 years ago, his family farmed wheat, soybeans, Northern beans, sunflowers, barley, corn and maybe more crops. Today all is left is soybeans and corn, nothing that I can consume directly. I know that his family is the recipient of large farm subsidies but I would very much encourage you to consider supporting small farms that actually grow produce that the consumer wants. The large family operation uses machinery that can easily cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, they spend huge amounts of money on seeds, fertilizer, herbicides and pesticides but at the end of the year, when all loans are paid back the actual family net income is not that high. Isn't there something wrong in the way we farm?

COMMENT OF LYNNE MCBRIDE, LAFAYETTE, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Lynne McBride.
City, State: Lafayette, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Director, California Farmers Union.
Comment:

California Dairy Campaign and California Farmers Union Testimony

Dairy operations throughout California continue to be in serious jeopardy due to record low producer prices. Many dairies have either filed or are in the process of filing for bankruptcy and many more are closer to bankruptcy each day. Many of the dairy operations near bankruptcy today have been in operation for several generations. They are family dairy farms that have weathered many economic storms, but the crisis they confront today is unparalleled in history.

From the third quarter of 2008 until the second quarter of 2009 dairy producers lost more than $1.4 billion dollars and producer continue to operate at a significant loss today. In addition farm values decreased by more than $1.2 billion during that time and today farm value declines are estimated to have reached $2 billion statewide. Feed and other input prices remain high and producer prices continue to be well below the average production costs.

The toll the dairy crisis has taken on dairy producers and related industries that supply and provide services to dairy producers will be felt for years to come. Even if dairy producer prices continue to improve, it will take five solid years of prices at $1 per hundredweight over production costs for producers to be able convert their debts to assets. Given the volatility of dairy producer prices, it is unlikely even under the most optimistic scenarios that producer prices will remain strong for that length of time.

Money is being made in the dairy industry, but producers are left out of the profit opportunity. Dean Foods Co., the largest U.S. milk supplier, reported last Monday that its third quarter profit rose 32% and raised its full-year profit forecast. Executive compensation at Dean Foods is up more than 50 percent from last year. According to Morningstar, Kraft Foods has a four star rating and executive compensation there is up by more than 60 percent. The gap between the farm and consumer dairy price is near an all time high. Many companies have prospered at the expense of dairy producers who are unable to pay their bills and are accumulating debt at unprecedented levels. Under the current system, plants are able to cover their production costs while producers do not have that ability. The gap between the farm and retail dairy price is near an all time high which shows that consumers do not benefit from the current system either.

CDC and CFU members traveled to Washington, D.C. extensively in 2009 calling on the President and Congress to take action to end the dairy crisis caused by record low producer prices. One important step taken by USDA Secretary Vilsack was his decision to raise the support purchase price. Since the beginning of 2009 CDC and CFU members have called on federal lawmakers to raise the support purchase price to a more reasonable level. CDC and CFU members met in person with Secretary Vilsack to urge him to take this important step which he announced in July of this year. Due to the current pricing system, California dairy producers do not benefit from this important safety net that was intended to aid producers in California and around the country. We call on lawmakers to correct this inequity so that producers in California receive the higher of the prevailing market price or the USDA announced federal support purchase price.

During discussions of the current dairy crisis it is often suggested that producer income in previous years could make up for the current economic shortfall. But the data on the "average dairymen's" monthly incomes and losses proves that it will take many years of profitability to regain lost equity. Acceptance of the alternative proposal we have put forward would be a good first step toward correcting inequities in the system and improving the outlook for dairy producers in the future.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for producers to pay their feed and other input costs when producer prices are so far below production costs. As a result, low dairy producer prices are having a ripple effect on the rest of the state agricultural economy and all related businesses. At the same time that producer prices have dropped, input costs continue to remain high.

Under the current system, producers are not able to recoup their higher input costs from the market. It is the processors and retailers who have that ability, not the producers.

We believe the current make allowance system overall sends a false signal to processors to continue production regardless of market demand. The current fixed make allowance system provides a strong incentive for processors to run as much raw milk through a plant regardless of market conditions. The result from this system is that it puts the needs of the processor at odds with the needs of the dairy producer. Too much milk reduces the price to the dairy farmer and milk shortages decrease the amount of milk available to the processor.

We believe the make allowance system should be reformed so that it provides benefits to the producer and processor. We favor the establishment of a variable make allowance that would tie processor and producer prosperity together. A variable make allowance would increase significantly when milk prices are high, thereby giving an incentive to the processor to continue production because the return would be greater. However when milk prices are low the make allowance would decrease and send a signal to the processor to limit production in order to allow demand to catch up with production. We believe a variable make allowance is a "win-win" proposal because it would enable producers and processors to make a higher return when milk prices rise.

Under the current pricing formulas, the plant make allowance is a fixed number; while the price received by the producer is highly volatile and until now, has not included the dairyman's cost of production. A milk pricing system that is balanced requires that dairy product prices, producers' cost of production, and plants' cost all be given consideration when determining the value of milk. Each of these items sends signals to the other in a free market environment, so that adequate price and production adjustments will occur.

Under a variable make allowance, when the supply of processed product is in line with demand, the make allowance is generous. As the market signals oversupply through lower prices, the make allowance would automatically decrease causing manufacturing to slow until once again supply and demand are in balance.

In California's milk pricing system there is insufficient marketplace balance between these factors, because the make allowance guarantees that the costs of the

processing segment of the industry are covered. In fact, since the make allowance includes costs plus a profit for an efficient plant, over supply can actually be a benefit to proprietary processors because it lowers the raw product costs. This is less true for cooperatives whose members are dairy farmers affected by lower producer prices.

The California dairy pricing system has allowed plants to be profitable and expand processing of the lowest value dairy products regardless of true market demand because producers covered the plant costs. This has resulted in lower producer milk prices in our state. The generous make allowance level enables processors to use the additional margin to discount their product price to gain market share at the expense of producer pay prices and at the expense of other manufacturers in the rest of the United States. Plants are merely operating by the rules of the system. The CDC variable make allowance proposal is aimed at creating a true market-oriented system.

As long as the manufacturing allowance is fixed at the processor's cost plus a return on investment, and is paid for by farmers, the processing segment of the industry will be unconcerned with market signals. We need a system that works with the marketplace at all levels: producer, processor, wholesaler, retailer and consumer to provide an equitable, stable and viable economic environment for all segments of the dairy industry.

Our members support a variable make allowance based on the relationship between the commodity price and the producer's cost of production. It is unfair and market distorting to force the producer to continually cover the costs of processing including a profit, when he has no similar compensation guarantee. It is far from certain if and when a producer is able to cover his production costs. Market signals should be sent to both the producing and processing sectors of the industry and our variable make allowance proposal achieves this important goal.

California leads the nation in dairy production generating more than $61 billion in economic activity and more than 434,000 full-time jobs. The dairy crisis is adversely affecting all the related businesses that supply and provide services to dairy producers. Dairy producers across the country face the same grim outlook due to record low producer prices that cover just a fraction of the average cost of production.

In order to end the dairy crisis it is vital that dairy producers come together to agree upon policy changes that will lift our industry out of this deepening crisis. Prices have remained below production costs for more than 18 months now and many dairy producers are desperate for relief.

There is considerable and widespread consensus among dairy producers and their allied industries about what should be done to improve federal dairy policy end this crisis.

Increase the Dairy Support Purchase Price

In order to be effective, the dairy support purchase price must factor in today's cost of production so that is can provide a meaningful safety net during crisis like the one faced by producers across the country today. We support a temporary emergency floor price of $18 per hundredweight to provide immediate relief to producers. We call for an increase in the federal support purchase price to the level included in the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program, which is the Boston Class I price plus the feed adjuster.

The federal government supports the price of dairy products at $9.90. This is the price milk producers received 30 years ago. We call upon Congress to act quickly to adjust the federal purchase price so that it includes the current cost of production, not the costs paid to producers more than 30 years ago.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) during the last Administration publicly stated that the price support needs to be at the cost of production. We call upon Congress and the Obama Administration to act quickly to adjust the federal purchase price so that it includes today's cost of production, not the costs paid by producers more than 30 years ago.

The recent devastation of the dairy industry can be attributed to a number of factors including the financial meltdown that began last fall, rising concentrated dairy imports, a lack of competition in the marketplace, consolidation, rising input costs and other factors. To be an effective safety net, the price support program must be increased in response to rising production costs.

The U.S. is already a net deficit milk producer. Federal dairy policy should foster a healthy and viable domestic milk supply because each cow in the U.S. generates $20,000 per year to the national economy. In these uncertain financial times, it is critical that dairy producers receive a fair price that is based on their full cost of

production. An equitable price support that more closely reflects the prevailing cost of production would be an important first step in ending the dairy crisis.

Implement Fair Tariffs on Unregulated Dairy Solids

Concentrated dairy imports for January and February of 2009 surged upward more than 70 percent compared to 2008 despite record low producer prices. Much attention has been paid to the decline in dairy exports. But rising imports of concentrated dairy proteins are the real threat to the future of our domestic milk supply. With these imports a little goes a long way in displacing domestic milk production and most do not meet basic food safety standards.

It is difficult to comprehend the impact of concentrated dairy imports because these imports, including milk protein concentrate (MPC), casein and caseinates for food usage, are not included in the commercial disappearance data issued by USDA. A 2004 USDA Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) report titled, "Milk Protein Products and Related Government Policy Issues" stated that the amount of imported milk protein concentrates accounted for 5.9 percent of the total U.S. milk protein production. The report concluded that on average milk protein imports are equivalent to approximately five percent of our domestic milk protein production.

The U.S. dairy market is the world's largest single commercial dairy market. This market last year reached and exceeded 200 billion pounds of milk including exports. However, the USDA ERS fails to include any usage data for casein, caseinates and MPC in its commercial disappearance of milk data. Therefore, the commercial disappearance or utilization reports from USDA ERS are not complete or accurate. Once all the different categories are included in the commercial disappearance calculation such as casein, butter, MPC, and lactose the total for imports surpasses 15 billion pounds of milk equivalent or more than 7 percent of U.S. milk production. Just a few percentage changes in milk consumption can have a significant impact on producer prices. Concentrated dairy imports amount to more than 7 of our domestic milk production and have a substantial impact on the prices received by U.S. dairy producers and have made our country net deficit in milk production.

Dairy producers have fought for years to pass legislation to regulate dairy imports by supporting passage of the "Milk Import Tariff Equity Act." So far, dairy processors and food manufacturers, with their well funded lobbying firms, have fought off any regulation. To end the dairy crisis, lawmakers need to direct their attention to the dairy imports that are flooding our market and forcing so many operations to the brink of financial collapse.

As consumers become more interested in where their food comes from, a trade loophole is allowing a flood of concentrated dairy imports from far off places. Our country already relies on dairy imports to meet our domestic needs, and if action isn't taken soon we are going to become even more dependent on imports.

Mandate Greater Market Transparency

In order to establish an effective dairy price discovery system the federal government must restore fair, transparent and open dairy markets. The consolidation that has occurred over the past couple of decades has eliminated market competition to the point that now the last one percent of our daily milk production determines the price of all of the milk produced regardless of prevailing market demand for dairy products.

A handful of traders set the prices for cheese and butter on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME). This thinly traded market operates for only a few minutes five days per week yet it is the mechanism that sets all milk futures contracts. The CME completely lacks transparency. Traders use code names to guarantee their anonymity. Capitalism and the interests of society are trumped by a handful of traders that are self-regulated with virtually no over site. Dairy producers across the country are very concerned that the lack of federal oversight and transparency at the CME has led to market manipulation, and created a highly volatile market that negatively impacts dairy producers.

Due to the lack of transparency at the CME, producers that may be economically impacted by anti-competitive trading practices, have no recourse to independently inquire or investigate the lack of competition in the marketplace. If the CME was more open and transparent, more businesses would trade, and the sales volume would increase fostering a more accurate and reliable market that better reflects the actual value of milk in the United States.

In June 2007, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report on the spot cheese market titled, "Market Oversight Has Increased, But Concerns Remain about Potential Manipulation." The 2007 GAO report documented that few daily trades occur on the CME and a small number of traders account for the majority

of trades. The report further concluded that the CME is susceptible to potential price manipulation.

One of the greatest challenges facing U.S. producers and every other producer in the world is consolidation and concentration of the marketplace, which also drives market globalization. Capitalistic markets function properly when there is a balance of buyers and sellers. There are about 60,000 dairy farms marketing milk today through 200 cooperatives. Half a century ago, there were 180,000 dairy producers marketing through 1,000 cooperatives. While the number of farms and cooperatives continue to decline, the marketing presence of farmer-owned dairy cooperatives has actually expanded during the past generation. Despite this expansion there is less competition vying for producers at the co-op level, with more intervention by non-cooperatives and non-farmer controlled businesses.

Dairy cooperatives continue to grow in size and form strategic alliances with private entities. For example, my own cooperative, Land O' Lakes, sells a large portion of their cheese to Kraft Foods. The largest cooperative, Dairy Farmers of America, has ongoing agreements to supply milk to Dean Foods and Leprino Foods, and continues to expand its relationship with Fonterra. Cooperatives justify their actions by claiming they are subject to the growing demands of retailers. Wal-Mart, for example, wishes to consider no more than two suppliers for each food product it features in its stores across the U.S. The consolidation and concentration not only harm producers through lower prices, but also negatively impacts consumers with less choice at the grocery store.

In most U.S. metropolitan areas, one company, Dean Foods, has acquired the majority of fluid plants. Two corporations dominate the cheese sector; Kraft Foods at the retail level and Leprino Foods at the food service level. Regardless of which cooperative a U.S. producer markets his milk, at the end of the day the vast majority of milk is purchased by only three major buyers that dictate each market. Dean Foods dominates the fluid market, Kraft owns the retail market and Leprino runs the food service market. Until steps can be taken to end the stranglehold that these three entities have on the three major components of the dairy sector, competition will be stifled and producer prices depressed.

Economic power concentrated in the hands of a few players has essentially eliminated the price system, which capitalism is thought to rest. The farm-gate price is no longer cost plus profit; instead it is a command economy with a few corporate players dictating farm price. The loss of producer economic power is best illustrated by the widening gap between retail prices and farm-gate prices. While consumers continue to experience sticker-shock on dairy products, dairy producers are left with a shrinking percentage of the consumer dollar.

Many organic dairies throughout the country are also struggling due to the dairy crisis. Many have seen the price they receive for organic milk decrease substantially and are now subject to production caps. Organic dairy producers have invested heavily to meet organic standards, but now that many of the same corporate processors have entered the organic market, these producers are also struggling due increasing consolidation and concentration.

Establish an Inventory Management Program

Inventory management is sorely needed now more than ever. At the turn of the century the federal order adopted the California style make-allowance structure. This pricing mechanism establishes cost of production values for plants. These values remain constant whether the market is short or long. Plants become isolated from market conditions and are decoupled from capitalistic signals in regard to supply and demand.

Since the loss of parity in 1981, the gap between retail and farm-gate prices has continued to widen dramatically. As the mid 1990's approached, volatility constantly increased due to several factors including consolidation; introduction of futures contracts, and the U.S. became a net-importer. Establishing a milk inventory management program will ensure the stability of the marketplace and provide sustainability for all in the dairy industry and these benefits will also be enjoyed by retailers and consumers alike.

California dairy producers have been in a constant growth mode. When prices are good, we add cows; when prices go down, our bankers tell us to add cows in order to cash flow, even though, historically, California has had some of the lowest mail box prices in the nation. An effective inventory management system would provide an incentive for dairy producers to manage milk production to meet prevailing market demand. Producer price volatility is a threat the dairy producers in California and across the nation. The current system provides an incentive for dairy producers to simply maximize their production, especially when producer prices are high which can lead to lower prices due to the increase in supply that results. An inven-

tory management program could provide an incentive for smart growth in milk production that is based upon current market conditions. It would lead to the end of the boom and bust cycles that have plagued dairy producer prices for so many years and provide some stability in the future for all producers.

Conclusion

The outlook for dairy producers in California and across the country is grim unless Congress acts quickly to reform federal dairy policies. We call upon Congress to increase the dairy support price to factor in today's cost of production; address rising unregulated imports of concentrated dairy proteins; mandate greater market transparency and establish and inventory management program to balance milk supply with market demand.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify today and look forward to working with members of the House Agriculture Committee to end the dairy crisis and sustain our domestic milk supply in the future.

ATTACHMENT

California Dairy Resolution

Relative to dairy producers.

Whereas, California has been the nation's leading dairy state since 1993 and is ranked first in the U.S. in the production of total dairy product, butter, ice cream, yogurt, nonfat dry dairy product, and whey protein concentrate and is second in cheese production, and

Whereas, the dairy industry provides an economic impact of an estimated national average of $20,000 per cow per year, primarily in local economies, and

Whereas, dairy farming is the leading agricultural commodity in California generating more than $7 billion in revenue each year, and

Whereas, the California dairy industry generates more than $61 billion in economic activity and more than 434,000 full-time jobs, and

Whereas, the absence of profitable prices in the dairy industry for farmers, the lack of competition in dairy product processing ownership, as well as outdated regulations are causing an economic crisis among California dairy producers, and

Whereas, since last year, the price that dairy product processors pay farmers for their dairy product has dropped as much a 50 percent, and

Whereas, the primary safety-net for California dairy producers is the federal dairy product price support program of $9.90 per cwt., and

Whereas, the federal dairy product price support program does not adequately provide a safety net due to the fact that it is based on production costs from thirty years ago, and

Whereas, the federal government in 2006 implemented an ethanol policy mandate that has increased all feed costs to dairy producers in California, and

Whereas, the federal dairy product price support program does not account for this new federal energy mandate, and

Whereas, the federal dairy product price support program should maintain market prices near average operating costs in order to be successful. This will ensure that efficient producers are able to stay in business until prices recover; however, few efficient producers will have the protection at the current price support level, and

Whereas, California dairy product prices are set by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) cash cheese exchange. A June 2007 General Accounting Office (GAO) report on the CME states that the CME is thinly traded and is not a very competitive market. As a result, the CME should be reviewed and analyzed to determine if it is an effective and transparent price discovery mechanism; and

Whereas, the federal dairy product price support program needs to be at an adequate level to ensure California dairy producers have a viable, competitive and stable market free of manipulation, and

Whereas, a significant loss of capacity would create a dependence on imported dairy product and other dairy products and reduce our nation's food security, and

Whereas, concentrated dairy imports for January and February of 2009 surged upward more than 70 percent compared to 2008 despite record low producer prices.

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests that the President, Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture acknowledge the importance of the dairy industry nationwide as well as the unique aspects of the dairy industry region-by-region through:

(1) Updating the federal dairy product price support program to reflect today's cost of production;

(2) Implementing fair tariffs on unregulated imported dairy solids;

(3) Mandating greater market transparency.

(4) Establishing a milk inventory management program.

COMMENT OF SARAH MCCANN, PHILADELPHIA, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 8:06 p.m.
Name: Sarah McCann.
City, State: Philadelphia, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Administrative Assistant/Student.
Comment: I hope that farming policy can be adjusted to better serve our country's dietary needs. The high subsidies for unhealthy foods are making it next to impossible for many people to eat as well as they should. I believe subsidies should be used to encourage the purchase of healthy foods, instead of making the most unhealthy options—fast food—the cheapest.

COMMENT OF WALTER MCCLATCHEY, ALEXANDRIA, LA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Walter McClatchey.
City, State: Alexandria, LA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Lawyer.
Comment: I propose these considerations for the next farm bill:

1. Farmers and ranchers must have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so they can be the best stewards of our natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar and biomass.

2. A strategic base of our agricultural land is essential to our ability to produce and supply fresh, healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Farm policy must enhance land protection to address the threat to our land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.

3. We must increase production of and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers stay profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Congress and the USDA should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers' markets.

4. We need to build on the success of the 2008 Farm Bill by strengthening the ACRE Program.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF MARLENE MCCLEARY, UPPER SANDUSKY, OH

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Marlene McCleary.
City, State: Upper Sandusky, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Property & Casualty & Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment: I find it amazing that the House Agriculture Committee is already thinking about the next farm bill when the 2008 bill was not implemented timely. The Farm Service Agency recently received their THIRD BOOK on the SURE Program with the third set of changes. The FSA offices have not been given the necessary information, books and tools for the 2008 farm program on a timely basis. The information and training should have been done prior to the planting of the 2008 wheat crop. It does not appear that Congress or the Agriculture Committee realizes the "businessman" the farmer of today needs to be. The farmer/producer needs information in plain English in regards to any new farm bill and needs to have the information along with the FSA, and all other agricultural offices in a timely, organized fashion I do not know of any successful business that implements a new plan or direction for the business two years after it was supposed to be in effect. Please realize that producers do plan ahead and set goals for their operation. The agriculture of today is far past the "Hee-Haw" days. I also feel that it is a prob-

lem with different Farm Service Agencies interpreting rules, regulations, *etc.* differently. The training should make changes and implementation rules clear so that the offices are doing things the same way. Agriculture and farmers are so important to this great country. We do not want to get to the point that farmers give up farming in frustration. It is vital that the United States realize the importance of a safe food supply in this country. We do not want to get to the point that we depend on other countries for too much of our food supply. Think about what could happen if we do not take the agriculture community seriously. Do you want your children or grandchildren to have a safe good supply or do you want to make it a possibility that some day there could be an embargo on incoming food supplies to teach us a lesson. Do not think that is far fetched. Who ever would have thought that something as horrendous as the Holocaust could happen. Also, I am a crop insurance agent who feels the recent proposed cuts to the SRA and crop insurance program are too deep. I do understand that some cuts are necessary but feel that the proposed cuts will damage the program. A crop insurance policy is more time consuming than any commercial, home or auto policy. I work in a full service agency so I do know first hand.

COMMENT OF DALE MCCLURE, OMAHA, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Dale McClure.
City, State: Omaha, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I think its time for the American Farmer to step up to the plate and request the elimination of farm program payments! For years the farmers have said that they wanted their income from the market. With $4.00 corn and $10.00 soybeans the farmer does not need assistance from the government! Why do think that farm land prices are at record highs! So its time to dump the farm programs that cost money for no significant reason!

COMMENT OF CHAD A. MCCOLLESTER, SILVER CITY, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Chad A. McCollester.
City, State: Silver City, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager/Crop Insurance.
Comment: In the passing of the 2008 Farm Bill Section 1619 was slipped in at the last moment, and was not subject to public comment. As a Farm Manager and Crop Insurance Agent having access to accurate CLU data on a daily basis is a important part of my business.

While I understand the importance of privacy, I feel that Section 1619 has taken the spirit of privacy a bit too far. Please reconsider the inclusion of Section 1619 in the next farm bill.

- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Sincerely,

CHAD A. MCCOLLESTER, A.F.M.,
Accredited Farm Manager.

COMMENT OF PETER MCCREA, WESTPORT, CT

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:05 p.m.

Name: Peter McCrea.
City, State: Westport, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nonprofit.
Comment: Stop subsidizing agribusiness, GMO seeds, Monsanto-types, *etc.,* and instead support local small farmers and organic growers!

COMMENTS OF DAVID MCELHANEY, HOOKSTOWN, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: David McElhaney.
City, State: Hookstown, PA
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: The U.S. needs a full Animal Disease Traceability system, much like Australia. Minus a full traceability system, U.S. producers will be at a disadvantage on the world market. Traceability will be used as a non- tariff trade barrier. Other country's such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the EU have systems in place. Brazil is now working on a full traceability system similar to Australia's, at 200 million head of cattle, this will have dramatic effect on U.S. Beef Exports. Successful programs have been implemented for less than the U.S. has spent on an unsuccessful voluntary system, a mandatory traceability needs to be made law by Congress. Thank you.

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: David McElhaney.
City, State: Hookstown, PA
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: The U.S. needs to incorporate Ethanol production for dairy products (Whey) into energy and dairy policy as a long term solution to dairy over production. Country's such as Ireland and New Zealand utilize this as a means of reducing oil imports while insuring the future of the dairy industry. The CWT program has shown to be a very short term solution and also puts pressure on cull beef prices. USDA has done a study on this manor of Ethanol production in 2006. Thank you.

COMMENT OF ALLISON MCGARRY, FLINT, MI

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Allison McGarry.
City, State: Flint, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: My suggestion to the House Agriculture Committee would be to review and evaluate what crops this country subsides for farmers. Subsides for crops like corn and soy provides the foundation for much of the low quality, less nutritional food that is produced and sold in the United States. I feel this is one of the contributing factors to the obesity problem here and it limits the access to healthily sustainable crops to our nation's lower income communities. If the government provides subsidies to farmers, provide those subsidies to farmers who practice sustainable agriculture practices and grow food that is good for a person's health and not detrimental to it.

COMMENT OF KYLE MCGARRY, AMMON, ID

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Kyle McGarry.
City, State: Ammon, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agriculture Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Please make the CLU data public in order to for us to better serve our local farmers financial needs. The CLU data makes it possible to provide more accurate appraisals and decrease the cost of doing business.

COMMENT OF COREY MCGILLIS, PORTLAND, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Corey McGillis.
City, State: Portland, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Sales.
Comment: ACRE and Sure are programs that are very slow in getting money to the farmer. If that farmer needs that money, many times it will be late to help him/her in there situation. Crop Insurance is a much more efficient way to manage farmers risk. Take the money spent on ACRE and Sure and put it into the Crop Insurance Program. We all will admit that the program needs improvements however it is still the best form of protection that is available to the farmer. By allocating other money from ACRE and Sure, that could help to make more improvements and expand into other crops that are lacking proper coverage. Crop Ins checks can be issued within week of farmers signing there proof of loss. ACRE/SURE take up to 12–15 months. To slow and inadequate. Farmers in our area like crop insurance and do not prefer to go to the FSA if they don't have to. We spend a large amount of time helping them with ACRE because nobody seems to have a grasp of how it works. Also we can use the money for ACRE and Sure to increase subsidy to 85%, reducing the need for disaster payments. Cutting farmer subsidy, what Congress wants to do will hurt the program and increase the need for Disaster payments. Whole farms is a bad idea, doesn't fit in different areas of the country, and in our part we raise 9–12 different crops. That makes for poor risk management and banks would not be as willing to loan money. As the program stands now, banks like the program, it gives them protection for their risk. Lets work on making a good program better and stop trying to re-invent the wheel. It is fact that the government has made more money on the program than the industry. Why is it that when the government gets something fairly right, they work twice as hard to destroy it. This program is good for farmers, it is good for rural America, it works and with reallocated funding, it could become a whole lot better. Not to mention, I believe that the WTO do not score crop insurance negatively, I also see that as a plus for trade.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF SEAN MCGINTY, LUTZ, FL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Sean McGinty.
City, State: Lutz, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Training and Development.
Comment: The farm bill is a great Food Stamp support and development bill. However it does not address the nutritionally deficient aspects of our nations corporate food production. The government continue to help people become fat by the subsidization corn. Cows were not meant to eat a diet of whole grains. Nor does it address Monsanto and there GMO soy beans creating a monopoly in there industry. You want a farm bill I would be happy to support ban GMO food items that includes Monsanto and the cloned fish getting ready to enter the supply chain. I wish the Federal Government cared about what the nation was eating. Hopefully government run health care will open everyone's eyes, if we had clean foods with less processing the average weight of the nation would decrease and so would a host of managed care problems. Stop avoiding the source of a lot of problems just because they provide campaign dollars. There not paying enough in campaign cash and taxes to cover the health problems there products cause.

COMMENT OF TIM MCGUIRE, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Tim McGuire.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Photographer.
Comment: I want close regulation of companies like Monsanto making sure they do no harm to our food supply, environment, and ecosystems with their genetically modified products. We cannot allow these multinational corporate entities to do what makes them the most money. See what happened in the oil and banking in-

dustries lately? Don't let that happen with the big agribusiness conglomerates. They act first to make money and then think later when they get caught. Insects such as bees and birds and other animals who exist with these GMO's need to be studied for harmful affects from altering nature for profits. And it must be done long before the practice is widely used and approved. These are issues we cannot afford to take risks with as we have in other industries that should have been better regulated by the government.

Thank you for you time.

COMMENT OF WILLIAM J. MCHALE, STOCKTON, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 05, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: William J. McHale.
City, State: Stockton, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Delivery Driver.
Comment: We can produce amazing amounts of top-quality food here in the Central Valley. But I see fields going to the weeds and I see orchards dying of neglect. Farmers do NOT have enough water. We have all the water we need, but we allow it to go to waste for the sake of the Delta Smelt. GIVE ME A BREAK! Turn the Tracy pumps back on and put our agricultural producers back in business.

COMMENT OF VIRGINIA MCKAY, SPRAGUE, WA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Virginia McKay.
City, State: Sprague, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Please don't forsake agriculture for the animal rights such as HSUS and PETA. They claim 11 mil members then why were there only 1,000 people at last weeks national conference or in Oct. 2009 HSUS annual meeting in D.C. had only 18 people present, mostly board members. They had the meeting in a room designated for 60. Less than 13,000 cast ballots to elect HSUS board. They just don't have the numbers they claim. If and when the minority have control of our food supply they will have control of our country.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER MCKENDRICK, MANTI, UT

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Jennifer McKendrick.
City, State: Manti, UT.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Like many Americans, I would like to own my own organic farm and greenhouse. However, I settle in helping my parents with their garden. I am disgusted and outraged at the power of the corporations to hold little to no responsibility towards food safety and health. Pesticides, insecticides, genetically modified foods, and food additives are all a source of major concern to me. Illness and the health care system pay for these, and every person across the world. Please keep GMO's out of America's farms, and start to regulate food additives. Many of them have shown to be cancer causing. Please subsidize only organic farmers. We have enough chemical imbalance in this country, we don't need another catastrophe around the bend.

COMMENT OF TERESA A. MCLEAN, PH.D., WATKINSVILLE, GA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Teresa A. McLean, Ph.D.
City, State: Watkinsville, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Behavioral Scientist.
Comment:

Dear Committee Members,

I would like to urge you to make organic farming a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill. Besides being a behavioral scientist, I am a mother of young children. My husband and I are committed to feeding ourselves and children organic produce and farm products. I would like to see the support by our government increased for the producers of these products.

Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber to American consumers and consumers abroad.

I would like to urge you to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

1. Research and extension programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
2. Conservation programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
3. Transition programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
4. Crop insurance programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and support for making organic farming a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill.

Sincerely,

TERESA A. MCLEAN, PH.D.

COMMENT OF LIZ MCLELLAN, HALFWAY, OR

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Liz McLellan.
City, State: Halfway, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consumer.
Comment: Small meat producers desperately need regional mobile slaughter units so that their meat isn't ruined by travel to huge commercial slaughter factories. Please consider grants and subsidies to support rural development in this way.

STOP subsidies for petroleum dependant corporate agriculture.

MORE support for integrated sustainable small growers.

More regulation for corporate CAFOS—less for small producers.

COMMENT OF MONICA J. MCMANIGAL, CENTER, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, June 07, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Monica McManigal.
City, State: Center, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nebraska Knox County Assessor.
Comment: I am writing to you on behalf of Knox County, Nebraska. We wish to strongly urge the Agriculture Committee to make an adjustment to the current farm bill. The one piece of information that would help us greatly is allowing us to view the GIS layer that is now available to the local FSA Offices. In 2008, the bulk of information was made confidential and will not release this information to other governmental agencies. It contains no personal or owner information, nor actual crop production information. This information is recreatable, but at a substantial cost to the taxpayers.

We respectfully request that this GIS field layer be made available to other governmental agencies, including the county assessors. It would make identifying parcels more convenient for our office and we also feel that our information should be the same as the FSA records.

Thank you greatly for your time and we wish that our concerns will be heard and considered for the updating of the farm bill.

Sincerely,

MONICA J. MCMANIGAL,
Knox County Assessor Center, NE.

COMMENT OF MARY ANNA MCNAIR, DRISCOLL, TX

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Mary Anna McNair.
City, State: Driscoll, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Specialty Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: The Agricultural Family is dwindling slowly and dying a slow death. Before long, all of our food, clothing, and all necessary essentials will be imported. I do not want to rely on another country for basic necessities such as food, but if we do not do something to support the American Farmer more, that is exactly what is going to happen. He works from sunup to sundown and only asks for a reasonable price for his commodity but somehow the middle man always gets his share and unfortunately the farmer's share is almost nil. Without Federal Subsidized programs, such as crop insurance to help him with his expenses, he cannot survive. He pays RETAIL for everything he purchases and then sells his commodity for WHOLESALE! What a disservice we are doing to the backbone of our nation. He relies heavily on his crop insurance agent to help him manage his financial risk. Please do not cut subsidies any more for the farmer or the few people left in agriculture that help him survive. I SINCERELY DO NOT WANT TO HAVE MY CHILDREN AND MY GRANDCHILDREN STANDING IN FOOD LINES WAITING ON A SHIPMENT FROM A FOREIGN COUNTRY!!!! Please, please do not let this happen. Thank you for listening.

COMMENT OF SUSAN MCNAMARA, SOUTHAMPTON, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Susan McNamara.
City, State: Southampton, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Health Counselor.
Comment: I am writing to urge you to change the way food is subsidized in this country. The Farm Bill needs an update representing the needs of the people. Big agriculture should not be receiving our money, especially when the majority of their crops, corn, wheat, soy go to fast food production and feed lots. We need more fresh, local, clean food. Support local organic with your funding distribution.

COMMENT OF THOMAS MEEKINS, TOM, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Thomas Meekins.
City, State: Tom, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am a State Certified General Appraiser that appraises agricultural land in eastern South Dakotas for the past 18 years. The lack of access to FSA aerial maps affects my ability to accurately analyze comparable sales. With cropland values sometimes being twice the amount of pasture land, it is not hard to see where the analysis can lead to misleading values. Most of my appraisals are for banks and attorneys dealing with filing estate tax returns. This lack of FSA aerial maps for comparable sales can affect the bank's collateral value as well as the amount owned on estate taxes.

COMMENT OF JOEY MEIBERGEN, ENID, OK

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Joey Meibergen.
City, State: Enid, OK.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agribusiness.
Comment: Why is the United State still paying farmers to not grow a commodity. Especially when we are trying to pass environmental laws in the U.S. that will further distance U.S. competitiveness in Commodity Exports and make it even harder to feed the world's growing population. What does the average citizen in the United States get from CRP?? It sure has been a great taxpayer funded retirement program for what used to be a producer.

COMMENT OF JULIE MEISNER, HARPURSVILLE, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 04, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Julie Meisner.
City, State: Harpursville, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment:

Dear Honorable Sirs and Madam's of the House Agriculture Committee:

Please note: That the number of producing dairy farms in the United States in heading for a number below 60,000, down from 648,000 in 1970.

I am submitting this letter to state that we small dairy farmers are being systematically exterminated by the lack of for thought and understanding of the complexities of farming in 2010. We have the volatility of fuel and feed prices going up at the blink of an eye. And we are competing against corporations such as Dean Foods, whom now have their dairies and our own Co-ops who are only looking out for their next golf game with the Ag Secretary.

Not all farms have 1000 head of cattle, nor do we all have hired help. But, what we do have is hard working men and women trying to full fill our American dream of our businesses and take care of our families, by providing the American people and safe and reliable food grown here.

Fact: Dairy farmers need a fair and equitable price for their milk. There is a very wide difference between what is paid to the dairy farmer and what is charged to the consumer. Processors are allowed to charge back to the farmer a item called make allowance to secure their income profitability. But, there is no safety net like that for the American Dairy farmer Right now, 92% of milk produced in this country is valued at a price of 8% of the products sold, (Cheddar cheese—sold on the CME with very few buyers.)

Needed Change: The complicated milk pricing, needs to change to include all utilized milk and products made for consummation in this country and prices paid by consumers. It should not include imported products brought into this country and then put in to storage and then is included in our inventories and used in the equation for pricing.

Fact: Dairy farmers are required to pay for hauling of their milk to creameries.

Needed change: Creameries—processors should pay for milk at the farms, and should be required to pay for hauling.

Fact: Dairy farmers are required to sell their milk products in this country with a specific set of health standards.

Fact: Products are being imported into this country and used or food production that are not categorized as food grade. Therefore, the exporting countries and have an unfair advantage in the production of their milk and products sold here and utilized in the production of food for the American public. (Milk Protein Concentrates—MPC)

Needed change: The FDA should classify Milk Protein Concentrate as a food product, not as an industrial product. Therefore, the MPC's and products like them would be under the USDA and those safety requirements that the United States dairymen use in the production of milk and milk products used for the American people.

Fact: Parts of the United States produce more milk than is needed in their areas, and may have contributed to the over production of milk in this country.

Needed Change: Regional milk production and utilization of milk and its products should be included into a base-quota pricing plan such as Canada's for those specific regions, along with residency requirements. Regions in this country that have an excess in milk could be used to make MPC's for the companies that use it in their products here in the U.S.

Fact: Farmers are worried about buying quota, especially with the last few years of income.

Probable Change: Quota could be based on 5 years of production, taking out the highest and lowest and averaging the rest together, with each fall having an open quota building time of 3 months, if additional production was necessary. Thus after, the quota could be bought and sold giving the farmers added equity.

Fact: Farmers are unable to borrow money without adequate information regarding the price of their milk.

Probable Change: With the farmers knowing how they were going to get for their milk, they could actually, do reliable cash flow, including the purchase of base or quota if it was needed for their business. (There has been some reluctance on the use quota, because of the new farmer starting out. But if they have enough equity they will find the way.)

Fact: The American people are buying milk and milk products that may or may not be made in this country, but assume that it is.

Needed Changes: Country Of Origins labeling should include milk and its products. The Manufactures will say they cannot change the labeling on the carton. But, they have to put expiration date and where it was made on the carton. Putting the Cool Labeling on the carton could be added at that step, along with the percentage of that countries content in the product. This would be helpful to the American consumers, so that they would know where their food was coming from.

Fact: There may be a need to lower the cattle inventories in the United States.

Need Change: Instead of using CWT, a buyout program. Fellow farmers have suggested using our veterinarians and DHIA to cull cattle with diseases that we would like to eradicate. Such as Johnnes, BDV, mastitis *etc.*

Thank you for your time.

JULIE MEISNER.

COMMENT OF WOLF MELBOURNE, ROCKY MOUNT, NC

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 6:35 a.m.
Name: Wolf Melbourne.
City, State: Rocky Mount, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Military.
Comment: As a father of two young children entering school age I am concerned about the direction our nation is headed in terms of food policy and its effect of child nutrition.

If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

I appreciate the hard work and attention you all are giving to this subject. We have an opportunity to steer this nation towards a responsible food policy which supports rather than undermines child nutrition. Please seize it.

Respectfully yours,

WOLF MELBOURNE.

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH MELUGIN, RALEIGH, NC

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Elizabeth Melugin.
City, State: Raleigh, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Yoga Instructor and Seamstress.
Comment: Please make our farmers' food safe to eat. Cut the chemicals, cut the genetic engineering, cut the coast to coast transport. If subsidies are a necessary evil, then subsidize the farmers who grow organic. Offer incentives to the farmers

to encourage more of them to go organic. Please look into the correlation between the death of the small family farm and the fattening of America. I do everything I can to feed my family locally grown, organic produce and meats. It is not easy and it certainly is not cheap. Living in the south makes it easier for me than for those in more northern locales, but it is a challenge.

Another thought is this . . . you have got to fix the school lunch program. For far too many children it is the only meal they are going to get. And what do they get? Sugar laden breakfasts, deep fried lunches, and dessert every single day is what's on the menu. This is a government sponsored program. It almost looks like our government is trying to make our children fat, weak, and sick. Contract it out if you have to. I could cater my children's entire school lunch for what they're paying for the school lunch.

The fact that the cheapest way to get the most calories for our shopping dollars is to buy sugar and chemical laden junk is beyond wrong. Whole, fresh, local foods logically (to me) should be the least expensive. Those foods produced from many, many ingredients that are shipped repeatedly across the country should not. The system is broken. Please fix it. Please give our citizens access to the fresh healthy foods they need. Please.

COMMENT OF DR. JOAN P. MENCHER, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Dr. Joan P. Mencher.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Not-for-Profit Chair.
Comment: Considering the fact that there is a growing body of scientific data that shows how small scale, organic agriculture grown on farms with significant inter-cropping and the inclusion of trees and the rotation of crops can absorb CO_2 rather than adversely affect the climate on this planet, I strongly urge:

1. Enact a robust and well funded Conservation Title to support working lands conservation programs, conservation easement programs, and sustainable and organic transition assistance.

Farms and ranches make up more than half of the land mass of the lower 48 states. Farm polices driving the industrialization of agriculture have created a system of agriculture on these lands that is productive in the short term, but polluting, energy gulping and unsustainable over the long term.

Agriculture is the largest source of pollution of rivers and streams, affecting roughly half of total stream miles. Over 100 million acres of cropland continue to erode at levels that are unsustainable despite decades of soil conservation efforts stemming back to the Dust Bowl of the 1930s. Nearly ⅔ of threatened and endangered species are listed due in some part to agriculture and agro-chemicals. Human health, ecosystem health, food security and even our long term economic well being are all tied to how well farmers and ranchers steward these resources.

We urge Congress and the Administration to enact a Conservation Title of the 2012 Farm Bill that provides the technical assistance, cost share, and financial incentives necessary to ensure the long term productivity and stewardship of agricultural lands.

Long term sustainable food production will require an increasing emphasis on the adoption of conservation practices on lands in active agricultural production. We must defend, strengthen, and extend conservation compliance, which requires that farmers receiving federal farm program payments adopt conservation plans. Conservation compliance must apply to federal subsidies for crop insurance as well as any new revenue insurance program that may be adopted. In addition, the survival of prime grasslands depends on the adoption of strong uniform Sodsaver protections.

Working lands conservation programs must actively assist farmers to transition to sustainable and organic farming systems by providing the necessary technical and financial assistance. A shift to organic production and sustainable and grass-based livestock systems will yield environmental, economic, and public health benefits.

As we move closer to enacting comprehensive energy and climate change legislation, policy makers must recognize that the best structure available for shaping agriculture's response to climate change is the Conservation Title of the next farm bill. Whether to help farmers cope with climate change or to reduce green house gas emissions attributable to agriculture the basic tools to accomplish climate change mitigation and farmer adaptation are already in place.

Agriculture can make a substantial contribution to a shift toward renewable energy. That shift, however, must emphasize production of a new generation of cellulosic fuel stocks, strong sustainability criteria, and local and farmer ownership of production facilities.

Wetland, grassland, and farmland easement programs do much to protect America's fragile soils and critical ecosystems. These programs also offer opportunities for climate change mitigation, ecosystem regeneration, and refuge for wildlife. They need to be extended and strengthened in the next farm bill. The Conservation Reserve Program should include an easement option so that land that should be permanently retired from production has the appropriate conservation tool available. As other Conservation Reserve Program contracts expire it is essential that those lands come back into production under sustainable systems, which in most cases will be grass-based production.

2. Refocus federal farm program payments upon farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits and promote long-term food security.

Since the Great Depression, USDA has administered commodity programs for corn, wheat, rice, other grains, and cotton. For most of that time, the programs focused on reducing production and managing supplies to keep prices relatively constant. However, in the modern era, our federal farm programs have been transformed into pure production subsidies, encouraging overproduction of grain and cotton at tremendous cost to the environment and the family farmers they were intended to help.

The next farm bill may make some changes to the commodity programs. One simple-to-craft reform could be a re-allocation of a portion of current production subsidies to farmer conservation and farmer value-added business development. One obvious place for increased funding is the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP).

The CSP pays farmers for producing healthier soil, cleaner water, fewer greenhouse gases and greater biodiversity. It is the only program in the USDA tool kit that rewards sustainable farmers for the multiple and ongoing environmental benefits delivered by their farming practices.

This program can point the way forward for U.S. farm policy by providing a model for what the next generation of farm programs should look like. CSP rewards farmers for how they farm, not for what or how much they produce. CSP advances conservation practices on crop, pasture, range, and forested land and includes options that work for sustainable and organic operations, specialty crop farms, grazing operations, and diversified crop-livestock farms.

Feeding ourselves and future generations will demand the expansion of sustainable production practices on working agricultural lands. Programs that reward our best stewards and encourage other farmers to make the transition to more sustainable farming practices are crucial to our food security.

CSP is on track to sign up 25.6 million acres for 2009 and 2010, or over 50 million acres during this current farm bill cycle, and 115 million acres by 2017. We urge Congress and the Administration to significantly expand its commitment to this program by providing the funding necessary to reach a total enrollment of 230 million acres by the end of the next farm bill cycle in 2017.

3. Encourage and support the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

The future health and vitality of agriculture, the food system, and rural communities depends on the successful launch of a new generation of farmers and ranchers. Across the country, there is a groundswell of interest in agriculture among young people, farm raised or not who want to take up farming as a profession. Many new immigrants, women, and farm workers also aspire to becoming farmers.

Over the next two decades an estimated 400 million acres of U.S. agricultural land will be passed on to heirs or sold as farmers 65 and older retire (currently ⅓ of all farmland owners are retirement age). Transitions present opportunities for economic and social mobility. Given the opportunity, these new entrepreneurs can bring hope and capital to rural economies desperate for renewal.

Changes in farming practices also happen at the transition. This new generation of farmers has enthusiastically embraced sustainable and organic agriculture. These farming systems offer new market opportunities and oftentimes lower start up costs. And not incidentally, these systems produce more economic multipliers for their communities than raw commodities sold into the conventional market. Public policy needs to encourage and reward this generation's embrace of environmentally sound farming practices.

We urge Congress and the Administration to make a greater investment in beginning farmers and ranchers. The 2012 Farm Bill must ensure this new generation of farmers has the technical assistance, capital, access to markets and land it needs

to succeed. Federal assistance to beginning farmers should prioritize those establishing sustainable and organic farming operations.

4. Increase resources for research that fosters sustainable agriculture systems.

Agricultural research is a powerful and fundamental force that shapes our food and farming system. Publicly supported agricultural research has too often, and for far too long, produced technologies and tools that best serve industrial agriculture. This research fosters systems that strive for increased production at the expense of other important public values. The $2.5 billion USDA spends each year on food and agricultural research has produced a U.S. food system that is increasingly concentrated and focused on a narrowing base of crop and livestock breeds.

We urge Congress and the Administration to enact a Research Title that truly serves the interests of rural communities and our collective long-term food security. Our research, education and extension programs must focus on the full and diverse set of practical, economic and social challenges facing America. Environmental degradation, depopulation, the loss of mid-sized family farmers, the loss of biodiversity, and climate change all demand an expanded federal commitment to research that fosters sustainable and organic farming systems.

Publically supported research should be aimed squarely at technologies and systems that support small and mid-sized farmers. It should examine food systems, sustainable renewable energy production and public health issues. Most importantly, the only competitive grants program in the entire USDA portfolio to involve farmers and ranchers directly in research, the Sustainable Agriculture, Research and Education (SARE) program must finally be funded at a level that begins to meet the demand.

A renewed public commitment to classical plant and animal breeding is critical to conserving our dwindling genetic diversity. Increased genetic diversity will be vital in addressing global climate change, increasing pest pressure and our own food security. Sustainable and organic agricultural systems can contribute to the development of a new generation of seeds and breeds that are well adapted to local conditions and changing environmental conditions.

5. Reinvigorate regional agricultural economies and local food systems.

The surge in consumer demand for organically-produced food and agricultural products from local and regional markets offers a significant new opportunity for diversified rural development but we need to provide producers and their communities with the necessary tools to serve these new markets. Rising demand for these foods is an important incentive for farmers and ranchers, but many communities lack the processing and distribution infrastructure necessary for economically robust, sustainable food systems.

We urge Congress and the Administration to provide the capital and technical assistance necessary to rebuild the local and regional food infrastructure.

We applaud this Administration's commitment to the Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food Initiative. The grant and loan programs publicized through Know Your Farmer can provide the capital and technical assistance necessary for small and mid-sized farmers to respond to new market demand.

Mid-sized farms in particular are often too small to thrive in the international commodities markets but are well positioned to sell local and regional, organic and value added farm products directly to wholesale and institutional purchasers. Fostering these markets can help preserve those farms "in the middle," the farm size category that is shrinking the fastest, yet which is essential for the vitality of rural communities. Further, cultivating the growth of regional food systems can create jobs, retain more food dollars in rural economies and spark development opportunities.

Connecting food producers and consumers directly through existing USDA programs—when farmers sell directly to schools or when SNAP participants use their benefits to buy fresh, nutritious food at farmers markets—makes economic sense and ensures that the Nation's nutrition safety net is doing its job while also strengthening the bottom line for America's family farmers.

6. Ensure fair and competitive agricultural markets.

Large segments of the nation's food supply are dominated by a handful of corporations. Family farmers and ranchers are facing markets for the sale of their products that are increasingly concentrated in fewer and fewer firms. This is especially true in the livestock and poultry sectors. In an attempt to gain market access, farmers and ranchers enter into production or marketing contracts with corporations that have far greater bargaining and market power.

We urge Congress and the Administration to ensure more market channels, greater bargaining power, and strong rules that ensure fair contracts for producers. Fair contracts and competition will allow producers to provide consumers with a greater diversity of higher quality and fairly priced goods.

7. Fully recognize the inherent value of sustainable and organic farming systems in addressing climate change.

Conventional agriculture is a ravenous consumer of fossil fuels and producer of greenhouse gases. Yet, our federal farm and energy policies continue to reward intensive row-cropping, corn ethanol production and large-scale confined livestock production systems. These systems are all heavily dependent on mechanization, chemical fertilizers, and pesticides. These systems are specialized, brittle and susceptible to collapse under the weight of climate change.

To best address climate change, federal farm policy must emphasize farming systems that can best help farmers cope with climate change and reduce the overall level of green house gas emissions attributable to agriculture.

Research confirms that sustainable and organic farming methods when compared to conventional agriculture can result in the reduction of nitrogen use and pollution. Studies also show that over the long term, organic crop rotations show increased yield and steadily improved soil quality over conventional systems. These systems are diverse, resilient and best suited to coping with the variability of weather and pest pressures resulting from climate change. They consume less fossil fuel and sequester more carbon than conventional agriculture. They also offer the most sustainable means of producing on farm renewable energy.

8. Reform commodity payment programs.

Commodity programs offer farmers production subsidies for commodity crops like corn, rice, cotton, and soybeans. While some payments are made when commodity prices are low, a majority of payments are made regardless of whether prices are high or low, and can be made even when a crop is not grown. A disproportionate share of benefits goes to the largest farms, with the largest one percent of farms receiving about a quarter of total benefits. The result is farm consolidation as farm subsidies are used to buy more land. The subsidy allows large farms to bid up land prices well above market levels while mid-sized family farms disappear and farming opportunities diminish for a new generation of farmers.

Furthermore, commodity programs, as currently administered, encourage the intensive production of one or two commodities on the same fields year after year, resulting in polluted runoff, soil depletion and loss of biodiversity. Taxpayers, consumers, farmers and rural communities deserve better. We urge Congress and the Administration to enact farm subsidy reforms that serve a broader set of interests including public health, rural economic development, resource conservation, and economic opportunity and entry.

One starting place for reform would be to enact effective payment limitation reform to reduce program incentives to farm consolidation. In addition, farmers should be allowed to plant fruits and vegetables on at least a portion of their farm program acreage provided their payment is reduced accordingly. Re-invigorating the conservation compliance system is also overdue. If Congress takes the step of adding a more comprehensive revenue insurance option to the commodity program mix, it too should have effective payment limitations, full planting flexibility, and strong conservation requirements.

9. Reform Crop Insurance.

Farming is inherently a risky business. Weather, pests, variable costs for inputs, and wild fluctuations in market prices for farm products create a volatile business environment and can cause farm income to vary significantly from year to year. A healthy farm and food system depends on public policies that help farmers manage risk effectively.

Traditionally, farmers managed risk by growing multiple crops and raising a variety of livestock. If one crop failed or prices for cattle or hogs were low, then sales of other products would make up the difference. By contrast, current crop insurance policies are skewed in favor of less diverse crop production systems that are not only more vulnerable to markets, weather, and pests, but that also have serious environmental impacts.

We urge Congress and the Administration to reform Crop insurance to ensure that it is structured in a manner that significantly rewards diversification in recognition of its high environmental and risk management value.

This farm bill should begin a transition toward an effective whole farm revenue insurance option.

Unjustified surcharges on insurance premiums for organic producers should be removed and insurance options implemented that take organic product price premiums into consideration. New insurance provisions should also be adopted to allow farmers who are engaged in direct and value-added markets to insure their production based on their higher value markets.

Signed:

DR. J. MENCHER, *Chair,*
The Second Chance Fd., NYC.

COMMENT OF ISABELLE MENOZZI, FAIRFIELD, CT

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Isabelle Menozzi.
City, State: Fairfield, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: Please support this bill so our children can have healthier food in school!!

No farms, no food!

COMMENT OF GREG MERRILL, STOCKTON, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Greg Merrill.
City, State: Stockton, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment: Please keep crop insurance *status quo*, as per the 2008 Farm Bill and review for the upcoming 2012 Farm Bill. Further reductions in funding via the 2010 SRA will ultimately hurt the producer/farmers who rely on crop insurance as: (1) Loan funding requirement, (2) Risk management safety net & (3) Stability for their farm and family during adverse weather years. Producers/farmers have no control over the weather, please don't restrict the program that allows them to keep operating year-after-year even when Mother Nature is unpredictable. Agriculture is the backbone of this nation and to further reduce funding to the Federal Crop Insurance Program would be a critical blow to the carrier industry that underwrites the program, agencies that sell it, and producers/farmers that rely on it.

Sincerely,

GREG MERRILL, AFIS—Pan American Insurance Agency, Inc.,
Director of Crop Insurance Services.

COMMENT OF JOHN MEYER, BRATTLEBORO, VT

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: John Meyer.
City, State: Brattleboro, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: CEO of a dairy breed association.
Comment:

Dear Chairman Peterson and members of the House Agriculture Committee:

Please accept these comments from John M. Meyer, Chief Executive Officer of Holstein Association USA, Inc.

Almost one year ago, Gordon M. Cook, Jr., a member of the board of directors of our 30,000 member producer organization, testified in your Committee room to explain our proposal: The Dairy Price Stabilization Program (DPSP).

While much has happened since that time, the dairy farmers of this country are still suffering. The reason they continue to suffer is because the market signals they receive are still telling them to produce more milk. In fact, this is the signal dairy farms constantly receive, no matter what the price of milk is.

It was our hope that swift action would be taken in 2009 in the form implementation of Holstein Association USA's Dairy Price Stabilization Program. The principles of the DPSP are:

- To prevent severely depressed producer milk prices that result in low and negative returns over feed costs to dairy producers.
- To reduce the volatility of milk prices to dairy producers and thereby reduce the price risk to dairy producers, dairy processors, and consumers of milk and dairy products.
- To complement, and not replace, other existing dairy programs such as the federal dairy product price support program and the Milk Income Loss Contract Program. In fact, our program may reduce the federal government cost of both of these two programs.

With the Dairy Price Stabilization Program, we have a long-term solution that can have an impact almost immediately, with no cost to taxpayers. The DPSP was developed for dairy producers, by dairy producers. The key to this program is that dairy farmers now have an incentive to produce milk for the market instead of producing all the milk they can and finding out what they are paid after it is sold. The program will be beneficial to dairy farmers, milk cooperatives, processors and consumers.

In closing, I would like to emphasize three points:

1. The Dairy Price Stabilization Program could be put into place without affecting any current dairy programs.
2. Implementing the DPSP does not require opening the Farm Bill.
3. The Dairy Price Stabilization Program is the only new, detailed program available that can have a positive effect on mailbox milk prices now and in the future.

On behalf of the Holstein Association USA's 30,000 members across the country, we ask that you implement supply management legislation with the principles of the DPSP as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF MELODY L. MEYER, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Melody L. Meyer.
State: CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Wholesale Distributor Alberts Organics.
Comment: Please Invest in Organic Farmers in the 2012 Farm Bill . . . Why because Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market. Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad. If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Many thanks,

MELODY L. MEYER.

COMMENT OF NAOMI MEYER, BOSTON, MA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Naomi Meyer.
City, State: Boston, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Legal Services Organization.

Comment: Greater Boston Legal Services provides assistance to Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) applicants and recipients throughout Boston and 31 surrounding cities and towns, including working families, those suffering from disabilities and/or homelessness, immigrants and those with limited English proficiency. The SNAP program is essential to the well-being of our clients and their children. The following recommendations are based on our extensive experience representing individuals and families, as well as working with the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance to improve access to SNAP benefits in our state.

(1) Increase the amount of the SNAP benefit to reflect the real costs of an adequate, healthy diet. In addition, income and asset eligibility limits and deductions for expenses should be raised to ensure that everyone who needs SNAP benefits to meet their nutritional needs—for example, due to high expenses for housing or medications—is able to participate in the program.

(2) Fully restore SNAP eligibility for legal immigrants, including eliminating sponsor deeming. The current restrictions not only deprive those who are living legally and permanently in the United States of access to proper nutrition, they are complicated and confusing for state workers to implement. My colleagues and I have represented numerous clients who were erroneously denied benefits, sometimes for many months or even years. Moreover, giving adult immigrants access to the SNAP program will reduce fears within immigrant communities and encourage them to obtain benefits for their eligible children.

(3) Continue "categorical eligibility" options. This provision has dramatically simplified the application process and successfully facilitated the participation of eligible families in the SNAP program in Massachusetts. It also saves administrative staff time, allowing that time to be better used toward the effort to timely process applications and recertifications.

(4) Increase funds for SNAP administration. States need more funding to ensure that staffing is adequate to process and maintain SNAP cases in a timely and accurate manner.

COMMENT OF PATRICIA MIDDLETON, QUEENSBURY, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:06 p.m.
Name: Patricia Middleton.
City, State: Queensbury, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Underwriter.
Comment: I would like to see the subsidies end. They are resulting in cheap, non-nutritious food that is destroying the health of the American public. It is a shame that healthy food is unaffordable to so many Americans. In discussing this topic with a farmer I buy from at my local farmers market, he stated he would like the subsidies to end as well to at least try to level the playing field for small farmers.

Our current food production methods contribute heavily to our reliance on oil and to climate change. We need to shift to sustainable, organic food production to improve our health, reduce our reliance on oil and address climate change.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MIDDLETON.

COMMENT OF BRIAN MILLARD, ARENZVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 5:37 p.m.
Name: Brian Millard.
City, State: Arenzville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Lender.
Comment: Please make sure the proposed farm bill includes language to make FSA field data public information. Disclosure of this type of information is critical to the agricultural lending and appraisal industry. Making this information public should not adversely affect producers or landowners that may have privacy concerns because that information is no different than the assessed value of farm real estate for property tax purposes. Assessed value information is publicly available. Thanks for your consideration.

COMMENT OF BARBARA MILLER, YUMA, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Barbara Miller.
City, State: Yuma, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: I appreciate my current freedom to purchase organic, non GMO produce and supplements discerned by appropriate labeling. I would like to see more funding go towards boosting organic farming for the overall health of our nation's people and environment. Thank you for reading and considering this voter's concerns.

COMMENT OF DELVIS MILLER, NORTON, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Delvis Miller.
City, State: Norton, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Applicator.
Comment: Please reinstate public access to Common Land Unit (CLU). Proper mapping is very important to my business and to our small rural/farming community!!

Thank you for your time,

DELVIS MILLER.

COMMENT OF DIANE MILLER, SOUTHAMPTON, NJ

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Diane Miller.
City, State: Southampton, NJ.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Poultry/poultry products, Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Please end the corn subsidy. Change all policy that rewards producing food using chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides. There is ample proof that these practices are destructive, to farmland, farm economy, the environment at large, our health and our national security, insomuch as chemical supports are mostly petroleum based. Change policy that rewards monoculture and the use of GMO crops. Again there are ample proofs that these practices are ultimately destructive. We need to foster diversity on the farm, we need to put animals back on the land as well as crops, instead of segregating each to the detriment of both. Plants, animals and humans all need to be treated with respect and dignity. Our farmland is shrinking and our farmers are aging. If we want to engage the young, farming must return to a vibrant community lifestyle. Local food is critical to the health of a community. Animals are critical to the health of the land. Too many farmers are captive to corporate interests, be it for seed, machinery, how to raise their animals. We do not need cheap food, we need good food. We do not need to feed the world, we need to feed our own, the absolute best we can. Current policies do not support those goals and have resulted in depleted land, plants and animals that produce substandard food which in turn is producing substandard humans. We, the richest nation in the world are starving our population through plenty, plenty of worthless, cheap "food". Good farm policy and good food will solve many of our social ills. Overall health will improve with good food. Students will do better in school with good food. Our land and overall environment will improve with better husbandry of the land. Ending subsidies will help level the playing field for small local producers. Ending monoculture will improve food safety.

Putting animals back on the land will negate the need for antibiotics. Please, please make the hard decisions, the right decisions, the inexpedient decisions. Let us care for and foster our land, plants, animals and humans, rather than exploiting them.

COMMENT OF DUANE MILLER, COBLESKILL, NY

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Duane Miller.

City, State: Cobleskill, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: The farm and field borders are very important to me as a farm appraiser. In very simple terms the borders should be public information. They don't give away any personal information about the farm. When this information is not available it will make my job more difficult which simply translates into a GREAT EXPENSE FOR THE FARMER, JUDGE, BANKER, *ETC.* THAT HIRE ME. With the current problems in the dairy industry—why would anyone make an appraisal more expensive for a farmer.

Thanks,

DUANE MILLER.

COMMENT OF BEVERLY MILLS, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:07 p.m.
Name: Beverly Mills.
City, State: San Francisco, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Artist/Civic Leader.
Comment: Bloated agricultural subsidies have resulted in overfed, undernourished generations. All sorts of health issues strain our public funds, more sustainable methods of agriculture are threatened and we increasingly squeeze our food supply into a very few corporate hands. We need an agricultural policy that promotes land conservation programs, sustainable farming practices, and encourages a wide range of energy saving and ecological practices.

COMMENT OF CECILE MILLS, ROYAL OAKS, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:35 a.m.
Name: Cecile Mills.
City, State: Royal Oaks, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Food Waste Recycling.
Comment: Invest in Organic Farming in the 2012 Farm Bill. Organic farming means less pollution (both air and water); better habitat; better soil and water health; and improved human health. I am a Horticulture student studying Organic Production. My community will benefit from support for Organic Farming.

COMMENT OF BRADLEY MITCHELL, CHARLESTON, SC

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 7:05 a.m.
Name: Bradley Mitchell.
City, State: Charleston, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Computer Scientist for the Navy.
Comment: Please provide higher subsidies for growing fresh fruits and vegetables. Please also note that when I say vegetable, I do not mean ketchup!

COMMENT OF BARB MOBERG, MARIETTA, OH

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Barb Moberg.
City, State: Marietta, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: P.E. Teacher.
Comment: Everyday I teach P.E. in the Washington School gym in Marietta, OH that also serves as the cafeteria at lunchtime. I'm shocked at some of the food choices offered to our kids, kids who are the future of America. Most mornings I smell the food that's being heated for lunch, food loaded with fat and salt. No food is cooked at our school. It's only heated up here. Kids need more fresh fruit and vegetables, not more processed food. The stuff we're feeding them is leading to the health problems we are currently faced with: heart disease, cancer, stroke. This is no way to educate our kids. Our government needs to support local produce as much as possible and stop or reduce all these corn, meat and dairy subsidies. Our govern-

ment overly subsidizes these industries. I would also like to see kids have some non-dairy options on a regular basis. Many children are lactose intolerant. It's a sad state of affairs when the cheapest food is the unhealthiest. The free breakfast program Marietta City Schools offers is hardly a breakfast . . . it's frequently processed food, like cookies or waffles in a bag. Please change how the school meal programs are funded and provide healthier options. I see food and health care closely allied. Our country is in a downward spin with health care costs spiraling out of control. Yet, we teach our kids everyday that it's acceptable to eat the junk food that is served in school, even though we know it's not healthy. Children don't understand this. They trust their parents and adults to do what's in their best interest. Please help turn this sad situation around. Something must be done. Our national security is at risk because of the poor shape our young people are in. Let's start with healthier food choices in our schools.

COMMENT OF KELLY MOLTZEN, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Kelly Moltzen.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Small and medium sized farmers need to be supported, as do farmers of fruits and vegetables. Please stop subsidizing the large agriculture corporations and support sustainable, regionalized food systems. Work with nonprofits such as the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP) and academic institutions such as the Tufts Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy (where Kathleen Merrigan is from). Please do provide farmers in developing countries with the ability to have a livable income. Also, support $4 billion PER YEAR for Child Nutrition Re-authorization.

COMMENT OF JEFF MONTGOMERY, PHOENIX, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Jeff Montgomery.
City, State: Phoenix, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Application.
Comment: I'm writing on the behalf of the Aerial Application industry that's responsible for application of seed, fertilizers, herbicides and insecticides that are applied to millions of acres every year. Over the last ten years, this industry has become more a science than ever before.

The technology that is used today is called "precision application", which means a limited amount of products are applied to target areas of a field. GPS, infrared technology, and variable rate equipment are used to make this happen. This not only saves money for the growers by reducing the amount of chemicals used, it also protects the environment.

It is important that we amend the Farm Bill to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data in SECTION 1619.

Without this change, the data we need to measure field boundaries and acre counts will render this technology useless and create an environmental impact.

Support a change to Section 1619 and be assured that there is no compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data. This is your chance to make a difference.

Best regards,

JEFF MONTGOMERY.

COMMENT OF MICHELLE MONTI, MANSFIELD, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Michelle Monti.
City, State: Mansfield, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Website Producer.
Comment: Please consider putting funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors to enhance our children's nutrition at school. Thank you!

COMMENT OF MARGARET MOORE, CALABASAS, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Margaret Moore.
City, State: Calabasas, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: 1,000,000 strong against factory farming. Please support local, organic farming systems for a healthy and sustainable America.
Thank you!

COMMENT OF PHYL MORELLO, WHITE PINE, TN

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Phyl Morello.
City, State: White Pine, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: YOU MUST support fully organics! Small farming, not factory mega farming is needed. If ag businesses continue, they MUST stop using chemicals, toxins & GMO's.

COMMENT OF AVA MORGENSTERN, CAMBRIDGE, MA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Ava Morgenstern.
City, State: Cambridge, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Accountant.
Comment: I oppose Farm Bill subsidies for these reasons:

1. Budget.

A. The subsidies cost the government more over time, since the increased yield each year lowers the real price of the food on the market (the government pays the difference between floor price and market price).

B. The health care bill of America would be decreased DRAMATICALLY if ingredients like high fructose corn syrup weren't artificially cheap and finding their way into everything we eat instead of real ingredients.

2. The price floors result in the maximization of crop yields each year regardless of market signals.

A. Environmental consequences

i. Subsidies are resulting in over-use of pesticides and fertilizers, which is poisoning our waterways (agriculture is now the biggest polluter of waterways in the world, creating vast dead zones which hurt both wildlife and our fisheries).

ii. The pesticides and fertilizers are petroleum products, and cutting their use back to efficient levels would improve air quality along with helping to stave off climate change.

iii. Subsidies on specific crops result in vast monoculture, decreasing biodiversity, increasing vulnerability to disasters, pests, and other shocks.

B. Cost to farmers

i. As the program gets more expensive, it puts pressures on law makers to levy more taxes and cut funding to other areas.

ii. Their land quality is degrading with such intensive use, further increasing need for petroleum products like fertilizers to off-set the reduced fertility.

iii. Most of the subsidy money goes to large industrial farms, giving them even more of an edge over small farmers, who are losing their jobs in droves.

iv. The increasing input costs (fertilizers, insecticides, GMO seeds, *etc.*) which farmers are using more and more as land quality degrades dramatically cuts down profitability of farms.

3. International considerations

A. The over-production is filling international markets with artificially cheap crops.

i. This is incredibly detrimental to developing countries, whose producers are getting pounded by our cheap exports. Remember, their economies are generally overwhelmingly agricultural. Result: huge increase in poverty and bigger pressures for international aid.

ii. Increases animosity toward U.S.

B. Fertilizer and insecticide are petroleum products, and thus their ever-increasing use is resulting is an enormous increase in our dependence on foreign oil.

Yes, these subsidies are keeping prices in the grocery store low, but the real costs are showing up in things like our health bills and taxes, not to mention the social and environmental cost associated with these practices.

COMMENT OF JACK A. MORLOCK, INDIANAPOLIS, IN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Jack A. Morlock.
City, State: Indianapolis, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: As the Committee discusses the 2012 Farm I would like to make it known that this bill must provide more and stronger investment in organic & sustainable agriculture. For too long as Washington rolled with the tune of agribusiness and left the consumer and family/small independent farms in the dust.

It must be known that Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market. There are many benefits to organic agriculture. Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad. I consider all of you as people serious about organic agriculture and there you must understand that if we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

1. Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

2. Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

3. Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

4. Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

These four programs along in added incentives and investment must be the staple of the 2012 Farm Bill. Anything else would be a major failure on your part as the U.S. House of Rep. Agriculture Committee.

COMMENT OF JARRETT & RUTH MORRIS, CLAYTON, AL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Jarrett & Ruth Morris.
City, State: Clayton, AL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock, Poultry/poultry products, Vegetables, Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment:

Attended Meeting in Troy, Alabama

1. I've attended national farm programs (Louisville, Kentucky) and statewide programs (Tuskegee, Alabama)—Representatives. Representatives or inter-

preters of the farm bill seem to discourage Black individuals seeking assistance by saying "This farm bill is too complicated."

2. Meetings that I have attended statewide give lost hope in farming by only offering farm loans and no grants. White farms have been given subsidies, which are no different than welfare to start some successful business in farming.

3. Why the secretive meeting (hush, hush) hearing to review U.S. Agriculture policy in advance of the 2012 Farm Bill. Meeting information given by a secret source. The Black to White ratio was approximate 1 to 20 at the meeting. There was no Black representation on the panels. We were informed at the meeting that 5 more meetings were scheduled. On our way home, we saw some of the key members, including Mike Rogers at a farm in rural Pike County after the meeting. Was this a secret meeting? Speaker of meetings never gave next location of meeting. There was a sense of the movie Guess *Who's Coming To Dinner* and the *Invisible Man* by Ralph Ellison.

4. Yes, this Sate Farm Bill discriminates. I can stand up bold and say it, being a black woman that is socially disadvantaged. Am I actually socially disadvantaged, or is this something only in Ink. I feel used. If these FSA offices in the Deep South wanted others to achieve and be successful, more effort and support would be provided.

5. There is a need for more "people of color" in the Deep South FSA Agencies as full time workers. The minority farmers need to be kept informed of every aspect of farming. The minority advisor in Barbour County does not keep Blacks informed.

6. The new 2012 Farm Bill is already deceitful in allowing a few to gather and give their opinions about its needs and structure secretively. What about the farmers who didn't know about the June 14, 2010 deadline. God will not bless anything that is not right. My God is a God of Justice. You may come up with the unscrupulous, unethical ways and methods of keeping farmers like me who really want to know all he/she can about farming. Some of us are in the dark, because we are only allowed assess to some farm programs. We all lose in the end if we don't help each other equally. The Bible does state that which you reap you will sow. Any private farming organization supported by state and/or federal monies should be revealed to all incoming farmers so all the farmers can benefit.

7. Who is the real American Farmer? Do all farmers receive benefits equally? Can I inquire each farmer who received state and/or federal benefits with a previous 10 year span? Are there any private federal auditors that oversee whether funds are distributed fairly? Is there assistance to help farmers pay for farm equipment? There are farmers everywhere new tractors and *etc.* Many don't have large farms. My father Leon Morris, was a lifelong farmer and he worked double due to a lack of reliable farming equipment. He passed away on March 8, 2010, but it is sad how he was denied assistance even though he did so much for Alabama politics.

COMMENT OF HEATHER MORRISON, LONG BEACH, CA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Heather Morrison.
City, State: Long Beach, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Parent.
Comment: I am writing to ask you to consider supporting changing the way the Farm Bill allocates money. The Farm Bill is an antiquated subsidy system that benefits large scale industrial agribusiness and does nothing to help with the nutrition of our citizens, in particular children. I would love to see a change in the Farm Bill that would help smaller scale, organic, diversified agriculture and help to promote healthier options for children in settings such as the school lunch program. The system is broken. You can help fix it. Our children are counting on you. Thank you very much.

Kind regards,

HEATHER MORRISON.

COMMENT OF EMANUEL MOSS, AUSTIN, TX

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Emanuel Moss.
City, State: Austin, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Archaeologist.
Comment: It seems to me that the crops receiving the majority of subsidies, *i.e.,* corn and soy, contribute to a diminishing proportion of what most nutritionists would consider healthy meals and an increasing role as industrial inputs, contributing to corn plastics, soy-based inks, cellulose-based products, food additives, and chemicals. It therefore seems backward to me that the companies producing these crops receive large subsidies while farmers producing fruit and vegetable crops that have little or no non-food-based demand receive relatively smaller subsidies. It is my opinion that the U.S. Government should apportion subsidies based on the desired proportional contribution of food products to a healthy diet, not based on the historical disbursement of subsidies or the concentrated political power of certain crop producers.

COMMENT OF GREGORY MOSTSTAD, WEST FARGO, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Gregory Moststad.
City, State: West Fargo, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: I want to make sure that on the next farm bill, FSA maps are available for public viewing. I use these maps very often to verify fields and acres for custom spraying and fertilizer applications. They are extremely valuable to my business and it helps us to reduce mistakes when applying fertilizer or herbicides.

COMMENT OF LARALYIN MOWERS, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Laralyin Mowers.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Farm subsidies in the U.S. are not going to the farmers who need assistance and are undermining farmers producing commodity crops in developing countries. They are only serving corporate agriculture.

COMMENT OF ANNIE MROZ, MEDIA, SC

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Annie Mroz.
City, State: Media, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Engineer.
Comment: Please reduce subsidies for corn and increase those for other important agricultural commodities such as fruit and vegetables.

COMMENT OF LEE MULCAHY, HUNTERSVILLE, NC

Date Submitted: Sunday, May 23, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Lee Mulcahy.
City, State: Huntersville, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: It's time to make food that's good for you affordable. There's something seriously flawed with a system that makes a Big Mac cheaper than a salad. These subsidies need to be amended, and they need to be amended now. Make good food affordable for everyone and they'll live longer, healthier lives! Regardless of where you stand politically, that's a goal we can all get behind.

COMMENT OF RANDY MURBACH, ELLICOTT CITY, MD

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Randy Murbach.
City, State: Ellicott City, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Project/Program Manager.
Comment: The World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF VICKI MURFIN, SATELLITE BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Vicki Murfin.
City, State: Satellite Beach, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: In the Farm Bill please do not support Factory Farming of animals. Close confinement of animals is inhumane, unhealthy and people who eat factory farmed animals become unhealthy themselves, The impact of factory farming on the environment is devastating. Vote against supporting factory farming in the Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF CORTNEY MURPHY, LANGHORNE, PA

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 03, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Cortney Murphy.
City, State: Langhorne, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Pediatric Nurse.
Comment: I want to see the farm bill help the health of the nation and our environment. By supporting health and environmental protection you will be truly doing the most good you can in the position you hold for those that need you the most. You will also be supporting lower cost and fiscal responsibility. Better health ultimately equals lower cost for healthcare spending. Please support organic agriculture.

Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.

Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.

Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

COMMENT OF MACY MURPHY, VINCENNES, IN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Macy Murphy.
City, State: Vincennes, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I work for one of the largest agricultural lender's in the U.S. and regularly access online information sites to obtain data about farm fields. None of the

data that I access gives any private information that would put a producer at risk. Rather the information I gather allows me to produce and accurate and competent appraisal assignment. We have all seen what has occurred in our economy over the past couple years due to issues in the real estate market.

Accurate and timely appraisal assignments are something that not only my client expects, but so does the producer. In order to produce accurate and timely appraisals it is necessary in today's modern technological based economy to have data/information made available online via the Internet. I would hope that you respectfully consider the value of making this information available through companies such as Surety Mapping Systems. We are respectful of private citizens and protecting that information that might put them at risk, however, that is not what we are asking for. We simply would like to see producer's field data made available to help us create accurate picture of the various rural real estate markets throughout the country.

COMMENT OF THOMAS MURPHY, LIVINGSTON, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Thomas Murphy.
City, State: Livingston, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Broker.
Comment: We have been using CLUs since their release by FSA. They are invaluable to ensuring we have the correct land insured for a client, and that the client's unit structure is appropriate for their risk tolerance.

Also, RMA now requires we report back to them CLU data, yet we are restricted from access to current CLU access. In the CLUs that were available prior to May 2008, there were no attributes included that would even come close to violating a producer's privacy. In fact, a plat book published by various companies, or a trip to the county court house would reveal more info about a land owner or operator of a parcel of land than I have ever seen in a CLU data set.

We have been mapping for our insurance clients since 1998, and CLU files help us provide our clients with the service they deserve, and that RMA requires.

Please give us back access to CLU data!

COMMENT OF LARRY E. NAAKE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Larry E. Naake.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Director, National Association of Counties.
Comment:

June 14, 2010

House Committee on Agriculture Members
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Members of the House Committee on Agriculture:

I am writing on behalf of the National Association of Counties (NACo), the only national organization representing America's counties. NACo commends Chairman Peterson, Ranking Member Lucas and the members of the House Committee on Agriculture Committee for seeking public input as you prepare to consider reauthorization of the 2012 Farm Bill. We offer the following suggestions and key priorities for reauthorization and seek to provide detailed testimony as we move further into the reauthorization process.

The Farm Bill ensures that all Americans have access to a safe, secure and inexpensive food supply, provides a safety net for farmers and ranchers and provides critical assistance to rural communities with key infrastructure and business development programs. It also authorizes important nutrition programs, encourages environmentally friendly conservation programs, and supports the development of agriculturally based renewable energy, which will help to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. The law affects the economy and the tax base of many of the nation's counties. The ability of county governments to provide services financed by property and other local taxes is dependent on farm income and rural business.

Therefore, NACo supports full funding of all titles in the 2012 reauthorization of the Farm Bill and calls on Congress to place a particular emphasis on crafting a

bill that provides enhanced resources to Rural Development programs and strategies that promote rural prosperity. NACo supports full funding for flexible rural development programs that allow counties to work regionally and locally to develop infrastructure improvements, community facilities, business development, broadband deployment, entrepreneurship, healthcare and many other essential programs.

NACo supports four key priorities in the Farm Bill reauthorization that will help rural counties revitalize their economies and quality of life.

(1) NACo supports an enhanced commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next farm bill, especially key infrastructure and business development programs that support the agricultural sector and the retention and creation of businesses.

(2) NACo supports rural development strategies which focus on making USDA's investments more efficient and effective by rewarding strategic regional approaches to rural development that allow counties and their regional partners to focus on their local economic assets, priorities and goals.

(3) NACo supports enhanced funding for renewable energy development, especially programs that assist local governments in their efforts to develop renewable energy and increase energy efficiency.

(4) NACo supports policies that ensure all farm programs recognize that youth play a vital role in sustaining American agriculture and rural communities. New programs and updates to old programs are needed so that it is possible for young and beginning farmers to survive and thrive in the modern agricultural economy.

Again, we thank you for inviting our comments and pledge that NACo will work with you to continue to strengthen this critical piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

LARRY E. NAAKE,
Executive Director,
National Association of Counties.

COMMENT OF KEVIN NASH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Kevin Nash.
City, State: Salt Lake City, UT.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: I would love to see Congress work harder to protect the small farmers or this country. Large scale commercial agriculture is starting to encroach on small scale in such a way that family farmers are losing their land due to law suits or just by being re-zoned and broken financially. We need to get our country back to its roots, back to where everything we produced we produced here, in America. All of our agriculture should be returned to a community based system, not large scale mono crops which hurt the soil. What we need is many small farms, all producing an abundance of different products, only this will save the Earth's biodiversity and also save the soil which is so essential to our survival. In using these methods we can eliminate the need for harsh chemicals which not only hurt nature, but they poison the soil and the food they grow. Thank you for your time, and hope together we can make a better future for our food.

COMMENT OF SEAN NASH, SANTA CRUZ, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Sean Nash.
City, State: Santa Cruz, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

Dear Mr. Farr,

As an American concerned about the future of farming for my children and grandchildren, I would like to see more support for farming that protects the land from

unsustainable practices that are eroding our soil away to the tune of 38 tons annually. In order for our state to continue to be economically viable, we must protect this important resource through new advances in farming. Another natural disaster due to poor farming practices like the once of the 1930's is possible with our current drought in California. I think that educating farmers and the public on soil conservation is the most important thing we can do.

Sincerely,

SEAN NASH.

COMMENT OF GARY NATION, PITTSFIELD, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Gary Nation.
City, State: Pittsfield, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I urge you to support the reinstatement of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data into Section 1619.

COMMENT OF NANCY NEAL, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Nancy Neal.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Increase funding for TEFAP and Food Stamps. Rework the subsidies program so that it supports small farmers as opposed to corporate farmers. For food aid, support local economies by sending cash payments for purchase of local food.

COMMENT OF DAVID W. NEBEL, NEVADA, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: David Nebel.
City, State: Nevada, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: The last farm bill prohibited FSA offices from providing appraisers with farm information on properties we are appraising and properties we use as comparable sales.

Appraisers and lenders, it is very ironic that the farm bill makes it difficult, if not impossible, for state certified appraisers to obtain information which is fundamental to accurate farm appraisal.

At the least, please make FSA field boundaries available to the public once again. It would also enhance appraisal accuracy if we could have access to the 156EZ, aerials, and CRP contract information on all farms. This information is tied directly to the real estate and in no way reveals any private information regarding the owner.

Please give serious consideration to the affect the farm bill has on the ability of appraisers to provide accurate valuations. We need this information to better analyze and more accurately value farmland.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. NEBEL, A.R.A.

COMMENT OF RUTH NEIL, AUSTIN, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 25, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Ruth Neil.
City, State: Austin, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Extension Education Assistant.
Comment: Please try to counteract the consolidation in agriculture. Having more farmers each improving a smaller piece of land, which they personally own, is intuitively better for the environment, local economies, and nation than having landlords owning broad swaths of land. "In no other country in the world is the love

of property keener or more alert than in the United States," wrote Alexis de Tocqueville in 1840. If my generation, those born after 1980, lack farm property because of a lack of skill, fine. Or if we just aren't interested, fine. But if it is because our nation's policies favor the rich farmers and help them get richer, that is not okay with me.

COMMENT OF KYLE NELSON, MOORHEAD, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Kyle Nelson.
City, State: Moorhead, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I strongly urge the reinstatement of CLU data in Section 1619. I am an agricultural real estate appraiser and I rely on access to this data to be able to accurately analyze comparable sale data. Not having access to this data makes me less accurate, and adds time and expense which gets passed on to the client, who are typically farmers.

COMMENT OF SHAUNA NEP, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Shauna Nep.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Demand fair prices for commodity crops. It's hurting all of us.

COMMENT OF ROBIN NESBURG, FAIRFAX, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Robin Nesburg.
City, State: Fairfax, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Please consider revising rules regarding disclosure of CLU data in the new farm bill. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information. I do NOT believe this information compromises the privacy of the producer or the landowner, but does increase the cost of services to them. Many of the services which the producers and landowner use including appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators, are made more costly because of the current rules.

COMMENT OF ROBERT NEWMAN, BURLINGTON, OK

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Robert Newman.
City, State: Burlington, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retail.
Comment: Public access to the USDA Farm service Agency Common Land Units is a very important tool in field identification. Having access to our customers CLU's, provides us the ability to produce maps for our applicators and this greatly reduces the chance of applying product to the wrong location.

COMMENT OF JOSEPH C. NEWTON, EUFAULA, AL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 04, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Joseph C. Newton.
City, State: Eufaula, AL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Resource Facilitator for Town and County Library, Clayton, AL.
Comment:

Dear Sir,

I am the Joseph C. Newton, President of the Bullock/Barbour County Cooperative of Agricultural Producers. As president I represent 25 farmers in the area. I missed your field hearing session in Troy, AL because I was running for the State Representative seat in our area.

We are a minority group of farmers in dire need of resources. We are beef cattle ranchers, produce growers and farmers. We deserve modern equipment to grow vegetables and to run our farms. We deserve better equipment, irrigation systems and better fencing, both parameter fencing and pasture fencing. We are in need of fertilizer and herbicide, fuel and other resource in order that we may grow better produce and more produce. At our meeting last evening, there were a gambit of needs expressed by the membership. We further need, excavation equipment to clear the land and farming equipment, (tractors, tillers and plows) to grow decent produce. Additionally we need subsidies to pay the cost of fuel and other product used to grow our produce. If I was to place a figure on our needs, the figure would be approximately $500,000.

Our ranchers need de-wormers and other medical suppliers to grow a good head of cattle. We need replacement cattle and a better price for our cattle when we sell them on the market. I know the federal government has subsidies to aid the ranchers and we want our share of those subsidies.

I closing, I am sorry I missed the meeting in Troy, AL, on May 15, 2010, but our comments need be hear. The Federal Government owes the Black Farmer and we want our share of the resources being given out by the government to help all farmers.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. NEWTON.
[Redacted],
Eufaula, AL
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF PATTI NOETHE, BRITT, IA

Date Submitted: Saturday, August 21, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Patti Noethe.
City, State: Britt, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Wholesale Pet Distributor—USDA Licensed.
Comment:

Dear Sir:

This letter is on behalf of the citizens of our great country who are not farmers. I am a 63 year old widow, raising 2 grandchildren. I am also a small business owner, employing 7 people full-time. I work hard for every penny I make and I didn't inherit any money or land that helped me build my business. I did it from scratch, using credit, elbow grease, and ingenuity. No one ever told me the American dream was dead, and I still don't think it is.

I live in a rural farming community in Iowa, and many of my friends are farmers. In addition, my deceased husband was a farmer until shortly after we married. Every time I file my income tax return, I still laugh about the first time he had to file as a non-farming entity. He couldn't believe the tax deductions that were allowed to farmers, that he was no longer going to benefit from. I just said, "Welcome to the world of the average working stiff!"

Well, this isn't about the tax deductions farmers are allowed. They are after all, in business, and every business has it's share of expenses which are indigenous to that particular vocation, and should be acceptable tax deductions. What I don't understand though, is why the rest of the American taxpayers have to subsidize the farmer's business further. No one subsidizes my business, governmentally or otherwise. In fact, quite the opposite is true. My business is government regulated and new legislation is making it almost impossible to continue to operate it cost effectively. But that's another letter, to a different government official.

We all realize that farm subsidies came into being during the Depression era, when farming was a whole different situation and consisted of basically smaller tract family farms. These people surely needed that help back then, but in today's high-tech world, where corporate farming has taken over the agricultural scene, and small family farms are fewer and fewer, it appears as if the people who might still truly need this program are benefiting the least from it.

A recent article in *Reader's Digest* noted that $13 BILLION in government subsidies are given out to farmers and agribusinesses each year, with 75% of it going to only 10% of the recipients. The article is titled "Phony Farmers Exposed", and it's easily found on the *Reader's Digest* website, if you missed it (*http://www.rd.com/your-america-inspiring-people-and-stories/phony-farmers-exposed/article179127.html*).* The purported abuse of the farm subsidy program is documented and another website is listed for the Environmental Working Group (*farm.ewg.org/farm*) where you can find out who is getting the farm subsidies in your state, by county, and how much they've gotten for the last 14 years. I was shocked to learn, upon going to the site, that most of those receiving the largest subsidies in my county, are far from living in dire straits. It made me angry to know that these people, who have a living standard far, far, far above mine, are obviously getting rich on the tax dollars that I must work (at 63 years of age) between 40 and 70 hours a week to pay. HELLO!! Is there something wrong with this scenario??? And the article was right . . . there are actually DEAD people getting farm subsidies in my county!!!

Removing this $13 billion a year from the nation's enormous deficit sounds like a good place to start. At the very least, the farm subsidy program obviously needs investigating for abuses and some controls instated, similar to those of another worthy government program . . . FIP (or as it used to be called . . . ADC). Personally, I'd rather see my tax money going to help the UNDER-privileged people in our country. We had Welfare Reform, and it's HIGH TIME for Farm Subsidy Reform!!

Thank you for listening and for giving this matter your utmost concern.

Respectfully,

PATTI NOETHE.

COMMENT OF ERICA NOFI, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Erica Nofi.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nonprofit Fundraiser.
Comment: It is essential that government subsidies to agriculture be modified to promote the production of healthy foods, rather than commodity crops. The fact that current subsidies make processed, HFCS- and soy-based foods cheaper than fresh produce is shameful, and detrimental to the overall health (and therefore economic productivity) of the country. Instead of supporting giant agribusinesses and their economic stranglehold on the family farmers that depend on subsidies, the government should be supporting diversified, sustainable, independent farmers. While awareness of these issues is growing, and people are beginning to vote with their wallets, they cannot truly be solved until the corn and soy subsidies are abolished.

Additionally, as a taxpayer, I resent that my tax dollars are making unhealthy foods cheaper for others while I also pay more for vegetables. In effect, I am paying for this terrible policy twice. Of course, everyone is losing much more than money in this equation.

COMMENT OF TIMOTHY R. NOLEN, CARMI, IL

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Timothy R. Nolen.
City, State: Carmi, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: IL & IN Certified General Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am a farm real estate appraiser located in Carmi, White County, IL. Not having access to FSA/USDA aerial maps with only field boundaries and acreages marked has made my job more difficult. It makes it harder to arrive at the most accurate market value estimates possible, and forces me to charge more for each assignment. With the obvious need for farm loan providers to have the most accurate appraisals humanly possible, it is obviously ridiculous to not allow certified general real estate appraisers easy access to the type of FSA aerial maps I mentioned above. Don't you agree?

I have yet to be informed by a farm land owner that they did not want a certified general real estate appraiser, and other professionals, to have access to those maps.

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

Their concern is that I complete my assignments as quickly and as accurately as possible.

I would like very much to hear you opinion on this matter. My contact information is below.

TIMOTHY R. NOLEN,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
Carmi, IL,
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENTS OF MICHAEL NORGAARD, TYLER, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Michael Norgaard.
City, State: Tyler, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager/Real Estate Salesperson.
Comment: This message is regarding Section 1619 in the farm bill. As a property manager and a licensed real estate salesperson, I rely heavily on the accessibility of current CLU boundaries and current acreages. It is now much more difficult to perform property valuations and accurately research properties for our clients. Our company has incurred much higher administrative costs because of Section 1619 and at times we must pass that along to our clients. I am certain that Section 1619 has also increased the administrative costs at all Farm Service Agency offices across the country. I believe that certain information regarding each parcel of farmland should be kept confidential and should not be available to the general public. Field boundaries and acres should NOT be deemed confidential. Thank you.

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Michael Norgaard.
City, State: Tyler, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager/Real Estate Salesperson.
Comment: Please consider reinstating public access to the USDA CLU data. I rely on this data daily in our efforts to effectively manage property for our landowner clients. As a real estate agent, having access to the CLU data helps us to efficiently analyze comparable properties for valuation purposes. Our firm also provides certified appraisals and the use of the CLU data drastically improves the accuracy of our work.

COMMENT OF DAN NOSAL, CASTLE ROCK, CO

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 01, 2010, 4:37 p.m.
Name: Dan Nosal.
City, State: Castle Rock, CO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Range Conservationist.
Comment: I think the best way to describe what has happened to agriculture in the U.S. is to read the following story. I would encourage the Committee to consider eliminating farm subsidies. It does not allow the free market system to operate as it should and makes producers dependent on the federal government. It is also counterproductive to conservation because marginal cropland remains in production (cropland subsidy payments are hard to resist!) rather than being converted back to permanent vegetation. In the case of CRP land it is returned to cropland for the same reason (cropland subsidy payments). Permanent vegetation allows the land to have less erosion problems, higher carbon sequestration, lower fossil fuel inputs, better water quality, lower air pollution, less dependence on pesticides, better wildlife habitat, increased plant and animal diversity, and an overall healthier environment.

Subsidies are trumpeted as being necessary for a cheap food policy, but it is not cheap. It costs billions in tax dollars and is ultimately detrimental to the environment. It is time to eliminate farm subsidies and allow U.S. agriculture producers to prosper.

The Wild Hog Story . . .

Some years ago, about 1900, an old trapper from North Dakota hitched up some horses to his Studebaker wagon, packed a few possessions and drove south. Several weeks later he stopped in a small town just north of the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia. It was a Saturday morning—a lazy day—when he walked into the general store. Sitting around the pot-bellied stove were seven or eight of the town's local citizens.

The traveler asked, "Gentlemen, could you direct me to the Okefenokee Swamp?" Some of the old-timers looked at him like he was crazy. "You must be a stranger in these parts," they said. "I am. I'm from North Dakota," said the stranger. "In the Okefenokee Swamp are thousands of wild hogs," one old man explained. "A man who goes into the swamp by himself asks to die!" He lifted up his leg. "I lost half my leg here to the pigs of the swamp." Another old fellow said, "Look at the cuts on me; look at my arm bit off! Those pigs have been free since the Revolution, eating snakes and rooting out roots and fending for themselves for over a hundred years. They're wild and they're dangerous. You can't trap them. No man dares go into the swamp by himself." Every man nodded his head in agreement. The old trapper said, "Thank you so much for the warning. Now could you direct me to the swamp?" They said, "Well, yeah, its due south—straight down the road." But they begged the stranger not to go, because they knew he'd meet a terrible fate. He said, "Sell me ten sacks of corn, and help me load it in the wagon." And they did. Then the old trapper bid them farewell and drove on down the road. The townsfolk thought they'd never see him again. Two weeks later the man came back. He pulled up to the general store, got down off the wagon, walked in and bought ten more sacks of corn. After loading it up he went back down the road toward the swamp.

Two weeks later he returned and again bought ten sacks of corn. This went on for over three months. Every week or two the old trapper would come into town, load up ten sacks of corn, and drive off south into the swamp. The stranger soon became a legend in the little village and the subject of much speculation. People wondered what kind of devil had possessed this man that he could go into the Okefenokee by himself and not be consumed by the wild and free hogs. One morning the man came into town as usual. Everyone thought he wanted more corn. He got off the wagon and went into the store where the usual group of men was gathered around the stove. He took off his gloves. "Gentlemen," he said, "I need to hire about ten or fifteen wagons. I need twenty or thirty men. I have six thousand hogs out in the swamp, penned up, and they're all hungry. I've got to get them to market right away." "You have WHAT in the swamp?" asked the storekeeper. "I have six thousand hogs penned up. They haven't eaten for two or three days, and they'll starve if I don't get back there to feed and take care of them."

One old-timer said, "You mean you've captured the wild hogs of the Okefenokee?" "That's right." "How did you do that? What did you do?" the men urged. One of them exclaimed, "But I lost my arm!" "I lost my leg to those wild boars!" chimed a second. The trapper said, "Well, the first week I went in there they were wild all right. They hid in the undergrowth and wouldn't come out. I dared not get off the wagon, so I spread corn along behind the wagon. The old pigs would have nothing to do with it. But the younger pigs decided that it was easier to eat free corn than it was to root out roots and catch snakes. So the very young began to eat the corn first. I did this every day. Pretty soon, even the older pigs decided that it was easier to eat free corn. After all, they were all free; they were not penned up. They could run off in any direction they wanted at any time. The next thing was to get them used to eating in the same place all the time. So I selected a clearing, and I started putting the corn in the clearing. At first they wouldn't come to the clearing. It was too far. It was too open. But the very young decided that it was easier to take the corn in the clearing than it was to root out roots and catch their own snakes. And not long thereafter, the older pigs also decided that it was easier to come to the clearing every day. And so the pigs learned to come to the clearing every day to get their free corn. They could still subsidize their diet with roots and snakes and whatever else they wanted. After all, they were all free. They could run in any direction at any time. There were no bounds upon them. The next step was to get them used to fence posts. So I put fence posts all the way around the clearing. I put them in the underbrush so that they wouldn't get suspicious or upset. After all, they were just sticks sticking up out of the ground, like the trees and the brush. The corn was there every day. It was easy to walk in between the posts, get the corn, and walk back out. This went on for a week or two. Shortly they became very used to walking into the clearing, getting the free corn, and

walking back out through the fence posts. The next step was to put one rail at the bottom. I left a few openings, so that the older, fatter pigs could easily walk through. Still there was no real threat to their freedom or independence. They could always jump over the rail and flee in any direction at any time. Now I decided that I wouldn't feed them every day. I began to feed them every other day. On the days I didn't feed them the pigs still gathered in the clearing. They squealed, and they grunted, and they begged and pleaded with me to feed them. But I only fed them every other day. And I put a second rail around the posts. Now the pigs became more and more desperate for food, because they were no longer used to going out and digging their own roots and finding their own food. They now needed me. They needed my corn every day. So I trained them that I would feed them every day if they came in through a gate. And I put up a third rail around the fence. But it was still no great threat to their freedom, because there were several gates and they could run in and out at will. Finally I put up the fourth rail. Then I closed all the gates but one, and I fed them very, very well. Yesterday I closed the last gate, and today I need you to help me take these pigs to market."

(Author Unknown)

What is the price of free corn? The parable of the wild hogs has a very serious moral lesson for all of us. This story is about federal money (free corn) being used to bait, trap and enslave a once free and independent people. Federal welfare, in its myriad forms, has reduced individuals to a state of dependency. Folks, lest you think this could never happen to you, think again. Farmers and ranchers are slowly being baited in to feed on the federal government's so-called "free" corn. In fact, many have already found themselves in a trap that they do not know how to escape from. They think it would be impossible for them to survive without the government's free corn. That sounds a whole lot like the wild hogs squealing and begging to be fed, because they no longer knew how to make a living for themselves. Billions and billions of tax dollars are being paid out every year to farmers and ranchers. Our current farm program has essentially guaranteed that the prices farmers receive for their crops will remain at or below break-even prices. Opportunities to prosper have all but been eliminated. Ironically, the producers who benefit the most from these government programs are NOT the small family farms and ranches that these programs were originally set up to help. Instead of helping the small family farms and ranches, the existing farm programs are making it harder and harder for them to compete and survive. A few very big producers actually receive the bulk of the government's free corn.

What are we to do? Like the wild hogs, farmers and ranchers will eventually lose their freedom and independence if we don't get the federal government out of farming and ranching. We need to restore a free market system that enables farmers and ranchers to truly prosper. When New Zealand stopped its runaway government, it completely eliminated all agricultural subsidies. In the process, 1% of their farmers fell by the wayside, but the other 99% are happier and more profitable than ever.

COMMENT OF DAVID NUTTLE, TAHLEQUAH, OK

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: David Nuttle.
City, State: Tahlequah, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Bioenergy.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: USDA grant applications and procedures have become far too complex for most small, disadvantaged, minority, and/or refugee farmers/ranchers—or groups representing these farmers/ranchers. In addition, USDA still acts to discriminate against these groups despite considerable efforts to stop the discrimination. Not less than 30 percent of grant funds should be placed in a grant lottery that said farmer/rancher groups can qualify for with very very minimal paperwork—and no potential for USDA's usual bureaucratic and political games. Funds will then start going to those most in need.

COMMENT OF COLLEEN O'BRIEN, MONT VERNON, NH

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Colleen O'Brien.

City, State: Mont Vernon, NH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: Please include organic farmers on the next Farm Bill!

- Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.
- Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.
- If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:
  - Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
  - Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
  - Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
  - Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF PHIL O'BRYAN, PARIS, IL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Phil O'Bryan.
City, State: Paris, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As a real estate appraiser involved in farm land appraisals I urge you to open up the privacy protections of the farm program to allow viewing of current aerial photography and field mappings. It is often not possible to get an absentee property owner's signature for the property under appraisal. More importantly the ability to view up to date mapping of comparable sale property is restricted by the present law and is an impediment to accurate farm land appraisals. The field layout, tillable acreages and other land designations can provide information that is not otherwise available with any degree of accuracy for these sales. And the procurement of permission slips is not realistic for comparable research. I do not care about the amount of payment an operator is receiving, *albeit* there are concerns about transparency with my tax dollars. If you see the need to keep those number secret so be it, but the mapping can be a valuable tool toward the objective of improving the appraisal product and ultimately the insurance of good loan collateral values for the banking industry as well.

Thank you for your consideration.

PHIL O'BRYAN,
Real Estate Appraiser.

COMMENT OF MARYBETH O'DONNELL, MANCHESTER, VT

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: MaryBeth O'Donnell.
City, State: Manchester, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Stay At Home Mom with four school aged children.
Comment: Please make natural, real unprocessed food more accessible for our children. Stop subsidizing school food budgets with items called "ham turkey" turkey so filled with nitrates and food color to give the illusion of ham? How about ham or turkey? Please look at Jamie Oliver's *Food Revolution* and realize not only our food would be revolutionized by local farm grown meals, but also our health care system.

We just started our first vegetable garden. I can't tell you how delicious our food is. Our children are active participants in bringing food to our table and it takes

time and energy and it feels really right. The same as shopping at our local farmer's markets.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. You have the power to help our Nation become healthier and keep our agricultural heritage alive. Don't forget Farm to School!

COMMENT OF JAMES O'DOWD, NEW PALTZ, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:07 p.m.
Name: James O'Dowd.
City, State: New Paltz, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Federal Funding for school food is inadequate. A $.06 increase per child is insulting to our nation's children.

Healthy Non dairy plant based foods need to be a regular part of school nutrition

Local and organic farm to school programs need to be encouraged and subsidized.

Heavily processed foods with multiple additives, sugars salt and high saturated fat content need to be eliminated or drastically limited.

Dept. of Agriculture dual role as an advocate of Agribusiness and as setting nutritional standards is a recipe for a conflict of interest. A structural change is needed. The health and safety should come before short term corporate interests. The high cost of poor nutritionally based health issues should be a part of the calculus. Even in sheer economic terms the costs of childhood obesity and concomitant diseases such as diabetes, premature heart disease and even cancer are staggering compared to the cost of a nutritionally sound school lunch program. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Ben Franklin got it right!

Please, guys, get it right for our kids and grandkids!

Thank you,

JIM O'DOWD,
[Redacted].

P.S.: I've been actively working with a group of families in my community to get our school district to improve the food served in the cafeterias, but unless there is support on a federal level there is very little that can be done. We need your help!

COMMENT OF KENT OLSON, BISMARCK, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 12, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Kent Olson.
City, State: Bismarck, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance.
Comment:

Dear Representative Peterson,

THANK YOU for coming to ND last week along with Rep. Pomeroy.

Here are some IDEAS I hear from around the country as I visit with FARMERS and CROP INSURANCE AGENTS:

1. Crop Insurance is the best Risk Management Tool out there—DON'T cut or underfund it. It is finally a product that farmers and bankers can rely upon.

2. ACRE and SURE are TOO slow—They payments are 12–15 months behind the need for money. This is no one's fault but by design of both the SURE and ACRE program based upon "after the fact" disasters. Crop Claim Checks are immediate—within weeks after the Proof of Loss is agreed.

3. IDEA: Take all of the monies in the SURE and ACRE program and ADD to the Crop Insurance Budget. Then add ALL crops in an actuarial sound rating base and subsided the premium or supplement the program. This will allow the minor crops as well as the major crops to receive a sound crop risk plan. Crop Ins should be the ONLY game in town for risk management. NO *ad hoc* disaster—No money for it. Farmers than self-insure—by not buy Crop Ins.—are just that—self insured!

4. Whole farm—not popular in the upper Great Plains and Midwest. Too many variables such as livestock, truck farming and other incomes that affect the "whole farm" income. The poor ACRE sign-up and the SURE program dem-

onstrate that farmers don't like group plans or being compared to other farmers to depending upon losses outside of their farm exposure.

I'd be glad to visit about these ideas if you are interested.

Sincerely,

KENT OLSON, *Director,*
PIA of North Dakota,
Bismarck, ND.

COMMENT OF STEVE OLSON, MAYVILLE, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Steve Olson.
City, State: Mayville, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am a Real Estate Appraiser. I work for many banks, attorneys, Farm Service Agency, buyers and sellers. In the last farm bill you took away the access to the common land units that the Farm Service Agency provides. We were not able to access even the tillable acres on parcels of land much less data about farms that we were appraising such as CRP acres, base acres, yields, *etc.* It was even difficult trying to value land for Farm Service loans. Would you put the CLU data back in the public domain again. And make data about farms easier for licensed appraisers available so we can do our jobs in a consistent manner. Thank you.

COMMENT OF JOHN OPPELT, CASTROVILLE, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: John Oppelt.
City, State: Castroville, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Sales and Marketing of Agricultural Input Products.
Comment: John Oppelt is a member of the executive board of directors for the Texas Ag Industries Association (TAIA).

TAIA was created in 1995 from the merger of the Texas Agricultural Chemicals Association and the Texas Plant Food Institute. In 1997, the Texas Commercial Ground Applicators Association merged into TAIA. Since then, the association has grown to represent over 300 member companies and 200 individual members involved in providing inputs to production agriculture in Texas.

In my comments today my primary message is: There are major policy needs related to bioenergy in the Farm Bill.

The existing programs for biomass energy production incentives (including BCAP) for alternative energy production are complex, cross agencies, are continued and then discontinued, have varying deadline dates, and require approvals through a variety of unrelated Government agencies. Instead of focusing on the production of jobs and timely production of renewable energy, the on-again, off again nature of the incentives leads to huge project development inefficiencies and development. What is needed is a new program that is offered as an alternative option to the current programs so that new applications can be completed in less than 90 days with all approvals. It should be designed to speed up the production of jobs, and to meet national energy production replacement priorities.

Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP), which was established in the 2008 Farm Bill and has the potential to further help stimulate the growth of a biomass production industry. It is critical to fully study the impacts of such programs and then to provide consistent, uninterrupted funding which will allow the program to have the desired effect of establishing the new bioeconomy. The new farm program should serve as a platform to extend this program. It should also continue to serve as a basis for supporting an important segment of our economy to develop sustainable and renewable energy.

I appreciate the opportunity to be able to submit these comments to the Committee and that Texas agriculture will be involved in this process as it moves forward.

COMMENT OF JIM ORMISTON, LA CONNER, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Jim Ormiston.
City, State: La Conner, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information. This information is vital to appraisers and many others serving the agriculture industry.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF SCOTT OSBORNE, BANDON, OR

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Scott Osborne.
City, State: Bandon, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Self-Employed.
Comment: Don't handcuff small producer with micro regulating and taxing. Allow it to be feasible for families to produce a USA food sources that are sustainable for are future. Regulate the use of GMO seeds.

COMMENT OF RAY OTTO, PALMYRA, MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Ray Otto.
City, State: Palmyra, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: As an appraiser of farm land it is very helpful to fully see the FSA map with the field acreage. I do not belive this is confidential information.

COMMENT OF PAUL OVERBY, WOLFORD, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Paul Overby.
City, State: Wolford, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: This comment is regarding the sneaky insertion of the removal of Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries from public access in the last Farm Bill. While I support the removal of name, address, farm, *etc.* from the CLUs in the public access data base, removing access to the updated boundaries is just silly. We use them for a variety of services FOR farmers as part of my consulting business, as well as for my OWN farm! It is ridiculous that the public can have access to how much money USDA provides a farmer in program payments, yet USDA won't allow the CLU boundaries to made public. Time to fix the fix.

COMMENT OF KEVIN PAAP, BLUE EARTH COUNTY, MN

Date Submitted: July 7, 2010.
Name: Kevin Paap.
County, State: Blue Earth County, MN
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: President, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation

Comment: Good morning, my name is Kevin Paap. My wife Julie and I own and operate a fourth-generation family farm in Blue Earth County, Minnesota where we raise corn, soybeans and boys. I also serve as president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation. As you know, Farm Bureau is the nation's largest general farm organization, representing producers of every commodity, in every state of the nation as well as Puerto Rico, with more than 6 million member families.

I would like to thank Representative Pomeroy and Chairman Peterson for holding this forum. I appreciate the opportunity to participate and provide some views on the next farm bill.

In June, county Farm Bureaus from across Minnesota came together to begin our policy development process. Based on those meetings it is clear that Minnesota farmers are poised to look ahead to the 2012 Farm Bill. As the 2,800 county Farm Bureaus across the country work through the policy development process to provide more detailed recommendations, I would like to begin the discuss by outlining five key principles that will guide us in our work on the 2012 Farm Bill and any proposals that we ultimately put forward:

- **The options we put forward will be fiscally responsible.** Proposals that we put forward will work within the budget constraints Congress must use to draft the new bill. Our members are greatly concerned about the deficit and want to be fiscally-responsible in considering farm policy.
- **The basic funding structure of the 2008 Farm Bill should not be altered.** Farm Bureau's proposals for the next farm bill will not shift funding between interest areas. For example, if we suggest an increase in spending for a particular conservation program, we will offset that increase by reducing spending elsewhere in conservation programs.
- **The proposals we put forward will aim to benefit all agricultural sectors.** Again, Farm Bureau is a general farm organization, with members who produce everything from pork to peanuts. As such, the overriding goal of Farm Bureau's proposals will be to maintain balance and benefits for all farm sectors. It can be tempting for a single interest organization to say Congress should allocate more funding for programs that benefit only its producers without worrying about the impact of that funding shift on other commodities. Farm Bureau does not have that luxury and will seek balance for all producers.
- **World trade rulings will be considered.** Farm Bureau's options may include changes to comply with our existing World Trade Organization (WTO) obligations and litigation rulings. However, they will not presuppose the outcome of the Doha round of WTO negotiations, which are far from complete. To do so would reduce our negotiating leverage in the ongoing Doha round.
- **Consideration will be given to the stable business environment critical to success in agriculture.** Abruptly changing the rules of the game on farmers, particularly in a tight credit environment, can be disastrous to a farmer or rancher's operation. Our options will recognize the need for transition periods for major policy changes so that farmers and ranchers will have an opportunity to adjust their business models accordingly.

I have witnessed or been part of the development of farm bills since 1981 and I can say with confidence that each has faced new and more difficult challenges. The 2012 Farm Bill will be no exception. Budget constraints, baseline decreases and political pressures are among the many challenges we will face. Another challenge for the 2012 Farm Bill will once again be to address the priorities of a wide variety of interests, from farm and ranch groups to conservation groups to nutrition groups. Even within the agricultural community, farm bill priorities and agendas will likely vary by commodity and region. As an agricultural organization that represents all types of farmers and ranchers in every state, we look forward to working with you to achieve the balance in interests that will be necessary to craft a successful piece of legislation.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my statement, Farm Bureau members from throughout Minnesota recently came together to begin the 2010 policy development process. During the discussions surrounding the farm bill, one thing was clear—there are varying views on what is right about and what needs to improve in the farm bill. Some farmers think the safety net coverage provided under the 2008 Farm Bill is "Just right." But in other cases and for other farmers the coverage is sometimes too little. In a small number of cases, the coverage may even be duplicative and too much.

Whole-Farm Revenue Programs

Given the great deal of discussion that has already occurred regarding whole-farm revenue programs, we would be remiss if we didn't at least briefly discuss our thoughts on this topic.

There are currently crop insurance products and components of the farm safety net that use the whole-farm revenue concept, and challenges that have arisen with these programs can be very instructive if the concept is further pursued in the context of the 2012 Farm Bill. For example, there and whole-farm revenue insurance programs already in place through USDA's Risk Management Agency, namely the Adjusted Gross Revenue and the Adjusted Gross Revenue Lite plans. While they are both only available in limited areas, the acceptance of these programs has been modest at best. There are limitations on farm size as well as on the proportion of the farm's income that can derive from livestock operations. Producers must submit several years of tax records in order to establish their revenue benchmark, and in many cases, complicated adjustments to the records are required to determine those benchmarks. In addition to submitting tax records, a producer also must file farm plans. These limitations, as well as the complicated paperwork involved, have discouraged sign-up for the programs.

The SURE program provides us another case study on whole-farm revenue programs, although SURE only covers crops and not livestock. Yet, the complexity of this program still has caused implementation delays and has created technological challenges for USDA. Another issue with the SURE program is that it does not provide support until months, even years, after the disaster event. In true disaster situations, such a delay negates the value of the program.

A whole-farm program that included livestock exponentially increases the complexity of a program and the paperwork involved. Consider a livestock producer who decides to sell cattle every other year. On average, the rancher's income might be constant, but that income would gyrate significantly year over year and thus could be seen as triggering a payment every other year. Even for crop producers, determining appropriate whole-farm revenue guarantees can be complicated. For example, farm size may vary from one year to the next due to changes in rental agreements or real estate purchases or sales. Accounting for these changes over time is essential to having a fair and effective program, but it does increase the complexity of the program.

Moving beyond these examples, a whole-farm revenue safety net raises a number of both pragmatic and philosophical questions. Does the program cover gross or net revenue? Will it require full access to Internal Revenue Service filings? Would it be more appropriately administered by FSA or RMA? How would the protection offered under such a program be viewed by our WTO partners? These represent only a few of the questions that need to be answered.

Understand that Farm Bureau would not necessarily reject a whole-farm revenue option out-of-hand, and in fact would be very interested in continued discussions in this regard. But such a program needs to be easily understood, be straightforward to administer and needs to actually provide producers with risk management tools before we commit to such a path.

In conclusion, we appreciate the hard work of the Agriculture Committee to ensure that America's farmers have a practical safety net that provides protection against the vagaries of the market and weather and allows our farmers to continue to produce the safest, most abundant, least expensive food supply in the world. We look forward to working with you toward this goal.

I would like to thank you again for the opportunity to speak this morning, and I look forward to answering any questions you have.

COMMENT OF CHRISTINE PADO, THIRD LAKE, IL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Christine Pado.
City, State: Third Lake, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: H.R. Consultant.
Comment: Please stop supporting factory farms in the Farm Bill, and instead support local, organic, plant-based farming systems.

As a citizen and taxpayer I want my tax dollars going to sustainable local plant based farming systems that do not harm the environment. I do not want to subsidize cruelty or environmental degradation.

COMMENT OF STACEY PALEVSKY, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Stacey Palevsky.
City, State: San Francisco, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Journalist.
Comment: There is a reason so many American children are fat. It's because the food that is cheap and accessible to working families is laden with corn and soybeans, foods that are heavily subsidized by the federal government that have little to no nutritional value. It is a great tragedy of our time that subsidies enacted during the Great Depression are still in place during the Great Recession 80 years later. They are horribly out of date! The 2012 Farm Bill should be subsidizing farmers who grow fruits and vegetables, especially those who don't use harmful pesticides on their crops. This would make fruits and vegetables more affordable and accessible to our nation's children, to our public schools and to low-income Americans. Please repeal or reduce the subsidies to corn and soybean farmers and put REAL FOOD in school cafeterias and on the dinner table again.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL PALMER, STILLWATER, OK

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Michael Palmer.
City, State: Stillwater, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Scientist.
Comment: Please help level the playing field for small producers, and in particular for organic producers. The BP disaster is teaching us that we need energy efficiency, and the agricultural sector consumes a huge proportion of the nation's agency. Encouraging sustainable production of high-quality food that is close to the markets will decrease our demand for fossil fuels. Please help the little guy, for the sake of the consumer, the nation, and the planet.

COMMENT OF NOEL AND MEGHAN PARENTI, WINSTON-SALEM, NC

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Noel and Meghan Parenti.
City, State: Winston-Salem, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Owners, Operators, Teachers of Yoga Studio.
Comment: We would like to see in the 2012 Farm bill more support for farmers to raise food that using sustainable, organic practices for local consumption. We would like more incentives for farmers to use renewable forms of energy and to conserve land for wildlife and for protection of species, habitat, and soil and water resources. Small farms that provide food to local communities should be supported by the 2012 Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF ANDREA PARHAM, SHERBORN, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Andrea Parham.
City, State: Sherborn, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Sales Manager—mostly "just" a Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Please re-allocate a portion of the exiting subsidy funding currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors.

Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way towards improving the nutrition in our food supply and ensuring that our school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats that are more nutrient dense in school nutrition programs.

It would be a key component to reversing the obesity issue our country is experiencing as it would reduce the subsidization of less healthy foods, such as the corn syrup production and industrial meat and dairy production.

COMMENT OF ALVIN PARK, MILILANI, HI

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Alvin Park.
City, State: Mililani, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Self-Employed.
Comment: I highly encourage the House Committee on Agriculture to start moving towards a progressive society and ban intensive confinement of farm animals. As constituents in California last year demonstrated with the passing of Proposition 2, public sentiment of animal welfare is widespread and demanded. I strongly urge this Committee to ban the usage of battery cages for egg-laying hens, gestation crates for sows, and veal crates for calves. I also encourage the eradication of cruel and archaic practices such as de-horning, de-beaking, and tail-docking which is ALWAYS administered without the use of anesthesia. Please, let our country move towards a nation that is caring and compassionate toward the 9 million animals we condemn to death every year for our palate preferences. Thank you!

COMMENT OF JAMES D. PARK, PRESQUE ISLE, ME

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: James D. Park.
City, State: Presque Isle, ME.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser—Rural Resource Properties.
Comment: At Farm Credit and as rural land appraisers, we use the CLU layers extensively to verify crop acreage, tillable ground within a property and to aid in defining property boundaries. We do not request that specific payment information to property owners be made public or acreage of crops that they are growing, but request that the maps, overlays of boundaries and soil types be made available. We also request that specific payment information be supplied by a simple call from the property owner or by a signed release. The present system and requirements are very cumbersome and invasive to the property owner making it difficult to obtain needed data.

Please consider a revision to the policy that makes common sense, allowing for better use to the land owners and their associates.

Thank you,

JIM PARK.

COMMENT OF MELISSA PARKER, WESTPORT, CT

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Melissa Parker.
City, State: Westport, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nutritionist.
Comment: The Farm Bill sorely needs a BIG 'makeover' to ensure that local farmers can survive and flourish. Our children, families, communities and citizens deserve wholesome, organic, local crops and foods that will help support local businesses and our overall health. As we approach 2011, our country is both economically and physiologically challenged. We are getting sicker and larger each day with no end in sight, PLEASE restructure this bill to level the Farming/Food Production playing field and help to contribute to a healthier, more productive American public.

COMMENT OF RILEY PARKER, NORTH BEND, WA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: Riley Parker.
City, State: North Bend, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please vote for the Organic Farmer. On our small farm we work hard to supply the local public with quality grass fed beef. It is important that the organic, small farmer is well represented in our government.

COMMENT OF DR. DAMIAN PARR, DAVIS, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Dr. Damian Parr.
City, State: Davis, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.

Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

- Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
- Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
- Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
- Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

COMMENT OF CLIFFORD PATRICK, ALEXANDRIA, MN

Date Submitted: Sunday, May 02, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Clifford Patrick.
City, State: Alexandria, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Dairy Inspector for the Minnesota Dept. of Ag.
Comment: Please be mindful of water usage (irrigation), field run-off & pollution of stream, lakes & rivers. Well water quality, land & soil erosion from wind & water.

A supply management system for dairy, the market is not doing producers justice.

Limit payments to producers of grain, corn, beans & wheat. Support mo [*Editor's Note:* the comment was incomplete as submitted.]

COMMENT OF KERRY PATRONE, HIGH POINT, NC

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 5:35 a.m.
Name: Kerry Patrone.
City, State: High Point, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Health Nutritionist.
Comment: Could we please have a bill that supports the health of Americans? Let us support organic farming and small farms that grow fruits and vegetables in order to make them more affordable for all Americans. Let us stop spending over $5 billion a year of our tax dollars each on high fructose corn syrup (HFCS) and hydrogenated oils, giving millionaire corporate farms millions to increase diabetes and heart disease. Can we stop making HFCS so artificially cheap for soda manufactures and start making organic broccoli and grapes more affordable for families and school systems?

Thank you.

COMMENT OF PAUL PATTERSON, MORRIS, IL

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Paul Patterson.
City, State: Morris, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Chef.

Comment: As a chef of thirty some years, working at summer camp, boy scout camp, colleges, universities, casino, resorts and hotel. I have cooked for many people and many young people. We have gone away from the truck farms of my fathers age to where we do not know where the produce is grown or under what conditions it is grown. Plus travel times to bring it to market places a huge burden on our infrastructure. If something would happen that would limit the transportation of goods across this country many people would get very hungry. I grew up with corn and soybeans planted all around my town, but not one vegetable garden that could supply a town of 12,000 souls. Change this attitude in Congress before it hurts all of us. A fresh picked tomato, cucumber or pepper is so much better than one trucked across country. Most students do not know where or how most vegetables are grown. I plant a garden each year for my house and friends and it is no bigger than 30′ by 30′ yet I always have extra to give away. We are teaching our children that someone else will supply us with our food and they sit back and do nothing. The computer is not bad for us but the idea of sitting in front of it all day and after school and during summer breaks is making all of us a lazy nation. Change the funding for our schools to reflect what it actually cost to provide a good health meal to our children. I have read the guidelines for planning a meal by the USDA standards for meal reimbursement to the local schools it takes more time to do the paper work than it does to plan and prepare the daily lunch that most of our children receive. Why do you make it hard to supply a basic meal to the children?

Sincerely yours,

PAUL PATTERSON,
ACF Chef Member 30 years.

COMMENT OF DARRELL PATZER, JAMESTOWN, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Darrell Patzer.
City, State: Jamestown, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Banker/Land Management.
Comment: Farmers and their bankers require crop liens annually and security must be by crop by farmer. MPCI is the only program that fits their need and everyone I know wants to get rid of "SURE and ACRE Programs" and improve crop insurance to be more affordable and simplified. Each farmer wants to feel in control of his individual farm business and income protection plan. He knows his expenses and financial obligations and wants to buy protection according to his need. There should be one dependable insurance plan with all other programs eliminated with funding directed to their MPCI individual program.

COMMENT OF DAVID PATZER, JAMESTOWN, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: David Patzer.
City, State: Jamestown, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment: I am a crop insurance agent. I do not sell any other lines of insurance. As a whole our Crop Insurance program is working. I would like to see some improvements but for the most part producers and lenders like the program. My thoughts regarding areas to improve:

(1) Prevent Plant payments should be a flat rate. This will fairly compensate producers for acres that cannot be planted and will also entice them to seed when possible.

(2) Stop disaster payments from FSA—SURE and ACRE—and use that money to improve the already working crop insurance program by allowing producers to buy up to a higher level or having a trigger point to automatically increase the insurance level based on the experience of the producer. This meets the need on a producer level and is helpful in large diverse counties/areas.

(3) Whole farm policies don't work. An enterprise unit is catching on because of the lower premium but in order for the enterprise unit structure to grow the premium will need to be substantially lower so the producer is willing to take on the added risk. If optional units are available there will always be some producers who choose the added protection.

(4) Increased penalties for when the system is abused.

(5) Independent agents are why the system works. We compete for business through quality service and program knowledge. If you take away financial incentives and reduce competition the program integrity will suffer.

COMMENT OF DEXTER PAYNE, BOULDER, CO

Date Submitted: Friday, June 04, 2010, 6:35 a.m.
Name: Dexter Payne.
City, State: Boulder, CO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables, Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: 2012 Farm Bill should promote organic. Organic agriculture, both rural and urban, small and large scale, is diverse and provides clear taxpayer benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. Please:

- Remember the pollinators. If we do not tend to the health of smallest in our food chain, insects which pollinate the plants we depend on for food, clothing, feed and fuel, there will be big news and it will not be pretty, nor reversible. We will die.
- Farmers must receive incentive for environmental good they do: increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields. Farmers who raise organic food crops, the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, are our best asset. Reward them! When the sole remuneration is for quantity of crops produced—we end up with GMO!
- Take a stand on GMO crops, which have been proven dangerous—to public health AND to biodiversity. The health of our planet IS our health. And our wealth! If corporate agendas control our agriculture, we are in for a rough ride. Sooner . . . or later. (The same can be said for ALL legislative issues!!!!!!!!!)
- Remember—Consumers are not against organic. Some feel they can not afford it. It does not lend itself, by nature (hmmmm, interesting!), to facilitate the money grab. But it is time for our government to stand up for what is clear and right. Trashing our planet, and our food supply, is NOT OK! In reality, we cannot afford to do anything else!

I am a very small producer, for those close to me, and a friend of plants that feed pollinators—often considered by economic powers to be a nuisance. I am a champion of "weeds" that farmers and gardeners pull and toss, which are more nutritious for human consumption, and easier to grow, than the actual crops. But they do not make money for anyone. (They DO create vibrant health and save money for those who eat them). Should the Ag Dept. be a special interest promoter just for those who make money off of the need for food????? I think not!

COMMENT OF MARK PEACHEY, PRATT, KS

Date Submitted: Friday, May 07, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Mark Peachey.
City, State: Pratt, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Give up direct payments and all the requirements at FSA office and fund crop insurance at a higher level that can really be used for risk management in your farming operations and at the bank for operating loans.

COMMENT OF NICOLE PEIRCE, HOLLAND, PA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Nicole Peirce.
City, State: Holland, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.

Comment: As you consider the next farm bill, I urge you to hold high standards for the medications being used in the meat and dairy produced on the farms in this country. I am happy to see the current recommendations from the FDA and I hope the new bill will have strong enforcement of these recommendations outlined. I also have great concern for the pesticides being used on the U.S. grown produce and cotton. I do not want to put toxins on or in my body from the crops grown on U.S. farms. I urge you to include incentives for farms to use organic and cruelty free practices. I hope there is some way to encourage local sustainability in the new bill. Finally, I'd love to see some way for local farms to connect with the school lunch programs that are also federally supported so that we can get back to providing quality, fresh, healthy foods to our youth. Thank you for listening.

COMMENT OF JUSTIN PENCE, OMAHA, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Justin Pence.
City, State: Omaha, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: GIS Mapping.
Comment: One item I would like to see changed is in Section 1619 in the Farm Bill 2008 pertaining to Common Land Unit Data (CLU) from the Farm Service Agency. A special provision in Section 1619, thrown in the last minute, banned the release of CLU data to the public. I would like this amended allowing once again for the public release of CLU data. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data was at one time, from 2004 to 2008, released to the public in a GIS file format that many GIS and Agricultural professionals used. We do not need specific information on each tract released, all that we are looking for to be released is the CLU shapefile, which just contains the farm field boundaries, nothing else.

Please reconsider this in the 2010 farm bill. Having this data allows me to perform my tasks for my job, without this data, I can not perform them.

COMMENT OF AMY PENNINGTON, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:06 a.m.
Name: Amy Pennington.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Gardener.
Comment: Please make organic farming a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill!!

- Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.
- Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.
- If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:
  - Research and Extension Programs, Conservation Programs, Transition Programs are of utmost importance in order to continue building healthy soils for our next generations.

Look at what happened with BP—laws were not updated after new technology for drilling was developed and as a result of this outdated law, we've suffered a catastrophe. Be forward thinking! Make a change!!

Thank you,

AMY PENNINGTON.

COMMENT OF DAVID PERKINS, SAINT AUGUSTINE, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: David Perkins.
City, State: Saint Augustine, FL.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Please limit or cut out subsidies paying farmers to grow corn. Ethanol has been a waste and costs more to make than benefits us, corn is turned into many products that are not productive and significantly affect the obesity in our country and by subsidizing corn and not other vegetables we make wholesome vegetables more expensive for the poor.

COMMENT OF JULIE PERRY, TOWANDA, PA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:36 a.m.
Name: Julie Perry.
City, State: Towanda, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I am submitting comment even though I feel that our voice has no power compared to lobbyists.

As a sustainable farmer with a small dairy/swine/chicken/hog/produce operation I would hope for the simple chance to have our efforts go into a fair market situation with hope of making a modestly comfortable income. We desperately need transparency and choice in the dairy industry; the system as set up bans (or makes cost-prohibitive) the ability to sell our products competitively as the middle ends take the lion share and enjoy an unreasonable amount of the profit. We need on-farm sales of raw milk or a small local creamery in many areas and other products available for informed consumers to have a choice, without regulations and requirements that make such options so cost prohibitive they are guaranteed to fail.

We need the bulk of the funding from the farm bill to go to the small and medium producers (even in the form of building local processing facilities), who have more personal interest and ability to manage quality and safety instead of almost all the funding going to fake farms and mega corporations whose lobbyists are camped on your steps. We also need protection from the absurd. Odor management plans because people from town want to buy up cheap land from fallen farms but don't want us to smell like a farm? Honestly? The regulations and requirements have become over-the-top silly.

I invite any one of you to watch as my friends and neighbors stand proud with tears streaming out of their eyes while their herds, each with a name and a story go to slaughter as the current system is so broken that the real backbone of this country does not have a chance to scrape by, let alone earn even a modest living.

Small and medium farms can feed this country, can do it well, safely, environmentally sensitively; and do it under the eyes and ears of the neighbors we serve in our localities. We can produce both the needed volume with the quality and safety the public deserves at a price that is fair to all, but only if something is done, and done yesterday.

Again, we don't want handouts, all we want is a fighting chance.

COMMENT OF MELISSA PETTUS, LAFAYETTE, LA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Melissa Pettus.
City, State: Lafayette, LA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Realtor.
Comment:

Dr. Boustany,

Please do not support subsidies to large, mono-agricultural, genetically modified crops such as corn and soy. Please support smaller farms who grow diversified, non GMO crops. With obesity running rampant in our culture, we must find ways to produce healthy foods for Americans. If you have ever traveled to Europe, I'm sure that you experienced that the food they eat is far superior to ours. It's not rocket science, you can taste the difference. They have stricter standards and often reject stuff that we feed our very own children in school cafeterias no less.

We must support smaller operations, that raise food in a sustainable manner. I already refuse to buy food from the big players that use all of that subsidized corn. However, many citizens are much less informed about the impact that the large

mono culture crops have on their health. Please support better farming practices and eliminate the outdated subsidies.

Respectfully,

MELISSA PETTUS.

COMMENT OF CHRISTINE PEVARNIK, MOBILE, AL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Christine Pevarnik.
City, State: Mobile, AL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Business Owner.
Comment: There needs to be more backing behind growing more agriculture that is healthy for everyone, not just our children. The reason the least healthful calories in the supermarket are the cheapest is that those are the ones the farm bill encourages farmers to grow.

COMMENT OF ADAM PFEIFFER, OAK HARBOR, OH

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Adam Pfeiffer.
City, State: Oak Harbor, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: State Certified Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: This message is in regards to Section 1619 that restricts the use of CLU data in FSA (Farm Service Agency) mapping. As an agricultural appraiser in the state of Ohio, the information provided by FSA is integral in preparing an accurate appraisal for Lender's, Attorney's, and private land-owners in our state. The majority of our work is used for lending purposes in the farm credit system. The lack of current CLU data provided to us would have a tendency to create inaccuracies in reports that are used in federal lending. It is the boundary information that the CLU data provides to us that is of the utmost importance in that it gives us the current field sizes for farms being appraised. Without this current information, estimates must be made for current field size, *etc.* It is my opinion that Section 1619 should be repealed and/or removed from the current farm bill. If removal is not possible, an exception allowing state or federal licensed professionals should be included so that professionals (who have confidentiality to uphold) could continue to have access to important, current CLU data. After speaking with other state licensed appraisers in Ohio, it is my opinion that the majority of our profession feels the same way about this matter as I do.

COMMENT OF KATHLEEN PHILLIPS, WELLINGTON, FL

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Kathleen Phillips.
City, State: Wellington, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Office Administrator.
Comment: My husband and I don't want to ingest pesticides and hormones in our food. We want a healthier food system for ourselves and our country. We would like Congress to STOP supporting large factory farms in the Farm Bill, and instead support local, organic, plant-based farming systems.

COMMENT OF RICHARD PITCHFORD, WAVERLY, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Richard Pitchford.
City, State: Waverly, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Specialist in the Growmark System.
Comment: I would like to see the CLU data be made public. As we use the data in our day to day field applications.

COMMENT OF JANET PLACKE, CENTRAL CITY, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 02, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Janet Placke.
City, State: Central City, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Merrick County, Nebraska Assessor.
Comment:

Dear Congressman:

County assessors in Nebraska have the task of assigning an assessed value to agricultural land for property tax purposes. We gather as much information as we can at the lowest cost.

One piece of information that would aid us is a Geographic Information System (GIS) crop field shape layer that was created by each local FSA office and reviewed by each landowner. Unfortunately the FSA office will not release it to other government offices due to it being deemed confidential. It contains no ownership information or crop production information. The FSA will release a GIS layer but all details regard crop or non-crop designations have been purged leaving it virtually useless. This information could be re-created at great expense.

I respectfully requests that the next farm bill require that the unmodified GIS field layer to available to county government officials thereby saving local tax dollars and a more accurate layer.

I realize this a relatively insignificant request but making this information available to local government would produce more accurate assessments with no added cost.

Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely,

JAN PLACKE,
Merrick County, Nebraska Assessor.

COMMENT OF NORA PLANK, MILFORD, MI

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Nora Plank.
City, State: Milford, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: School Secretary.
Comment: Please stop supporting factory farming, which is ruining our environment and human health as well. Instead please support local, organic plant-based farming.

COMMENT OF GEORGE PLIML, COOK, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 26, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: George Pliml.
City, State: Cook, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: The focus of the new Farm Bill should be on strengthening local food networks and targeting money towards growing fruits and vegetables.

At this time we are dependent upon very large food distribution companies to keep the shelves of local grocery stores stocked. We need to develop smaller local infrastructures (processing, storage and distribution facilities) to help supply our communities. In this way we can take advantage and build our local economies.

According to the food pyramid Americans are to eat servings of fruit and vegetables each day. However all the subsides now are targeted to corn and soybeans. This must change to again help smaller local farmers and local economies.

COMMENT OF DOUGLAS R. PLOETZ, LITTLE GENESEE, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 07, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Douglas R. Ploetz.
City, State: Little Genesee, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.

Type: Livestock.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: As a farmer and a professional Appraiser it is very important to me that some major changes be made in section 1619 of the farm bill. Prior to the 2008 Farm Bill geospatial information, or CLU data was public information and was developed with public monies. The 2008 Farm Bill made this information private, requiring individual farmer consent to obtain the information. This has made obtaining accurate data on agricultural property sales very difficult as not all property owners are available, nor do they all provide access to this information.

This lack of accurate data can cause appraisals to be potentially less accurate at a time when there is financial stress in much of the agricultural community as well as the banking community.

I would strongly encourage the House of Representatives to make the following information available to appraisers to help ensure the safety and soundness of our financial institutions and the farm community.

The information needed is:

- CLU field boundaries.
- Acres.
- Maps—aerial, soils, topography with FSA field boundaries.
- FSA Yield information.
- Information on if the property is enrolled in CRP, WRP, or other programs that may effect the value of the property.

Thank you for considering this information.

DOUGLAS R. PLOETZ,
VP/Sr. Regional Appraiser,
Farm Credit East, ACA.

COMMENT OF LAURA PLUNKETT, MARBLEHEAD, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Laura Plunkett.
City, State: Marblehead, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Author on nutrition for children with diabetes.
Comment: I think subsidies should be shifted from corn, wheat and soy into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural efforts. This would make healthy foods more avoidable and ensure that local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

I hope you will consider this.

COMMENT OF STEVEN POLKOW, OWATONNA, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Steven Polkow.
City, State: Owatonna, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Business Manager.
Comment: I as an ag business manager use the mapping portion to provide to the growers accurate and geophysical locations for crop nutrient and crop protection products in to exact and easily identifiable areas of their fields. These resources help to identify areas of concern for all concerned with regard to environmental concerns as well.

COMMENT OF BRIAN POPPE, FALLS CITY, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Brian Poppe.
City, State: Falls City, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.

Comment: The current farm program is very confusing for most producers. I have been able to use the spreadsheets to make my decisions, so I feel more comfortable making decisions. I think most producers would agree to a direct payment program, such as the one that we currently use, along with the gross income protection plan that is trying to be used. The key to the income protection plan is it needs to be more simplified for the producer. The ACRE program benefits just vary to much between regions in a State and from State to State. A dryland farm in Southeast Nebraska could benefit from ACRE, whereas a dryland farm in Southwest Nebraska would not benefit. The weather conditions between these two regions are hugely different. The other problem is that most farmers can only see outside their back door. They have a difficult time thinking global, thus they can't correlate State yields to their own farm.

I personally think the timing of the ACRE program is excellent and signed up for the program. We are experiencing records yields and records prices which can only help the two year price average and the five year yield average. I am extremely worried about the producer who can't focus on the future years and how a major drop in prices could put them out of business. I contend that all bubbles burst and agriculture is in a major growth bubble right now. I believe the ACRE program will protect my farm investment for two years if this bubble should break.

Watch for increased debt in the ag sector. Most producer have set their sights on net income levels that I believe are unsustainable. The suppliers of agricultural products are becoming irrational as well, especially the fertilizer companies. Their business plan is not based on supply-demand factors, it is based on the gross income level of the farmer and how many of those dollars they can extract from the farmer's account. Another problem in the fertilizer sector is that we are importing to much product, instead of producing it in the USA. Anhydrous Ammonia is priced at $525 per ton compared to $400 last year. Natural Gas futures are only $.65 per unit higher than last year. I don't know if this price increase justifies a $125 increase to the farmer, but it seems like a gouge. The total cost per acre to raise corn has doubled in the last 5 years. Any disruption on the income side of the equation could spell disaster.

The current income levels are sufficient enough that government involvement is not necessary right now. I am worried that the law makers and lobbyist will use these income levels against the ag sector and severely reduce the income net that is needed. I can see that once this safety net is lowered, the net income side of the equation could change to cause a farm crisis.

With all of this said, I don't have many issues with the current farm policy. It would be nice to have a shorter time period than a year to determine if an ACRE payment is generated, 5 months (Nov.–Mar.) would be acceptable. I know it takes a year to figure out the final yields, 2009 is a prime example. There is no such thing as a perfect program, only one better than the other. Most producers don't grasp the inner workings of the farm program for at least two years, by then, they have already missed out on the gravy.

Just don't get carried away with the next farm bill. The last two have been complete over hauls and have cost the taxpayers millions to implement. Believe me, I have seen the amount of work that my local office has done on my small farm, way too much time and our office has excellent staff.

COMMENT OF JOANN PORTER, PORT TOWNSEND, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:06 p.m.
Name: JoAnn Porter.
City, State: Port Townsend, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Please address the Monsanto practices that effect our food that results in illness and obesity and what it is doing to the soil—also the cruelty to animals.

What happen to wholesome and healthy food and healthy farming practices?

We now have a young generation that is obese and suffering from diseases—these are your grandchildren and mine!

Please address corporate farming and their unhealthy practices!!

JOANN PORTER/Port Townsend WA.

COMMENT OF KATHLEEN POWELL, FRESNO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 1:35 p.m.

Name: Kathleen Powell.
City, State: Fresno, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: N/A.
Comment: The farm bill is working well in it's current form and needs to continue as is. No cuts are needed unless you want to take non-farm items such as the school lunch program out of the farm bill and put it somewhere else. Farmers have been hit hard enough.

COMMENT OF SCOTT POWELL, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 21, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Scott Powell.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please work to generate a real change in U.S. agricultural policy with this farm bill. Market power is way too consolidated in very few companies. Their practices pose risks to the environment, to the genetic basis for agriculture, to farming communities, and to consumers. U.S. policies have severe impacts to neighboring countries, especially the rural poor in Mexico. We can and must do better. The American public has shown a tremendous interest in environmentally sustainable practices in many fields. Help give them those choices in food policy and together we can reach real transformation. Thank you for your work.

S.P.

COMMENT OF KRISTEN POWERS, CHAPEL HILL, NC

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Kristen Powers.
City, State: Chapel Hill, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: High School Student.
Comment: Many of the issues we face today concerning nutrition can be traced to the fact that processed foods can be made cheaply because of subsidized corn and soy. Not only is this a social injustice, as it makes poor quality food the only thing affordable to the poor, it is also an environmental issue as the monocultures in the Midwest destroy soil quality and biodiversity.

I'd love to see the Farm Bill phase out, or reduce, the subsidies the government gives to corn and soy farmers, and instead encourage them to grow a more diverse crop. We also need to start subsidizing organic and local farmers as family farms are crucial to our nation's success.

Thank you for taking the time to read my suggestions. Please let me know if this type of new subsidiary program ends up in the Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF ARAVIND PRASAD, ARLINGTON, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Aravind Prasad.
City, State: Arlington, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Scientist.
Comment: I suggest increased dissemination of information and provision of technical support for farmers following organic methods in farming. This will lead to an increase in safe and healthy organic food availability and also tremendously decrease environmental damage because of inorganic fertilizers and pesticides. This will also decrease farmers' dependence on corporations thus decreasing their farming costs. I would like to point out here that internationally several experiments (large and small scale) have proven that scientific and environmentally conscious organic farming can on the long term lead to higher production and better food security than inorganic fertilizer and pesticide dependent farming

A second issue is that of genetically modified foods. I demand my right to know which foods have genetically modified (GM) organisms (or their derived products) in them. Like the "USDA Organic" stamp, I think there is a need to identify clearly

foods containing GM organisms (and their derived products). This is the only way to protect a consumer's right to choose foods free of GM organisms and their derived products.

COMMENT OF TERRELL PRICE, MODESTO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Terrell Price.
City, State: Modesto, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: If, we the Citizens of California, treasure the ability to Produce Agriculture, and Market our Valley as a premier agricultural area, then why do we not protect our water supply with unnecessary pesticides and harmful chemicals? We need to balance the ability to turn a profit from our land and the ability to turn the profit from our land! We need to ensure through legislation that when their is an alternative we take a real look on all possibilities and use only natural remedies in dealing with pests and diseases. Through Education and on-going development of new methods and products in our Universities, Colleges, Future Farmers of America and 4–H Clubs, we can turn the direction of saline, soil, contaminated water, and pesticides. Don't be split by the pressures of Large Profit Corporations and their need of more profit, but for Healthy Farming that benefits the body of our Citizens and Animals.

God wants the people to be taken care of, I want you to make a stand for Equality, Integrity and due Diligence and take action for better farming practices and processes. God Bless America!

COMMENT OF TODD PROBASCO, EXETER, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Todd Probasco.
City, State: Exeter, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy Manager.
Comment: As an Agronomist it is crucial that I have up to date field maps and acres for my growers. I need this information to make accurate recommendations and spray applications. 90% of the farmers don't remember to bring this information with them, when placing an order. The AgriData website gives me this crucial information. Please make maps and acres available online again.

COMMENT OF KIMBALL PROBST, LOGAN, UT

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Kimball Probst.
City, State: Logan, UT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I use the field information from the FSA almost daily for appraisal work. I use the information to know what is being farmed and what is not. It is vital information when valuing farm/ranch properties. This is generally information that is not technically private, but because of privacy issues, I can only access the data with permission of the property owner. I agree with the following statements and would like to see access to this information become available again.

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Thank you,

KIMBALL PROBST, M.A.I.

COMMENT OF BECKY PUGH, BETHESDA, MD

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Becky Pugh.
City, State: Bethesda, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I am involved in Arkansas family farm. I want to see legislation that helps independent farmers and animals. I am sickened by factory farming.

COMMENT OF FISHER QUA, SEATTLE, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Fisher Qua.
City, State: Seattle, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Intern—Washington Health Foundation.
Comment: Please reform agricultural subsidies to promote crop diversification and enhance the production of non-staple food-stuffs.

COMMENT OF GRETCHEN QUARTERMAN, HAHIRA, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Gretchen Quarterman.
City, State: Hahira, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Forestry, Vegetables.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment:

Dear Members of the Agriculture Committee,

Thank you for taking input from the citizens of this country. I am not a large business. I'm not even a large farmer. My husband and I live on the family farm upon which he was raised. We grow trees and vegetables.

We appreciate the work the Agriculture Committee does in promoting programs like the Conservation Reserve Program which promotes re-forestation. We are a part of that program and are pleased to be growing Long Leaf Pine.

I have three basic concerns.

First, I would like it if the government would stop subsidizing agribusiness, like Monsanto.

We do not need any more GMO seed, trees, cotton, corn, soybeans, non-native eucalyptus or the like. Round-up is either killing everything in sight or speeding up the natural modification of weeds like pigweed. Mutant pigweed is all around Georgia and it's directly the result of Monsanto spraying. Round-up is not safe and should be banned from use.

Second, farming methods have changed drastically, from small family farms to giant factory farms. Factory farms for meat, corn, soybeans, potatoes, etc. while perhaps resulting in large outputs, do not produce a quality product. The way food tasted when I was a child in the 1960's was a vague memory until we started getting locally grown clean food. No-till and factory farming are not the best farming methods. Spraying everything in sight is poisoning our environment, our families, our livelihood. The over-use of antibiotics and hormones is passed through the food-chain and is dangerous.

Third, the preservation of farmland is essential to the survival of our nation. Here in Lowndes County, we had a terrible flood last year. The loss of farmland, both row-crop and timber, and the subsequent paving over of the land has produced both erosion and additional run off. If our nation is going to have anything that resembles a sustainable economy, we must put a priority on preserving farm land by pro-

viding incentives to small farmers to keep their land in production rather than selling it off to developers to grow houses and vacant strip plazas.

Thank you,

GRETCHEN QUARTERMAN.

COMMENT OF PETE QUASIUS, FT. MYERS, FL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Pete Quasius.
City, State: Ft. Myers, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: End the sugar support program.

COMMENT OF RICHARD RADFORD, CLINTON, KY

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Richard Radford.
City, State: Clinton, KY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: As a farm appraiser for the last 30 years, restricting FSA maps and crop base data on farm appraisal assignments has reduced the accuracy and reliability of many farm appraisals. Since this appraisal data relates to the loan collateral, and many of these farm loans are government guaranteed, assuring the accuracy by providing this basic data to farm appraisers, actually protects the tax payers from future bail-outs from loan defaults.

COMMENT OF DAVID RAGAN, EFFINGHAM, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: David Ragan.
City, State: Effingham, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As a real estate appraiser, it would be helpful if the CLU data (FSA acreage) would be available to appraisers again.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF JAMES RAKICH, VISALIA, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 10, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: James Rakich.
City, State: Visalia, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Insurance Agent for Crop Insurance.
Comment: Crop insurance for the farmer is the only way he can survive in the event of a disaster. One disaster can break the farmers back and bankrupt him. He can't control the weather that happens, nor can he predict the price for his goods. He plants his crop and does all his good farming practices and looks to the sky for help. We as a nation depend on our farmers to provide the crops to put food on our tables. Please continue the crop insurance program.

Thank you,

JIM RAKICH.

COMMENT OF JAMES RAMSAY, LOMA, CO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: James Ramsay.
City, State: Loma, CO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: Less than 50 acres.

Comment: I support small sustainable farming and ranching. Unfortunately it is very difficult to profit on a small scale with-out over utilizing the land. I don't use chemicals and I raise only grass fed beef, that will help bring in a better price for my cattle in a niche market. I would however prefer to sale at a competitive price to folks who want to buy chemical free grass fed beef but can't afford to. I am not sure that you can help with a farm bill, but please consider it.

Thanks.

COMMENT OF PATRICIA RATHMANN, MOSCOW, ID

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Patricia Rathmann.
City, State: Moscow, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Farm policy should do the following: (1) support efforts toward renewable energy, (2) make sure that agriculture programs give the greatest weight to the growth of vegetables which enable families to have access to healthy, nutritious foods, (3) provide aid to the small family farms, and (4) provide funds for land trusts to preserve our farm land.

COMMENTS OF DAVE REDDING, NAPLES, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Dave Redding.
City, State: Naples, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Director Nonprofit Healthy Food Coalition.
Comment: Organics must be a larger part of the farm bill for 2012. Thank YOU!

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 5:36 p.m.
Name: Dave Redding.
City, State: Naples, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

- Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do IN ADDITION TO paying for the amount of crops they produce.
- Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.
- Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

COMMENT OF ANN REDIG, ROCHESTER, MN

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Ann Redig.
City, State: Rochester, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Religious Sister.
Comment: Please refocus federal farm program payments upon farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits and promote long-term food security.

And please put a limit on who receives subsidies and try to close loopholes for the corporation absentee farmers who seem to get rich from government subsidies and don't need any subsidies. Promote family farms and growth of rural communities.

COMMENT OF BRAD REDLIN, ST. ANTHONY, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Brad Redlin.
City, State: St. Anthony, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Owner and Director of Ag Programs for the Izaak Walton League of America.
Comment: I want to thank the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture for providing this opportunity to submit comments on agricultural policy for the 2012 Farm Bill.

Farmers understand that conservation is key to agricultural production, rural economies, and future well-being. To meet the needs of the future, the 2012 Farm Bill must recognize, protect, and enhance the status of conservation policy in federal farm policy.

Research from USDA consistently shows that conservation practices and programs that support rural America's natural amenities also bolster the number of rural jobs and even farms. Furthermore, protection of our finite soil and water resources is essential if farms and ranches are to meet the challenge of feeding a growing population. Conversely, an extraction ethic in agriculture can at best serve only short term rewards at the expense of our future.

Success in the 2012 Farm Bill can be achieved without inflated spending, but conservation must be at the center of policy considerations. As you begin the process of re-authorizing our national farm policy, please include the following recommendations in your work:

1. Enact a robust and well funded Conservation Title to support easement, working lands, and all conservation programs. Congress and the Administration must enact a Conservation Title of the 2012 Farm Bill that provides the technical assistance and financial incentives necessary to ensure the long term productivity and stewardship of agricultural lands.

2. Refocus federal farm program payments upon farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits and promote long-term food security, rather than prioritizing paying for the historical production of a few select crops.

3. Recognize and re-prioritize the existing and logical covenant between taxpayers and producers represented by the conservation compliance regimen. Conservation compliance is a means for ensuring that where public money is invested, the public's interests are protected by requiring basic levels of protections for soil, water and wetlands. Further, prioritizing compliance will require no additional Farm Bill investment and in fact can result in saving federal dollars. Specific actions that should be taken include:

(a) All land in production, both Highly Erodible Land (HEL) and non-HEL, should be required to have a conservation plan to be eligible for any USDA benefits. This would strongly encourage producers to create and follow that plan.

(b) Remove incentives to convert marginal lands by requiring non-cropland and native sod on which an agricultural commodity is planted for which a policy or plan of insurance is available to be ineligible for those benefits.

(c) Re-establish compliance penalties on crop insurance support provided to producers so that all existing or new crop and revenue insurance or other risk management programs must be subject to conservation compliance provisions. This is absolutely critical, particularly with respect to the recent calls for making insurance a more integral component of the federal farm policy "safety net" and proposals to increase use of subsidized insurance for crops and regions of the country where it is not currently prominent.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit these comments.

COMMENT OF ANNE REEDER, SALEM, OR

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Anne Reeder.
City, State: Salem, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nursing Student.
Comment: Please support more programs to get farm-fresh foods into low income areas so that everyone can have access to nutritious foods. As a nursing student in

an urban setting, I have seen first hand the effects of "food deserts" on the health of the urban poor. I would also like to see more support for farm workers attempting to "go organic". The more we, as a country, can nurture such farming practices, the more accessible organic food items will be.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER REFICI, MACEDON, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Jennifer Refici.
City, State: Macedon, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Wellness Consultant/Mom.
Comment: Please make sustainable agriculture and chemical free food a priority for America. We are expected to be the leaders, let's do it responsibly. Please give organic farmers more subsidy. We would all like to be able to provide a truly healthy lifestyle for our families, and I am forced to make what I know are poor choices every day because buying organic costs nearly three times as much.

COMMENT OF KEVIN REILLY, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Kevin Reilly.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: U.S. Citizen.
Comment: Please consider withdrawing your subsidies to the major commodities like corn and soybean. This badly distorts markets and creates perverse incentives. Please consider removing your tariffs on imported sugar and sugar based ethanol. Again you are manipulating the market and it is not to the benefit of the U.S. citizens, only to the special interests who wish to be protected by these subsidies and tariffs. Remember you serve the greater interests of the American people, not the narrow interests of a specific lobby.

COMMENT OF ANGELA RENALA, DUNWOODY, GA

Date Submitted: Sunday, May 16, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Angela Renala.
City, State: Dunwoody, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment:

House Agriculture Committee,

I would like to share with you a blog entry I wrote (below) entitled "Cheap Food Nation" which expresses my desire to see us return to healthy eating (and growing) practices. For my vote, I would like to see my family's taxes go towards helping American farmers convert to uncompromised organic farming. I understand that those who are profiting from our current subsidy system may stand in the way of this change. My own senator Saxby Chambliss has told me that a move towards organic practices would be crippling to Georgia farmers. I would like someone to prove him wrong, and quick. Until the hallmarks of conventional farming, (*i.e.,* synthetic pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, CAFOs, routine antibiotic use, and genetically engineered crops) are made illegal in this country, I certainly do not support subsidizing these practices. It is like paying to endanger the health of all our children, most notably in the lower socioeconomic classes.

Thank you for your attention,

ANGELA RENALA.

ATTACHMENT

Saturday, October 17, 2009

Eating Well, Part Two: Cheap Food Nation

http://retracingmysteps.blogspot.com/2009_10_01_archive.html

> "I pay more for my chickens than I would for store bought, mass-produced ones, but I don't pay too much. The farmer charges me only what it costs him to raise

> and dress my chickens plus a reasonable profit. He is a farmer who endeavors to operate in an environmentally sound, ethical way. Buying from this farmer, I support a food system that embodies my values—one that provides wholesome food, cares for creation, and provides a living wage to family farmers."
>
> Marta Cleaveland, "*You Should Pay More for Your Food* (*http://www.coopdirectory.org/salt001.htm*)," *Salt Magazine.**

At first glance, it seems like quite an achievement that Americans today spend less than 10% of our *disposable incomes on food* (*http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/CPIFoodAndExpenditures/Data/table7.htm*),* especially compared to 1933, when spending was at 25%.

U.S. Family and Individual Food Expenditures, As Percent of Disposable Personal Income (chart)

[*Editor's Note:* the comment was incomplete as submitted.]

During the depression era, U.S. Government hatched a relief program to encourage farmers to produce food as cheaply and abundantly as possible. Oil was cheap then, as were the pesticides derived from it, and as the chart above shows, we began to feed our families for less.

Perhaps that system fed our hunger sufficiently to allow us to focus on the specifics of how we have been feeding ourselves, and at what real cost to our long-term health and environment.

For generations Americans have been offered food—*and consumer goods* (*http://retracingmysteps.blogspot.com/2009/02/story-of-stuff.html*)*—at artificially low prices. A fast food value meal may feed you for less than $5, but it didn't cost $5. Your tax dollars already paid subsidies to the agricultural conglomerate who produced it, allowing them to remain profitable while selling you that meal at a dirt cheap price.

Even though our receipt totals don't tally the real cost of our food, which also includes climate change.

> "the way we grow, process and transport food uses more fossil fuel and contributes more greenhouse gas to the atmosphere than any other industry (17–34%)."

and rising healthcare costs.

> "Spending on healthcare as a percentage of GDP has risen from 5% in 1960 to 18% today. Of 2 trillion we spend on healthcare, 1.5 trillion is going to treat preventable chronic disease linked to diet."
>
> Author Michael Pollan, keynote speaker, Georgia Organics' 2009 Annual Conference (*http://clatl.com/freshloaf/archives/2009/04/21/michael-pollan-at-georgia-organics-conference/*).*

We get what we pay for, whether it's obvious to us or not. In Americans' case, we pay with our tax money via farm bill subsidies to make processed food cheaper than real, whole foods.

> "The real price of fruits and vegetables between 1985 and 2000 increased by nearly 40 percent while the real price of soft drinks (aka liquid corn—[made with high fructose corn syrup]) declined by 23 percent. The reason the least healthful calories in the supermarket are the cheapest is that those are the ones the farm bill encourages farmers to grow."
>
> "Compared with a bunch of carrots, a package of Twinkies, to take one iconic processed food-like substance as an example, is a highly complicated, high-tech piece of manufacture, involving no fewer than 39 ingredients, many themselves elaborately manufactured, as well as the packaging and a hefty marketing budget. So how can the supermarket possibly sell a pair of these synthetic cream-filled pseudo-cakes for less than a bunch of roots?"
>
> Author Michael Pollan, "*You Are What You Grow* (*http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/22/magazine/22wwlnlede.t.html?pagewanted=1&_r=2&emc=eta1*)," April 2007, *New York Times Magazine.**
>
> "Nearly 90% of all federal farm payments go to only five favored crops that include corn, wheat, cotton, soybeans, and rice, while fresh fruits, vegetables and organic agriculture receive little."—Environmental Working Group (EWG) (*http://www.ewg.org/news/obama-stands-firm-on-push-for-farm-program-reform.*)*

---

* The documents referred to are retained in Committee files.

Then, many of us gravitate towards these heavily marketed products of industrialized agriculture, perhaps for "great value" or "great taste."

"Energy-dense foods, many of them nutrient poor, are good tasting, readily available, and cheap . . . Simply put, as incomes drop and food budgets shrink, food choices shift toward energy-dense refined grains, added sugars and fats."

Author Adam Drewnowski, Director of Center for Obesity Research, University of Washington professor of Epidemiology and Medicine, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* Nov. 18, 2008.

Sometimes we pay again, to treat the health problems we develop (*i.e.,* obesity/heart disease, type II diabetes, polycystic ovarian syndrome (PCOS), *etc., etc.*) from our refined-grain, added-sugar, *partially-hydrogenated-fat-filled diets* (*http://retracingmysteps.blogspot.com/2009/03/partially-hydrogenated-oils-are-so-last.html*).*

"Americans are becoming more obese while spending a lower share of disposable income on food."

Author Adam Drewnowski, "Fat and Sugar: An Economic Analysis", *American Society for Nutritional Sciences Journal of Nutrition*, 2003

Good Intentions . . .

"While initially meant to protect farmers from the vagaries of weather and the fickleness of the free market system, the subsidy system now often rewards big growers over small- and mid-sized producers. Moreover, in recent decades it has tended to consolidate government payments in the hands of a few. Between 2003 and 2005, for example, American taxpayers paid $34.75 billion in crop subsidy benefits to farmers, but only the top one percent of farmers received nearly ⅕ of that amount."

WATCH: "King Corn" *http://www.pbs.org/independentlens/kingcorn/*

"EWG data shows that the largest 10% of farms receive almost 70% of total farm payments. Often, the large plantation scale operations use the increased capitol to outbid smaller family farmers for land."

WATCH: Cutting the Pork from U.S. Farm Bill, CBS I-Team, March 2009 *http://cbs4.com/video/?id=72461@wfor.dayport.com*

"The [farm subsidy] payments are very concentrated in the hands of a narrow slice of agriculture. And it's important to remember that ⅔ of the farmers in this country are not on the programs at all."—Ken Cook, President, Environmental Working Group (EWG), July 2007 NPR Interview.

LISTEN: *http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=12309276&ps=rs*

Real Food Revolution

Baby, who loves you? The owner of a huge industrialized farming operation, or a fourth-generation farmer who appreciates your patronage in helping sustain his family business? The system needs changing, and I'll write a future post about political involvement, but in the meantime, we can vote with our dollar, and support food systems that are good for our families and our future. How about.

1. We choose to pay more for real, whole foods, grown sustainably without synthetic chemicals. We frequent *local farmer's markets, co-ops and CSAs* (*http://retracingmysteps.blogspot.com/2009/04/eating-well-part-one-local-and-organic.html*)* for affordable alternatives to supermarket natural food chains.

2. Whenever possible, we buy from a *local provider* (*http://www.localharvest.org/*) to keep responsible family farms in business, to reduce cross-country transport emissions and to ensure that our produce, meats and dairy are truly organic, *free-range* (*http://www.carltonfarmsnaturalfoods.com/carltonfarmsnaturalfoodscgi/coranto/viewnews.cgi?id=EElAZAkAAAppAMQhLf*),* and grass-fed.

3. We make sure we know what is in our food. We read ingredients or ask about them ("What kind of sweetener is in your sweet tea?").

4. We make home-cooked meals a priority. We learn how to make quick fix meals from scratch, as well as stretch one cooking stint into several meals (check out *Food Network's Robin Miller's Quick Fix Meals* (*http://*

*The documents referred to are retained in Committee files.

www.foodnetwork.com/quick-fix-meals-with-robin-miller/index.html)). We substitute real ingredients for the processed ones in a favorite recipe.

5. When we eat out, we pay a little more at locally-based eateries that make their food from scratch with fresh, whole ingredients. Look for a future post on *local scrumptious meals for less than $10–$15* (*http://retracingmysteps.blogspot.com/2009/11/yummy-local-eats-under-10-15.html*).*

Take inspiration from Georgia Organics' 2010 conference keynote speaker, *Slow Food* (*http://www.slowfood.com/*) nonprofit organization founder Carlo Petrini of Piedmont, Italy. Petrini founded Slow Food in 1989 to "counteract fast food and fast life, the disappearance of local food traditions and people's dwindling interest in the food they eat. We consider ourselves co-producers, because by being informed about our food production and making choices in support of good, clean and fair food, we become a part of the process."

The time, energy and money we spend to eat well is worth our families' health and future.

COMMENT OF GILLIAN RENAULT, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Gillian Renault.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Communications Consultant.
Comment: For the health of all Americans, I am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of our country. This type of policy will also cut healthcare costs which are spiraling out of control.

COMMENT OF CHARLOTTE RESEJ, LEWISBURG, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Charlotte Resej.
City, State: Lewisburg, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Former Chemist, Stay At Home Mom.
Comment: I have heard very negative things about the farm bill helping major ag companies a lot more than it helps the individual farmer. I think that farming would be a much more fulfilling life for future farmers if they weren't just slaves to ADM or ConAgra growing what they are told and blindly using their chemical fertilizers and pesticides. Could we not give incentives for people to run their farms in sustainable manners which would be better for the people they are providing food to and the environment that surrounds them. SMALL FARMERS should get the same concern that SMALL Businesses get with politicians.

COMMENT OF BEN RETTELE, FAIRVIEW, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Ben Rettele.
City, State: Fairview, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: We use the mapping service daily, and really could use the farm numbers, because farmers know them and communicate easily with them.

COMMENT OF LINDA REX, BOYNTON BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Linda Rex.
City, State: Boynton Beach, FL.

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Grandmother who eats.
Comment: I hope and pray that you will finally take our tax dollars away from the industrial farmers who are ruining our food supply and our environment with their INDUSTRIAL PRACTICES. Please do not subsidize these giant greedy INDUSTRIAL "farmers". Please give your assistance to the smaller, True Farmers, who care for our FOOD SUPPLY and OUR ENVIRONMENT. **The industrial companies are promoting corn and sugar and meat, all things that we know give us fat, diabetic and sick citizens. Enough of the processed and dead food. Please help the people who want to give us live, nutritious vegetables and fruit!!! Our big fat country is counting on you to return our food supply to real food.** Thank you!

LINDA REX,
Boynton Beach, FL.

COMMENT OF JULIE REYNOLDS, LEASBURG, NC

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Julie Reynolds.
City, State: Leasburg, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Business Owner.
Comment: It is imperative that the 2012 Farm Bill invest in organic farming in a huge way. Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agriculture due to Americans lost faith and trust in big corporate agriculture as it is tainted with pesticides, GMO's and as we have found out in the past few years is subject to any number of bacteria from run-off of factory animal farming as well. By investing in organic farms through research and extension programs that expand the knowledge of organic farming we will help conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food for our people here as well as abroad. Transition programs are needed as well to provide technical support to farmers who want to move into the organic sector but do not know how. Crop Insurance programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses are needed as well that are based on organic value not conventional. New research that has come out from prestigious Universities like Duke, Princeton, and Berkeley all point to the benefits of eating organic food for our health as well as environmental benefits. It is most urgent that you incorporate into the new farm bill all of these programs to keep American agriculture strong, vibrant and healthy.

COMMENT OF MELANIE RICHARDS, GAINESVILLE, FL

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Melanie Richards.
City, State: Gainesville, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graphic Designer.
Comment: It is my hope that the Committee would focus on subsidies to a diverse range of crops, including vegetables and fruits that would be integral in supplying a healthy, affordable diet to our families and schools. Thank you for serving the American people, and I hope that you create better access to fresh produce for all our citizens.

COMMENT OF MARK RICHEY, EAGLE, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Mark Richey.
City, State: Eagle, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Appraisers and other professionals need full access to the NRCS information. Access varies substantially within our state from County to County as some of the agents feel their information is proprietary. I have enjoyed using your service so I didn't ever have to go in to a County office again and beg for an aerial photograph because I didn't have the proper request form.

COMMENTS OF NESSA RICHMAN, TAKOMA PARK, MD

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Nessa Richman.
City, State: Takoma Park, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consultant.
Comment:

Ref: 2012 Farm Bill

Please find below six recommendations for the 2011–2012 Farm Bill.

(1) USDA/FNS—Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program. Restore funding to the initial $25 million annually in mandatory funding that the House of Representatives passed in the 2008 Farm Bill and the Senate cut back to $20 million. This very popular program is currently benefiting 18,000 farmers and 840,000 low income seniors. With restoration of funding to the 2008 initial House level of $25 million for vulnerable seniors, nearly 1 million seniors and 20,000 small farmers would benefit.

(2) USDA/Rural Development. Community Facilities Grants—Provide authority under the Community Facilities Grant program for consistent and easy online access to pre-applications to State Rural Development Offices for an early assessment and if qualified under simplified criteria, indicate that applicants can submit a full package. This early assessment would save considerable time and effort by hard pressed rural non profits in submitting the extensive paperwork required for these grants.

(3) USDA/AMS—Federal State Market Improvement Program (FSMIP). The upcoming Farm Bill could explore revitalizing the ongoing State implemented FSMIP program by allocating 30% of the funding authorization for projects within applicant states that connect new markets with local low-income population food access and affordability.

(4) USDA/NIFA—Increase the mandatory authorization for the very popular Community Food Projects to $10 million annually.

(5) USDA/FNS—EBT Wireless Capability at Farmers Markets. Provide cost free access (machines and transaction costs) for farmers markets to utilize wireless EBT technology at farmers markets similar to the cost free access that hard wired retail stores currently have under the statues.

(6) USDA/AFRI Re-direct a portion of AFRI funds to social research projects addressing intersection of issues related to: food deserts, obesity, low income populations and local and regional food systems. This research would examine the impact of development of local/regional food systems on low income populations.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Nessa Richman.
City, State: Takoma Park, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consultant.
Comment:

Dear Committee Members:

Ref: Farm Bill 2011/2012 Options—Farmers Markets as Healthy Food Hubs

Please find below a recommendation for the 2011–2012 Farm Bill.

Through investing in the Specialty Crops Block Grant Program and the SNAP program, the 40,000 farmers selling at farmers markets, roadside stands and CSA's could further expand their revenue and also provide healthy, local fresh fruits and vegetables to SNAP and WIC clients. These farmers would be recognized as "healthy food hubs" in rural and urban underserved neighborhoods.

Currently, a few pilot programs are underway in several states (California, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island) fostered by foundations and health care groups to provide "nutrition incentives" to SNAP clients to shop at farmers markets. Some very modest funding from their state's "specialty crop" programs are allocated to encourage SNAP clients to use their EBT cards at farmers markets for local fruits and vegetables. Foundations in a few cases are providing funding for double vouchers to provide "nutrition incentives" to further encourage SNAP clients.

An increase of Specialty Crop Funding from $55 million to $150 million annually, with $50 million annually allocated to the states to promote use of SNAP and WIC at farmers markets, roadside stands and CSA's could leverage an estimated $500

million annually in additional specialty crop producers revenue while improving diets and reducing health care costs for SNAP and WIC clients.

With ongoing pilot programs in several states to measure the impact of additional fruit and vegetable consumption on SNAP and WIC clients, reduction in blood pressure, weight and improved cholesterol and BMI's will likely reduce health care costs for the 30% of the population with weight caused health issues. These savings will receive a CBO score and a portion of those savings allocated to the $95 million increase in specialty crop funding, bringing the total to $150 million, with $100 million for state specialty crop programs and $50 million for promoting nutrition incentives at farmers markets, roadside stands and CSA's.

COMMENT OF LYNN E. RICKARD, BAKERSFIELD, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Lynn E. Rickard.
City, State: Bakersfield, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

Dear Chairman Peterson and Committee Members:

I am a real estate appraiser based in Bakersfield, California who specializes in valuing farm and ranch properties. I am writing to express concerns with Section 1619 of the current Farm Bill in the hopes that if a solution to the issues presented by this Section cannot be worked out within the framework of the current Farm Bill a resolution can be reached in the upcoming Farm Bill.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill contains language that restricts access to geospatial data known as Common Land Units (CLU) that prior to this were available from the Farm Service Agency. As appraisers of rural properties, we have found this to be a cause for concern and time delays since its inception as well as a threat to the overall accuracy of appraised values due to the lack of access to this information in many cases.

We as rural appraisers understand that Section 1619 allows for release of the information that we need to complete accurate appraisals given the consent of owners or operators through a release of information form. This requires the operator and owner to physically travel to the county office to obtain this information. It can then be shared with others. When we are working directly with the owner or operator, this is not overly cumbersome, but is a cause for time delays if the operator cannot immediately obtain this information. However, for the most part on a subject property, we have a cooperative customer whom we are working with. The major concerns, delays and lack of information typically involve the collection of comparable sales data.

Farm specific geospatial information is widely used by professional appraisers. We know this is required information sought after by prospective buyers. These factors all have impact on value. Boundaries, yields, soils, topographic information, and details of any enrolled government program on the property are necessary for the proper analysis of not just the subject of the appraisal but all comparable sales used within the appraisal. In order to provide accurate comparable sales information farm specific data is needed for all recent transactions in order to provide an accurate reflection of market value.

For proper analysis, the appraiser must be able to collect information on comparable farm sales from the area. It is not realistic for appraisers to go to recent buyers and sellers and expect to get access to their farm information via a consent for release form. Most typically the buyer and seller are not clients or acquaintances of the appraiser and therefore obtaining permission for access to this information is difficult, if not impossible, to say nothing of the time constraints. However, this information is market based evidence of comparable values for the area. If we cannot gain access to this information, or only limited information, our analysis could be faulty and impact another, buyer, seller and financial institution. Farmland appraisals for real estate transactions will suffer in accuracy if this information cannot be obtained. We note that the information that we seek is specific to the land and not operator specific information.

The USDA–FSA recognizes the importance of this information to complete reliable farm appraisals. If we complete contract appraisal work for the USDA they allow us access to all of this information as they know it needs to be considered in both the subject property as well as the comparable sales. This is an exclusion that was written into Section 1619 but is only allowed for USDA contract work. We feel that

the fact that the USDA recognizes this information as critical to proper analysis and appraisal technique offers strong support to the need for this information for the other users of our appraisal services. As currently interpreted, 1619 does not allow this. We believe that the information that we need for analysis is not personal information but information that is critical to proper analysis of sales and value conclusions.

Appraisal Data Needed:

The information that is needed includes:

- CLU field boundaries.
- Acres.
- Maps (aerial, soils, topographic) tied to FSA boundaries.
- FSA yield information on the property.
- Whether the property is enrolled in CRP, WRP or another easement or rental agreement or federal program and the specifics of the program on the property.

This information is not available anywhere else. We cannot seek this out in county courthouses when we are searching deed transactions. It is information that is only available from FSA.

We are aware of the confidential nature of the information contained in the CLU data. We respect the confidentiality and only need access to the limited information listed above. We are professionals that serve the public, and we are bound by strict confidentiality requirements contained in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, which is the law in all 50 states. We have a need to know this information for the proper analysis and valuation of rural property in order to carry out our professional duties, and we would only be using this information to carry out our professional duties. We are not asking that this information be made available to the public, but rather be made available only to professional, certified real estate appraisers.

As professional appraisers we would be using this information to carry out our profession while providing a service to prospective buyers, sellers, lenders and investors. Our accuracy is vital to the safety and soundness of all parties involved. We specifically note that the operator's name is not in our list of necessary information.

In a time when the safety and soundness of lending institutions is of critical concern to all we are very concerned that, without access to the key attributes that affect value, analysis and resulting values could be faulty and lead to a safety and soundness dilemma for agricultural lending and agriculture as a whole. In this case we believe safety and soundness far outweighs any minor privacy intrusion.

Our recommendation: Allow professional real estate appraisers (only State Certified General Real Estate Appraisers) access to this FSA data without the cumbersome and time consuming requirements of the consent for release request. We, the members of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers (ASFMRA), have previously asked for a technical correction to the current Farm Bill in order to rectify this problem. If this is not possible, we strongly urge that this be corrected for the upcoming Farm Bill.

I thank you for your time and consideration with respect to this issue.

Yours truly,

LYNN E. RICKARD, A.R.A., M.R.I.C.S.
Bakersfield, CA.

COMMENT OF PAM RICKARD, PISMO BEACH, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Pam Rickard.
City, State: Pismo Beach, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: CUTTING PESTICIDE AND FERTILIZER USE that fouls our water and endangers our health, DESTROYS SOIL PRODUCTIVITY, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

- Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.

(Instead of subsidizing the beef/meat and corn industries . . . I don't eat these things and don't want to pay for them.)

- Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.
- Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR GREAT WORK!

COMMENT OF KAREN RIDA, WORTHINGTON, MA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Karen Rida.
City, State: Worthington, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: We as a country need to do something for the American Farmer who is making less money than was made 30 years ago. I don't care what the size of the farm is, farmers are farmers because it is in their blood. The long hours, and seven days a week doesn't matter, but they should at least be able to supply a decent income to raise their families. We do appreciate all the grants and other incentives you have given, I am sure some farmers have not taken advantage of some incentives, sometimes pride and their own self worth is more important than taking money from different opportunities. I hope we can turn this around like we have done for other issues in this country during the recession. Please treat farmers who supply food like a bank. It sorts, they don't supply money but food is just as important. Thank you for your time and consideration in helping the agriculture of our country.

COMMENT OF JESSICA RIDGEWAY, APTOS, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Jessica Ridgeway.
City, State: Aptos, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Organic Farm Education Director.
Comment: Organic, local, sustainable and family farming need to be priorities on the 2012 Farm Bill. We must strengthen the health and wealth of our communities, by improving our local, environmentally friendly food systems.

COMMENT OF FRANCIS RIEDELL, WALL LAKE, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Francis Riedell.
City, State: Wall Lake, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Fertilizer, Chemical & Seed Salesman.
Comment: We use the FSA Field maps everyday in our operation, for our operators it is to the upmost importance to make sure that our operators are in the right field and also for documentation, and for our farmer it makes them feel a lot more at ease knowing that can map out the fields and be correct on the acres and for our aerial operators it is a must for them with there Satloc systems we can not afford to be in the wrong field. We cover a 40 mile radius so it is very important that we be able to use the FSA Field Maps in all aspect of our operation.

COMMENT OF DERRICK RILEY, LEE'S SUMMIT, MO

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Derrick Riley.
City, State: Lee's Summit, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Architecture Student.
Comment: We need a complete overhaul of our food subsidy system if we want to have healthy future generations.

COMMENT OF CHAD RINGENBERG, GRAND FORKS, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Chad Ringenberg.
City, State: Grand Forks, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Web Application Developer.
Comment: CLU data has been publicly available via FOIA since 2004 at the following USDA website *http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov*. The 2008 Farm Bill included section 1619 which removed public access to CLU data. The CLU data made available on the Data Gateway contained only the field boundary and acres. No personally identifiable information or other information like CRP, wetlands, highly erodible, etc was in the CLU data. It clearly fit within the FOIA guidelines. Our business uses the CLU data regularly to help farmers communicate with aerial applicators, ground applicators, rural appraisers, farm managers, real estate, crop insurance and others allowing them to be more efficient and accurate and to help meet compliance requirements.

COMMENT OF ANNE RITCHINGS, PLACITAS, NM

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Anne Ritchings.
City, State: Placitas, NM.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Clergy.
Comment:

- We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support homegrown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.
- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.
- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF ROBERT RIZZUTO, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Robert Rizzuto.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Social Work.
Comment: As someone on a fixed income I am presented with this decision when buying grocery's: to buy the ingredients for two salads it will cost $7.66, that's just for the salad. I try and buy healthy foods, and my weekly grocery bill is between $120–$150, but if I ate every meal at McDonalds my weekly expense for food would be $60. I am single, and for some I suppose my income is middle-class I make $40,000 annually, but I am still living pay check to pay check with virtually no savings. I wonder how a single mother could possibly feed her children healthy food? I know from experience that my own single mother was faced with paying the electric bill or buying groceries. I grew up eating a lot of cold cuts in the dark!

Please consider the health of this nation, the children of this nation, and the cost of health care when crafting the next farm bill.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF ED ROACH, PLAINFIELD, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Ed Roach.
City, State: Plainfield, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: I recognize that we are in a period where budget constraints dictate policy. I would rather forgo direct payments and subsidize revenue assurance with the funding. Most of the time it would reduce costs to the government. I am also an appraiser. The lack of information concerning government payments and programs is leading to less effective appraisals. This is important as federally insured institutions are lending on less than the best information. I would also like online data such as aerial photos updated. I think that I understand the reasons for 1619 being enacted. I think it is only a plus for a limited number of producers. It is a negative for appraisers, most producers and the public.

COMMENT OF PATTI ROBINSON, THOMASTON, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Patti Robinson.
City, State: Thomaston, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farmers Market and Multiple Georgia Farm CSA.
Comment: We are a dependant society if we must ship a tomato across the country or state to serve sliced tomatoes at the family dinner table or in lunch boxes.

Small Family Farms that provide local produce for local residents increase independence in our State and County.

Our local farmers market has a Multiple Farm CSA program and we are experiencing growing demand for affordable locally grown produce with a limited supply of small family farmers.

Please put local family farmers and the systems that support their efforts as top priority for a healthy and strong society.

COMMENT OF HARMONY RODE, LAMOURE, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Harmony Rode.
City, State: LaMoure, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: County Tax Assessor.
Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway. It would make my job (as a County Tax Assessor) a lot easier. Thanks!

COMMENT OF PARTHENA RODRIGUEZ, SEBASTIAN, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Parthena Rodriguez.
City, State: Sebastian, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: No genetically modified foods and more organic.

COMMENT OF LORI ROGERS, OSSIAN, IN

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Lori Rogers.
City, State: Ossian, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Occupation: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

Honorable Members of the House Committee on Agriculture,

I have grave concerns about the movement of the Animal Rights groups lobbying for increased laws pertaining to the rearing of Livestock. I am fully aware that there are items of concern and room for improvements. The solution is not more government regulation, but the enforcement of already existing laws. With the economy the way it is and grocery prices on the increase. I believe that enacting laws impose changes that will increase production costs will only result in increased costs for consumers and federal food programs. As an example, the proposal that all government provided food stuffs must come from farms that raise animals humanely. At the moment there are not enough farms to provide this, and the cost of implementation may drive some producers out of Ag all together. I also oppose the fact that most those who are behind this have no working knowledge of livestock. For instance, I know what an Auto Mechanic does, but there is no way I could begin to tell him what tools to use or the best way to make a repair. I do not know how many of the Members are aware of the situation in Ohio. Last year the State of Ohio voted to elect a Livestock Advisory Board. It was done to try and circumvent the attempts of The Humane Society of the United States from succeeding in their attempts to railroad the state laws. Now, HSUS has formed Ohioans for Humane Farms and is gathering signatures on petitions to make an amendment to the state constitution for those same laws. When is enough, enough. They HSUS, and other groups are currently going state by state and lobbying for legislation. They are suppose to be a nonprofit, whose lobbying practices are limited by law. Yet they have paid Lobbyist in every state. I and many others, believe their end goals are not for humane practices, but to force American consumers into Veganism. It is a simple strategy, drive the production cost so high, only the very rich can afford to buy it or produce it.

Which will phase out Animal Agriculture a little at a time. The CEO of the Wayne Pacelle, has made the following statements:

> "One generation and out. We have no problem with the extinction of domestic animals."
>
> Wayne Pacelle, quoted in *Animal People*, May, 1993.
>
> "We would be foolish and silly not to unite with people in the public health sector, the environmental community, [and] unions, to try to challenge corporate agriculture."
>
> Wayne Pacelle, at the Animal Rights 2002 Convention, July 1, 2002.
>
> *http://placeropolis.com/detail/110832.html*

Thank you for your time,
Respectfully,

LORI ROGERS.

COMMENT OF SHEILAH ROGERS, REDWOOD VALLEY, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Sheilah Rogers.
City, State: Redwood Valley, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Business Consultant.
Comment: Invest in rural economies by providing capital and technical assistance to rebuild local and regional food systems. This is a strategy that will increase economic prosperity and improve public health in rural communities.

COMMENT OF AMANDA ROGGENBUCK, UNIONVILLE, MI

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Amanda Roggenbuck.
City, State: Unionville, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Attorney and County Commissioner.
Comment: Please strengthen your commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next farm bill, especially key infrastructure and business development programs that support the agricultural sector and the retention and attraction of new businesses. USDA Rural Development's programs for water/wastewater infrastructure, community facilities, broadband and business development are key ingredients for county economic development efforts.

Please recognize that youth are the future of agriculture and farm programs must recognize that they play a vital role in sustaining American agriculture and rural communities. New programs and updates to old programs are needed so that it is possible for young and beginning farmers to survive and thrive in the modern agricultural economy.

Coming from and representing a rural community allows me to see both the established generations of farmers and new farmers, all of which are working to preserve their way of life but also support their families and our communities.

COMMENT OF DANIEL ROHRER, VERDIGRE, NE

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Daniel Rohrer.
City, State: Verdigre, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager & RE Broker.
Comment: Access to the CLU information regarding field boundaries is vital to my business. I use the information on a daily basis during visits with producers assisting them with crop insurance, farm management, and real estate marketing. Public access to this data needs to be restored in the next farm bill.

COMMENT OF LESLIE ROOS, GRAND FORKS, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Leslie Roos.
City, State: Grand Forks, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I respectfully, but strongly, encourage reinstatement of public access to CLU data and 'rescinding' Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill. As a former producer, a current farm land owner, and with 23 years of service to ag producers and their families and lenders as a certified real estate appraiser, I observe on an almost-daily basis the inefficiencies and corresponding negative impacts this section of the current farm bill has created, resulting in greater costs for businesses supporting agriculture, and ultimately, for farm families and taxpayers. Prior to the 2008 Farm Bill, this information had been available to the public for years, to no one's objection. As it is paid for by the taxpaying public, relied on regularly by same, and involves no private information, it needs to be readily available to the public. Thank you.

COMMENT OF JOHN ROSENGREN, STERLING, IL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: John Rosengren.
City, State: Sterling, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Broker (Land).
Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway because CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Not providing this vital information creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Thank you for your consideration.

JOHN ROSENGREN,
Broker/Owner,
RE/MAX Sauk Valley,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF DEBBIE ROSE-WALTER, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Debbie Rose-Walter.

State: NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: It should be made easier for organic farmers to receive grants and financial aid that they may need. It should also be easier for farmers that want to start an organic farm or at least start farming the land with the idea of becoming organic or at least taking all the steps that an organic farmer would take. The United States is a very ill country. People need and want healthy food. Giant CAFO's are taking away the land and polluting the earth. The United Nations has a report that states that methane gas from these factory farms is adding more to climate change than cars are. Isn't it time for people to revamp their ideas and become productive in a way that benefits everyone so we all can live healthy and comfortable ways? Change may seem hard, but if it benefits everyone, isn't that a good thing?

COMMENT OF ROSE ROSS, ALMO, KY

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Rose Ross.
City, State: Almo, KY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis. My role as a Farm Appraiser is vital to the lending process, and the unavailability of CLU data hinders the development of accurate farm appraisal reports, which can negatively impact the borrower (land owner), the lending institutions, and even the federal government (as guarantor of federally backed loans).

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate. Please consider repeal of Section 1619 to allow access to vital information concerning many in the sector of the agricultural production industry in this country.

Sincerely,

ROSE ANN RADFORD ROSS,
Certified General Real Estate Appraiser,
Kentucky, Tennessee.

COMMENT OF JERRY ROSSITER, ATWATER, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Jerry Rossiter.
City, State: Atwater, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist & Irrigation Engineer.
Comment: I believe with over 52 percent of California's agriculture water being used for gravity flow surface flood systems is no longer sustainable, since over 50% of the water is wasted. Therefore California's farmers and ranchers must CHANGE ASAP to Mechanized Overhead Irrigation and Micro/drip sub-surface irrigation systems which provide proven 90% to 95% uniformity and efficient water applications, while effectively conserving California's valuable waters similar to the rest of America and the World. Today there are over 3,000,000 overhead irrigation systems working worldwide on 30 million acres of irrigated land (over 60,000 in Nebraska alone) and only a few hundred working in California. For Proof read the amazing Publication Rainmakers, "A Photographic Story of Center Pivots, from The Groundwater Foundation," Lincoln Nebraska 2005. Dr. William E. Splinter, former chair of the University of Nebraska Department of Agriculture Engineering, said it well when he described center pivots as the "most significant mechanical innovation since the replacement of draft animals by the TRACTOR".

Jerry Rossiter, (73 years of age) Controlled Irrigation Systems Company, founded in 1981.

COMMENT OF RUSS ROSSMAN, JR., STATE COLLEGE, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 28, 2010, 5:35 p.m.

Name: Russ Rossman, Jr.
City, State: State College, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Delete subsidies to corporations. Corporations have sufficient sources of capital to rely upon. Individual farmers do not.

COMMENTS OF TODD ROTH, HOLCOMB, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 9:36 p.m.
Name: Todd Roth.
City, State: Holcomb, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: 2012 Farm Bill. Change the name. Agriculture makes up only 20% of The Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008. Anti-farming sentiment from activist organizations would subside with a simple name change. Grow the economy out of the recession with agriculture. Policing the world with food no longer works.

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Todd Roth.
City, State: Holcomb, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Consider a set-aside program again like in the previous food bills. With the huge global stocks and CRP coming back into production prices will continue to tank. (By the way who's idea was it to put CRP back to production?). The banking crisis wont compare to the farm crisis if prices continue to fall. Price per bushel has once again fallen below cost of production. Everyone we do business with that control our inputs are doing very well, and I can't afford to take my kids on vacation. Kind of ironic when I control the food supply.

TODD ROTH,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF JULIE ROY, LAINGSBURG, MI

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Julie Roy.
City, State: Laingsburg, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: As teacher, parent and consumer, I am deeply concerned about the upcoming ag bill. It is imperative that we tighten the use of organic standards, restrict the funding of GMO foods and clean up our food supply. I am especially concerned that the standards required of school districts are completely off base nutritionally. We need a system that no longer relies on fossil fuels, pesticides and processed foods.

I would especially like to see programs like The Center for Economic Security out of Muskegon, Michigan be a model for farm to school food programs. Most states can provide much of the food for schools and other institutions. The subsides should be given to farms that promote responsible, diverse, farming. Not monocultures that are depleting and poisoning our food supply.

In Michigan especially, we have many farmers that are becoming active in food policy that promotes healthy fresh, affordable food for all. It is unacceptable that we find candy machines and processed chicken substitute foods fed to the future of this country. We must get behind these farm to school programs as well as community gardens, land trusts and so many great programs sprouting up and flourishing in Michigan and across the country.

COMMENT OF JARAD ROYER, INDUSTRY, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Jarad Royer.
City, State: Industry, IL.

Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: I am a producer as well as an agriculture real estate appraiser and would look to comment on the availability of FSA field boundaries being public. As a producer I see nothing wrong with having my field boundaries available as they could be manually calculated and be within a few acres anyway. As an ag appraiser I need these FSA boundaries for accurate appraisals. I can manually calculate what I see for field boundaries any ways through other programs, but it would be much easier to have the data available. This information is not giving any program payments or giving anything that would be detrimental to producers, but makes information easier for custom applicators, crop insurance salesmen and real estate appraisers. I can understand why producers would not want payments as public record, but there is no reason not to have this info available as it would be beneficial to appraisers and custom applicators, which are the people behind the scenes. In the end it helps producers with quality appraisals and accurate custom application.

COMMENT OF NANA ROYER, ST. AUGUSTINE, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Nana Royer.
City, State: St. Augustine, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Registered Nurse.
Comment: We need to end the subsidies to crops like corn. Current subsidies are borne by the taxpayers to finance an overabundance of cheap foods which contribute to the obesity epidemic. It costs less to buy a big Mac, fries, and a coke (mostly corn), than to buy a large head of broccoli. I prefer to subsidize the farmers that grow sustainable vegetable and nut crops, and fruits. Present subsides do more harm than good.

COMMENT OF GREG RUDDELL, MERIDIAN, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Greg Ruddell.
City, State: Meridian, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: To accurately value agricultural property for almost any purpose, as an appraiser we need to have available accurate acreages, field sizes, CRP, wet land and any other acreage defined. Without FSA acreages, it is impossible to arrive at accurate value conclusions. For comparable sale verification, it is a burden and greatly increases the cost to client to obtain information from each seller and/or buyer. Appraiser need the basic information to complete the appraisal assignment and to be in compliance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP), federally mandated rules for licensed appraisers and required for all federally related transactions.

Thanks,

GREG RUDDELL,
Certified General Appraiser,
Idaho/Oregon.

COMMENT OF PETER RUDDOCK, PALO ALTO, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Peter Ruddock.
City, State: Palo Alto, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Software Engineer/Food Advocate.
Comment: It is time to consider the Farm Bill as a Food Bill, one which impacts the health of citizens (consumers) throughout our nation, steering their choices by setting the prices and availability of food stuffs. We need to think FIRST about the food that our citizens need, THEN about how best to get them what they need at affordable prices. Yes! we need to be concerned about keeping our farmers and producers in business, but only through the mechanism of supporting a healthy popu-

lace, not for its own sake. Producing low quality or bad food actually costs the country MORE in secondary costs to our health and the environment. When creating the new Farm Bill, think about the ENTIRE food system in this great country of ours and how to make it stronger and more resilient.

PETER RUDDOCK,
Slow Food South Bay—*Chapter Chair.*

COMMENT OF RUSSELL RUDERMAN, KEAAU, HI

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Russell Ruderman.
City, State: Keaau, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please support organic agriculture in the Farm Bill. Organic is the fastest growing agriculture segment, and organic farmers are the future in terms of sustainability and diversified ag.
Mahalo.

COMMENT OF KEVIN RUGAARD, CRESTON, IA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Kevin Rugaard.
City, State: Creston, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: I am writing about the CLU data on the FSA field information. This data is very useful in making farm plans with our producers. The more current the data the more accurate the plans and applications. These aerial maps are crucial in helping our applicators get to the correct field and having the most current acreages helps greatly in batching the correct amount of products.
Thank you for your consideration.

KEVIN RUGAARD, C.C.A.,
Agronomy Department Manager,
United Farmers Mercantile Cooperative,
Red Oak IA.

COMMENT OF JOSEPH RUTKOWSKI, DALLAS, TX

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Joseph Rutkowski.
City, State: Dallas, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Post-Doctoral Fellow.
Comment: I would like to see the subsidization of bulk crops, notably corn and soybeans, reduced in favor of encouraging greater crop diversity. Subsidies for bulk crops only provide for cheap raw materials for food manufacturers who are by no means obligated to pass those savings on the consumer. If subsidies were more equivalently rewarded for greater crop diversity, there is at least potential for a greater variety of nutritious vegetables, fruits, and staple crops to be more affordable for lower class individuals whom need them most. The goals should be low cost, nutritious food, not just cheap anything, if there is a goal at all to subsidies. Or eliminate them altogether.

COMMENT OF DARREN RYALS, PALMYRA, MO

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Darren Ryals.
City, State: Palmyra, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.

Comment: As an appraiser, limiting access to the CLU data limits the accuracy of the data available to perform my job. Considering what has happened the past few years, I think that more rather than less information should be available.

COMMENT OF ROGER RYALS, UNIONVILLE, MO

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Roger Ryals.
City, State: Unionville, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: New farm bill; Information needs to be available to appraisers as to aerial photographs, field borders, field acres to assist in completing an appraisal for lending for a government agency, or other federally regulated lender. This information is needed not only for the property being appraised, but also for the comparable sales. I understand that other private information should not be available, except with written authorization from the land owner. The bill could provide that an appraiser provide a copy of his/her Appraiser Certification. Thank you.

COMMENT OF DARCY RYAN, NIPOMO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Darcy Ryan.
City, State: Nipomo, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother/Business Owner.
Comment: I am highly against GMO food and have joined a group against Monsanto. We already have high levels of wheat allergies, *etc.* I'd be afraid to find out what happens next! This was the best comment on the subject I could find:

> "Considering that wheat is one of the primary crops which is reserved for human consumption I have strong resistance to the notion of having Monsanto have their grimy hands in the operation of seed selection and research at State Universities.
>
> This company has shown time and again that their promises never bear fruit. And in fact, much of their miracle science has created short-term gains and long-term complications.
>
> Let's rethink the use of GMOs in particular. More needs to be done in regards to long term testing of effects on human and animal health before we give over the reigns completely to these soulless corporations who do anything to turn a dime."

Please do not allow GMO crops!! Thank you for your time!

COMMENT OF HOPE RYAN, BOISE, ID

Date Submitted: Monday, May 31, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Hope Ryan.
City, State: Boise, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker.
Comment: Please include support for small farms and organic agriculture in this farm bill. Please remove subsidies for farming to encourage farmers to grow food or non-food (feed) crops that the country needs—not what they are paid to grow/not grow. Thank you for caring about America's food and America's children.

We, like many Americans, grow an extensive garden and have eliminated a lot of our water-thirsty sod *in lieu of* food plants (berries, herbs) and garden crops. We use zero pesticides and our food is delicious! Of course, we garden, not farm, but the absence of chemistry from GMO's and pesticides/herbicides AND the inclusion of plant diversity makes not just my family healthy, but my neighborhood and the neighboring school & park.

COMMENT OF WENDY RYAN, SILVER SPRING, MD

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 3:36 p.m.
Name: Wendy Ryan.
City, State: Silver Spring, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Project Manager—Consultant.
Comment: I would like to see more transparency in our food system. Although the ability to purchase strawberries year-round might be a technological marvel, the flavor and nutrition of most produce and butchered meats is in question. I believe that programs such as the USDA's "Know Your Farmer" are well-meaning and intend to re-teach consumers via farmer's markets and their purchasing relationships about the seasonality of local agriculture. I would hope that the next farm bill would focus on sustainable farming practices and bringing consumers closer to the source of their daily nutrition and the corresponding impacts on the environment.

COMMENT OF RYON RYPKEMA, CAPUTA, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Ryon Rypkema.
City, State: Caputa, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser and Livestock Producer.
Comment: I am a real estate appraiser as well as a livestock producer so I am very familiar with both sides of the coin. However, I strongly feel that Section 1619 was not property represented when it was added to the Farm Bill. As do many of the original supports of the Farm Bill. I feel that this is very typical of the actions that occur in government. To do a lot of things right and screw it up in the end with a unrepresented rider added after gaining the support of many for such a bill. I strongly feel that this information should be public information. The CLU in no way violates any of the privacy issues that the oppositions are claiming. This is a very vital source of information within the appraisal process; by taking this information away from appraisers it is becoming difficult to perform a credible and reliable appraisal report. As the many changes to the lending laws have been implemented, I feel this is a counterproductive step in the direction that the lending regulations are headed. Also at a state level (SD) with the taxation and assessment module changing this information would provided a credible platform for the state to rely on for the production indications. As it stands know the state has very little ground to stand on to support their new module in land use and production and I feel would be easily protested by an experience appraiser in the support of the land owner. I feel that the impact of this information was not property assessed be for the change was implemented.

COMMENT OF RAY S., MODESTO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Ray S.
City, State: Modesto, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Spend no tax moneys for nothing until the dept is paid off!!!!

COMMENTS OF JOANN SACCATO, CLEARLAKE OAKS, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 22, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: JoAnn Saccato.
City, State: Clearlake Oaks, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consumer Food Co-op; Farmers' Market; Community Gardens; Education.
Comment: The growing demand for locally grown and organic produce is swelling. A shift in priorities for the Farm Bill is called for. Opportunities that provide access to fresh, affordable, organic produce is a must in Farm Bill efforts. Supporting transitioning farmers, small diverse production intended for local markets and providing gap funding for farmers in this sector is vital, as are efforts to create

sustainable agriculture models that do not include synthetic pesticides and genetically engineered crops.

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 22, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: JoAnn Saccato.
City, State: Clearlake Oaks, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator, Food co-op.
Comment: I urge you to continue to shift your funding away from the top three commodity production into small, sustainable, synthetic and GE-free food production! The reasons are obvious.

COMMENT OF JESSE SADOWSKY, DICKINSON, ND

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Jesse Sadowsky.
City, State: Dickinson, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: Please consider increasing the funding level for organic farmers and organic agriculture researchers. Understanding organic food production systems is just in its infancy. Organic agriculture is ecological agriculture; it relies on ecology and biology to sustain crops, rather than fighting natural patterns of biology and ecology as in synthetic farming systems. Investment by the federal government in organic agriculture will provide a return now and for future generations of Americans. In contrast, short-term gains of conventional, synthetic-input agriculture will compromise the long-term health stability of our people. We don't need multi-national corporations controlling our food supply. We can do better. We can support community-based agriculture again. We've made strides in organic production, let's use the 2012 Farm Bill as a stimulus to bring organic to the mainstream.

COMMENT OF TIMOTHY SAETER, FOSSTON, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Timothy Saeter.
City, State: Fosston, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Spraying/Owner.
Comment: This mapping is a very good source of precise information that saves time, money, and headaches for all that have use for it. It would be very inconsiderate to not provide anymore updated information to all those businesses that use mapping software. Please continue the use of the updates and the service, it is very useful for anyone that has anything to do with agriculture, farming, *etc.*

Thanks,

TIM SAETER.

COMMENT OF GLAYOL SAHBA, M.D., SACRAMENTO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Glayol Sahba, M.D.
City, State: Sacramento, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Family Physician, Mother Nutrition Educator.
Comment: Please STOP subsidizing the "staple Crops" which are contributing to the Obesity Epidemic: Corn, Wheat and genetically Modified Soy!! High Fructose Corn Syrup, used in sodas, sweetened cookies, crackers, and just about any food you name is killing our population through causing enormous weight gain with foods that are so high in their glycemic index. Also, wheat, especially processed, with the fiber, germ and all of the vitamins removed directly contributes to the obesity epidemic due to being very high in the glycemic index. Even whole wheat bread is very high in this number which is correlated with bringing about increased insulin leading to excess fat storage leading to insulin resistance and an endless cycle of progressive obesity. Please INSTEAD subsidize locally grown fruits and vegetables, preferably organic. If we don't take this action, we as a nation will have such huge costs in caring for all of the diabetics that these subsidized commodities and the corn-fed meats are causing.

COMMENT OF CHARLOTTE SAHNOW, EUGENE, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Charlotte Sahnow.
City, State: Eugene, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Professor.
Comment: I strongly urge the House Committee on Agriculture to break up Factory Farms that continue to heavily pollute air, land & water, to torture farm animals, and destroy riparian areas and public lands with impunity.

COMMENT OF RANIA SALMAN, PLANO, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:06 p.m.
Name: Rania Salman.
City, State: Plano, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graduate Student.
Comment: Another very important opportunity to effect positive change in the child nutrition legislative process is through ensuring that changes to the Farm Bill that support child nutrition are made in 2012. Until June 14, 2010 the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture is accepting public suggestions as to how to improve the Farm Bill. If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF CHRISTINE SANDER, FAIRFIELD, CT

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 7:35 a.m.
Name: Christine Sander.
City, State: Fairfield, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher/Mother.
Comment: As a country fighting soaring obesity rates you really need to take a long hard look at the kind of food your are subsidizing! It is not rocket science that with grains, soybeans and the like being the cheapest foods and the backbone of the processed food industry that we place so many Americans in harms way. Gone are the days of blaming the weak and understanding that making food from scratch in ones kitchen no longer fits in the American way of life. I know Agribusiness benefits in a huge way and the little farmers are not protected under our current farm legislation not to mention how we crush other small farmers in third world countries pumping in our cheap grains and making these countries unsustainable leaving us with permanent outlets for our cheap food. We need change and I thought that why I worked so hard in the last election to make that happen. Lets see some real bravery in the House and lets bring down the farm bill and start supporting the things that will make us all healthier and happier Organic VEGGIES and FRUIT grown by small local farmers!!!!!

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE SANDER.

COMMENT OF KIRIEN SANGLE, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Kirien Sangle.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.

Comment: Fair prices, fair treatment of farmers! Better food quality needed! Consider the health of America's poor!

COMMENT OF GENE SCHAAF, NELIGH, NE

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 03, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Gene Schaaf.
City, State: Neligh, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: County Assessor.
Comment:

Chairman Peterson,

The Northeast Nebraska Assessor's Association is requesting the ability to use the FSA GIS crop field layer as part of our assessment process, therefore, we would need to have access to the crop field layer to do this. Thank you for taking our request into consideration.

GENE SCHAAF,
NE Nebraska Assessor's Association *President*.

COMMENT OF LEAH SCHAEFER, BLUE ASH, OH

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Leah Schaefer.
City, State: Blue Ash, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Supervisor.
Comment: It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets. Locally grown and healthy foods don't need to be more expensive than fast and processed foods, and consumers need to be educated about the long term effects of the junk they eat on a daily basis.

COMMENT OF JASON SCHICKEDANZ, PERRYTON, TX

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Jason Schickedanz.
City, State: Perryton, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Bioenergy, Field Crops, Livestock, Specialty Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: When considering the farm bill, there are two aspects that are greatly needed—more crop insurance support (this is much better than direct payments and disaster payments) and CLU information. As a producer and owner of a company that works closely with producers (crop dusting), this data is vital to efficient and effective agricultural production.

Specifically:

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

Thank you,

JASON SCHICKEDANZ.

COMMENT OF BOB SCHMITZ, GRANDIN, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Bob Schmitz.
City, State: Grandin, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Other.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Lets support the crop insurance industry. They already have a sound mechanism to provide support to the farms both small and large. We should quit the *ad hoc* disaster programs and use those millions to fund and improve the crop insurance program. Crop insurance is already their to provide a safety net during disasters and do it fairly and without all the extra red tape and expense that is used to run a disaster program. Disaster programs are slow to react with excessive costs. The concept of taking money away from the crop insurance industry does not make sense. The agents spend a lot of time working with the farmers and a lot of it is to help us fill out paper work that we need to take to the FSA to complete to get disaster payments. These programs typically create more work for them without reimbursement. Therefore, lets put additional monies into the crop insurance programs to expand the number of crops insured, increase coverage levels at an affordable premium, and so we can keep the level of service from our local agents.

COMMENT OF ADAM SCHNEIDER, WAVERLY, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Adam Schneider.
City, State: Waverly, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment: I use these maps on a daily basis. I am able to make very nice and accurate maps if the acres and the aerial photos are current. The accuracy of these maps has an affect on our business and our customers!

COMMENT OF DWIGHT SCHOLL, GARDEN CITY, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Dwight Scholl.
City, State: Garden City, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Commercial Applicator, Fertilizer/Ag. Chem. Retailer.
Comment: CLU data needs to be available to the public again!

COMMENT OF MARK SCHONBECK, FLOYD, VA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Mark Schonbeck.
City, State: Floyd, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consultant in Sustainable Agriculture.
Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the development and content of the 2012 Farm Bill. I am a consultant in sustainable agriculture, and I work with organic and sustainable family farmers in Virginia and neighboring states. I urge the House Agriculture Committee to consider the following points in drafting this important bill.

First, the 2012 Farm Bill should continue to expand emphasis on organic and sustainable farming systems. The reasons for prioritizing organic farming in the upcoming Farm Bill are many. Consumer demand for organic and locally produced, high quality food continues to increase; in fact this is one of the few areas of our economy that did not contract during the severe recession of 2008–2009, maintain-

ing an annual growth rate of 8–10%. Organic farming offers many conservation and environmental benefits, including soil, water, and wildlife conservation; reduced nutrient and pesticide pollution; improved soil quality; greater potential for carbon sequestration and reduced greenhouse gas emissions (carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide); and reduced fossil fuel consumed in production. In addition, the higher level of diversification inherent to organic production systems can promote the economic well being of the farms themselves and their surrounding communities, and improve nutrition, community food security, and public health. Specific recommendations include:

- Increase the proportion of funding for research and extension programs devoted to organic systems to be at least commensurate with the market share of organic foods (about 5% in 2010). Funding should be targeted at priority research needs of organic producers, and at delivering practical information to organic and transitioning farmers.
- Conservation programs should fully recognize and reward organic farmers and ranchers for the resource conservation and quality benefits they deliver, and address the specific needs of organic producers.
- Organic transitions programs under the Conservation, Research and other Titles should deliver effective technical assistance to organic and transitioning growers, as well as financial assistance.
- Crop insurance programs should be reformed to eliminate all discrimination against organically produced crops, and to reimburse crop losses for certified organic farms at the organic market value for the crop.

Second, the 2012 Farm Bill should provide incentives, and technical and financial support for the reintegration of crop and livestock agriculture. Over the past 50 years, crop and livestock production have become increasingly separated and specialized, so that much of our food today is produced either on crop farms without any livestock, or in concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs). This has resulted in multiple environmental, economic, and public health problems, including:

- Pollution of waterways with nutrients, and pathogens of humans and wildlife from CAFO manure lagoons and stockpiles.
- An increased need for energy-intensive and potentially polluting synthetic fertilizers for crop production.
- Soil erosion and degradation on farms growing only one or two agronomic crops.
- Increased pest, disease, and weed problems in both crop and livestock production.
- Increased fossil fuel consumption and carbon emissions related to transportation of agricultural inputs, grains, livestock, and consumer-ready food products.
- Reduced profit margins and net returns for both crop and livestock farmers, forcing producers to take on management of large acreages or herds just to support one family; and often resulting in farm bankruptcies.
- Public health costs resulting from reduced nutritional quality of both animal and plant based foods, as well as an increase in virulent foodborne illness pathogens.

Decentralizing livestock production and reintegrating crop and livestock production, with emphasis on appropriate stocking rates and management-intensive pasture-based production of meat, milk, eggs, and other animal products, can address most of the above problems in our current food and agricultural system, and offer the following benefits:

- Improved soil fertility and soil quality, resulting from appropriate nutrient recycling via manure.
- Improved soil conservation through permanent or rotational pasture.
- Reduced fertilizer inputs and costs, and reduced nutrient pollution of ground and surface waters.
- Increased carbon sequestration in soil organic matter.
- Greatly reduced health and environmental hazards when manure is recycled to the land at environmentally sound rates, rather than concentrated in tremendous excess as occurs in today's CAFOs.
- Improved food quality and food safety.
- Improved animal health, reduced need for antibiotics and other medications.

• Enhances farm and rural prosperity through diversification of farm enterprises.

Integrated farming systems include both those that market both animal (meat, milk, eggs, *etc.*) and crop based products (vegetables, fruits, grains, pulses, *etc.*), and those in which the cropland mainly provides pasture, hay and other fodder for livestock. The 2012 Farm Bill can promote and support this necessary reintegration in several ways. Research, education, and extension programs in the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) and throughout programs administered through the National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) should prioritize integrated, diversified crop-livestock systems, and reduce emphasis on more narrowly defined specialized systems such as "grain production" or "poultry production." Research and outreach efforts should address practical problems and information needs of farmers seeking to diversify, as well as documenting the benefits of such integration. The Conservation Title should mandate increased incentives and technical and financial support for adoption of and transition toward integrated crop-livestock systems, especially within working lands programs such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). Third, rural development programs such as the Value Added Producer Grants should include specific priorities and funding for development, implementation, production, and marketing for crop-livestock integrated farms. Finally, the Commodity, Conservation, and other Titles of the new Farm Bill should not create incentives for continued separation and concentration of livestock and crop production, and especially must not subsidize the expansion of the CAFO system of livestock and poultry production in any way. Current subsidies for CAFOs should be phased out gradually over time, giving those whose living depends on such enterprises adequate time, technical and financial assistance to make a successful transition into more sustainable and healthful forms of agriculture and animal husbandry.

Third, the 2012 Farm Bill should attend to the needs of mid-scale family farms. While large corporate farms have continued to grow in per-farm size and share of the nation's food production; and small scale, direct-market farming has undergone a renaissance thanks to rising consumer demand; midsize family farms have found themselves in a terrible bind, being too large to direct market their products and too small to make a living even for one family in today's commodity markets. The ongoing loss of farms to bankruptcy continues to hit the mid-scale family farms disproportionately hard. These "farms of the middle" need commodity title reforms that maintain adequate support in the event of depressed commodity prices, yet close loopholes that have allowed large corporate farms to garner huge subsidies and use them to squeeze moderate size family farms out of production. The market and contract agriculture reforms initiated under the new Livestock Title in the 2008 Farm bill must be continued and greatly expanded to protect farm families' ability to remain on the land. Most important, alternative marketing strategies, such as value chains and cooperative markets, should be supported through the Rural Development Title and other parts of the new Farm Bill. As public demand for higher quality, local or regional, sustainably produced foods continues to grow, we are going to need a vibrant constituency of mid-scale family farms to supply regional institutional markets such as farm-to-school programs that can improve nutrition for the nation's schoolchildren.

Fourth, the 2012 Farm Bill must include substantive reforms to the Commodity Title to end incentives for overproduction and for further concentration in agricultural production. Effective payment limitations and a tightened and clarified definition of "actively engaged in farming" must be adopted to close loopholes for corporate farms while maintaining needed support for mid-scale farms. Commodity programs should emphasize true price supports designed to be activated only when market prices fall too low for family farmers to make a living, and phase out production payments that are based on how much is produced, regardless of market price. Also, the Commodity Title should increase flexibility, and provide incentives, not penalties, for diversification into fruits, vegetables, and other currently non-commodity crops.

Fifth, the 2012 Farm Bill must include a strong Conservation Title that provides both technical and financial support for the adoption and improvement of sustainable and organic production systems. Mandatory funding for the Conservation Stewardship Program should be expanded to permit enrollment of 230 million acres in the CSP by the year 2017. Expansion of the CSP, concomitant with Commodity Title reform, will gradually shift tax dollars away from commodity production subsidies to paying farmers to optimize their conservation practices, and thereby protect the long term fertility of our soils and sustainability of our nation's agriculture.

Sixth, on-farm renewable energy programs should emphasize conservation, solar, wind, and sustainable bioenergy production for local use; de-emphasize large scale

biofuel production; and exclude corn ethanol and cellulosic biofuel based on removal of annual crop residues from the land. The adverse impacts on soil quality and soil erosion rates of the removal of crop biomass from the land on a widespread scale are potentially severe, and have not been adequately researched to merit a large scale implementation of biofuel production. In particular, diversion of corn grain crops to ethanol production can effectively take land out of food and fodder production; and conversion of the entire aboveground biomass of corn, wheat, or other grains into biofuel will severely draw down soil organic matter reserves and aggravate erosion.

Seventh, the 2012 Farm Bill should provide mandatory funding for the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) program, at least at the current statutory level of $60 million per year. Among USDA programs, SARE has been uniquely effective in supporting practical research and education into sustainable systems, resulting in numerous research outcomes and several excellent manuals on sustainable soil, crop, and pest management, that both organic and conventional farmers use every day to improve the economic and environmental sustainability of their farms.

Finally, I want to respond to an exchange in this spring's hearings on the 2012 Farm Bill, which bears on the importance of developing local and regional food systems alongside national and global commodity agriculture. Professor Neil Hamilton of Drake University urged the Committee to continue federal programs that promote the development of these local and regional farming and food systems, in line with the Know Your Food, Know Your Farmer program launched by the Obama Administration and Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack. I disagree entirely with comments by Rep. Jerry Moran (R–KS) to the effect that these programs represent an emphasis on "lifestyle" over "production" agriculture to the detriment of Main Street. As Professor Hamilton pointed out, local and regional production on diversified family farms keeps more dollars circulating within rural communities, strengthens the economic viability of family farms, and improves the quality of our food supply. Lest anyone on the Agriculture Committee doubts the power of smaller scale, diversified, sustainable farming to protect the environment, feed the people better, promote farm and rural prosperity, and build social capital, I would refer you to the 2008 report from the United Nations Environment Programme, entitled *Organic Agriculture and Food Security in Africa,* (*http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/ditcted200715_en.pdf*)* by Rachel Hine, Jules Pretty, and Sophia Twarog. In a study of 114 projects in 24 African countries involving 1.9 million smallholder farmers working 5 million acres, adoption of basic organic and conservation practices, and farm diversification, doubled yields and vastly increased food security in the farmers' communities, representing a major key to the solution to global hunger.

Thank you for taking these comments and recommendations into account in developing the 2012 Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF BONNIE SCHONEBERG, PAHALA, HI

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Bonnie Schoneberg.
City, State: Pahala, HI.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Forestry, Greenhouse/nursery, Specialty Crops, Vegetables, Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: *Aloha* from Hawaii. I come from the poorest area of the Big Island, the district of Ka'u. Since the sugar cane plantations closed down years ago, this area has been extremely impoverished. There are very few jobs, and many unemployed people who have given up finding work in the area. The area has many potential cash industries, but help only reaches a select few to jumpstart operations. Because few farms have enough money to hire workers, jobs aren't being created for those who need them. I believe the farm bill should have a section devoted to creating farm jobs in Ka'u. These can be in the form of creating a farm research center in Ka'u which favors job creation for Ka'u residents (this could be to test new crops in Hawaii, vog test these crops, and so forth). Another idea for aid to these residents is making monies to subsidize small business ventures more accessible to people in these impoverished areas. Many people in Ka'u are undereducated and lack the capabilities and know how to write grant proposals to help them get started. A lot of the grants I have researched also seem to favor businesses that are al-

---

*The document referred to is retained in Committee files.

ready running and have money, when most people in Ka'u lack the money to get a business started, have bad credit, and don't have the means to get loans or grants, and don't have the power to lobby for money like industrial agribusinesses do. The farm bill should address these hard luck farmers by bringing the money to them. This could be in the form of government subsidies that go to the area, where the Representatives of Ka'u can take proposals from residents (of all ages, races, and sexes), and hold a vote (for all Ka'u residents) for which proposals should receive the funding. This would allow a fair distribution of funds. This would allow a fair distribution of money that favors the merit of ideas rather than solely the education and connections that usually win only the lucky few federal grants to fund their agribusinesses. Thank you.

COMMENT OF GWEN SCHRODER, POWELL, MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Gwen Schroder.
City, State: Powell, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Greenhouse/nursery, Vegetables.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: We are a struggling to be organic farm in the SW corner of Missouri. We have a lot to learn and want to make a contribution to providing healthy local food to our surrounding communities. We are investing heavily in the process of extending our growing season to provide fresh produce year round. We need all the help we can get in terms of legislative action and financial incentives to continue this development on a broader scale. Please support initiatives to improve this growing segment of the agriculture in this state. We are woefully behind other states in the country in organic production.

COMMENT OF ERIC SCHROEDER, AUSTIN, TX

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 5:36 p.m.
Name: Eric Schroeder.
City, State: Austin, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student, Family Farmer.
Comment: The older generations don't understand the need for organics, we need more informative things to turn them onto the ideas and help them realize it is better in the long run *versus* short term production.

COMMENTS OF GUS SCHUMACHER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Gus Schumacher.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Non Profit Organization.
Comment:

Dear Sirs:

Ref: 2012 Farm Bill

(1) USDA/FNS—Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program. Restore funding to the initial $25 million annually in mandatory funding that the House of Representatives passed in the 2008 Farm Bill and the Senate cut back to $20 million. This very popular program is currently benefiting 18,000 farmers and 840,000 low income seniors. With restoration of funding to the 2008 initial House level of $25 million for vulnerable seniors, nearly 1 million seniors and 20,000 small farmers would benefit.

(2) USDA/Rural Development. Community Facilities Grants—Provide authority under the Community Facilities Grant program for pre-applications to State Rural Development Offices for an early assessment and if qualified under simplified criteria, indicate that applicants can submit a full package. This early assessment would save considerable time and effort by hard pressed rural non profits in submitting the extensive paperwork required for these grants.

(3) USDA/AMS—Federal State Market Improvement Program (FSMIP). The upcoming Farm Bill could explore revitalizing the ongoing State implemented FSMIP program by allocating 30% of the funding authorization for projects within applicant states that connect new markets with local low-income population food access and affordability.

(4) USDA/NIFA—Increase the mandatory authorization for the very popular Community Food Projects to $10 million annually.

(5) USDA/FNS—EBT Wireless Capability at Farmers Markets. Provide cost free access (machines and transaction costs) for farmers markets to utilize wireless EBT technology at farmers markets similar to the cost free access that hard wired retail stores currently have under the statues.

(6) USDA./AFRI Re-direct a portion of AFRI funds to social research projects addressing intersection of issues related to: food deserts, obesity, low income populations and local and regional food systems. This research would examine the impact of development of local/regional food systems on low income populations.

Sincerely,

GUS SCHUMACHER.

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Gus Schumacher.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Non Profit Organization.
Comment:

Dear Sirs:

Ref: Farm Bill 2011/2012 Options—Farmers as Healthy Food Hubs

With a modest investment in the Specialty Crop Program and the SNAP program, the 40,000 farmers selling at farmers markets, roadside stands and CSA's could further expand their revenue and also provide healthy, local fresh fruits and vegetables to SNAP and WIC clients. These farmers would be recognized as "healthy food hubs" in rural and urban underserved neighborhoods.

Currently, a few pilot programs are underway in several states (California, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island) fostered by foundations and health care groups to provide "nutrition incentives" to SNAP clients to shop at farmers markets. Some very modest funding from their state's "specialty crop" programs are allocated to encourage SNAP clients to use their EBT cards at farmers markets for local fruits and vegetables. Foundations in a few cases are providing funding for double vouchers to provide "nutrition incentives" to further encourage SNAP clients.

Given the leverage impact from using existing SNAP and WIC funding and the leverage shown by interested health care foundations and health care insurance firms to reduce health care costs, an increase of Specialty Crop Funding from $55 million to $150 million annually, with $50 million annually allocated to the states to promote use of SNAP and WIC at farmers markets, roadside stands and CSA's would leverage an estimated $500 million annually in additional specialty crop producers revenue while improving diets and reducing health care costs for SNAP and WIC clients.

With ongoing pilot programs in several states to measure the impact of additional fruit and vegetable consumption on SNAP and WIC clients, reduction in blood pressure, weight and improved cholesterol and BMI's will likely reduce health care costs for the 30 % of the population with weight caused health issues. These savings will receive a CBO score and a portion of those savings allocated to the $95 million increase in specialty crop funding, bringing the total to $150 million, with $100 million for state specialty crop programs and $50 million for promoting nutrition incentives at farmers markets, roadside stands and CSA's.

Sincerely,

GUS SCHUMACHER,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF CHAD SCOTT, WEST POINT, MS

Date Submitted: Monday, May 17, 2010, 9:36 p.m.
Name: Chad Scott.
City, State: West Point, MS.

Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: Unfortunately, there is a shortage of sensible policy in Washington. From the federal budget and pork-barrel spending to unfair trade policy, the federal government, as noted earlier, has been promoting shortsighted policies that produce prosperity for a few at the expense of the rest of us.

In the depths of the Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Congress were concerned that many farmers were being driven into bankruptcy by plummeting crop prices. So lawmakers passed the New Deal's Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

Today, that offer still stands, but to whose benefits? Here's a sampling of the folks who prospered from farm subsidies in recent years:

- David Rockefeller, former chairmen and chief executive officer of Chase Manhattan Bank and an heir to the vast Rockefeller fortune, has received $518,122 in farm subsidies from Washington.
- Scottie Pippen, the onetime Chicago Bulls basketball star who was Michael Jordan's sidekick and one of the highest paid players of all time, has been paid $210,520.
- Ted Turner, Cable News Network founder, media mogul, and number twenty-five on *Forbes* magazine's list of the five hundred wealthiest people in the United States, has been paid $206,948.

Need we ask any American whether these people need help from their government? Of course they don't. The prosperity they enjoy from this policy comes at the expense of everyone else; the tax money spent to make them even wealthier is clearly a waste of resources and a burden on all of us taxpayers and on the entire economy. And to the extent that the giveaway actually produces the original objective—higher prices—it is even a greater economic load, since consumers who must pay them can't spend the money on something else.

Yet federal giveaways to pseudo-farmers who don't need them are just minor signs of how truly counterproductive laws, policies, and programs that successive Congresses and administrations of both parties have imposed on us, the people.

For example, as Heritage's Brian Riedl has noted, the budget-busting $180 billion dollar farm bill passed before the 2002 elections actually encourages overproduction, pushing down prices and eroding farm income-reversing the goals of the original subsidies. It also undermines overseas trade and encourages other nations to put up barriers to U.S. exports. But if it harms the economy in general, it does bring prosperity to a favored few: huge corporate farms, a handful of lawmakers sitting on Agriculture Committees, and celebrities—David Rockefeller *et. al*—with tax shelters camouflaged as farms.

How did farm subsidies become corporate welfare? Easy: The subsidies have nothing to do with a recipient's income or financial need; they are determined by the crop you choose to raise and its size. Growers of the big-five favored crops—corn, cotton, rice, soybeans, and wheat—receive more than 90 percent of all farm subsidies. Growers of nearly four hundred other domestic crops, Riedl has pointed out, are completely shut out. The more acres you plant of the five preferred crops, the more government subsidies you receive. Size trumps everything else: In 2002, the most recent year for which figures are available, nearly ⅔ of all farm subsidies went to a mere 10 percent of all recipients.

Big farms keep on buying up small ones, and the subsidies have fueled the consolidation process. In 2002, corporate farmers received a huge, extra, and irrational bonus. They browbeat Congress into tripling the subsidy giveaways—now $30 billion a year—on the grounds that crop prices had fallen ("dipped a bit" would be a better term), and they needed "emergency" help.

Enhancing the prosperity of corporate farms that don't need taxpayers' money clearly imposes a burden on everyone else in the country. The big winners are often giant companies that practice agriculture at beast as a subsidiary or minor division-corporations like John Hancock, which most people would call an insurance company but which, in 2002 alone, got $2,289,364 as a sometime "farm" operator. Other eyebrow-raising beneficiaries that year included nine Members of Congress, five of them sitting on Committees overseeing U.S. agriculture. They received subsidies averaging forty-six times those given to the country's typical farmer.

This information came from the book *Getting American Right The True Conservative Values Our Nation Needs Today* by Edwin J. Feulner and Doug Wilson pg. 129–133.

I don't agree with this book on trade policy, but this make my point apparent. I would like to get rid of farm subsidies, or slash them by 70% to 80%.

ATTACHMENT

The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty

Just Say No to Farm Subsidies

September 1995 • Volume: 45 • Issue: 9 • Print This Post • 0 comments

Congress is busy tying itself in knots of anguish over the future of federal farm subsidies. Many lawmakers are unwilling to stand up to the farm lobby and do what's right. But exactly 100 years ago, one Secretary of Agriculture had the courage to do just that. His name was J. Sterling Morton, and he served in the second Administration of President Grover Cleveland.

With the encouragement of his grandfather and uncle, young Morton devoured the writings of economist Adam Smith and statesman Thomas Jefferson. He became a staunch proponent of their ideas of free markets and limited government by the time he went to college in his home state of Michigan. The notion that no free society could survive if government started redistributing the people's wealth became a life-long guiding principle for Morton. A strong advocate of voluntarism, not more centralized political power, he was the man who originated Arbor Day in 1872 to encourage private citizens to plant trees.

In the late 1890s, when the Democrats were the party of free trade, Morton was three times the Democratic candidate for Governor of Nebraska. In 1892, when Grover Cleveland recaptured the White House for the Democrats, he chose J. Sterling Morton to be his Secretary of Agriculture and gave him a free hand to liberate farming from the federal dole.

Noted economic historian Burton Folsom has written that Morton proved to be as principled a free market advocate as the President who appointed him. "In his four years as Secretary," Folsom observes, "he chopped almost 20 percent from his department's budget. He fired unproductive bureaucrats, starting with a man who held the job of federal 'rainmaker.'" Then he slashed the travel budget: if farmers wanted to hear a spokesman from Washington, they would have to pay the bill to send him.

"If the Department of Agriculture is to be conducted in the spirit of paternalism, the sooner it is abolished the better for the United States," Morton declared. Accordingly, he cut farm subsidies wherever the law gave him the authority. He reduced the government's role in beet sugar production with these words: "Those who raise corn should not be taxed to encourage those who desire to raise beets. The power to tax was never vested in a Government for the purpose of building up one class at the expense of other classes."

In 1895, Morton ended the free seed program. For 60 years, the government had sent free seed to farmers. But many farmers didn't even use the seeds; in fact, fewer than one person per thousand even acknowledged receiving them. "Is it a function of government to make gratuitous distribution of any material thing?" Morton asked. He called free seeds a "gratuity, paid for by money raised from all the people, and bestowed upon a few people."

In a biography of Morton, historian James C. Olson writes:

> Every bill to appropriate money for special purposes was looked upon suspiciously by the Secretary. If it could not run the gamut of rigid laissez faire, if there was the slightest danger that it would extend the functions of the government, if it was paternal in any aspect, the Secretary of Agriculture was against it. When, for example, J.Z. George, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, asked his opinion on a bill to appropriate money for the extermination of the Russian thistle in the states of the Northwest, Morton asked in return whether it was "the business of the Government of the United States to make appropriations out of which men, women, and boys are to be hired, at wages fixed by law, to exterminate weeds, called Russian thistles, any more than it is the business of that Government to prescribe the manner of plowing, planting, and cultivating cereals, cotton, and tobacco, and to limit the wages to be paid cultivators?" [1]

Those who favored subsidies and business as usual were aghast at Morton. They wrote him vitriolic letters and filled newspapers with their attacks on him. Many urged President Cleveland to fire Morton, but the President was elated with the cost

[1] James C. Olson, *J. Sterling Morton: Pioneer Statesman, Founder of Arbor Day* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1942), pp. 358–9.

savings his Agriculture Secretary was achieving. This was the President who had once vetoed a $10,000 appropriation for drought-stricken farmers in Texas by declaring, ". . . though the people support the government, the government should not support the people."

Morton himself challenged his critics. He called the pro-subsidy Granger Society a "bunko establishment." He urged a farmer in Iowa to quit "plowing with preambles, planting with resolutions, and gathering by legislative enactment" and get on with the business of an honest day's work. His battles with lobbyists and the millions of dollars he saved became almost legendary in Washington.

When Morton left the nation's capital in 1897, the subsidy crowd slowly returned. Free seeds were again distributed. By the 1930s, the federal government was paying some farmers not to produce at all. By the 1950s, even mohair producers were getting federal handouts. Today billions are doled out to subsidize a wide range of farm commodities, and it seems farmers sometimes produce as much for the government as they do for the market. Many agricultural economists believe that farm subsidy programs actually increase instability in the industry because the rules governing them change so often.

The experience of New Zealand is instructive: after that country abolished all farm subsidies in 1986 with a mere eight months' notice, the farm economy improved and output rose. The awful predictions of the subsidy-seekers that disaster would ensue never materialized.

Author Osha Gray Davidson, writing in the January 4, 1993, *New York Times,* termed the U.S. farm subsidy program "hopelessly outdated, exorbitantly expensive and environmentally and socially devastating." Far from "saving the family farmer," they price American produce out of world markets, hurt low income families, and swamp the farmer with endless regulations. "A whopping 73¢ of every farm program dollar," Davidson noted, "ends up in the pockets of 15 percent of the nation's superfarms." In other words, the large and well-off get the biggest checks, while their smaller competitors get a pittance in cash for the strangling controls subsidy brings. Because of these realities, there may be considerably more support for the abolition of subsidies among farmers themselves than is generally believed.

As Congress tries to muster the courage to challenge the government's destructive role in agriculture, its members ought to look to J. Sterling Morton for inspiration. One hundred years ago, he didn't waffle on the issue; he knew what had to be done, and to the extent the law allowed him, he did it with a flourish.

COMMENT OF DAVID SCOTT, MEMPHIS, TN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: David Scott.
City, State: Memphis, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: As a small producer, I'm VERY concerned that the following are addressed in the upcoming farm bill in a way that helps encourage small farming:

(1) Overburdening small farmers with regulation.

(2) Create programs that allow new/young farmers to purchase land to start new farms, especially close to urban centers where land convenience is essential to providing locally grown food economically.

(3) Strict regulation of what is considered "organic", since it seems the idea of what is organic is being loosened (such as human waste products considered organic mulch in some circles)

(4) Subsidies for low-income citizens that allow them to buy healthy, locally grown food.

(5) Extending research by the USDA and land-grant universities for sustainable and organic farming practices.

And on a larger front, strict regulations on genetically modified organisms (GMOs) as food sources. GMO alfalfa and it's potential to infiltrate the alfalfa supply at large DIRECTLY affects my production as a producer of natural food products, and gives Monsanto even more control over the American and world food supply (to the detriment of small independent farmers).

COMMENT OF SARAH SCULLY, ALEXANDRIA, VA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Sarah Scully.
City, State: Alexandria, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: I would really like to see more efforts in the Farm Bill to support organic and decentralized food systems. Grain subsidies should be redirected into healthy food that nourishes people and the environment. I do not want to subsidize unhealthy food and then pay growing healthcare bills for obesity-related diseases later. Moving towards organics would decrease fossil fuel dependency and ensure that our ecosystems will be able to continue to produce food. Organic growing is more productive than conventional agriculture anyway. Concerns over antibiotic resistance should start with the agriculture industry too. That our livestock consumer over 70% of pharmaceuticals in America is a major problem, especially since antibiotic consumption only keeps animals alive. We're still eating infected animals. That cannot be healthy. Genetically modified foods will probably do more harm in the long-run. I would like to see them banned, but at least labeled so I know what I am eating. Please change the Farm Bill!

COMMENT OF RICK SEAMER, GOOSE LAKE, IA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Rick Seamer.
City, State: Goose Lake, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: Please make FSA maps open to public.
Thank you,

RICK SEAMER.

COMMENT OF CLAUDIA SECREST, ROBSTOWN, TX

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Claudia Secrest.
City, State: Robstown, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment: I strongly object to the undermining of the crop insurance program with cutbacks to the farmers and their agents. For whatever reason, testimonies have been inaccurate and paint a false picture of what an agent has to do to service a policy. Only yesterday I spent an entire day on only one aspect of servicing only one producer's policy. Multiply this time my 900 policies and you will see my need to hire competent help. It has become a bureaucratic nightmare over the years. Any cutbacks will prevent my ability to pay help and expenses required to manage all the paperwork now required by RMA rules and regulations. Producers and their lenders have come to depend upon and respect the knowledge of their agents. The private sector has worked hard for many years to build a strong crop insurance program, one the government failed in doing many years ago. To undermine the results would be a travesty.

COMMENT OF AHMED SELIMAN, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Ahmed Seliman.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: I support a farm bill that has a focus on nutrition, not cheap calories. The farm bill should support the family farmer and the small local farmer, not corporate farmers. The farm bill should support organic farming, fruits and vegetables.

COMMENT OF LORETTA SEPPANEN, OLYMPIA, WA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Loretta Seppanen.
City, State: Olympia, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired from Post-Secondary Education.
Comment: The 2012 bill needs to provide more support for environmental issues in farming. Agriculture that uses the land without regard to soil health in the future is not sustainable.

Current farm subsidies are too narrowly focused on corn and soybeans which has resulted in much too much production of those two crops by large farms. We need subsides that (1) help small farmers that serve a local market, (2) help smaller farmers transition to organic (and perhaps also larger farmers).

COMMENT OF DANIEL SERDA, KANSAS CITY, KS

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:36 p.m.
Name: Daniel Serda.
City, State: Kansas City, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Historic Preservationist.
Comment: Increasingly, rural communities are seeking support from USDA Rural Development for a range of historic preservation initiatives, including Main Street revitalization, heritage tourism, and historic building rehabilitation projects.

I am writing to support an enhanced commitment to USDA Rural Development programs in the next Farm Bill, especially programs that support downtown revitalization with a focus on business development and retention, rehabilitation of community facilities, heritage tourism, and housing.

These programs foster sustainable rural development and job creation.

I am also writing to support the Obama Administration's proposed Rural Innovation Initiative (RII) or similar rural development strategies which focus on making USDA's investments more efficient and effective by rewarding strategic regional approaches to rural development that allow regions to build on their unique assets, including their heritage and culture.

Rural development strategies such as (RII) could be a source of support for regional, "heritage-based" projects that incorporate initiatives such as Main Street revitalization, heritage tourism, farm building preservation, and agricultural conservation.

Finally, I support funding for the Historic Barn Preservation Program. Barns are not only important historic structures of rural America, they are also practical, functional buildings that can be rehabilitated to meet modern agricultural needs. This program is designed to help document and rehabilitate them for productive use.

COMMENT OF CAROL SEVERSON, GEM, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:06 a.m.
Name: Carol Severson.
City, State: Gem, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Sprayer Secretary/Former FSA Employee.
Comment: Having flown these photos in the past and working daily with farmers, I know this information is important to have AT HAND. Photographers can claim "public domain" if they see a good photo by the roadside. In the air, I would think aerial photos are "public domain". Also, we have NEVER had a farmer be anything but delighted that we can verify his fields, and what he wants sprayed. Access to this information is a boon to agriculture. Crippling that access is only stifling progress for everyone concerned.

COMMENT OF JOSHUA SEWELL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 22, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Joshua Sewell.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Analyst.

Comment: We need to reform agriculture in a manner that removes taxpayer funded subsidies that are effectively corporate welfare.

COMMENT OF GAIL ROBIN SEYDEL, ALBUQUERQUE, NM

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Gail Robin Seydel.
City, State: Albuquerque, NM.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: The 2012 Farm Bill is very important in supporting the growing local and regional foods movement. Please support it with funds for specialty crops, and organic production, especially given the information in the Presidents Panel on Cancer report. Also help protect conventional and organic farmers from contamination by GMO crops with a liability fund to reimburse us when we get contaminated with GMO pollen and loose our markets. This is very important both nationally and in relation to our international sales.
Thanks.
Most sincerely,

GAIL ROBIN SEYDEL.

COMMENT OF JAMES SHAFFER, HILMAR, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 04, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: James Shaffer.
City, State: Hilmar, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Truck Driver, Seasonal Ag.
Comment: The only reasonable, rational, and Constitutional thing you can do in this matter is, cut the subsidies entirely. Aside from having no authority to subsidize anything whatsoever, it is completely senseless to use taxpayer's money to pay for subsidies that artificially inflate the costs of goods and services—it amounts to a double tax on the consumer.
Quit it. Now.

COMMENT OF TIM SHAMBLIN, BURLEY, ID

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Tim Shamblin.
City, State: Burley, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Duster.
Comment: USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis

---

COMMENT OF GARTH SHANEYFELT, GREENFIELD, MA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 05, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Garth Shaneyfelt.
City, State: Greenfield, MA.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mead Maker.
Comment: As we move forward and think about how to feed ourselves in a sustainable manner, I encourage you to support SMALL family farms and not commodity crops (those subsidies just helps the food processors not the farmers). As in so much, our DIVERSITY is our strength! Diversified small farms grow more on a per-acre basis large monocrops (in addition to being much better for the soil, water, land, & people) and are more likely to use sustainable practices.

Subsidizing corn to fatten feed-lot cattle so everyone can have hamburgers 2/day (and all the associated health problems) is bad for our economy, health, and communities.

COMMENT OF DENNIS SHANNON, AUBURN, AL

Date Submitted: Monday, May 03, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Dennis Shannon.
City, State: Auburn, AL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professor of Agronomy.
Comment: Subsidies distort markets and create winners and losers. Among the losers are small family farms that do not produce crops that are subsidized and poor farmers in developing countries who must compete against artificially cheap prices on the world market because of subsidies. We need to start weaning farmers off of subsidies, starting with large mega-farms by lowering the ceiling on how much then can earn.

COMMENT OF JERAD SHARP, INDIANOLA, IA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:06 a.m.
Name: Jerad Sharp.
City, State: Indianola, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Application Operator.
Comment: Having up to date FSA boundaries available to our business helps our operation run more efficiently and safely.

COMMENT OF RANDY SHAW, BIG SPRINGS, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Randy Shaw.
City, State: Big Springs, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy Sales and Service.
Comment: We need this tool to help our farmers. It is important to know the exact legals that we are applying products to. With the mapping system in place. We can be assured that we are in the correct fields. We need and use this tool on a daily basis. Our growers have come to count on us for this information. Please do not take this service away from us!

COMMENT OF KAREN SHEA, SCITUATE, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Karen Shea.
City, State: Scituate, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Marketing.
Comment: If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricul-

tural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

For any parent out there, this of vital importance (even if they don't know or understand that yet). It's time to take back our food and our health. This affects not just agriculture, but national health care as well.

If the economic impact to the farmers of "staple" crops is overwhelming, then I would ask that you consider funding retraining programs which could teach these farmers how to move toward organic farming and production.

Thank you,

KAREN SHEA,
Marketing Professional and Mom.

COMMENT OF KATHERINE SHELLY, THOMPSON, PA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 7:05 a.m.
Name: Katherine Shelly.
City, State: Thompson, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Forestry.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: Forestry is important to watersheds as well as for forest products. But I'm writing about my neighbors in dairy. So many of them have sold their herds recently because the farm gate price of milk doesn't begin to cover their feed, energy and maintenance costs. Please work to close that gap before we lose them and our farms altogether. We'll need this land in farming as our population grows, in the U.S. and the world. Thank you for considering my comments.

COMMENT OF RON SHEPARD, MAZEPPA, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 18, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Ron Shepard.
City, State: Mazeppa, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I raise 100 head and direct market my meat. It bothers me that the Honorable Congressman Colin Peterson seems to have such disdain for small or medium farmers, not sure which category I would be in. I have to compete for land with farmers that get a lot of govt. money, not very fair. I want to expand my operation but land prices make it impossible. How about every farmer gets the same amount of govt. money and let the best farmers win. His idea that small farms and maybe medium farms are almost useless is both outdated and selective thinking on his part.

COMMENT OF JILL SHEPHERD, BLOOMINGTON, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Jill Shepherd.
City, State: Bloomington, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Holistic Health Practitioner.
Comment: It is time to change the Farm Bill! Stop making our children obese by feeding them government subsidized food like genetically and hormonally altered wheat, corn and dairy products. These foods have gotten so far away from their original form that they are turning against our bodies and brains. They are junk with very little nutritional value left in them. Children and adults need real food! The need organic, clean, food that packs more nutritional punch! Food that is grown in nutrient-dense soil managed by small, community farmers who have a connection to the land and the very people they feed. Our children deserve they same high-quality food as the children of Europe and South America. Food is a body's fuel and you only get out of it what you put into it. We are organic living beings not petri dishes.

COMMENT OF TRACEY SHEPPARD, FORT WAYNE, IN

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Tracey Sheppard.
City, State: Fort Wayne, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Registered Nurse.
Comment: There should be positive incentives for our local farmers to produce fresh fruits, vegetables, meat and dairy products for the local school districts. The schools should only be feeding the children with food grown locally. The schools should help with the cost of transporting the produce from the farms to the schools. The schools should be eating seasonal foods instead of getting produce from other countries. Our farms in the U.S. should be able to sustain the people of the U.S.; instead of getting things from other countries.

COMMENT OF MORGAN SHERIDAN, ALBUQUERQUE, NM

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Morgan Sheridan.
City, State: Albuquerque, NM.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Home Care Worker.
Comment: My hope is the 2012 bill will encourage more options in farming, particularly for local and regional organic farms. I am deeply concerned that mega-scale agribusiness's interests in and desire to implement large scale use GMO products will contribute to reducing overall nutrition quality in the food put on America's tables and lead to further diminishing seed stock of heritage foods. This would be a farm scale disaster of the kind the BP's Deepwater Horizon spill is to the Gulf.

I would also like to see a larger urban movement where unused urban land can be used in lower income areas for growing food—both vegetables and small animals (chicken, lamb, goats, rabbit) for area residents, and those eligible for food stamps, WIC, Senior food programs, *etc.*

Think small—think local, support our small farmer—they deserve it.

COMMENT OF KATIE SHERMAN, MINNEAPOLIS, MN

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Katie Sherman.
City, State: Minneapolis, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Please stop the subsidization of corn and soy, along with vast federal regulations that affect small, local farmers negatively. Big business farms and small organic farmers are two completely different entities. United States citizens deserve to have more say over what goes into our soil and food, and small organic farmers have the right to sell quality products for a fair price, not having to compete with cheap, government funded, chemically-laden products.

Big agribusiness is contributing both to obesity and a myriad of other health issues that stem from synthetic fertilizers that get into our waters and air. Please open your eyes to what real food is, and help support the people who grow it.

Thank you for your time.

COMMENT OF MARY SHERMAN, CINCINNATI, OH

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Mary Sherman.
City, State: Cincinnati, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Attorney.
Comment: To paraphrase Michael Pollan, I want a bill that aligns agricultural policy with our public-health and environmental values, one with incentives to produce food cleanly, sustainably and humanely. I want a bill that makes the most healthful calories in the supermarket competitive with the least healthful ones. I want a bill that feeds schoolchildren fresh food from local farms rather than processed surplus commodities from far away. I want a bill that guarantees the people who raise our food not subsidies but fair prices.

Right now, I buy most of my produce and meat at local farms and rarely travel to the grocery store. Unfortunately, these small farms are in danger of being wiped out by companies like Cargill and Monsanto, and even the heavy restrictions by the government. I want the freedom to shop locally and to buy from someone who farms 5 miles from my house. I want to stop the subsidization and mass production of soy, corn and wheat, which would in turn (hopefully) stop the mass production of junk food, which is killing this country.

COMMENT OF VALERIE SHERMAN, PALATINE, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Valerie Sherman.
City, State: Palatine, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Attorney.
Comment: Although I realize corn and soybeans are an important part of Midwest agriculture, and Illinois agriculture especially, I would like to see less subsidies for these crops and more support for farms who diversify their crops and are more friendly to the environment. Diversified farms are better for the environment and better for consumers because the farms need to use fewer pesticides, and the diversified crops support each other symbiotically and protect against disease. Regarding pesticides, I think there should be subsidies for farms who DON'T use pesticides rather than those who DO. It seems to me that the government subsidizes and encourages farmers to grow crops in monoculture and with the heavy use of pesticides, and I would like to see that change. I always buy my meat grass-fed, and I always avoid the "dirty dozen" produce items that are saturated with pesticides. These items are currently more expensive than their industrially produced counter-parts—fueled by corn, pesticides, oil, and subsidies—and if the government supported more sustainable practices instead of less sustainable ones, the sustainable produce would be more affordable for purchasers like me. I'm already voting with my supermarket dollar, but the consumers need the support of the legislature, who does not support small, organic, diversified farms. For more sources about organic produce, grass-fed meats, and diversified farms, read "The Omnivore's Dilemma" and "In Defense of Food" by Michael Pollan, and "To Buy or Not To Buy Organic" by Cindy Burke.

COMMENT OF SCOTT SHERRETS, INDEPENDENCE, IA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Scott Sherrets.
City, State: Independence, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Carpenter.
Comment: Please help farmers willing to invest in renewable energy.

COMMENT OF RAY J. SHINN, SENECA, K

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Ray J. Shinn.
City, State: Seneca, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment:

July 28, 2010

Dear Agriculture Committee:

My comments are on Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill. I would like to address not only the restrictions that Section 1619 has on verification of classification and composition of land for collection of data on sales being used by agricultural appraisers, but the ramification the closure of information will effect on the Use Value system the state governments are using to arrive at valuations for taxation.

The economy in rural America over the past 50 years has seen highs and lows in the market of agricultural land. We have been on a steady uptrend since the lows of the mid 1980's where inflation and high interest rates with low commodity prices placed pressure on the markets. As we all know, these trends have a tendency to correct themselves. With the uncertainty in the U.S. economy as well as the world

economy, the chance or likelihood of a correction in the agricultural sector is eminent. When pressure is placed on the agricultural economy, farmers and businesses in agriculture will need to rely on clear and accurate valuations to determine their solvency and viability. The need for good clear information will be of upmost importance from all sectors that have a hand in supplying data to support values. With the restrictions of Section 1619, that data and information available to certified appraisers is cut, and thus accuracy and possibly the credibility of good appraisals for valuations is flawed. This will have an effect not only on the farmer and businesses to borrow money, but could have a domino effect on the economy of entire regions and states on how they conduct business in the future.

The State of Kansas adopted the Use Value method of valuing agricultural land in the 1980's. There are forty-three states that employ some version of Use Value to determine agricultural land value for property tax purposes. Kansas State University is currently compiling the data and doing the research in collecting yields, cash rental rates, rainfall and water usage to determine the proper value for each land capability class and land types. It is imperative that they also have access to data and records to complete their task in a professional manner. The releasing of information to certified appraisers and professionals is vital in forming clear values for the future of agriculture and the state's fiscal well being.

RAY J. SHINN,
President,
Kansas Chapter of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers.

COMMENT OF JEAN SHIRAKI, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Jean Shiraki.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Daniel K. Inouye Fellow—JACL Policy Fellow.
Comment: As an organization dedicated to improving the health and well-being of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) seeks to ensure that the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill of 2012) removes barriers to the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) that prevent lawfully-residing immigrants and their family members from enrolling in this vital anti-hunger program. We believe that the Farm Bill of 2012 must include the following provisions to mitigate these harmful barriers.

1. Fairness for legal immigrants. Eliminate the five year waiting period imposed on immigrant adults under current law. Hunger does not wait five years, nor should lawfully-residing families have to wait before gaining access to SNAP. Households headed by immigrants work at the same rate as U.S. citizens, but are twice as likely to be poor. Approximately 12% of Asian Americans and 16% of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders live in poverty, and almost 2-in-3 Asian Americans is foreign-born. In these challenging economic times, no U.S. household should have to suffer from food insecurity due to arbitrary waiting periods.

2. Clarify eligibility for immigrant families with children. Eliminate sponsor deeming rules for SNAP households that include children. Over half of young, low-income children of immigrants live in households that experience hunger or other food-related problems. Most of these children (80%) are U.S. citizens. The existing eligibility rules are confusing and complex. Although lawfully-residing immigrant children are exempt from waiting periods and deeming rules, many households with mixed-immigration status individuals do not participate in the program even though they are eligible. In fact, U.S. citizen children in noncitizen households experienced the greatest drop in participation rates in SNAP/food stamps from 1994–2004 among all eligible participants.

3. Simplify administrative reporting. The Department of Homeland Security's requirement that SNAP agencies collect data on sponsored immigrants who would go hungry or homeless without assistance (the "indigence" exemption from deeming) should take the form of an aggregate report that omits individual names. This alternative would meet federal statistical needs while ensuring that eligible hungry families are able to secure assistance without fear.

We urge Congress to reauthorize the Farm Bill and strengthen the SNAP program to meet the needs of hungry families and promote program participation.

COMMENT OF WENDY SHOEMAKER, LAWRENCE, KS

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Wendy Shoemaker.
City, State: Lawrence, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Career Counselor.
Comment: Please encourage small farms (and farmers) who provide food to local markets with less energy expenditure. There is a need for more farmers—Growing Growers is an example in this area that could be studied and reproduced elsewhere. Also, the subsidies to large corporate animal facilities should be reconsidered in light of our nation's growing obesity epidemic.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

COMMENT OF BRITTANY SHOOTS-REINHARD, COLUMBUS, OH

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 7:05 a.m.
Name: Brittany Shoots-Reinhard.
City, State: Columbus, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graduate Student.
Comment: It is disturbing that subsidies go predominately to humongous agribusinesses, or to the family farms that are already wildly profitable. It is disturbing that we pay for junk food twice, once in these subsidies that are paid out, particularly for feed corn, that is made into processed foods, soda, and feedlot beef. Then we get to pay for it again, in the public health sphere because of obesity-related illnesses. The corn and livestock lobbies are destroying the health of this country.

First, smaller family farms on the poverty line should get more subsidies than giant operations, after all, this is who the subsidies were initially meant for, before we let lobbyists rather than common decency make our decisions. Second, priority should be given to farms that are raising fresh fruits and vegetables: this will make food that is actually healthy cheaper for the people that need to eat it most, and offset the costs of growing food that are more perishable. Finally, wouldn't it be good to invest more in organic practices, which don't result in increased dependence on oil, undrinkable water, harm to local wildlife, or pesticide-resistant pests?

What's more American than family farms? Shouldn't we be trying to help them rather than help giant corporations at the expense of family farms' and the health of the American public at large?

COMMENT OF SIERRA NEVADA CONSERVANCY, AUBURN, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 7:05 p.m.
Name: Sierra Nevada Conservancy.
City, State: Auburn, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: State Government Agency.
Comment: Our agency initiates, encourages, and supports efforts that improve the environmental, economic, and social well-being of the Sierra Nevada region, its communities, and the citizens of California. We currently have two comments on the next Farm Bill.

(1) We understand that there are at least five different definitions of "rural area" in the 2008 Farm Bill. There are many small, isolated communities in the Sierra, and we believe they would be best served by a Farm Bill definition that does not deem them ineligible for rural programs simply because they are within a certain distance of a large metropolitan area.

(2) Additionally, we suggest including the following definitions used by various California state agencies: (a) "Disadvantaged community" means a community with an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income; and (b) "Economically distressed area" means a municipality with a population of 20,000 persons or less, a rural county, or a reasonably isolated and divisible segment of a larger municipality where the assessment of the population is 20,000 persons or less, with an annual median household income that is less than 85 percent of the statewide median household income, and with one or more of the following conditions: (1) Financial hardship, (2) Unemployment rate at least 2 percent higher than the statewide average, (3) Low population density.

Thank you for considering our comments.

COMMENT OF ROCHELLE SIHM, GRANT, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Rochelle Sihm.
City, State: Grant, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial & Ground Application.
Comment: We would like to see the FSA field maps be made public again. They are a great tool for the applicators in making sure that they are on the correct fields and obstacles around the fields. Also very useful when the grower can draw on the map precisely where they need something sprayed. In the age of GPS it is great to have the coordinates, especially when you are flying in a new territory.

COMMENT OF MARGARET SILVER, ATLANTIC BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Margaret Silver.
City, State: Atlantic Beach, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support home-grown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.

- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for specialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.
- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF RONALD SILVER, ATLANTIC BEACH, FL

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 3:05 p.m.
Name: Ronald Silver.
City, State: Atlantic Beach, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: We must make sure that farmers and ranchers have a full suite of conservation programs with adequate funding so that they can be the best stewards of our nation's natural resources. Federal farm policy should also support home-grown renewable energy like wind, solar, and biomass.

- A strategic base of our agricultural land is absolutely essential to our long-term ability to produce and supply fresh healthy sources of food, fiber and energy with the fewest inputs. Federal farm policy must enhance farm and ranch land protection to adequately address the threat to our strategic agricultural land resources from non-farm development and fragmentation.
- It's critical to increase the production of, and access to local and healthy food while helping farmers remain profitable. Farm and food policy should be linked more strongly with national health and nutrition goals. Federal government programs should promote healthier diets and meet increased demand for spe-

cialty crops and fresh, locally grown food by expanding access, facilitating institutional purchases and supporting farmers markets.

- We need to build upon the success of the 2008 Farm Bill in creating the ACRE program, a new safety net for farmers. I believe ACRE better serves farmers by providing help when producers suffer real revenue losses, helps address the inequities and distortion of our current programs, and is a better investment of public tax dollars into agriculture.

COMMENT OF GREG SINGLETON, SPRINGFIELD, VA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Greg Singleton.
City, State: Springfield, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired U.S. Army Officer/Defense Contractor.
Comment: I want to thank the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture for providing this opportunity to submit comments on agricultural policy for the 2012 Farm Bill.

Farmers understand that conservation is key to agricultural production, rural economies, and future well-being. To meet the needs of the future, the 2012 Farm Bill must recognize, protect, and enhance the status of conservation policy in federal farm policy.

Research from USDA consistently shows that conservation practices and programs that support rural America's natural amenities also bolster the number of rural jobs and even farms. Furthermore, protection of our finite soil and water resources is essential if farms and ranches are to meet the challenge of feeding a growing population. Conversely, an extraction ethic in agriculture can at best serve only short term rewards at the expense of our future.

Success in the 2012 Farm Bill can be achieved without inflated spending, but conservation must be at the center of policy considerations. As you begin the process of re-authorizing our national farm policy, please include the following recommendations in your work:

1. Enact a robust and well-funded Conservation Title to support all conservation programs. Congress and the administration must enact a 2012 Farm Bill that provides the assistance and incentives necessary to ensure stewardship of agricultural lands.

2. Enact a federal Farm Bill that promotes payments for farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits rather than emphasizing payments for historical crop production.

3. Re-prioritize the existing conservation compliance regimen. Conservation compliance is a means for ensuring that where public money is invested, the public's interests are protected by requiring basic levels of protections for soil, water and wetlands. Prioritizing conservation compliance will require no additional Farm Bill investment and, in fact, can result in saving federal dollars by withholding subsidies. Specific actions that should be taken include:

- Require all crop land to have a conservation plan in order to be eligible for any USDA benefits. This would strongly encourage producers to create and follow that plan.
- To remove the incentive to convert remaining grasslands to crops, make native sod and all land without a cropping history ineligible for federal crop insurance.
- Require all existing or new crop and revenue insurance or other risk management programs to be subject to conservation compliance provisions. This is absolutely critical, particularly with respect to recent calls for making insurance a major component of the federal farm support system.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit these comments.

COMMENT OF MICHAEL SITZMAN, SURPRISE, AZ

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 2:05 a.m.
Name: Michael Sitzman.
City, State: Surprise, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Not Employed.

Comment: Farmers need strong federal protections against lawsuits from owners of patents on genetically altered foods. For instance, a soybean grower whose land is passively invaded by patented seeds from neighboring fields (via wind, bird-transport, or runoff) should not be liable for the cross-contamination that he cannot control. Under the existing circumstances, innocent farmers have been reduced to bankruptcy attempting to defend themselves against aggressively litigious multinational seed patent-holding corporations such as Monsanto. This is fundamentally unfair to growers; it reduces choices for the American consumer; and it compromises the biodiversity in the crop supply so vital to the world's long-term environmental sustainability. Please support the rights of the independent American food producer.

COMMENT OF RUTH ANN SKAGGS, FREDERICKTOWN, MO

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Ruth Ann Skaggs.
City, State: Fredericktown, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Business Owner—Food Service.
Comment: Make it easier for restaurants to sell LOCAL meats—we do not have a USDA inspection site nearby.

Promote AG education and more technical/vocational education opportunities for farm kids to stay rural.

Make more advantages for small farmers as opposed to corporate farms.

More encouragement for Farmers Markets in each community.

Promote biofuels, more markets for their use.

School gardens and farms to teach kids where their food comes from and how to eat fresh & local.

COMMENT OF BETHANY SLATER, EAST SYRACUSE, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Bethany Slater.
City, State: East Syracuse, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Director of Member Programs at Local Food Bank.
Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:

The Food Bank of Central New York believes that having a strong nutrition title in the 2012 Farm Bill is important to address hunger and achieve President Obama's goal to eliminate U.S. childhood hunger by 2015. Too many people in our community are living with hunger or are at risk of hunger. The USDA Economic Research Service estimates that 14.6% of households experienced food insecurity in 2008. 49.1 million Americans make up these households lacking access to nutritionally adequate foods—a 36% increase from the 36.2 million in 2007. Many attribute this large increase to our recent economic downturn. However we believe that the expanded eligibility, higher benefits and increased funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), coupled with additional funding for TEFAP commodities passed from the 2008 Farm Bill and the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act had an enormous impact in helping low-income families during this difficult time.

The Food Bank of Central New York serves eleven counties in New York State. We provide food, technical assistance, and nutrition education to 277 emergency food programs: food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters. We distribute over 11 million pounds of food each year, resulting in approximately 8.5 million meals each year or 30,000 meals every day. The Food Bank is also the local distributor of government commodities through The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP). In addition to supplying food, we also works to transition clients from the emergency food network to self-sufficiency, whether through our programs or referrals to government programs like SNAP. Our Food Stamp outreach workers work in Cortland, Oneida, and Onondaga counties to connect eligible people with the entitlement benefits that SNAP provides.

TEFAP commodities are a lifeline to our emergency food network and the people they serve. They help prevent empty shelves and ensure no one is ever turned away due to a lack of food. In addition, SNAP is the ultimate solution to hunger. Currently SNAP is effective but its reach is undermined by gaps in access and adequacy

of benefits as well as by administrative burdens. We recommend the following changes to improve SNAP and TEFAP:

- Improve benefit adequacy by replacing the Thrifty Food Plan with the Low Cost Food plan as the basis for SNAP benefits.
- Increase the minimum benefit.
- Restore eligibility to legal immigrants.
- Permanently suspend time limits on able-bodied adults without dependents.
- Provide greater support for states, including for SNAP administration and outreach.
- Increase funding for TEFAP commodities and administration support.

Therefore we urge the 2012 Farm Bill to invest resources to make food stamp benefit allotments more adequate, to open eligibility to reach more vulnerable people, and to connect more eligible people with benefits. We appreciate your consideration of this matter.

BETHANY SLATER,
Director of Member Programs,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF RAD SLOUGH, RAD, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Rad Slough.
City, State: Rad, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Fitness Center Owner.
Comment: STRICT and clear definitions of farming methods is HUGE for me. Organic farming has become a large part of my life as a consumer. I have found the produce and meats to be more flavorful and very nutritious. Please do nothing in any bill but support sustainable farming and labeling.

COMMENT OF HELEN SMILEY, HOUSTON, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Helen Smiley.
City, State: Houston, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock, Poultry/poultry products, Specialty Crops, Vegetables.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: I began organic farming 30 years ago because my children had a sensitivity to chemicals and preservatives, *etc.,* added to foods being produced, they were effected by hyperactivity, allergenic effects to their nervous system associated to ADD and ADHD. Children function better in life skills and scholastically with organic meats and foods. Please support and include funding for organic food production so that producers can make the production more affordable. And also create a work force and job creation in rural development.

COMMENT OF CHARLES SMITH, HOUSTON, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Charles Smith.
City, State: Houston, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Comment: Please keep in mind proximity and funding for urban farming. Is there any reason why we cannot encourage agriculture in the neighborhood. Think of the benefits. Decrease transportation increased freshness and nutrition increased education.

COMMENT OF CHERYL SMITH, GORMAN, TX

Date Submitted: Monday, August 16, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Cheryl Smith.
City, State: Gorman, TX.

Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I am writing to you concerning the Estate Tax. Because of rising land prices in this country, this tax is going to affect more and more farms and ranches. Farming and ranching is hard work, full of financial risk. Young people can no longer afford to buy land and make a living farming and raising cattle. My family has worked hard, and over four generations have accrued enough land to enable us to make enough to keep the ranch going. With rising land prices, even a small farm or ranch will be affected by these unfair estate taxes. Our children have worked all their lives on the ranch, yet won't be given a chance to keep it. Our children would have to sell half the ranch to pay these taxes. There would not be left with enough to be a profit making enterprise. Agriculture in this country is already in dire straits. I have seen in our area many vegetable producers stop raising vegetables this year because it costs so much to comply with the food safety act, that they can't make any money. When they take their vegetables to market, they are told that Mexico can sell them vegetables much cheaper because labor is so cheap there. I have seen productive land being sold to hunters and taken out of production. I am seeing more and more corn grown for ethanol and our cattle feed and food prices going through the roof. The price of fertilizer is completely ridiculous.

Is it the intention of our government and the EPA to put all American farmers and ranchers out of business? How high do you think food will be if it's all imported?

Do we really want all our producers moving their operations to Mexico where there are no environmental laws? Many have already moved and won't be coming back. Is the EPA really going to be allowed to do something as stupid as regulate dust and cow methane?

Much needs to be done to encourage our young people to stay in agriculture so we will have safe food produced in this country. Fixing the Estate Tax will be a good beginning so they feel like there is a future for them on the family farm or ranch. There needs to be a Family Farm and Ranch Estate Tax Exemption so these farms and ranches can stay in production. Land that is sold in estate sales these days is not staying in the production of food.

If this unfair Estate Tax is not fixed where our children will be able to keep the ranch and continue in agriculture, then we too will be looking for a country that has more favorable tax laws.

The United States Government must get the runaway spending stopped. We cannot afford the war we are in. Taxing farms and ranches out of existence is not the answer. It is my understanding that homes sold for more than they originally were bought for, don't have to pay capital gains tax. This should be changed. Much government revenue could be raised in this way if it's really needed so badly.

Also it is my observation that farm license plates are being put on vehicles that are not used for farm use. Go to any rodeo and look at the very expensive aluminum trailers, many which cost over $100,000.00. Most of these trailers have farm tags on them and do not pay tax. I wonder how many millions, or maybe billions, of tax dollars are not paid on these trucks and trailers that are not farm use vehicles. Also supplies are bought by individuals that are not for farm use and do not pay sales tax. There is a simple solution to this problem. If a person does not file a Schedule F on their federal income tax, then they can't buy Farm license plates or get a farm use sales tax exemption. Farmers and ranchers need these programs, but they are being greatly abused. Make everyone show the Schedule F Income tax returns as proof before purchasing farm license plates or farm supplies.

COMMENT OF CHRISTINE SMITH, BOISE, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Christine Smith.
City, State: Boise, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nonprofit Social Service Agency Staff.
Comment:

Dear Congressman on the House Committee on Agriculture,

In order to address hunger in Idaho and the U.S., it is imperative that there be a strong representation of nutrition programs in the 2012 Farm Bill. In a state as abundant as Idaho, and a nation as affluent as the United States, there should be no one who is food insecure. Idaho hosted one of the first field hearings for the 2012

Farm Bill on May 1 in Nampa, Idaho. Nutrition programs were not discussed and we want to make sure that their continued importance is not underestimated.

The 2012 Farm Bill is an important asset to achieving President Obama's goal to eliminate childhood hunger by 2015. In order to achieve the President's goal, the Farm Bill must concentrate on:

- strengthening nutrition programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, known as the Food Stamp Program in Idaho),
- strengthening child nutrition programs, and
- guaranteeing convenient access to nutritional programs and affordable food for all Americans.

Hunger and food insecurity are serious issues in Idaho. In 2009 Idaho was ranked as the 29th most food insecure state in the nation. Idaho's first Congressional district, represented by Congressman Walt Minnick, had a food insecurity rate of 15.3% between 2008 and 2009. Idaho's second Congressional district, represented by Congressman Mike Simpson, had a food insecurity rate of 18% in the same time period. These numbers show that a noticeable population of Idaho residents is not able to purchase the food that they or their families needed.

Much of the hunger and food insecurity in Idaho can be attributed to a shaky economy. According to the Idaho Department of Labor, the state had a 9% unemployment rate in May 2010. And according to the United States Department of Labor, total unemployed, marginally attached workers, and total people employed part time for economic reasons is represented by 16.9% of Idaho's workforce.

Nutrition programs such as SNAP, The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) are the keystone programs needed to ensure support for the thousands of people struggling with food insecurity. There are more than 200,000 Idaho residents accepting food stamp (SNAP) benefits in Idaho. But the latest numbers we have for food stamp participation show that only 50% of those eligible are applying. This means there are another 200,000 who need assistance from Food Stamps/SNAP but are not accessing it.

SNAP is also an important sector of Idaho's economy. For each dollar of SNAP benefits spent in Idaho, $1.84 is generated in economic activity. The 2008 Farm Bill helped boost SNAP benefits for clients, helping to bolster economic improvement in Idaho. Future action is needed to ensure that food inflation does not hinder these extra benefits to SNAP clients and the local and national economy.

SNAP works well for those who use it, but there are gaps in access. Also, administrative regulations make it burdensome to apply and to verify eligibility. Recommendations for changes include:

- improve benefit adequacy by replacing the Thrifty Food Plan with the Low Cost Food plan as the basis for SNAP benefits;
- increase the minimum benefit (especially to help elderly, many of whom now only receive $16 a month);
- restore eligibility to legal immigrants;
- permanently suspend time limits on able-bodied adults (18–50) without dependents; and
- provide greater supports for states, including for SNAP administration and outreach.

SNAP is an important part of an anti-hunger and health agenda. SNAP allotments need to be raised to allow families to afford a nutritious diet on a regular basis. SNAP Nutrition Education as well as access to supermarkets and farmers' markets EBT contribute to good health outcomes.

With gratitude,

CHRISTINE SMITH.

COMMENT OF GRACE SMITH, ADAMSVILLE, AL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Grace Smith.
City, State: Adamsville, AL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: We need a farm bill that supports sustainable agriculture and small farms and that promotes and insures a healthy food supply that is not so reliant on fossil fuels, pesticides, insecticides and genetic modification. We need to make

sure that agribusiness does not write all the rules and that giant agricultural conglomerates are not allowed to flood the market with cheap, genetically modified crops and value added products derived from those crops that threaten our health and the health and welfare of our children. And we need to rethink farm subsidies that may have made sense in the 1970s but that have led to the obscene rise of giant agribusinesses that are concerned more with developing, growing, then flooding the market with cheap, unhealthy but very profitable products than with the health and welfare of the nation and the world.

COMMENT OF KIM SMITH, VANCOUVER, WA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 7:35 p.m.
Name: Kim Smith.
City, State: Vancouver, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: Please outlaw GMO's.

Please make important changes to Factory Farming: by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!

Stop subsidizing corn and soybeans; instead focus help on local, organic farmers.

COMMENT OF LARRY SMITH, LA PORTE, IN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Larry Smith.
City, State: La Porte, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager and Appraiser.
Comment: I am requesting that FSA maps remain public in your next farm bill. FSA soil and aerial maps contain information that is vital to farmers, appraisers, and prospective buyers. This information really enhances the quality and accuracy of appraisals, which benefits the land owner, mortgager, and state and federal tax agencies, as well. The information is already public on soil maps and has been for 40 years, and keeping it public cuts down on the staffing and copying costs required to have it only available in FSA, assessors, and recorders offices.

COMMENT OF MARIETTA SMITH, MOUNT PROSPECT, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 10:06 p.m.
Name: Marietta Smith.
City, State: Mount Prospect, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Full-Time Student.
Comment: Based on what I have learned not only from my classes at Dartmouth, but also from recent agricultural and scientific literature, I would advocate for modifying the incentive structure of the Farm Bill. We should not subsidize the production of corn, soy, and other cash crops as the push for high yields of these products has led to monocropping and subsequent destruction of soil, reliance on pesticides, and loss of genetic variation. By overproducing corn, we have been forced to find new markets in livestock feed and developing countries. For example, Farm Bill subsidies harm cows who subsist better on grass-fed diets and undercut local producers in countries like Jamaica.

Instead, the Farm Bill should support local agriculture that produces fruits and vegetables. This modification could ultimately decrease the agricultural carbon footprint by reducing the distance food travels from farm to plate, improve American diets by making produce affordable, and replenish nitrogen stores in the soil by supporting crop rotation.

I understand that agricultural powerhouses like Cargill and Tyson have a bunch of lobbyists working for them, but if you truly care about the well-being of the American public, you should, at a minimum, reduce corn subsidies. Because corn is so cheap, high-fructose corn syrup ends up in a variety of foods and in American stomachs. Although lobbyists may tell you that high-fructose corn syrup is safe, please consider recent scientific articles that have shown how high-fructose corn syrup can lead to weight gain (*http://www.sciencedirect.com . . .*) [*Editor's Note:* the URL submitted contained personally identifiable information and has been re-

dacted. An alternate link to the article is: *http://www.foodpolitics.com/wp-content/uploads/HFCS__Rats__10.pdf.*].* If you can't access that article, you can read a summary here: *http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/03/100322121115.htm.**

High-fructose corn syrup is not solely responsible for the rise of obesity and heart disease in this country, but it certainly does not help the situation. Many Americans cannot afford healthier options because of the current subsidies. Their poor diets have unfortunate health consequences. By changing the Farm Bill, we can shift consumption patterns and hopefully reduce one factor in rising health care costs.

It's truly amazing how interconnected our agricultural system is with many of problems facing our country. Please consider these connections as you review the Farm Bill!

Feel free to contact me with any further questions.

COMMENT OF MARK SMITH, MARIETTA, GA

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Mark Smith.
City, State: Marietta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag./Env. Student.
Comment: Thank you for taking public commentary on the next Farm Bill. I appreciate this opportunity.

I support the continued funding of programs which aid bio-diesel and cellulose-derived ethanol producers. I believe biofuels and bioplastics are a step in the right direction to create a viable domestic fuel and product supply to decrease our dependence on petroleum and fossil fuels.

I would also like to see a program which would help younger generations in gaining education and interest in agriculture as well as programs which may help decrease the cost or risk associated with those who would like to start their own agricultural operations.

I would like to see some kind of food safety and monitoring program in order to digitally track meat, seafood, and other products using barcode or RFID technologies. This would allow consumer to be more aware of where their food comes from as well as aid in containing outbreaks of *E. coli*, other bacteria, or a terrorist attack on the food supply should it occur.

I am conflicted in regard to organic *versus* biotechnology food. I believe that both should be encouraged yet both should not interfere with the production of the other (IE GE products should be contained in a better manner without being able to spread across neighboring fields). I support the decreased use of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers and increase in harvest yield using any technique available.

I also support having food of higher nutritional quality and thus foods which are picked at proper times and shipped nearby in order to preserve nutrients. Encouraging locally produced foods would be beneficial in all of these regards as imported fruits and vegetables from South America and other countries are more likely to contain high level of pesticides, even pesticides banned for use in the United States and are often picked before ripeness in order to endure the long voyage. Obviously there are some products which cannot or are not grown in the U.S. and these should be excluded from my opinion on buying locally.

I also believe it is vitally important to continue substantial funding of the food stamp and school lunch programs. If possible, I believe there should be a campaign in educating the public about the Farm Bill and its role in feeding much of the American population. With the public support of the Farm Bill, public awareness of agriculture and its vital role in America would be heightened.

Thank you again for allowing me to leave my comments on the upcoming Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF ROBERT SMITH, BOISE, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Robert Smith.
City, State: Boise, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

---

*The documents referred to are retained in Committee files.

Comment: I am a real estate appraiser who has been in the business in excess of 45 years working with farm and ranch clients in Idaho, Oregon, Washington and Montana. I have relied on information from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Services to get aerial copies of agriculture land and tillable acreages. This is not only on my clients property, but also the farms and ranches that have recently sold that I use as comparables. The sales comparison approach is one of our main valuation tools and the recognized tillable acreage by the Service is all important when valuing agriculture property. Access to these aerials and acreages have been an off and on again situation which needs to be resolved for us to better service our agricultural clients. Please do every you can to anyway allow Certified Real Estate Appraisers, like it was at one time, access to this all important information. In all my years in the appraisal profession, I have never seen access to this information abused. By the way this should be public information since it is collected and maintained with tax dollars.

Thank you for hearing me out.

COMMENT OF TIMOTHY SMITH, HARPER, OR

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Timothy Smith.
City, State: Harper, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: As both a cattle rancher and a farm/ranch real estate appraiser (State Certified General Appraiser—[Redacted]) I strongly ask that there be public access to Common Land Units (CLUs) from the Farm Service Agency. As an appraiser this information this information is vital to providing accurate appraisals to my clients. As a rancher I do not feel this information would infringe on my privacy if available to the public. It would, however, improve service from my fertilizer supplier and lender.

COMMENT OF ANGELA SMITH-DIENG, BURLINGTON, VT

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Angela Smith-Dieng.
City, State: Burlington, VT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Nutrition Specialist at Vermont Campaign to End Childhood Hunger.
Comment: According to a recent Gallop Poll on Food Hardship, 1 in 5 Vermont families with children struggle with hunger. The long-term health and well-being consequences of hunger are very real and well documented, affecting both individuals and our society. SNAP benefits are critical to preventing hunger and they bring essential economic stimulus to our small state—over $10.5 million a month for Vermont's grocery stores, farmers and markets. The Farm Bill is an opportunity to strengthen SNAP's ability to respond to hunger in our communities and provide a strong safety net that improves quality of life for everyone.

Thank you for taking these comments into consideration and for your hard work on behalf of all Americans.

COMMENT OF ARVIND SOLANKI, LAUREL, MD

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 2:06 p.m.
Name: Arvind Solanki.
City, State: Laurel, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Information Technology.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.

Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.

Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.

COMMENTS OF NORBERT SOLTWEDEL, SHUMWAY, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 7:05 a.m.
Name: Norbert Soltwedel.
City, State: Shumway, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Direct payments can be used to fund agriculture research such as assisting state experiment stations that do practical research demonstrations that benefit the farmers that feed the world. Use these funds to increase assistance to beginning farmers. Decrease funds spent on organic and sustainable agriculture as these are nothing more than subsidies of inefficient producers. In general programs like ACRE and improved crop insurance provide a safety net that is needed in light of the huge volatility in prices. Programs that save our soil and encourage conservation are of great value. Simplify the paperwork associated with Farm Service Agency and Federal Crop Insurance. (use information already available by IRS, satellite, eliminate duplication by Crop Insurance or Farm Service, and stop overlap among agencies) Conduct a buyout program to eliminate all FSA producers whose payments are under $2,500/year so as to cut administrative costs. Payment limitations are a good thing but they need to be kept high enough to cover farms where families provide a majority of the labor and management themselves. Place limits on Food stamp eligibility so that a family is weaned off of the program and require recipients to pay some share of the stamps cost. Redirect food subsidies to school and day care providers and decrease the amount of processed foods eligible for stamps. (Basically encourage raw vegetables, fruits, flour, shortening, milk, eggs, sugar, salt over prepared foods) Stop patronizing those who complain and start using common sense to cut out the frivolous and non essential. Reward those who work, invest, and take good care of our land. Allow those who are unproductive to suffer a little pain (no pain-no gain).

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 18, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Norbert Soltwedel.
City, State: Shumway, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As an appraiser, Section 1619 of the current farm bill creates very significant problems. This restriction on obtaining aerial photos from FSA and getting essential information such as crop acres, CRP acres, and field boundaries is making my job more difficult, less accurate, and more expensive to the client. Beneficiaries of my work and the one paying the price for this restriction is normally farmers seeking loans to purchase farmland. I fail to see how allowing FSA to provide this information creates a hardship on any landowner. Section 1619 certainly is creating a hardship for appraisers and hence sellers and buyers of farmland, that grows more difficult with each year that the rule remains in place. Please return to the method of disclosing this information that existed prior to the current farm bill.

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Norbert Soltwedel.
City, State: Shumway, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: As an appraiser we must have the ability to obtain USDA aerial photos with CLU data as a minimum (boundaries & crop acres) It would be very helpful if the information could also include wetlands and CRP use designations. The current farm bill took this information away from us and it has been a severe restriction on our ability to provide farm owners with accurate estimates of value needed to obtain loans, file estate taxes, and assist in sale/purchase of farms. I am referencing section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill that is causing a hardship as currently drafted.

COMMENT OF DENISE SORENSEN, KANNAPOLIS, NC

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:35 p.m.

Name: Denise Sorensen.
City, State: Kannapolis, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Food Blogger.
Comment: As a writer and friend of many small farmers and producers, I would like to see subsidies and assistance providing to them, as well as subsidies for polyculture. Our current program is too friendly with the large corporations, even if some are "family-owned". The Farm Bill should benefit those producers who are on the edge of being able to support their families, not those who have the most money to spend on lobbying. Our country will not be able to sustain our current agricultural/agribusiness system. If the government is determined to help farmers, it should be helping the farmers, not Big Business. Please stop subsidizing large industries that bring in millions or billions of dollars each year and create a bill that will provide assistance to those who actually need it and who will create a sustainable system for our country.

COMMENT OF TONY SOUZA, TULARE, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 27, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Tony Souza.
City, State: Tulare, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: The dairy section should include:

1. Milk should be priced on the national average cost of producing milk on all dairies in the U.S.
2. There should be only two classes of milk. Milk used for manufacturing (Class II) and milk used for fluid (Class I). Class I price will be determined by adding the existing Class I differentials to the class II price. Class II price will be determined by using the national average cost of producing milk.
3. Get the CME out of the setting price for milk.
4. All federal and state orders should stay intact.
5. Have an inventory management program funded by dairymen, not the government.

COMMENT OF AUDREY SPINDLE, CHECOTAH, OK

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Audrey Spindle.
City, State: Checotah, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Greenhouse/nursery, Livestock, Vegetables.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: I would like for the Members of the Committee to seriously consider the needs of small family-owned farms who are attempting to "go organic" in order to survive. The current regulatory climate for organic production unfairly favors larger industrial operations. The costs in fees and legwork labor to obtain and maintain organic certification are out of reach for most farms our size. The benefits, however, could be literally life-saving. Please consider reducing the fees and paperwork requirements for small organic farms. Thank you!

COMMENT OF NATHAN STAAB, HAYS, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Nathan Staab.
City, State: Hays, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: We need to reinstate public access to CLU data. In the job that I am in we are in need of this information, and can be very helpful to us.

Thanks,

NATHAN STAAB.

COMMENT OF ELLEN STADLER, DALTON, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Ellen Stadler.
City, State: Dalton, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mail Processing.
Comment: Keep small business' alive and the land undeveloped. We need home grown, locally grown food, and dairy products. Subsidize small farm business not just the big agras.

COMMENT OF DEB STANBRO, TIPTON, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Deb Stanbro.
City, State: Tipton, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraisal.
Comment:

- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.
- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF TERRI STANGL, FLINT, MI

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Terri Stangl.
City, State: Flint, MI.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Executive Director, Center for Civil Justice.
Comment: The Center for Civil Justice is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization which advocates for and with low-income persons and their allies. Last year alone, CCJ's Food and Nutrition Help Line fielded over 12,000 calls from people all over Michigan who are facing barriers in accessing SNAP benefits. The Help Line provides advocacy services to these individuals and their families, who depend on the SNAP program to buy groceries.

The assistance that the SNAP program provides is essential to thousands of families in our community. 21.2% of residents of the 5th Congressional district reported that there had been times in the past 12 months when they did not have enough money to buy food that they or their family needed. In Michigan, the number of people receiving SNAP benefits increased by 27% from October 2008 to April 2010. This evidences the increasing reliance of needy families on this program.

Unemployment and underemployment are also serious problems, further contributing to the need for SNAP. Michigan's rate of under- and unemployment is 21.7%, sharing the top spot for the highest rate in the country. Many of our callers in the last year were referred by Michigan's Unemployment insurance offices.

SNAP is important to our clients and the Michigan economy. Each dollar in federal SNAP benefits generates $1.84 in economic activity. We applaud steps Congress took in the 2008 Farm Bill, the 2009 American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, and the FY 2010 Department of Defense Appropriations Act to boost SNAP benefits for clients and administrative supports to states. Future action is needed to ensure that the value of the ARRA benefit boosts do not erode with food inflation.

SNAP is effective but its reach is undermined by gaps in access and adequacy of benefits as well as by administrative burdens. We recommend several changes. These include: update and improve benefit adequacy by replacing the Thrifty Food Plan with the Low Cost Food plan as the basis for SNAP benefits; increase the min-

imum benefit (especially to help elderly many of whom now only receive $16 a month); permanently suspend time limits on able-bodied adults (18–50) without dependents; and provide greater support for states, including funding for SNAP administration and outreach.

Additionally, the Center for Civil Justice recommends the elimination of the 5 year waiting period for SNAP eligibility for adult permanent residents. The Food and Nutrition Help Line receives numerous calls from immigrants who need to know if they are eligible for SNAP benefits. Unfortunately many of them do not qualify to receive benefits because they have not been green card holders for 5 years. This policy prevents immigrant households without permanent resident children from receiving any food benefits, despite the adults being lawful residents. It is especially sad when we have to tell elderly immigrants they do not qualify for the program, knowing that otherwise they could be receiving the benefits that they greatly need. Families with eligible children are also negatively affected by this policy, because they have to stretch a SNAP allotment that is not enough to feed the whole family. CCJ recommends the elimination of the 5 year waiting period for lawful permanent residents to give more equitable and fair treatment to those legal immigrants.

CCJ understands that SNAP is an important part of an anti-hunger and health agenda, and therefore allotments need to be raised and barriers to SNAP removed to allow low-income families to afford food on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF EDH STANLEY, SACRAMENTO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Edh Stanley.
City, State: Sacramento, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Postal Worker.
Comment: We need to strengthen the small, independent family owned farms.

COMMENT OF NATASHA STARK, COLLEGE PARK, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Natasha Stark.
City, State: College Park, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Government.
Comment:

Gentlemen,

As the parent of a growing child, I would like to express my support for changes to the 2012 Farm Bill that supports and promotes healthy food choices such as fruits and vegetables, that provides incentives for local food systems, and that encourages grass-fed rather than grain-fed livestock. I am particularly concerned that the current construct of the existing farm bill promotes an unhealthy focus on providing subsidies for commodities such as corn and soybeans that are being used by big agribusiness firms to overproduce sugars and fats that are contributing to the current obesity epidemic. As a parent, I strive everyday to provide my child with a selection of healthy food choices, and I have become increasingly dismayed at the difficulty I am having in finding products that do not have extra sugars and fats added, and/or that have not been genetically engineered in some way. As you consider changes to the farm bill, I would appreciate it greatly if you would consider changes that favor the average farmer and consumer, and do less to promote the interests of big business. Thank you.

COMMENT OF HELEN STARR, EASTON, MD

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Helen Starr.
City, State: Easton, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Attorney and Graduate Student in Gastronomy.
Comment: I am in the process of writing a paper on the ethics of the production of Prosciutto di Parma and came across the following in a speech given by Tufts professoro Will Masters.

Now after decades of study, it turns out that government interventions such as crop insurance, renewable fuel mandates, the conservation reserve program, land conversion restrictions and many others are not necessarily what they seem. Modern economics can explain them pretty well, but only as rent-seeking devices. These interventions are ways for farmers and landowners to obtain income transfers from the public in a way that is obscured from public view, hidden partly by their sheer complexity and partly by the claim that they exist to solve market failures such as credit constraints or environmental problems.

It is long past the appropriate time to stop giving Congressional favors and taxpayers hard earned dollars to a rich farming industry and rich individuals who pretend they are farmers (A.J. Clark of Clark Construction comes to mind, as does Sam Donaldson, both receiving subsidies while they make millions in their real jobs). Get some backbone and just say no. People won't accept this forever.

HELEN STARR.

COMMENT OF KIM STEARMAN, COOKEVILLE, TN

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Kim Stearman.
City, State: Cookeville, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: College Professor.
Comment: Please support Organic Farming in the Farm Bill for 2012 for the following reasons: (1) Organic Farming is the fastest growing area in agriculture approximately 20% per year (2) Consumers are demanding organic/local food (3) Organic farming is more environmental sustainable with less toxins entering are soils, water and foods (4) Organic farming conserves water by increasing soil organic matter and reduces greenhouse gases by sequestering carbon (5) Organic farming is now an established farming practice, but research dollars have not supported it based on it percentage of farm revenues. Thanks for your consideration

---

COMMENT OF LINDSAY STEEDMAN, NORTH BETHESDA, MD

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:36 p.m.
Name: Lindsay Steedman.
City, State: North Bethesda, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Financial Analyst.
Comment: The subsidy on corn should be removed, and free markets should resume.

COMMENT OF JEFFREY A. STEIN, HANKINSON, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 6:06 p.m.
Name: Jeffrey A. Stein.
City, State: Hankinson, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Lender/Agent.
Comment: I am writing you this message to urge you to carefully consider any cuts to the crop insurance program during the debates on the new Farm Bill. I am both a lender and licensed crop insurance agent. I see firsthand how crop insurance has become a vital risk management tool for our farm customers. The crop insurance program has evolved over the years into a product that provides real risk protection.

In my opinion, the crop insurance program is working and farmers are using it. Instead of looking for ways to cut the program, I suggest that the Committee consider ways to continue to improve it. Much has been made about the ACRE and SURE programs. These have proven to be very slow to get money into the hands of the producers, whereas crop insurance claims checks are normally mailed within a matter of weeks. I fail to see much benefit in receiving a disaster payment 12–18 months after it has occurred. I might even suggest that you use cuts in the ACRE & SURE programs to help avoid making ANY cuts in the subsidy levels of crop insurance.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY A. STEIN,
Senior Vice President,
Lincoln State Bank,
[Redacted],
Hankinson, ND.

COMMENT OF LEORA STEIN, PORT TOWNSEND, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Leora Stein.
City, State: Port Townsend, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: AmeriCorps VISTA.
Comment: There must be a focus on organic agriculture and the strengthening of local food systems in the 2012 Farm Bill. Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market. Sales of food sold through direct marketing is also increasing at a high rate.

Organic farming systems also have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.

If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.

Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.

Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.

Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

We also need to invest in programs that help build community food security, with a emphasis on providing fresh, local, and healthy foods for low-income areas.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

LEORA STEIN,
Local Food Resource Development,
Olympic Community Action Programs/Jefferson County WSU Extension Food and Farm Program,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
Port Townsend, WA,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF TODD STEINACHER, LITCHFIELD, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Todd Steinacher.
City, State: Litchfield, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: If is was not for the FSA mapping tool it would be a lot harder to service my customers. I am able to import field information to request fields for spraying with Aerial application. I also use this maps to build Record keeping books. This is a very good tool for farmers and the agriculture industry.

COMMENT OF STU STENSETH, BISMARCK, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Stu Stenseth.
City, State: Bismarck, ND.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser for Producers.
Comment: The CLU should at a minimum show the field boundaries and the correct acreage.

COMMENT OF BRIAN STEPANEK, FRESNO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 10:06 p.m.
Name: Brian Stepanek.
City, State: Fresno, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Airline Pilot.
Comment: I am, like many Americans, concerned about the quality of the food being produced and consumed in this country. I am also concerned with the health and financial stability of the American family farm. I attended the Farm Bill hearing that took place in Fresno, CA. After listening to what was said and doing much research and fact-finding of my own, I have come up with some suggestions that I would like to see taken into consideration for the next farm bill. I believe that the next farm bill should:

(1) Support small family farms. Family farms should, at the very least, be on an equal footing with large conglomerate farms in the new farm bill.

(2) Promote sustainable price structures, especially for corn, soybeans, and wheat. Lawmakers should take a hard look at altering the current crop subsidy system, especially for these three commodity crops. Future subsidies should promote fair compensation for farmers and end artificially low prices for these commodities.

(3) Discourage the production of industrialized, high calorie, low nutrition "food" that is a major contributor to the obesity epidemic, diabetes, and the overall decline in the health of our nation.

(4) Promote wholesome foods such as sustainably, naturally grown fresh fruits and vegetables, meats, poultry, fish, and dairy.

Thank you for taking my comments and concerns into account for the next farm bill. I appreciate all the time and hard work that has and will be put into the new farm bill.

COMMENT OF JESSICA STERN, ARLINGTON, VA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 18, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Jessica Stern.
City, State: Arlington, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Human Resources Manager.
Comment: I am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of the people, our nation, and the world as a whole.

COMMENT OF STEFANIE STEVENSON, CINCINNATI, OH

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Stefanie Stevenson.
City, State: Cincinnati, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Family Practice Physician.
Comment: Please consider our country's children's health and lives when making a decision how to support agriculture. PLEASE stop subsidizing products like corn and soy and begin to instead subsidize organic farmers! I see what is happening to children first hand in my office. More and more children that I take care of are eating diets full of high fructose corn syrup and processed foods with soybean oil. These are some of the key ingredients to why our children are more obese and more chronically ill than ever before.

COMMENT OF TRAVIS A. STEWART, MANKATO, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Travis A. Stewart.
City, State: Mankato, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: GIS Mapper for Crop Insurance Co.
Comment: In regards to the new rules that are being enacted that limit the access to the CLU'S will be inhibiting to our primary service to our clients. We as a independent mapping Insurance firm depend on the access to the CLU's to properly represent our Farmers land. I am so confused on why when RMA is increasing the accuracy in which the fields have to be reported to farm #, tract #, and field #, why would you restrict our access to this information. I understand the CIMS reporting is suppose to resolve this but when it comes to the belief that personalized maps most accurately represent our farmers along with the farmers of many of our Mappins Software Clients we are rendered with yet another free resource to our farmers.

I as a professional mapper spend year round using CLU data to map and compare our farmers actual acreage to reported acreage to ensure accuracy and often depending on FSA's mapping proves numerous inaccurate reported acreage. We as an independent mapping agency can accurately map our clients eliminating the excessive acreage that is often found with the CLU's and have to fortunate ability to use the CLU's to locate our farmers fields through a search for the Farm #. Without it we lose this timely ability to build our maps! Also being an independent mapping agent we can give our farmers the detailed mapping they deserve by being able to KNOW their land and accurately mapping it via GPS and GIS Mapping systems. Often due to the ability to provide more in depth attention to our farmers I can often eliminate the excessive acreage found in the CLU's (which fail to provide in depth detail because of the lack of individual attention that only independent mapping agents can provide)

I hope that these thoughts can be reflected upon and that the RMA can realize that we as the agencies due not pry for this data to exploit our farmers and other agencies farmer but to properly portray and accurately represent what would be in our farmer best interest by providing accurate maps.

But to do so the CLU's provide a useful tool and starting point for this and without will lead to numerous misreported acres and ultimately hinder the farmer and RMA by higher premiums loss payments due to over reported acreage, and excessive expenses.

My job and livelihood depend on my ability to map at our agency, without the access to CLU's my position is no longer a need or an above and beyond service we can provide to our farmers!

Please realize that there is more critical information that can be obtained through plat books, county offices, FSA, and elsewhere the what can be found in the CLU's!

Sincerely,

TRAVIS A. STEWART.

COMMENT OF TREVOR STIEG, HAZEL, SD

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 5:36 p.m.
Name: Trevor Stieg.
City, State: Hazel, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Sales Manager.
Comment: Please reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit data to the NRCS data Gateway.

COMMENT OF MARY STOCK, PHOENIX, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Mary Stock.
City, State: Phoenix, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Pharmacist.
Comment: I truly believe that it is time to give back to the small farmer. They work so hard for so little. Organics must be supported more if we are to get back to a healthy economy and healthy body. Please, no GMO, and if Monsanto still in-

sists, I want to know what products it is in. More info is coming out about how unsafe it really is.

Subsidies must be given to the small farmer. The factory and big farmer does not need it any more. Why should we pay someone to NOT GROW something. We need to be paying farmers to grow something, especially that which is local and fresh and healthy.

We also need to be supporting the school lunch program with much healthier choices. No more lunch out of a can or box. They need to incorporate more fresh fruits and vegetables. In order to do this they need more money. Please support this truly needed program. This kids all ready get too many bad carbs in their diet. We don't need to be doing the same at school. For a lot of children, this would be their only decent meal of the day.

Best regard,

MARY.

COMMENT OF NEIL STOLLER, TOULON, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Neil Stoller.
City, State: Toulon, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment:

Members of the House Agriculture Committee,

Your website was recently brought to my attention, and I appreciate the information presented there. It looks like a good source for staying informed on national ag legislation and deliberations.

I am writing in regards to considerations for the upcoming Farm Bill. I am an agronomist and GPS specialist for a private soil testing laboratory in rural central Illinois, serving producers/farmers in their soil fertility needs. I am concerned with an added provision of the 2008 Farm Bill (Section 1619) that has DEFINITELY negatively affected the job that I perform. I am writing today to request that the new Farm Bill reinstate to public access the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway.

From 2004 until 2008, the USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) CLU data was publicly available and easily accessible. It was relied upon by many agribusinesses and ag professionals (myself included) who used the CLU data to perform valid, productive jobs at reasonable rates for the producer. Today we must go to the farmers' fields and run GPS-boundaries for each field, SIGNIFICANTLY increasing time and cost to our jobs. The CLU data already contains that field boundary information, if only it were available for us to use.

I think the idea behind Section 1619 was that ag professionals could just retrieve the data from the producer or landowner. But the reality is that many producers do not maintain that information themselves, and many are not even capable of understanding the technical aspects of their farming operations. Much of it is outsourced to professionals like myself who are proficient at the technical side of modern agriculture. Besides this, the broad range of agribusiness that a typical producer works with might all benefit from the CLU data. The typical producer does not have the patience to provide all that information to each of his providers. He calls his fertilizer dealer, for example, and orders a fertilizer application to his field. The general expectation of the producer is that the dealer already has all the information he needs to perform the job accurately and efficiently.

If the intent of Section 1619 in the 2008 Farm Bill was to protect farmer information, I do not believe that the CLU data compromises in any way producer information. The CLU data only contains GPS field boundaries, and the associated reference information for the field (county, township, section, lat./long., *etc.*). It does not contain any compliance information, wetland, CRP, ownership, or any other private production information.

I would appreciate it if the House Agriculture Committee would consider an amendment to the 2008 Farm Bill Section 1619 that would allow for CLU data to be made available for public use. I am requesting that you restore the CLU data with the following attributes included: Field Boundary, Acres, Tract Number, Farm Number, Field Number, Primary Classification of Land Unit Type, and the Administrating County and State office.

Thank you for your time and consideration to this issue.

Sincerely,

NEIL STOLLER,
Agronomist, Certified Crop Advisor (CCA).

COMMENT OF REBECCA STONE, COOPERSTOWN, NY

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Rebecca Stone.
City, State: Cooperstown, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Please allow the CLU data to be public, this information is very important in valuing farms and does not contain any personal information. The CLU data gives field boundaries and acreage—nothing else. Please put this information back in as public information.

Thank you.

COMMENT OF DAVID STORY, WOODWARD, OK

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: David Story.
City, State: Woodward, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: Please reinstate the CLU information into section 1619. I see harm to this information being released.

Thanks,

DAVID.

COMMENT OF PHIL STOTESBERY, PELICAN RAPIDS, MN

Date Submitted: Thursday, July 08, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Phil Stotesbery.
City, State: Pelican Rapids, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Grocery Store Owner, Larrys Super Market.
Comment: I am a huge believer in the use of ethanol. I've used E20 for several years with no loss in mileage or performance . . . in non E85 vehicles.

Today, I walked up to a guy filling his car with E85. His dad is a retired mechanic-inventor, who uses E85 in non E85 cars. He claims the older cars' computers are able to adjust fuel mixture to burn E85.

He said everyone should be burning no less than E20. Ethanol has less of an impact on our environment. Is produced in rural America by small businesses . . . farmers. And keeps grain prices at a profitable level for our farmers without government aid . . . saving our govt. money and at the same time generating tax revenue.

The rise in food prices caused by higher grain prices was in part an excuse for food processors to raise prices. The "hype" seems to have gone away and prices stabilized.

As a side thought, I'm sure we would be willing to pay more for clothing if it were all made in the U.S.

Lets do what we can to lessen our dependence on foreign oil, and build back our economy.

Give gas station owners an incentive to install blender pumps, and mandate E20. We have to increase our use of ethanol so our Ethanol plants don't go "belly Up".

Keep up the good work!!!!!!

Thanks,

PHIL STOTESBERY.

COMMENT OF JOHN STRAND, MINNEAPOLIS, MN

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 12:06 a.m.
Name: John Strand.

City, State: Minneapolis, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: High School English Teacher.
Comment:

Dear People's Representatives:

Please consider organic, local, and (truly) sustainable agriculture in your deliberations on this very important bill, which (as has been said) probably should be called the food bill, rather than the farm bill, since it is so much bigger than just farming. Food and farming affects all of us—people, plants, animals, the earth itself. My wife Katie and I value small, sustainable family farmers greatly and want a bill that truly helps them. In fact my wife and I just took a year long course called Farm Beginnings offered by The Land Stewardship Project and are actively pursuing becoming farmers ourselves. We are paying close attention.

JOHN STRAND.

COMMENT OF RENO STRAND, BOTTINEAU, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Reno Strand.
City, State: Bottineau, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraisal Service & Tax Work.
Comment: I am requesting that Farm Bill section 1619 would relook at Making all FSA Data available to all again. If this is not possible then at least make the Data available to Appraiser personal.
Thanks for your reconsideration.

COMMENT OF REBECCA STRIEPE, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Sunday, May 23, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Rebecca Striepe.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Freelancer.
Comment: Thanks to farm subsidies, the unhealthiest foods are also the cheapest to produce. Let's encourage our nation's farmers to diversify their crops by offering insurance for growing healthy food. Crop diversification is better for the land and the people . . . it's a win all around!

COMMENT OF VICKIE SUAREZ, SAYRE, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 16, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Vickie Suarez.
City, State: Sayre, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Poultry/poultry products.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I am opposed to any government regulation/subsidizing/interference in the agricultural industry. I am opposed to any Farm Bill. Government regulation/subsidizing/control has made the management of farms more difficult and less prosperous. Quoting phrases from the letter I received from Congressman Carney regarding the Farm Bill, I am opposed to 'special funding for farmers,' 'legislation to eliminate milk hauling charges,' 'increased funding for purchases of surplus dairy products,' basically any government interference in farming. It amazes me that government bureaucrats would presume to know better than farmers how to manage farms! Leave the farmers free to use their money as they see fit. Lower taxes and repeal/oppose legislation which limits the farmer's freedom to manage his property the way he feels is best.

COMMENT OF BYRON SUNDERMAN, VILLISCA, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Byron Sunderman.
City, State: Villisca, IA.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomy Sales, Certified Crop Advisor.
Comment: We urge you to support reinstatement of CLU data in section 1619, I work closely with many producers and rely on this information for timely and cost effective services. It also allows our operators to be in the right fields and has reduced our mis-applications of wrong field areas.

COMMENT OF ALAN J. SVOBODA, BURWELL, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Alan J. Svoboda.
City, State: Burwell, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: In the upcoming farm bill, please allow CLU data (FSA Fields) to be made public. I am a certified general appraiser in the state of Nebraska with 17 years of ag appraisal experience. In previous years, I had to go to the county FSA office and have them print off FSA aerial photos of the property I was appraising and the possible comparable sales. This cost me only $1.00 per map, but it cost the FSA office several hours of time (to pull of the property I was appraising plus 50+ potential comparable sales as I need the most recent maps). This takes time and cost me and FSA expense. Prior to AgriData providing me with a service for providing current FSA maps at a cost of $400 per year, I was spending $2,000 to $3,000 per year simply for a current FSA aerial photo of the property which I am appraising plus the potential comparable sales, which is public information to an appraiser from the county FSA office for $1.00 per map.

This information is available to any American citizen who walks into an FSA office, lays down $1.00, however, it cost me time as an appraiser and it cost me (and anyone else who pays taxes) while the staff of the FSA office spends time pulling off the maps that I need to develop a credible appraisal report.

I understand the privacy issue. All I want or need to know, is what the property in question looks like on the last FSA aerial. Cropland acres (site, dry cropland, irrigated, grassland, waste, and road) is available to me and anyone else from the county assessor. All I and my clients (the people writing a loan on the farm I am appraising) need is a current aerial view of the property and comparable sales. It's not a secret. I can get a close approximation from Google Maps. That takes me more time, which I will bill the client for and the landowner will pay, and it will not be as accurate.

In my opinion, it is a disservice to your constituents to deny a convenient source of this information to agricultural real estate appraisers. To deny this information to the general public through a resource as valuable to my business as AgriData cost me money, my clients money, and ultimately the landowner money.

If this information is not available to me through AgriData, I charge (and have in the last year) added $500 to $1,000 onto my appraisal fee. When 2009 FSA aerial photos became available, I precluded my fee correspondingly.

I can log onto Google Earth and look at a recent satellite photo of Afghanistan, Iran, and Russia. Why can't I get a FSA recent aerial photo of the farm I am supposed to appraise so the landowner can get a loan to plant a crop? Which is where the wealth of this great nation (or at least it was a couple of years ago).

Please, please, pretty please allow CLU data (FSA Fields) to be made public to me through *AgriData.com.* I also own a farm. I really don't give a damn who looks at a current aerial photo of my farm. And if Osama Bin Laden (who you haven't been able to bring to justice) or any other terrorist SOB steps foot on my place because he had access to CLU data, may God have mercy on his soul.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN J. SVOBODA,
Certified General Appraiser [Redacted],
[Redacted],
Burwell, NE,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

P.S.: I call the seller, the buyer, the broker, the buyer, or the attorney to verify the information on each and every comparable sale I use in an appraisal. In 17 years of appraisal experience I have had two, (2) people tell me it was none of my business. In both of those cases I quickly responded I said, "I was just wondering

why you would pay too much for this property." In both cases, both, we then spent almost an hour talking about the property they bought, plus their neighbors property, and every auction they had attended in the last year. There are no secrets in the real estate sales business. You just have to dig deeper and dig deeper. If CLU data is not available to me as a real estate appraiser, I have a new tactic to get the information I need to write a credible and reliable report. I'll simply say, "You're public Representative (insert your name here) thinks I should work in the dark and eat used bull feed. So, I have to charge you an additional $500 to $1,000 to do my work. Sorry, call (insert your name here)!"

Sincerly yours,

ALAN J. SVOBODA,
Certified General Appraiser [Redacted],
[Redacted],
Burwell, NE,
[Redacted],
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF AARON SWANSON, LAKE NORDEN, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Aaron Swanson.
City, State: Lake Norden, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the farm bill and have three areas I would like to address.

(1.) The Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) is the best program I've ever seen in a farm bill. This is exactly the kind of thing we need to support and expand. In this country we will always have the resources to produce an abundant food supply provided we take care of our land with a long term view in mind. This is exactly what CSP promotes. The payment cap is appropriate as well keeping the benefits with small and midsize producers.

(2.) Crop insurance needs to have similar caps with limits on how much risk it will underwrite for individual producers. Crop insurance presently favors large producers getting larger and depopulating rural areas by offering unlimited risk protection. This needs to be scaled back dramatically. No one is going to starve because the govt. won't take the risk of someone trying to farm half the county.

(3.) Finally, while I don't presently participate in local farmer markets I am very encouraged to see how they've grown in the last few years. This is a low capital method to get more people involved in agriculture and foster greater interaction with the public. Modern agriculture has always relied on public support. It is important we recognize this and work to get numbers on our side. Thank you very much.

COMMENT OF GREG SWARTZ, STARBUCK, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:06 a.m.
Name: Greg Swartz.
City, State: Starbuck, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Broker/Farm Manager.
Comment: Please allow the FSA fields data to be available to the public.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER SWECKARD, DALLAS, TX

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Jennifer Sweckard.
City, State: Dallas, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Home-Maker.

Comment: Please allocate more subsidy funding to organic, plant-based, and small, family farms to improve overall health, reduce pollution, and combat childhood obesity.

COMMENT OF KRISTINA SWEET, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Kristina Sweet.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Support small farmers and sustainability, not corporate agribusiness and petrochemical/GMO farming!

COMMENTS OF BOBBIE SWIRES, DANVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 01, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Bobbie Swires.
City, State: Danville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser of Farmland.
Comment: I ask that you consider changing Section 1619 to allow access to CLU Common Land Units) from the Farm Service Agency. It is critical to have accurate information to perform an accurate appraisal. Specifically on "comparable sales" it is had to get the detail needed on a voluntary basis from a buyer or seller. Since they have no vested interest in the appraisal, it is highly unlikely they will sign a release. If there are several appraisals in the area they could be asked by several appraisers—what do you think their response would be! NO!!

Field boundaries, acres, aerial maps, and information on enrollment in CRP WRP or other programs is critical to developing an accurate appraisal. Names and address are not relevant. PLEASE CONSIDER allowing that information to be available. Thank you for the time.

BOB.

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Bobbie Swires.
City, State: Danville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Mgr./Appraiser.
Comment: The CLU information is invaluable in my work. It provides accurate information, that results in a better work product!!!! Section 1619 took that away. There is NO personal information tied to the CLU's, it does provide an indication of land use, size of fields, all of which makes my work more accurate and less cost to my client. Please do away with Section 1619 as unnecessary rules that increase cost to users of this information—but DOES NOT reveal any private information!! THANKS.

COMMENT OF TRENT TARVESTAD, DEVILS LAKE, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Trent Tarvestad.
City, State: Devils Lake, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Banker.
Comment: I would like to see the reinstatement of the CLU data into section 1619.

COMMENT OF KINDRA TATARSKY, MONTAUK, NY

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 7:35 a.m.
Name: Kindra Tatarsky.
City, State: Montauk, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Angel Investor.
Comment: In my line of work I see the multitude of benefits (job creation and innovation as highest on the list) of small business enterprises. The same effect

should be thought through with the farm bill. Enough subsidies: they are outdated, making our country fat and big food companies rich. We should shift those subsidies to encourage local farmers to produce a full range of crops that can support their local community. Organic would be nice too but I would start with creating a structure that would encourage more sustainability at the local level which encourages more "whole" foods . . . fruits, vegetables, *etc.,* of a variety in people's diets. The farm bill is pathetically weak not at all reflective of the intelligence and forward thinking our nation was once known for. In general, I am not a fan of subsidies but if that is what is required in early days to make this shift, perhaps a PARTIAL subsidy would be okay as farmers get set up, with a gradual shift to self sustainability. The difference could be put towards the child nutrition act, OR farms that support local schools with healthy, nutritious food would get a larger subsidy portion. ENOUGH ALREADY!! Our children cannot speak for themselves and the people in Washington have been irresponsible with respect to both of these issues for long enough. Please act NOW.

Respectfully,

KINDRA TATARSKY,
[Redacted],
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF ROBIN TATE, ANTIOCH, TN

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:36 p.m.
Name: Robin Tate.
City, State: Antioch, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mortgage Banker, Caterer.
Comment: Please keep our food safe and healthy!
Please protect our rights as consumers!
Please stop Monsanto!!!
Please outlaw GMO's, protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food.
Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides, and please address the terrible Animal Cruelty!
Please promote Natural Healthy Foods and Products.
Please help Local Organic Farmers compete and thrive.
Please invest in Permaculture, the best hope for our future.
Please take care of the Land as our lives depend on it.

Regards,

ROBIN TATE.

COMMENT OF JAMES R. TAYLOR, JR., NC

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: James R. Taylor, Jr.
State: NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits, Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: We need to invest in small local organic farms to help create jobs and better the environment. Me personally I would love to have the money to expand and reach people in my community as far as bettering health, creating jobs, and finding better newer ways, more sustainable ways to grow my community fresh USDA organic produce. This is going to be the way things are going fresh, local produce straight from the farmer.

Thanks,

JAMES R. TAYLOR, JR.,
Taylor Family Organics.

COMMENT OF ANNA TELLEZ, ARCATA, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Anna Tellez.
City, State: Arcata, CA.

Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Student.
Comment: I think that sustainable farming should be subsidized. I am not sure if livestock is considered as 'agriculture' but there should be better rules for factory farm practices, like . . . a farm must only feed an animal what it would naturally eat. Also, it is very important not to encourage overproduction of any kind. Think if it is necessary to slaughter the number of animals we do: should we be consuming that much meat anyway? Subsidize food in a way that mirrors what are dietary makeup should be.

And please do not listen to the pleas of groups that wish to keep the current unsustainable practices alive. If their job is to sell massive quantities of pesticides or growth hormones, they should find new ones.

COMMENT OF C.M. "CY" THOENE, ANSLEY, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: C.M. "Cy" Thoene.
City, State: Ansley, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Real Estate Appraiser & Consultant.
Comment: Request that CLU data (FSA Fields) be made public again. USDA's FSA removed the CLU data from the public website in order to comply with Section 1619 which prohibits public disclosure of USDA geospatial information with producer-provided information about ag land. We need this information in our profession and feel that this section of the Farm Bill needs to be relaxed. In simple words, aerial photo data can and should be available to the public, because it does not really have any confidential information. I have been in the business for over 30 years and have never encountered an instance where an ag producer felt that disclosure of field boundaries as well as CropBase information was any invasion of privacy. This is an extreme interpretation of the FOIA act and requires unnecessary administrative procedures to obtain basic information pertaining to agricultural lands.

COMMENT OF ELIZABETH THOMAS, TRUMANSBURG, NY

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 18, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Elizabeth Thomas.
City, State: Trumansburg, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Former Crop Consultant, Town Board Member—Ulysses.
Comment: Every 5 years we have one more opportunity to encourage local and smaller farms of dairy and specialty crops to flourish through providing thoughtful incentives in the Farm Bill. Please consider adding environmental incentives for growers who show their abilities to be excellent stewards of the land, who practice integrated pest management and sustainable agriculture. Chemically intensive and concentrated agriculture has taken its toll on our water quality, diversity of food, and the makeup of our rural landscapes where small towns, which once were focused on agriculture, can no longer prosper without their main means of income. Much more effort should be put into encouraging farms to grow food for their surrounding communities to reduce the huge distances food travels from field to plate.

Finally it is essential to limit the size of animal production operations. Concentrating animals and their waste in small areas has shown this practice to be highly detrimental to the surrounding communities in regard to water quality, flies, odor, and land management. It's time to turn our animal production practices into more humane, environmentally logical systems that produces meat, eggs, and dairy products in a manner free of disease causing microbes often caused by overcrowding.

Be brave. Let's see a real change in our food production systems.

Best regards,

LIZ THOMAS.

COMMENT OF ROD THOMAS, GOODING, ID

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Rod Thomas.
City, State: Gooding, ID.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Aerial Applicator.
Comment:

To Whom it may concern;

Please allow us the use of USDA FSA CLU data for maps. This is an invaluable product for precision application by air. I can't possibly see how any ownership or other information would be given out using the available data. It would just be a waste to not have this information available to us in the private sector so we can do our jobs with more accuracy.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

ROD THOMAS.

COMMENT OF PATINA THOMPSON, WILLCOX, AZ

Date Submitted: Friday, May 07, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Patina Thompson.
City, State: Willcox, AZ.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Crop insurance works! I depend on crop insurance to support my family. I encourage you to leave crop insurance *status quo,* as per the 2008 Farm Bill and review for the upcoming 2012 Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF MONTY THORNBROUGH, ALTUS, OK

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Monty Thornbrough.
City, State: Altus, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: I am in STRONG support of reinstatement to public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data. This information is essential to TIMELY and ACCURATE data collection within my rural appraisal practice. CLU data only contains field boundary information and not personal information!

COMMENT OF JIM THORPE, ABERDEEN, SD

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 p.m.
Name: Jim Thorpe.
City, State: Aberdeen, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Your support is needed to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway, especially due to the following circumstances:

1. The USDA, Farm Service Agency, CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the summer of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

2. The USDA, Farm Service Agency, CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the summer of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

3. CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

4. CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation, tilling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

5. Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF WILLIAM TIBBITTS, SALT LAKE CITY, UT

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: William Tibbitts.
City, State: Salt Lake City, UT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Anti-Hunger Project Director.
Comment: Please use this bill to permanently eliminate the time limits for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. These time limits were temporarily repealed in the stimulus bill. They disproportionately impact homeless people and place a heavy administrative burden on the states.

COMMENTS OF JAMES TIBBLES, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 02, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: James Tibbles.
City, State: Council Bluffs, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: We MUST have access to the FSA crop maps to maintain credibility in our farm appraisals. We have to analyze our subject property AND the comparable properties for crop ground acres, pasture and non-crop acres. As time goes on, there are many things that can change farms. Such as: convert pasture to crop ground, remove trees and convert non-crop into usable ground, convert dryland into irrigation and sell off building sites and acreages.

The following is a standard sentence that I put in my appraisal reports: "Because of Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill, current year data for the comparable properties was not available for analysis. Only 2008 data was analyzed and used in this report."

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 21, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: James Tibbles.
City, State: Council Bluffs, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Appraiser.
Comment: The integrity and accuracy of farm appraisals IS dependent on access to information that will allow us to complete the assignment correctly. You MUST allow appraisers access to FSA data. Allow access to FSA data to all licensed certified appraisers.

Appraisals in the future will not have reliable information because we do not have access to current data. Consequently, mistakes will be made in the analysis. Since we don't have access to current data, that is not OUR fault.

COMMENT OF RODGER TINJUM, DETROIT LAKES, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Rodger Tinjum.
City, State: Detroit Lakes, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: As a professional real estate appraiser who completes appraisals for financial institutions, multiple governmental agencies, attorneys and private parties, the information which Section 1619 excludes from my accessibility hinders my work and increases cost to my clients. I respectfully encourage Section 1619 to be revisited in the future farm bill.

COMMENT OF RUSSEL TODD, CLEGHORN, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Russel Todd.
City, State: Cleghorn, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Business.
Comment: Having up to date maps in Ag Business helps dramatically in making Fertilizer and Chemical custom application maps for farmers. The updated yearly maps help in identifying new field boundaries that may change year to year.

Farmers are liking the maps that AgriData is providing and are happy that we can generate maps so they don't have to go find them.

COMMENT OF MATT TOLL, LINDSBORG, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Matt Toll.
City, State: Lindsborg, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 301–500 acres.
Comment: I think that direct payments should be eliminated and more time and energy should be directed towards crop insurance subsidies. The direct payment program draws a lot of negative attention to agriculture and keeps guys in business that do a poor job, or that are old and need to retire. I still go sign up my acres and take my check, but if it went away life would go on.

The food stamp/food aid program should be separated from the "farm" bill.

COMMENT OF WAYNE TOMLINSON, RUSHVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Wayne Tomlinson.
City, State: Rushville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: I am an appraiser specializing if farm appraisals. Since the 2008 Farm Bill made impossible to access USDA FSA aerial photos and other data, the job of appraising is more difficult and more prone to mistakes due to lack of information. This has resulted in taking much longer to complete the task, and leaves some data needed in question.

Please do your best to remedy the situation. It will benefit our clients in addition to the appraisers.

COMMENT OF HOLLY TONEY, FLEETWOOD, PA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 03, 2010, 10:05 p.m.
Name: Holly Toney.
City, State: Fleetwood, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired/Admin.
Comment: Please support organic farming.

COMMENT OF KEITH TORGERSON, WAHPETON, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Keith Torgerson.
City, State: Wahpeton, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Management Instructor.
Comment: As a Farm Management Instructor I find that farmers look at Crop Insurance Program as the "best risk management program in town!" Ag loan lenders like it and enables them to maybe take a little more risk in the lending practices.

COMMENT OF JENNIFER TRACY, SAN DIEGO, CA

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 01, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Jennifer Tracy.
City, State: San Diego, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Anti-Hunger Advocate.
Comment: Please strengthen the SNAP program by making it available for people at 185%–200% the federal poverty level (FPL). The USDA's own data shows that people below 185% are likely to experience hunger, yet only those below 130% of the FPL are eligible for SNAP, leaving many hardworking poor people in the lurch

and unable to afford sufficient healthy food! Please correct this so the SNAP program can fully meet the needs of the working poor!

COMMENT OF JILL TRAVIS, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Jill Travis.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Attorney.
Comment: I am a supporter of quality, organic food and sustainable farming practices. A strong food bill which supports local farmers, no use of pesticides, subsidies for fruits and vegetables instead of grains, and a firm stance against GMO's and all companies attempting to infiltrate our precious food supply with this dangerous, short-sighted technology is necessary for the health of the people, our nation, and the world as a whole.

COMMENT OF STANISLAV TREGER, VERNON HILLS, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Stanislav Treger.
City, State: Vernon Hills, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graduate Student.
Comment: The United States Government needs to stop providing subsidies for growing grains, especially genetically modified grains developed by the large food processing and genetics corporations. The new Farm Bill should rather focus on supporting smaller farmers, rewarding organically grown producers. Furthermore, the bill should promote raising meat without the use of grain feed and antibiotics. Cattle should not be raised and fed soy and corn, as the diet is very unnatural and leads to disease which in turn leads to food poisoning. The Farm Bill could be a significant step in reducing the obesity epidemic facing the nation. The epidemic is a product of our reliance on processed vegetable oils, grains, and poorly raised meat.

COMMENT OF ERAIN TRENADO, LIVINGSTON, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 05, 2010, 10:06 p.m.
Name: Erain Trenado.
City, State: Livingston, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Quality Inspector.
Comment: I am a 31 year old man, grew up and spent most of my life in California's central valley; I grew up proud that our agricultural production in California was the major force compelling us to a GDP sufficient for a country, even larger than Mexico, Brazil, or even Spain. How can you ruin something like that. We need to go back to what works, and what works is the proactive avocation and implementing of agriculture promoting decree. REALLY, who in their right mind finds a better solution to cut water to farmers in preference of a fish. If you were looking for a real solution to saving the fish how about a fish farm, relocate the fish and once conditions become more favorable place the fish back in its natural habitat. If we are to survive as a state we need to get back to the tip of the spear.

COMMENT OF KENNY TUCKER, LYONS, KS

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Kenny Tucker.
City, State: Lyons, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Poultry/poultry products.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Make FSA maps free to the public.

COMMENT OF LORI TUCKER, BALDWYN, MS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 10:35 a.m.

Name: Lori Tucker.
City, State: Baldwyn, MS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Main Street Director.
Comment: Born and raised on a third generation Mississippi farm, I know the importance of our agriculture in the South. I also, know that it is an occupation that is fading fast. With this being said, I feel that we should bring our agriculture to our Main Streets communities. Farmers Markets are great in that they allow our community to enjoy fresh grown, American Made produce from local producers. Growing and purchasing locally are great for Main Street Communities and the local economy. As a daughter of a third generation farmer, I am proud of my roots and want to continue to share them with other people. Let's give incentivizes to local communities that can promote and produce a life style of goodness.

COMMENT OF MIKE TWOMBLY, BROOKLYN, NY

Date Submitted: Saturday, May 29, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Mike Twombly.
City, State: Brooklyn, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retail Inventory Controller.
Comment: Please think about how subsidies can help ALL people in the U.S., as well as the environment! Less money for meat and corn production, and more for vegetable farms that feed more people per acre of land!

COMMENT OF LIZ TYMKIW, ROSEMONT, PA

Date Submitted: Friday, May 21, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Liz Tymkiw.
City, State: Rosemont, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Graduate Student in Wildlife Ecology.
Comment: As someone who studies and cares about wildlife I have some suggestions:

1. Enact a robust and well funded Conservation Title to support working lands conservation programs, conservation easement programs, and sustainable and organic transition assistance.
2. Refocus federal farm program payments upon farming systems and practices that produce environmental benefits and promote long-term food security.
3. Increase resources for research that fosters sustainable agriculture systems.
4. Fully recognize the inherent value of sustainable and organic farming systems in addressing climate change.

Thank you for your time.

COMMENT OF DOUGLAS UECKERT, DICKINSON, ND

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Douglas Ueckert.
City, State: Dickinson, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Commercial Pesticide Applicator.
Comment: As an owner/operator of a pesticide application business the ability to access current field border maps is essential. These maps ensure that pesticides are applied to the correct field and give us the ability to easily and accurately keep our records.
Thank you.

COMMENT OF MARTHA VALADO, BETHESDA, MD

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 4:06 p.m.
Name: Martha Valado.
City, State: Bethesda, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Research Manager.

Comment:

Mr. Van Hollen,

Please consider changes to the Farm Bill that would support small scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors. This would have a positive effect on child nutrition by increasing the ability of local school districts to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

Thank you for you time and consideration,

MARTHA VALADO.

COMMENT OF JACOBUS VAN DER MERWE, BERKELEY, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, September 06, 2010, 1:35 a.m.
Name: Jacobus Van Der Merwe.
City, State: Berkeley, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Relief Worker/Graduate Student.
Comment: Having worked in food assistance programming (USAID/WFP) over the last 3 years I have seen the devastating results of U.S. commodity overproduction coupled with subsidies. These two factors have led to disaster results for local farmers in the developing world who are the most vulnerable. In Haiti for example U.S. rice sells for cheaper than Haitian rice. This is a complete disincentive for Haitian farmers to produce. My request is that major commodity subsidies are lowered to the point where production is competitive on the developing world market and not undercutting it. This should also reduce the rampant overproduction the U.S. Ag market experiences. U.S. Farmers should not be dumping produce on the world market purely because their costs have been covered through subsidies. This change would have a major effect on development of local small scale farmers in the global south. thanks for your time and willingness to listen.

COMMENT OF KRAIG VAN HULZEN, OSKALOOSA, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Kraig Van Hulzen.
City, State: Oskaloosa, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: I am writing to express my displeasure of the handling of the last farm bill. At the last hour, a section was added to the bill not allowing information to appraisers. What happened to the Freedom of Information Act? I do believe that the FSA is a government agency. Without current information from the FSA, it makes my job more difficult and not as reliable. In a time where appraisals are needed to reflect the market, current information is essential. I have written to you on this issue before but nothing ever happened. This is the time to revisit this issue.

Thank you,

KRAIG VAN HULZEN,
Van Hulzen Appraisal Services.

COMMENT OF CHERI VAN NESS, NEWARK, DE

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Cheri Van Ness.
City, State: Newark, DE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker.
Comment: Please increase federal spending support for local, organic diversified agriculture to ensure that local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF JAMES VANDERWERFF, PLATTSMOUTH, NE

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 21, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: James VanDerWerff.

City, State: Plattsmouth, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Comment:

Dear Mr. Jeff Fortenberry.

I am an agriculture real estate appraiser. It is imperative to doing my job to have access to the CURRENT USDA/Farm Service agency information on the farms I appraise and the comparable sales used to support the appraisal. This information in the past (prior to the 2008 Farm Bill) was readily available to State General Certified Appraisers. Since that time we have access to the maps only through AgriData Inc. and the information available is ONLY prior to the 2008 Farm Bill. On many farms this has change since that time and will continue to change. We do not have access to what farms are in the CRP program and the payments and expiration dates. This can have a significant effect on the value of the subject farm being appraised and the comparable sales used to support the appraisal.

I have been an agricultural real estate appraiser since 1972 and now are a Certified General Real Estate Appraiser in NE, IA, SD, MN, KS. The attitude is the same in all. The Farm Service Agency staff have gone from being very helpful to releasing nothing since the 2008 Farm Bill. They say its the law. Please change it. Thank you [Redacted].

COMMENT OF SHARON VANDEVENDER, ORMOND BEACH, MS

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:05 p.m.
Name: Sharon Vandevender.
City, State: Ormond Beach, MS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerobics Instructor.
Comment: If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF MARSHA VANLAERE, NORTHWOOD, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Marsha VanLaere.
City, State: Northwood, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: Please leave in the reinstate the CLU data into Section 1619 of the proposed farm bill. As an agronomist this data is invaluable in my ability to scout fields for pest and disease. I am able to use a photo and mark sections in the field where I find issues. Without the CLU data my farmers will not understand where the problems are.

COMMENT OF PETER VAUGHAN, REEDLEY, CA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 07, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Peter Vaughan.
City, State: Reedley, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Hydrologist.
Comment: Before starting my comments I should make some clarifications regarding my background. I was formerly an employee of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service and I was employed at the U.S. Salinity Laboratory in Riverside, CA as well as the San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Sciences Center in Parlier, CA. My term appointment at SJVASC ended in June, 2009. When

I worked at SJVASC I was involved in quantification of water use by plants using weighing lysimeters. I also have participated in the U.S. State Dept. Fulbright Scholar program from September, 2009 through early March, 2010. As a Fulbright Scholar I worked at the International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) located in Aleppo, Syria. I attended the Committee's field hearing in Fresno, CA on May 3.

During the hearing I was impressed by the testimony of all the stakeholders and the questioning by members of the Committee. In particular, I thought John Teixeira's testimony regarding organic agriculture was important as it relates to agricultural research. He noted that only 2% of budgeted research funds are dedicated to organic systems. I think this needs to be expanded and included as part of the specialty crops research program. One of the most important issues, in general, here in California is the provision of water to agricultural producers. The reason for this is simply that agriculture is still the largest water consumer. To the extent that greater efficiencies in the use of water can be obtained then the supplies of water can be better preserved to handle crop maintenance during drought years. Thus research into efficient use of water by agriculture is highly desirable. The specialty crops tend to be high-value crops so these producers will have greater resources available for investment in technology for implementing more water-efficient management practices. Therefore, in terms of the payback, it seems to me that a good investment in agricultural research in California would be in research aimed at improving water-use efficiency in production systems for organic and specialty crops.

During my term at ICARDA I cooperated with several other researchers around the world on analysis of computer models for crop production using lower-quality irrigation water. Such water might be produced by groundwater pumping or by blending agricultural drainage water with surface water of higher quality. The computer models can offer much more rapid methods for evaluation of contrasting management strategies as compared to actual experimentation. Of course, the model results should bear continued comparison with experimental results to improve predictive capability. I think that a comprehensive evaluation of all the crop models, and there are quite a lot, that have been produced by the Agricultural Research Service should be undertaken. From the point of view of an irrigation consultant or an agricultural producer these computer models are intimidating to say the least. I can only guess, but I would suspect that such models have very little usage by people concerned with actual production and, therefore, have rather minimal impact on decision-making that might actually conserve water. A systematic analysis of the crop modeling efforts and the use of crop models by stakeholders could provide a basis for the creation of a set of guidelines for crop model usability that would make the models more viable as management tools.

The ICARDA program for assisting agricultural producers was broader in scope as compared to the program of the ARS. For example, specific programs existed to assist very low income or subsistence producers by providing information on improving and sustaining production at this level. This was important in the Middle East where low income producers are common. One feature of the ICARDA program that I thought was especially interesting was the formalization of studies of the impact of research results. Statistical studies were undertaken to determine the depth of penetration of specific findings in the stakeholder community and to evaluate the effectiveness of the responses of stakeholders to the information provided. This kind of analysis could provide important clues as to the effectiveness of particular research programs as well as the methods being used to disseminate research findings. I think the Committee might consider evaluating how appropriate studies of this type could be in evaluating the effectiveness of the various agricultural research programs.

COMMENT OF EUGENE VER STEEG, INWOOD, IA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, May 11, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Eugene Ver Steeg.
City, State: Inwood, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops, Livestock.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: We need to put a more realistic cap on large mega corporation farm payments. If we fail to do that and also enforce it the anti-farm media will eventually win out and destroy our total farm program. Conservation must be the main concern in drafting a farm program.

COMMENT OF OWEN VIKER, MANKATO, MN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Owen Viker.
City, State: Mankato, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: The cost of preparing a farm appraisal will increase significantly if data is restricted. The quality and reliability of comparable data will diminish because most buyers will rely only on their memory to provide data and this is not always reliable. Providing tillable acreage as well as conservation easement will benefit the appraiser as well as the client who is the farmer or their estate.

COMMENT OF RON VIKRE, HARMONY, MN

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Ron Vikre.
City, State: Harmony, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser for County Assessor.
Comment: I am an appraiser for a county assessor's office. The CLU data availability is very important for my work as an appraiser in order to accurately and fairly value agricultural property for taxation purposes in our county. When the change to the 2008 Farm Bill was made I contacted my Representatives and the most common response was that the data was available because one could contact the land owner who then could sign a form allowing the data from his/her agricultural property to be released by the FSA office.

In our profession this is virtually impossible as in our county we have approximately 8,500 agricultural properties.

The CLU data does not include any compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information.

I urge the Committee to reinstate public access to the CLU that was taken away in Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill.

COMMENT OF SAMUEL VITELLO, ROSLYN HEIGHTS, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:06 p.m.
Name: Samuel Vitello.
City, State: Roslyn Heights, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: People only eat what they can afford. Don't make good nutrition too expensive for the average American. Support fruits and vegetables and tax HFCS to bring it to the same price as sugar (and so reduce its use).

COMMENT OF HUGH VOGEL, JOPLIN, MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Hugh Vogel.
City, State: Joplin, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Poultry/poultry products.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: Your support is needed to reinstate public access of the Common Land Unit (CLU) data to the NRCS Data Gateway, especially due to the following circumstances:

- USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.
- Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.
- CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

- CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.
- Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis

---

COMMENT OF SEVERINE VON TSCHARNER FLEMING, CAMBRIDGE, MA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 9:06 p.m.
Name: Severine von Tscharner Fleming.
City, State: Cambridge, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: I wanted to write in and re-state the critical importance of recruiting more young bright Americans into farming.

By all means possible, in ways you are not yet thinking of—look to the international examples if needed, set incentives, think broadly and RECRUIT!

This need for more brains, bodies and businesses in American farming is a national security issue and has a huge impact on the shape of our democracy in the coming century.

COMMENT OF PAUL VORACHEK, PARK RIVER, ND

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Paul Vorachek.
City, State: Park River, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: State Certified Rural Appraiser.
Comment:

Dear Members of the House Committee on Agriculture,

Prior to Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill, rural appraisers had access to geospatial information, tillable acres, aerial maps, and FSA yield information by simply calling or writing FSA. Now we must obtain consent from the owner before receiving this information. This makes rural appraisal more difficult.

Accurate CLU field boundaries (tillable acres) are absolutely necessary when completing rural appraisals for buyers, sellers, and especially financial institutions in this country.

Please revise this part of the New Farm Bill to make this information more readily available to all State Certified Appraisers.

Thank You,

PAUL VORACHEK,
President,
North Dakota Chapter of Farm Managers & Rural Appraisers.

COMMENT OF TOM VRBKA, PLATTSMOUTH, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 8:05 a.m.
Name: Tom Vrbka.
City, State: Plattsmouth, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist.
Comment: Please make FSA fields available again for public use via surety data mapping systems as well as others.

Up to date info is invaluable in applying pesticides where they need to go without mistakes.

COMMENT OF RAYMOND WAGESTER, BATAVIA, NY

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Raymond Wagester.
City, State: Batavia, NY.

Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: As a Full time agricultural service provider and a part-time farmer I support the reinstatement of public access to Common Land Unit data on the NRCS data gateway. This data is important to providing accurate and cost-effective services to local Western New York producers.

As a service provider I use this data regularly to assist farmers and land owners with decision making, as a producer I do not feel that the field data supplied is confidential or disclosing critical farm data.

The following series of points helps to further explain the issue.

Thank you,

RAYMOND WAGESTER.

USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF MALYNDA WALKER, NORFOLK, VA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 27, 2010, 10:06 a.m.
Name: Malynda Walker.
City, State: Norfolk, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned, Informed Citizen.
Comment: I would love to have fresh produce that doesn't cost an arm and a leg and isn't swimming in pesticides and isn't genetically modified. Corn subsidies are ridiculous and laughable. Agriculture is the heart of America and always has been. Somehow we got away from, or were pushed away from, eating well. We don't even know what's in our food let alone where it comes from. Children don't know the names of vegetables and have no clue that french fries come from potatoes. This is sad and insane. Please, please, please, help to provide fresh, clean, organic, healthy, non-GMO produce. Help the farmers to be able to grow this food in a healthy, safe way. Help farmers to be able to grow all produce and not flood every single market with corn products and soy products. Corn used to be one of my favorite foods and now I scan every label for any trace of it in its various forms and refuse to buy anything with corn. Agriculture has been ruined. America's heart has been ripped out. We need healthy food. We are supposed to be a world leader but we eat like we are poverty stricken third world citizens. And finally, get rid of Monsanto. Remove Monsanto from every aspect of our food supply. They are poisoners. Monsanto must go.

COMMENT OF JOHN WALL, MINIER, IL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: John Wall.
City, State: Minier, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I depend on Surety Maps, AgriData to accurately complete farmland valuations. We need this information for comparable sales analysis. Please allow them to access FSA maps for field sizes from current maps.

COMMENT OF EDWARD WALLACE, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:36 p.m.
Name: Edward Wallace.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Designer.
Comment: As an endurance sports athlete I need quality sources of clean natural and organic food and hope to see more sustainable farming moving in that direction. As a capitalist I would support no subsidies for farmer. If what they are producing is not profitable they need to be producing something else.

And I would also like to see any GMO's (Genetically modified organism) labeled as such, so that I my protect my own health from this dangerous and short-sighted technology.

COMMENT OF IRA WALLACE, MINERAL, VA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Ira Wallace.
City, State: Mineral, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Specialty Crops, Vegetables, Other.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market. As producers of organic seed we have experienced growth in our seed sales of 15–35% each of the last 3 years.

- Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad. As part of a cooperative seed business we have helped farmers to transition to organic systems and make productive farms on land previously considered marginal. USDA programs for organic agriculture have helped to make this possible.
- If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:
  - Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers. There is a real and pressing need for more research on organic seed production and conditioning.
  - Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation. Programs like the high Tunnel program really allow help.
  - Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
  - More Educational programs such as the organic no till demonstrations held by Dr. Ron Morse at Virginia Tech and Virginia State are needed.
  - Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.
  - Programs that support research and implementation of best practices for organic cover crops and other techniques for weed suppression and on farm fertility building that build soil support the growth of small organic farms and the contribution they make to the local economy and regional food security.

I hope that the new Farm bill will continue to support these and other aspects of Organic agriculture.

Thank you for your attention.

IRA WALLACE,
Southern Exposure Seed Exchange,
"Saving the Past for the Future."

COMMENT OF LORI WALLACE, GULF BREEZE, FL

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Lori Wallace.
City, State: Gulf Breeze, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Office Manager.
Comment: No more GMO foods. No more Monsanto. No more corn syrup or soy in every thing we are sold as a nutritious food source. No more. We, as a nation, are obese and ill. Diabetes is on the rise in our children and climbing in the adult population. No more. Stop poisoning us so that big ag can profit.

COMMENT OF ROSEMARY WALROD, OLYMPIA, WA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 21, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Rosemary Walrod.
City, State: Olympia, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: I am concerned that our system is concerned with money-making as a prime concern instead of human and animal health and preservation of land for sustainable production. I think the Department of Health should be a main player in decisions related to farming.

COMMENT OF GINGER WANKO, CATONSVILLE, MD

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:05 a.m.
Name: Ginger Wanko.
City, State: Catonsville, MD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Transportation Industry.
Comment: The food we serve our children in the school cafeterias cannot be called "food." It is instead ultra processed, preserved "products." Baltimore County should be ASHAMED of what it chooses to try to pass off as food in our lunchrooms. My children refuse to buy lunch at school (which thrills me)—although I would much prefer to support a lunch room that offered FRESHLY prepared fruits, vegetable that are as close to their natural state as possible.

COMMENTS OF LARRY WATTS, WINTERSET, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Larry Watts.
City, State: Winterset, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Please make available FSA data to Surety as I use this date in my real estate business. Thanks.

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Larry Watts.
City, State: Winterset, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Broker/Investor.
Comment:

Tom Lathum

Please make the FSA maps and information available to the public. This information has been of great value to me. Thank you.

COMMENT OF KATHRYN WEBER, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:35 a.m.
Name: Kathryn Weber.
City, State: Huntington Beach, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Stay at Home Mom.
Comment:

Dear Sirs,

Please consider increasing federal funding to support local, organic diversified agricultural. This would ensure that local school districts would have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

Thank you,

KATHRYN WEBER,
Concerned Mother of two young school children.

COMMENT OF MATT WEBER, BRUNING, NE

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Matt Weber.
City, State: Bruning, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Retail Location Manager.
Comment: Please consider reinstating the CLU data into Section 1619. My business works closely with producers and the CLU data is extremely important for our operations. The data allows for quick and convenient service which benefits our business and producers. Please remember a change to Section 1619 will not contain compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data. Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF MARTHA WEBSTER, LUBBOCK, TX

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 02, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Martha Webster.
City, State: Lubbock, TX.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Teacher.
Comment: I have not read the farm bill. I am interested in the future of Africa which, I believe, has been held down by the good willed aid from churches and governments. Making large support payments to farmers to produce excess to send to Africa to suppress African production does not seem efficient for the U.S. taxpayer or the African farmer or, even the U.S. farmer who may need to pursue another idea. China is apparently more respected for its involvement in Africa than the U.S. (Dead Aid Dambisa Moyo).

Thanks.

COMMENT OF STEVEN WEBSTER, DEVILS LAKE, ND

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Steven Webster.
City, State: Devils Lake, ND.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: USDA Farm Service Agency CLU data had been readily available and easily accessible to the public on the NRCS Data Gateway from 2004 to the spring of 2008 when the 2008 Farm Bill was signed.

Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill was not part of the bills passed by either the U.S. House or the U.S. Senate and was inserted during the Conference Committee process without public hearings or debate.

CLU data only contains field boundary information and does not contain compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) or ownership information.

CLU data is used by producers and their wide range of support businesses including: appraisers, crop insurers, financial service providers, farm managers, irrigation and tiling installers, and aerial, chemical, fertilizer and manure applicators for accurate and timely records and procedures.

Section 1619 creates unnecessary inefficiencies and negatively impacts agricultural professionals, producers, landowners, and others who utilize that data in their professions on a regular basis.

COMMENT OF HEATHER WEISENBORN, WATKINSVILLE, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 7:06 p.m.
Name: Heather Weisenborn.
City, State: Watkinsville, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Educator.
Comment: Our food sources need to be pure. Stop genetically modifying foods. Organically grown fruits, vegetables, and meat and dairy products is the responsible way to farm. It allows the soil to rest and to reinvigorate. Organically farmed animals are treated humanely which makes them healthier for consumption. Our subsidies need to be spent on fruits and vegetables instead of grains. Our bodies need more veggies instead of grains, which is shown in the health of poorer people who cannot afford to buy fresh fruits and veggies. Be responsible.

COMMENT OF ARNIE WELBER, SUNRISE, FL

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Arnie Welber.
City, State: Sunrise, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired.
Comment: Withdraw support for factory Farming practices. For the Earth, the animals, and your own health too.

COMMENT OF JOHN WELCH, SANTA CRUZ, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: John Welch.
City, State: Santa Cruz, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: Organic agriculture should become a priority in the next farm bill. With the country trying to move in the direction of energy independence, healthier food, and a greener economy, organic agriculture is the right thing to invest in.

COMMENT OF ROBERT WERT, MALVERN, PA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 16, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Robert Wert.
City, State: Malvern, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Business/Executive/Attorney.
Comment: I am very concerned about the future of farming in the U.S., particularly the small Family Farms. Farmers must be able to make a living at farming. We have too many small farms that have been lost. It is important for the economies in small communities and also to reduce energy usage (cost of transporting food long distances to market) as well as for national security that we not become totally dependent on large Agribusinesses. Please provide strong support for prices for milk and produce that comes from local farms so we can stop the loss of small local family farms in the USA.

Thank you,

BOB WERT.

COMMENT OF FRANCIS WESELY, KANSAS CITY, MO

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Francis Wesely.
City, State: Kansas City, MO.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.

Occupation: Truck Driver.
Comment: Honorable Mr. Cleaver, Please support a strong Anti Factory Farm Bill. Modest improvements in the Life of Farm animals mean a lot. Room to turn around, spread their wings, Even though these animals are destined for the slaughter house, They are still Sentient beings deserving of Respect. Thank you for the Wonderful Job you are doing. Especially on the health Reform.

COMMENT OF PAUL WEST, WICHITA, KS

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Paul West.
City, State: Wichita, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Ag Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: I am both a producer and non-producer as I own a farm and do ag real estate appraisals. As a producer I am not concerned with my farm number and field acreages being public knowledge, after all I have trouble remembering my farm number from one visit to my FSA office to another. I do some appraisal work for FSA and also do work as a fee appraiser for individuals, it is ridiculous that information that is available to me when I do an appraisal for FSA is not available to me in nearly all cases when I do an appraisal for an individual even if I have a signed consent form, *i.e.,* I can get field acreages for comparable sales from some FSA offices when doing an appraisal for FSA but in no circumstances can I get such info when doing it for an individual unless I also have a consent form signed by the buyer of the sale I am using as a comparable, which in most cases is not possible. Also the inconsistency from FSA county office to office is unbelievable, again *i.e.,* I have to pay for aerials in some office while others say "I am not required to pay anything if I provide them with a signed consent form".

COMMENT OF VAN WEST, MURFREESBORO, TN

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 03, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Van West.
City, State: Murfreesboro, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 50–150 acres.
Comment: As an owner of a Tennessee Century Farm, I strongly urge the Committee to enhance support for the USDA's rural development programs, including the R, C&D program. These have helped agri-tourism and heritage tourism in our region, which are important parts of our vision for the future, and important complements to farm income.

COMMENT OF TIM WESTRUM, ALBERT LEA, MN

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Tim Westrum.
City, State: Albert Lea, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I am requesting that CLU Data (FSA fields) be made public again in the next farm bill.

COMMENT OF JULIE WESTWOOD, CENTERVILLE, OH

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Julie Westwood.
City, State: Centerville, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Homemaker.
Comment: In America, a $1.00 buys more calories in the junk food isle than in the fresh produce aisle . . . This is why America is obese! The way agriculture is subsidized in this country must be changed. We don't need health care reform we need agriculture reform . . .

I ask you to please consider the following:

Please keep our food safe and healthy!—Ban GMOs

Please protect our rights as consumers! . . . If you can't ban GMO's then please require consumer labeling to indicate if products contain GMO foods. I WANT A CHOICE and I CHOOSE NO GMO

Please get out of Monsanto's back pocket.

Please offer higher subsidies to protect the sanctity of the standard for Organic Food . . .

No more corn subsidies!!!

Please make important changes to Factory Farming, by banning Steroids and Antibiotics and GMO feed raised with Pesticides.

Why the heck is tobacco subsidized????

No subsidies for giants like ConAgra!

Please pass laws that take care of the Land, the Soil, the Water, and our Bodies! Again, This takes us back to Monsanto and GMOs . . . Round-Up ready crops are destroying the land, soil, water AND our bodies!

Thank you for your efforts . . .

COMMENT OF CHRISTOPHER WHEELER, SAN PEDRO, CA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Christopher Wheeler.
City, State: San Pedro, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Accountant.
Comment: Stop subsidies on corn. It creates a paradox for producers and an over-abundance of food that leads to over-consumption by the population. Farmers rely on the corn subsidies and they feel they need to make more and more of a singular staple. This forces the price down, which then make them produce more, further pushing the price down . . . you can see where I am going. I realize that this cheap corn is needed for the production of pseudo-foods at the supermarket. But at that point it's no longer food. The consumption pseudo food has increased the girth and waist line of the American population and the medical expenses associated with it.

Start labeling genetically modified produce. People have a right to know what they are eating. Start labeling farms of origin. Again, people have a right to know where their food originates. Give FDA power to regulate on the consumer's behalf. It is now too much of a department used for the growth of the food industry which has a message of eat more, regardless of what it is.

Sorry to be rambling in this note.

COMMENT OF DONNETTE WHEELOCK, MANKATO, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Donnette Wheelock.
City, State: Mankato, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Business Owner.
Comment: Please reinstate public access to CLU information. This allows us to provide individualized maps for our farm clients and make their crop insurance policy more accurate. There is no invasion of privacy by allowing access to CLU data. Thanks you.

COMMENT OF GREG WHEELOCK, MANKATO, MN

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:36 p.m.
Name: Greg Wheelock.
City, State: Mankato, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Crop Insurance Agent.
Comment: We have been using CLUs since their release by FSA. They are invaluable to ensuring we have the correct land insured for a client, and that the clients unit structure is appropriate for their risk tolerance.

Also, RMA now requires we report back to them CLU data, yet we are restricted from access to current CLU access. In the CLUs that were available prior to May 2008, there were no attributes included that would even come close to violating a producer's privacy. In fact, a plat book published by various companies, or a trip

to the county court house would reveal more info about a land owner or operator of land than I have ever seen in a CLU data set.

We have been mapping for our insurance clients since 1998, and CLU files help us provide our clients with the service they deserve, and that RMA requires.

Please give us back access to CLU data!

COMMENT OF CODY WHITE, CHICKASHA, OK

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Cody White.
City, State: Chickasha, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Rural Appraiser.
Comment: Please reinstate the CLU data into Section 1619. As a rural appraiser, this non-personal data is very important in analyzing farms and comparable sales for appraisals.

COMMENT OF CYNTHIA WHITE, DUXBURY, MA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 12:35 p.m.
Name: Cynthia White.
City, State: Duxbury, MA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Small Business Owner.
Comment: I support a farm bill that provides taxpayer subsidies for organic farming and for humane treatment of farm animals, including an end to battery cages, confinement of animals in gestation crates, confinement of cows in crowded pens, and all the other inherently cruel practices that farmers continue to follow in this country. Americans are becoming better informed all the time about food issues, and we will fail economically if we do not reform our practices. And frankly, some folks will have to lose their subsidies to get the message.

Please put anti-cruelty practices front and center in the farm bill and don't fall for the "healthy school lunches" line—if farmers cared about that, they would have gone organic a long time ago. Thanks!

COMMENT OF DERREL WHITE, WOODWARD, OK

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Derrel White.
City, State: Woodward, OK.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Livestock.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: There is substantial efforts among many who are generally anti-agriculture to frame this debate to once again make the farm bill a social justice type of issue. While I am in the minority of producers who feel like the subsidy program does not help producers but rather just promotes an inexpensive food supply, much of the input that you have been given by animal rights supporters and radical environmental groups is not only misinformation but those policies could seriously jeopardize our country's food security. We must look at methods to make our farm program continues to encourage choice of production and ability to shift towards opportunities new markets and methods of production that are both sustainable and meet the primary goal of food security for our country. Specifically, I believe we should reduce the level of subsidies for all products, not expand those to niche products and markets. We should have a continued emphasis on programs that decrease long term impact on the land like the EQIP program and CRP. Less emphasis should be put into the farm bill on social programs like WIC, Food stamps and obesity issues. While those causes may be good, this is the farm bill and should address only issues directly related to agriculture production, not expansive progressive redistribution causes. Starting in the 1970's, the primary intent of the farm program has not been to sustain farming activities but rather to reduce the cost of food for our taxpayers. If that was the primary goal of the farm program it has been wildly successful and the return on investment from the subsidy programs has been very high. Currently we spend only about 11% of disposable income on our food while most other developed countries spend closer to 20% and many undeveloped countries spend closer to 50%. The current structure of farm programs has allowed

Americans to live a much greater standard of living than they would have if agriculture had been totally market driven but this enjoyment has come at great expense to the agriculture producers and rural communities. The current subsidy program does not allow producers to maintain reasonable levels of profitability, in fact it keeps them from having long term economic profitability because it encourages production at levels below the economic break-even. I support a gradual elimination of all subsidies including the elimination of price supports for ethanol and biofuel production. The free market can work if it is allowed to and while food prices would substantially increase over time, each product would have to stand on its own or not be raised.

A primary focus of this farm bill should be to encourage more market access for all sizes of producers. Grants and low interest loans should be made available for start up operations and for businesses that can fill voids in the marketplace where access is difficult if not impossible due to lack of investment in infrastructure. There is a considerable market for smaller producers to sell directly to the consumer but often that market access is limited because of our inability to process our product. As a sideline business, we often feed our cattle for slaughter and direct sell to consumers in our area. This product is a high end product that has plenty of demand. However, our ability to increase the scope of this operation is limited by a severe shortage of slaughter facilities in our area. Recently we had to get a kill slot more than 90 days in advance to slaughter one of our farm raised animals. We have sold all of the product from that animal and have a waiting list for more of the same product but due to our inability to get a kill slot it will take another four months to have additional product ready to sell. This lack of market access creates a market barrier for smaller producers and gives a competitive advantage for the ultra-large processors. We need the large processors to continue to keep food costs reasonable but we also need choices for the consumer. The best method of promoting choice for the consumer is by encouraging additional investment in market access.

Our government has to get back to the idea that it must live within its means. Our current system of massive deficits is not sustainable over the long term and we must seriously consider what the role of government should be in many different areas. Agriculture is not excepted from this nor are consumers that have gotten used to an inexpensive but abundant food supply that has been largely due to a farm program that has placed a high priority on inexpensive food supply rather than cultivating a marketplace where that producers who can react to changes in consumer tastes and preferences are rewarded financially and can continue to grow their operation. Most other countries are having to significantly reduce the level of subsidies paid to producers and I feel we are in the same boat as them. We should completely decouple all agriculture producer payments from production. In order to provide a necessary transitional period of adjustment, decoupled payments should be made based on acres rather than historical yields or crop bases. Additional funds should be allocated to EQIP particularly for operations that have found methods of production that address not only high production methods but also incorporate holistic methods to address issues including biodiversity, water quality, soil erosion, *etc.* We should not consider expanding the role of subsidies to include other crops including vegetables and fruits. Decouple everything, encourage increased market access and let the market and the consumer determine what the proper mix of products should be.

COMMENT OF CODY WHITMAN, VENICE, CA

Date Submitted: Thursday, April 29, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Cody Whitman.
City, State: Venice, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Media/Nonprofit.
Comment: Please subsidize sustainable agriculture. No more corn and soy subsidies, this is why we have an obesity problem in the United States.

COMMENT OF MARK WHITNEY, SOCIAL CIRCLE, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Mark Whitney.
City, State: Social Circle, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Game Management Section Chief, GA Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division.

Comment: Farm Bill Conservation Programs and Practices should be developed and implemented to maximize natural resource (including fish and wildlife resources) and taxpayer benefits. More specifically I recommend that fish and wildlife resources be designated as co-equal with Soil, Water, Air, and Forests in all Farm Bill Conservation Programs and legislation. I further recommend that adequate funding be provided to fully ensure effective program and practice delivery, including outreach, technical guidance and practice compliance.

COMMENT OF LISA WICKERSHAM, CALEDONIA, OH

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 2:36 p.m.
Name: Lisa Wickersham.
City, State: Caledonia, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Rural Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: Section 1619 of the 2008 Farm Bill limited public access to the Common Land Unit (CLU) data. As a farm appraiser, this data is vital to ensure accurate land valuations. Without CLU data, appraisers will have less accurate information to know the tillable acres, which is the main factor in land values. The CLU data does not include compliance information, wetland, Conservation Reserve Program, or ownership information. Many agricultural fields use this land data to benefit farmers, including: appraisers, farm managers, financial service providers, and chemical and fertilizer applicators. Please consider revising the 2008 Farm Bill to allow CLU data to be public once again.

COMMENT OF TIM WIEBE, MCCOOK, NE

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Tim Wiebe.
City, State: McCook, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agricultural Lender.
Comment: I am writing to request the reinstatement of the CLU data in the next farm bill. This information provides very useful data when working with our farm customers, and at the same time does not disclose any personal information. We are currently forced to work from outdated maps which can contribute to errors and confusion. Thank you for your consideration.

COMMENT OF TOM WIETBROCK, LOWELL, IN

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 20, 2010, 8:35 p.m.
Name: Tom Wietbrock.
City, State: Lowell, IN.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment: I am hoping that in the new farm bill you would please include the ability to have the base acres reinstated. We rent a farm with no base acres and no payments and are in the process of purchasing one with none. The people before said they didn't known you had to do anything so they did no certification. Now there is no base and no payments. Please consider this for the new farm bill.

COMMENT OF CASSIDY WILBER, FULLERTON, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Cassidy Wilber.
City, State: Fullerton, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Strategic Planner.
Comment: The amount of Americans who are hungry, undernourished and obese is appalling. We are one of the richest nations in the world and we have not made it a priority to provide fresh WHOLESOME food for our children and families. We need to STOP subsidizing crops like corn and wheat and encourage food diverse farms. We need to feed out children REAL food, not processed frozen pizza and nuggets that barely resemble something that should be eaten. As Americans, we need

to tell Agribusiness that we are tired of factory farmed meats and *E. coli* ridden run off that poisons our waters.

I have no faith that my words will sway men with pockets lined green by the soy and corn industry, but we will be heard. Consumers will choose with their dollars, the only voice you or your corporate cronies every hear.

COMMENT OF DINAH WILEY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 11:36 a.m.
Name: Dinah Wiley.
City, State: Washington, D.C.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Public Benefits Policy Attorney, National Immigration Law Center.
Comment: The National Immigration Law Center, with headquarters in Los Angeles, California (*www.nilc.org*), is very concerned about barriers to SNAP that prevent lawfully residing immigrants and their family members from obtaining this vital work support. We recommend that the following provisions be included into Farm Bill 2012 to eliminate some of these harmful barriers.

1. Fairness for legal immigrants. Eliminate the five year waiting period imposed on immigrant adults under current law. Hunger does not wait five years, nor should lawfully residing families have to wait before gaining access to the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program.

Under such a provision, lawfully residing immigrants who meet the general program requirements would have their food stamps eligibility considered in the same manner as citizens, eliminating the five year waiting period imposed under current law. It's important to remember that undocumented immigrants have never been eligible for food stamps or SNAP, and this proposal would not provide eligibility to undocumented immigrants.

2. Clarify eligibility for immigrant families with children. Eliminate sponsor deeming rules for SNAP households that include children. Exempting only immigrant children from deeming does not go far enough to remove barriers that prevent U.S. citizen and lawfully residing immigrant children from obtaining assistance or that reduce the amount of food available to these families.

In the 2002 Farm bill, Congress recognized the need to restore food stamp eligibility to qualified immigrant children, without a five year waiting period. In doing so, Congress also attempted to remove a barrier that prevents children from obtaining assistance, by exempting children from immigrant sponsor deeming rules, which can render low-income families ineligible, and can deter immigrant families from seeking assistance. However, by failing to address the deeming rules for parents or other household members, the new rules continued to prevent U.S. citizen and lawfully residing immigrant children from receiving assistance. This Farm Bill 2012 proposal would eliminate deeming rules for SNAP households that include children.

3. Simplify administrative reporting. Adjust the DHS reporting requirement regarding sponsored immigrants who would go hungry or homeless without assistance (the "indigence" exemption from deeming), by allowing SNAP agencies to provide an aggregate report that omits individual names. This would meet federal statistical needs while ensuring that eligible hungry families are able to secure assistance without fear.

Are damaging access barrier for immigrants who need SNAP is the requirement that agencies report immigrants who qualify for the indigence exemption to the Attorney General's office, now under the Department of Homeland Security, USCIS. This requirement serves no clear policy purpose and significantly deters participation in SNAP for eligible immigrant families. The requirement is confusing to applicants, and upon learning of it, most eligible families decline to invoke the indigence exemption and are unable to secure nutrition assistance. Allowing SNAP agencies to provide an aggregate report instead of an individual report would address this problem by reporting only numbers of applicants and omitting individual names and contact information. Aggregate reporting could meet federal statistical needs and would be more effective in evaluating the impact of the exemption because the exemption would be used by the families for whom it was intended.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. For more information, please contact Dinah Wiley, Public Benefits Policy Attorney, National Immigration Law Center, [Redacted], [Redacted].

COMMENT OF WILLIAM WILKINS, TROY, OH

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: William Wilkins.
City, State: Troy, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: I farm part time and do farm appraisal on a full time basis. Information and data provided by CLU is critical for both my farm operation and for the appraisal business.

I/we urge you to reinstate provisions that allow CLU data into Section 1619.

Thanks,

BILL WILKINS.

COMMENT OF BRAD WILKINSON, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Brad Wilkinson.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Management Consultant & Trainer.
Comment: I urge you to support sustainable farming practices, organic foods and the elimination of understudied genetically modified organisms in the nation's food supply. Please work to STOP companies who are peddling this dangerous technology. This is a national security issue and I beg you to stand up to the big money pushing it.

COMMENT OF EARL P. WILLIAMS, FRESNO, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Earl P. Williams.
City, State: Fresno, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: President/CEO, California Cotton Growers Association.
Comment:

Comments on Behalf of California Cotton Growers Association to House Agriculture Committee

June 2010

By:

EARL P. WILLIAMS,
President/CEO,
California Cotton Growers Association.

Chairman Peterson and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the writing of the next Farm Bill on behalf of the cotton growers of California.

The California Cotton Growers Association is a nonprofit corporation whose membership represents 100% of California's total cotton production, both upland and pima, and is supported by voluntary dues.

Let me begin by complimenting you and the Committee for the hard work and reasonable thinking that went into crafting the 2008 Farm Bill. For the most part, we think the general structure has severed our industry well. It is our hope that much of the current farm bill can and will move forward into the next farm bill.

Components of current farm bill that we would advocate continuing include marketing loans, direct payments and countercyclical payments, the so-called three legged stool concept. The marketing loan for upland cotton serves as a foundation of global competitiveness as well as a production financing tool.

Direct Payments continue to provide an important level of certainty and security in today's volatile market conditions. The countercyclical support based on pre-determined target prices adjust as designed to change up and down relative to changes in market conditions. Again, the three legged stool with all three legs important to the structure.

For pima cotton, the nonrecourse loan provides important cash flow for the extra long staple cotton producers. The fact that pima cotton has no futures market fur-

ther exemplifies the importance of this provision. Especially important to California where over 90% of the total U.S. production of pima cotton is produced.

The current farm bill also provides another vital provision to U.S. pima production and that is the competitiveness provisions. Almost 100% of the U.S. pima or extra long staple cotton production is exported so the competitiveness provisions are critical to remaining competitive in the world markets.

The cost of doing business in California is especially high in comparison to other areas of the country and certainly the world. To remain competitive, growers typically farm on a somewhat larger scale than other areas seeking economies of scale to lower costs of production. We are also blessed with good growing conditions normally and typically produce more per acre than other growing areas in the country. We must have high production to survive and compete.

The current program contains good planting flexibility that addresses our growers diversity and allows them to make cropping decisions based on economic signals and agronomic considerations. Believe me this works and when cotton prices have been depressed our growers have turned away from cotton. When water supplies are tight, permanent plantings get first preference, high priced contracted crops get second and if enough water is left maybe cotton gets planted, if not, no cotton!

We had 600,000 acres of cotton in California in 2004 and in 2009 190,000 acres. No one can convince me that cotton farmers in California are planting for the program!

The scale of farming in California and the average per acre production needed to help offset the high costs should not be discriminated against by payment limits. Such restrictions or limits deny benefits and promote inefficiencies in farm structure and size.

The cotton industry is not sustainable and not practical on a "mom and pop" sized operation especially in California. A cotton harvest machine today alone costs $300,000 today! Hardly an investment for small farms.

In California today there is no such thing as a cotton grower. Cotton is just one of many crops that a grower chooses from each year. Cotton fits well in many growers rotation programs and as stated earlier, acres planted to cotton *versus* other crops depend on economics and other agronomic circumstances such as water supply! So, eligibility restrictions on our size farms and the diversity of these farms seems to neutralize good farm policy for California producers with overly restrictive limits and eligibility requirements.

The basic principles that we would strongly support and advocate in new farm bill legislation would begin with an effective safety net. Full planting flexibility, full production allowance, and eligibility provisions structured to encourage maximum participation without regard to size or structure—are vitally important. Provisions must promote and insure cotton prices are competitive to domestic and international mills.

Finally, farm programs should not become the whipping boy for this country's financial woes. The trade policies of this country has sold the American farmers down the river for the past many years. Our domestic markets have been raided by lax import policies into this country forcing us to export to remain competitive yet we face higher export tariffs entering other countries. Couple all this with foreign currency manipulation, lower costs of production, non transparent support (subsides), fewer if any costly rules and regulations and our growers are struggling to survive.

The WTO further compounds this imbalance by asking the U.S. and other highly developed countries to level the trade field with developing and undeveloped countries. Can't be done without U.S. lowering our standards.

The recent WTO cotton case is just the beginning of the U.S. against the WTO. The case against U.S. cotton used flawed data and was ruled on by a kangaroo court. Outright extortion and it's just the beginning in my opinion and will continue as long as we stand for it.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments on the upcoming Farm Bill discussions and development. We appreciate the Chairman's and the Committee's efforts in the past and look forward to the process ahead.

Respectfully submitted,

EARL P. WILLIAMS,
President/CEO,
California Cotton Growers Association.

COMMENT OF EVERETT WILLIAMS, MADISON, GA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Everett Williams.

City, State: Madison, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 1,000+ acres.
Comment:

United States House of Representatives,
House Committee on Agriculture,
Feedback for Farm Bill 2012 Hearing.

Georgia Milk Producers, Inc.

June 14, 2010

Chairman Peterson and distinguished members of the House Agriculture Committee, Georgia Milk Producers, Inc. would like to thank you for your recent series of Farm Bill hearings across the United States and applauds your efforts of thoroughly investigating the needs and necessary changes that should be addressed in the 2012 Farm Bill legislation.

We are sure that the House Agriculture Committee is fully aware of the current crisis the U.S. dairy industry is experiencing and with recent market reports, it looks like there may be little relief in sight. Georgia dairymen operate in an area where population growth is one of the fastest in the U.S. The milk deficit for our area grows greater each year with Georgia now importing up to 68 million pounds of milk per month. The Federal Milk Market Administrator's office in Atlanta predicts that within the next decade no dairies will exist within the Southeast. One reason for this is the current dairy pricing system.

We appreciate this Committee's efforts to review the current economic situation and to investigate all short-term and long-term possibilities that would improve our industry. Here are some suggestions that we believe would help our region and the nation as a whole:

USDA Dairy Product Price Support Program

The USDA Dairy Product Price Support Program helps support prices and farm income. The price paid for Nonfat Dry Milk (NFDM), butter and cheese is too low to help dairy producers remain profitable, especially considering the dramatic rise in input costs over the past three years. Even though raising the support price appears to help producers now, however it is not a good long-term solution. Dairymen would be producing milk for the government to purchase instead of the market place. If these government purchased products are used in the U.S., such as for the school lunch program, they still depress market prices causing the government to buy more product. If large amounts of product were given or sold to foreign countries that would depress prices and cause harm to relationships between the U.S. and trading partners.

The government should encourage dairy product usage in the school lunch program to improve our children's diet and nutrition, but using surplus inventories displaces normal market sales.

The USDA Dairy Product Price Support Program is an example of good intentions by the government to help dairymen but now causes more harm than good. Buying products at a price below the cost of production does not support dairymen, but creates inventories that depress prices for months or years, only prolonging the low prices for dairymen. When the dairy industry has excess production processors make NFDM to sell to the government, instead we should be making whole milk powder for the world market. Most foreign countries want whole milk powder not NFDM. In addition, the global market would welcome dropping the support program because they will see the U.S. as a more reliable and consistent dairy exporter.

Without the Dairy Product Price Support Program milk prices might drop to lower prices than with the current system but prices would rebound faster because the market would use more dairy products and there would be no government inventories to depress future prices. Dairymen would get a better, clearer signal to cut production and to produce products for the market, not the government.

Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME)/Cheese Trading

Producers need a true dairy market for its price signals and income. Farm milk price correlates very closely with the Block Cheddar price on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME). We are concerned with the small amount of cheese (less than 1%) traded with the small number of buyers and sellers for cheese on the CME. The price could be easily manipulated to the detriment of dairy producers.

We know from a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report (GAO–07–707) released in July 2007, that the opportunity for price manipulation exists. GAO stat-

ed, "Because the CME spot cheese market remains a market in which few daily trades occur and a small number of traders account for the majority of trades, questions exist about this market's susceptibility to potential price manipulation."

Cheese plants report prices to the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). These prices are the CME cheddar cheese price of ten days earlier including basis. Therefore the cheese price on the CME sets the NASS survey price which sets the Class I Mover.

We want the government to follow up on this GAO report with an investigation to find improvements or a more equitable dairy pricing system.

Supply Management Programs

We support H.R. 5288, the Dairy Price Stabilization Act, introduced in May by Rep. Jim Costa of Fresno, California. Dairy markets continue to have ever increasing price volatility which hurts producers, processors and consumers. Low prices benefit processors and consumers, but help to force dairymen out of business causing a severe drop in production and the next round of high prices for consumers. These high prices are needed by dairymen to repay equity lost in the low part of the price cycle, but hurt processors and consumers causing a decrease in milk consumption which makes the next round of low prices even worse.

H.R. 5288, the Dairy Price Stabilization Act, is designed to match supply with demand, including exports. Federal legislation would be needed to implement this plan. An advisory board would be appointed which would set the amount of milk needed and the market access fee per hundredweight. This fee would be paid by those producers who produce more than their assigned market amount. The fees would be collected and paid proportionally to those producers who do not expand. This advisory board would react to market conditions by increasing supply when milk was short or decreasing supply when there is too much milk. This plan allows for expansion of production and new producers and its goal would be to control milk price volatility while not setting milk prices.

Daily Dairy Electronic Price Reporting

In the 2007 Farm Bill, section 1510 of the dairy title, Congress authorized daily electronic NASS price reporting (with auditing) for dairy. This very important piece of the current Farm Bill was never funded or implemented. Daily dairy electronic price reporting of cheese, butter, whey and powder would reduce the influence of "thinly" traded Chicago Mercantile Exchange spot market for these commodities.

Restructure Pricing of Class I Milk

The present system of using a formula that locks Class I pricing to manufactured pricing is adversely affecting markets that are primarily Class I. The expansion of milk production in the West over the last decade has negatively impacted dairymen producing for fluid markets. A system needs to be developed that would price fluid milk independently.

Southeast Milk Marketing Conditions

Our dairy cooperatives have done a very poor job of matching milk production with demand. We have allowed tremendous production declines in the Southeast while encouraging large milk production increases in the Southwest.

In the Southeast, milk production has decreased 23 percent from 12.0 billion pounds to 9.2 billion pounds since 2000. Meanwhile in the Southwest, production has increased 44 percent from 11.9 billion pounds to 17.1 billion pounds since 2000. The end result is that we have a fluid market in the Southeast that is short of fluid milk. The money that processors pay for milk is being spent to pay for milk hauling from the Southwest to the Southeast instead of going to pay local dairymen. Transportation credits of 30¢ per hundredweight of milk are paid by Class I processors to a Federal Order fund to supply milk from outside a marketing area during periods of deficit milk production. These transportation credits are being used to subsidize milk hauling from the Southwest to the Southeast even as some milk is being hauled out of the Southeast to manufacturing plants in the North. This is another example of good intentions by the government to help dairymen that has proven harmful. Transportation credits harm local dairy producers because they provide a subsidy for distance milk to replace local milk. This action hurts all dairy producers in the Southeast for the benefit of a few haulers

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our plea for help and a call for a drastic change both for the good of Georgia's dairy industry, the Southeast as well as for the U.S.

COMMENT OF KIM WILLIAMS, PAICINES, CA

Date Submitted: Friday, June 18, 2010, 6:05 p.m.
Name: Kim Williams.
City, State: Paicines, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Poultry/poultry products.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: My husband, neighbors and I produce beyond-organic pastured eggs, chicken, pork, beef and dairy. We are graziers who work in harmony with the sensitive habitat we live in, a valley that is a last refuge for many Threatened and Endangered Species whose range used to include the California Central Valley. Not only do we sell our food throughout the entire San Francisco and Monterey Bay Area, we run a farm-stay with our neighbors and promote the eco and agri-tourism of our area.

We are under serious threat from a proposed industrial solar development that will cover over 1.3 of the valley we farm in, 4,717 acres to be exact. A start-up company created by venture capitalist involved with oil drilling and ethanol production, and who have zero experience in solar, would like permitting approved so they can qualify for $360 million in ARRA funds, to be spent primarily on the purchase of 1.8 million solar panels from China. This project will lead to a reduction in jobs for our county, a reduction in tax revenue, and added debt because roads leading into the valley will need to be repaired before construction equipment can move in.

We are in an area zoned as Agricultural Rangeland—this company, Solargen, want the zoning changed. The majority of the valley is protected under the Williamson Act—Solargen wants the contracts cancelled on the grounds it's in the public's best interest.

There is a Species Recovery Plan specifying the need for traditional grazing activities to continue and 90% of the valley floor protected from development—Solargen wants the federal government to step in and override this protection measure.

If built, this project would wipe out the agriculture in the valley, eliminating this important local source of food. It just doesn't make sense to talk about reducing our dependence on foreign oil while increasing our dependence on foreign food.

It also doesn't make sense to decimate valuable ag land, (the valley is rated as Prime Ag land with Class 1 soil using federal criteria) and pristine open space in the name of "saving the environment". Grasslands sequester an enormous amount of carbon and this project will lead to desertification and zero carbon will be sequestered.

I and my neighbors respectfully urge you to work on protecting prime farm land and pristine open space from the onslaught of industrial development. Solar is a wonderful thing but it should be placed close to point of use, in urban areas—over land fills, in free-way right of ways, on every rooftop, *etc.* There are millions of acres of suitable space if government will make the right choice and refuse to support big energy special interests masquerading as the knights of clean energy production so they can maintain their monopoly over energy production in this country.

The old paradigm of producing energy far from point of use and transmitting over long distances is outdated, inefficient, and should be phased out. The future is distributed power and a great start towards achieving this goal is to stop the subsidies to big energy and fund a feed-in tariff program similar to the one that has allowed Germany and Spain to become world leaders in renewable energy production.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

COMMENT OF LINDSEY WILLIAMS, BOWLING GREEN, VA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Lindsey Williams.
City, State: Bowling Green, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Vegetables.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: First and foremost, I appreciate that the House Committee is looking to hear the voices of the people you seek to serve and represent. I am a Virginia nonprofit worker who grows fresh produce to add a more balanced element to offerings in food pantries and to those who often are not able to afford fresh produce in the store. I hope to some day have a larger farm that serves people on ALL economic levels. There are a few things that I would like to see in this "industry" as we look to the future of Agriculture. First, I think it is important that the nation be encouraged to look to fresh, local solutions. In order to do that, there needs to

be encouragement to those who grow fresh, local produce, rather than be hindered in their efforts.

It is important to have incentives for small farms who seek to support local communities, especially 'Buy Fresh, Buy Local'; To offer incentives to farmers who help the local communities they live and work in, especially for those who grow edible and nutritious foods; To encourage farmers, possibly through incentives, to move towards more organic means of growing, putting caps on the amount of chemicals that are allowed to be used on crops.

I seek to use organic methods in my growing and I realize it is not always feasible for larger scale growers. In those cases, I would like to know (through labeling, etc) what kinds of chemicals ARE being used, so that I have the choice of what to purchase. However, this is not meant to hinder farmers from growing, but rather protect the long term effects for consumer and grower.

There needs to be continued support to local communities seeking to grow food together to meet the needs of the community and ALL families in the community.

As well as continued support of the Cooperative Extensions in our states. With this, also encouraging support of non-traditional growing methods.

Additional support of and for Community Supported Agriculture and those who participate and produce.

I would also like to see continued and broader support of adding fresh and nutritious foods to SNAP programs and to the school cafeteria offerings. There are wonderful programs that have been offered, a broadening of these to reach more people would be wonderful. Incentives to families who seek to add more fresh and nutritious foods into their lives.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these ideas. Should you have any questions, I would be willing to answer them at any point.

Sincerely,

LINDSEY WILLIAMS.

COMMENT OF NIKKI WILLIAMS, ATLANTA, GA

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 11:35 a.m.
Name: Nikki Williams.
City, State: Atlanta, GA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Consumer.
Comment: I'm hearing from farmers that the rules in Georgia for slaughtering chickens are archaic. There is a high demand in Georgia for unadulterated, pasture raised, free range chickens that are free from inhuman pens, chemicals, and toxic hormones. The problem with growing these chickens is that farmers are not allowed to slaughter on their own farms, and the available slaughtering houses are 100s of miles away, and are often already booked up for weeks. This must change now. It wastes fuel and is a waste of time. Allow for more poultry (and cattle) slaughtering facilities to accommodate the growing demand for pollutant free poultry and other meats. Nobody wants disgusting Tyson, Perdue, and the other toxic chicken/meat provided by CAFOs Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations. The future is in sustainable wholesome food and not in animal confinement at high stocking density. There must be infrastructure in place to accommodate the demand for wholesome nutritious food. The future is not CAFOs Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs), so stop subsidizing such toxic, disgusting, filthy, immoral operations with tax payer money.

COMMENT OF ROSS WILLIAMS, RALEIGH, NC

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 9:05 a.m.
Name: Ross Williams.
City, State: Raleigh, NC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Commodity Association.
Comment: I serve as executive director for the North Carolina Nursery and Landscape Association. Our association represents nursery crop producers in NC. A major issue that our growers have been concerned and frustrated with for several years is crop insurance. A very small number of growers currently have crop insurance although they know it should be an important risk management tool for them. The cost-benefit ratio for nursery growers does not work for the potential benefits in protecting their crops. The current crop insurance plan is extremely expensive and when there is a claim, it is very difficult to qualify for any payment. This is

true for nurseries all across the country. The next farm bill should include funds to do a new actuarial study for nursery crops and completely revise the current program.

COMMENT OF TED AND LOUISE WILLIAMS, LAKE CHARLES, LA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 09, 2010, 5:05 p.m.
Name: Ted and Louise Williams.
City, State: Lake Charles, LA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: We are organically farming 10 ac. fruit, vegetable and specialty crops and without the assistance of the NRCS we would not be able to do so.
Please keep helping the small organic farmer.

COMMENT OF SUSAN WILLLARD, PEEKSKILL, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Susan Willlard.
City, State: Peekskill, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Scientist.
Comment: Please pass a farm bill that curbs factory farms and large food corporations. The children of the U.S. deserve fresh, wholesome food in our nation's public schools. Insist on a Farm Bill that allows farms to make a transition to organic, sustainable growing methods for the sake of a cleaner environment for our children and grandchildren.

COMMENT OF KAREN WILSON, EVANS MILLS, NY

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Karen Wilson.
City, State: Evans Mills, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Dental Hygienist.
Comment: Hello. Please make sure you are supporting organic and small, local farming in the 2012 Farm Bill. Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market. Organic farming systems have repeatedly been shown to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad. If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:

- Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
- Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
- Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
- Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Thank you for your time and for helping America's farmers and not big corporations.

COMMENT OF LORNE E. WILSON, ARAPAHOE, NE

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Lorne E. Wilson.
City, State: Arapahoe, NE.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agronomist in the Fertilizer Industry.

Comment: The CLU data is helpful to get the correct producer field treated when you are taking an order over the phone. At least you can both be looking at the map with acres on them. Many producers provide maps but some we are working on maps as old as 1993 and guessing where the pivot goes and how fields have changed. The CLU data is helpful and I do not see the down side to making it public.

Cooperatively,

LORNE E. WILSON,
Agronomist,
Ag Valley Coop,
Arapahoe, NE.

COMMENT OF DEB WINDECKER, FRANKFORT, NY

Date Submitted: Thursday, May 13, 2010, 8:05 p.m.
Name: Deb Windecker.
City, State: Frankfort, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Dairy.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: Dairy farmers deserve a fair pricing structure with more transparency than the CME's 1% surplus cheese sales that derive the class III milk price from the NASS survey done on a honor system by dishonorable people. We deserve a price that factors in our cost of production as any other free market business would. Dairy farmer's deserve a piece of the pie from the market place. We are tired of seeing all the profits being reaped by the processor/retailer off the back of the dairy farmer and MILC payments of the taxpayers. This is corporate welfare!!! We need to preserve local food systems and bring back more processing plants. Forcing farmer's to buy revenue loss insurance is another subsidized program that the farmer can not afford to buy and again provides for insurance companies to generate off the back of taxpayers for double digit returns . . . We also need to do away with BLOC Voting . . . The farmer's voices are no longer heard because of block voting controlled by a few large Co-ops.

COMMENT OF TAMMY L. WINFIELD, CORVALLIS, OR

Date Submitted: Friday, June 25, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Tammy L. Winfield.
City, State: Corvallis, OR.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: University Research Assistant.
Comment: Dear Committee members, as a person who is deeply concerned about our environment, our economy, and our access to chemical free fresh local produce, I implore you to consider organic farming a top priority in the 2012 Farm Bill and all future agriculture policy.

- Organic farming is one of the fastest growing segments of U.S. agricultural production and organic food is one of the fastest growing sectors of the U.S. food retail market.
- Organic farming systems have the potential to conserve water, improve air quality, and build soil quality while providing high quality food and fiber for consumers here and abroad.
- If we want to see the U.S. organic sector continue to grow and thrive, we need to invest in programs that support organic farmers, including:
  - Research and Extension Programs that expand the breadth of knowledge about organic farming systems and provide that knowledge to organic farmers.
  - Conservation Programs that reward organic farmers for the conservation benefits of organic farming systems and provide technical support for organic farmers who want to improve on-farm conservation.
  - Transition Programs that provide technical support to farmers who want to transition to organic farming practices but don't know how.
  - Crop Insurance Programs that work for organic farmers and reimburse them for any losses based on the organic market value of the crop, not average conventional prices.

Please consider these important points while crafting the next farm bill.

Sincerely,

TAMMY L. WINFIELD.

COMMENT OF ROBERT WINSLOW, NEW YORK, NY

Date Submitted: Wednesday, July 28, 2010, 1:05 p.m.
Name: Robert Winslow.
City, State: New York, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Concerned Citizen.
Comment: Regardless of lobbyist efforts, the very first requirement of any food policy must be to decrease hunger. I demand that farm subsidies be reformed towards this goal; that U.S. subsidies do not put farmers in other countries under financial distress; and that health and nutrition for children be made a priority.

COMMENT OF BETTE WINTER, LOCUST GROVE, VA

Date Submitted: Monday, June 14, 2010, 3:35 p.m.
Name: Bette Winter.
City, State: Locust Grove, VA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Entrepreneur.
Comment:

Dear Mr. Cantor et al.,

Two important child nutrition advocacy initiatives that I ask you to support are currently in progress. The first of these would improve the current proposed legislation. The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) is calling on citizens to support inclusion of The Healthy School Meals Act, H.R. 4870 into The Improving Nutrition for America's Children Act. The Healthy School Meals Act would bring forward the introduction of more plant-based meal options in accordance with recommendations made by the American Medical Association and the American Public Health Association. According to the PCRM . . . "The bill, in its current form, does little to encourage the substitution of high fat content foods (such as meat and cheese) with low-fat fruit and vegetables. Such substitutions are crucial in fighting childhood obesity."

Another very important opportunity to effect positive change in the child nutrition legislative process is through ensuring that changes to the Farm Bill that support child nutrition are made in 2012. I hope you are still accepting public suggestions as to how to improve the Farm Bill. If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

You want to bring jobs to Virginia. Supporting our own economy by buying locally and providing fresh local food for Virginia schools will show big business you care about the education Virginia children receive. Thank you for your time sir.

BETTE WINTER,
[Redacted].

COMMENT OF VELMA WOLLSCHLAGER, REVILLO, SD

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 4:05 p.m.
Name: Velma Wollschlager.
City, State: Revillo, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.

Size: 151–300 acres.
Comment: We feel that you must include Payment Limits in the Farm Bill. It should be up to $250,000 or Less for all farms, even those that have Multiple producers. It is very hard for Family farms to compete with those Large/Multiple ones and that is NOT FAIR, for them to get more government help; as they then, Bid up cash rent, get discounts on seed, feeds, equipment *etc.* . . . How can smaller family farms compete with that?? You tell me . . . THAT is why so many family farms are going out of business. PLEASE consider this, if you want to continue with family operations. Really, it should be even less; instead work on the commodity prices, which is WHAT should sustain Farmers/Ranchers. Thank you, for any help you might . . . give.

VELMA WOLLSCHLAGER,
Grant County, SD.

COMMENT OF JASON WOODS, SIOUX CITY, IA

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Jason Woods.
City, State: Sioux City, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified General Real Property Appraiser.
Comment: I ask that you support the reinstatement of the CLU data into Section 1619. Your support will reinforce the huge benefits that CLU data provides for businesses who work closely with producers, such as giving producers more timely, accurate and cost-effective services. There is no compliance, CRP, wetlands or other personal information in the CLU data.

COMMENT OF EDWARD WOOLSEY, PROLE, IA

Date Submitted: Monday, May 03, 2010, 2:35 p.m.
Name: Edward Woolsey.
City, State: Prole, IA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Other.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment:

House Agriculture Committee Hearing,
Des Moines Iowa.

April 30, 2010

ED WOOLSEY,
Iowa Wind Farmer,
[Redacted].

I would like to speak to the Energy Title of the coming Farm Bill, and thank you for supporting this effort in the past.

In 2001 I testified in front of the Senate Ag Committee on the vast potential that renewable energy offered rural America.

In 2007 I testified in front of the House Small Business Committee on the incredible number of jobs available from renewable energy.

Please reauthorize and fully fund the renewable energy Title of the Farm Bill. They are very successful and badly needed.

Now, I would like for you to give consideration to giving some very direct instructions to the Rural Electric Cooperatives related to renewable energy.

America can not capture the jobs, rural economic development or energy security benefits of renewable energy without the REC's support. Current support is sporadic, non-existent or completely negative. Your attention is critical.

I urge you to look at the wildly successful public policy used in the majority of Countries currently leading the international renewable energy revolution.

The public policy has the unfortunate name of FEED–IN–TARIFF.

Lots of information is available on how the FEED–IN–TARIFF works.

If you are interested I can provide you or your staff with a bibliography.

Thank you for your time.

EDWARD WOOLSEY,
President,
Green Prairie Wind Inc.

[Redacted].

COMMENT OF SCOTT WOOTON, ALDEN, NY

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 19, 2010, 9:35 a.m.
Name: Scott Wooton.
City, State: Alden, NY.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Certified Public Accountant.
Comment: Organic agriculture, practiced in rural and urban farms across the nation, can give U.S. taxpayers clear benefits: cutting pesticide and fertilizer use that fouls our water and endangers our health, while increasing economic development opportunities. For the 2012 Farm Bill, please:

- Pay farmers for the amount of environmental good they do rather than for the amount of crops they produce.
- Reward farmers for increasing biodiversity (more kinds of crops), adding carbon in their soil, and putting perennial crops (such as hay and pasture) in their fields.
- Protect income for farmers who raise organic food crops that fit the most nutritious parts of the USDA food pyramid, so that we get better food and fewer junk-food ingredients.
- Decrease dependency on foreign energy by supporting organic farmers that market locally.

COMMENT OF DON WORLEY, KETTLE FALLS, WA

Date Submitted: Thursday, June 10, 2010, 1:05 a.m.
Name: Don Worley.
City, State: Kettle Falls, WA.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Fruits.
Size: Less than 50 acres.
Comment: Big AG is not doing America any favors; they lobby for rules and laws that effectively deny small growers a chance at a fair playing field. They have all the money and they have agendas that they have been able to sell to Congress. The thinking they sell is that "this won't hurt, and it will benefit consumers" is misleading at best. Organic farming is a small part of the Farm Bill; however Organic produce is now available all across America—it is good for our Country. Please do not pander to the wishes of Big AG as they continue to lobby for looser regulations in the Organic section of the Farm Bill . . . and, PLEASE do keep or increase the availability of government money for Organic purposes in the Farm Bill. This will be good for the health and welfare of America.

Regards,

DON WORLEY.

COMMENT OF ALLAN WORRELL, JACKSONVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Sunday, July 25, 2010, 6:35 p.m.
Name: Allan Worrell.
City, State: Jacksonville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Professional Farm Manager.
Comment: I strongly urge the reinstatement of CLU data in the next farm bill. This is critical information for those of us in the professional farm management, farm appraisal and real estate brokerage business. We rely on accurate data to provide management and valuation services for clients. It is important to note that the CLU data does not include any data for CRP payments, direct program payments, *etc.* Anyone can go to the local courthouse and get much more detailed and personal information than what is contained in the CLU data. Please reinstate this important information.

COMMENT OF LUKE WORRELL, SPRINGFIELD, IL

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 3:05 p.m.

Name: Luke Worrell.
City, State: Springfield, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Farm Manager.
Comment: I would like to express my desire that USDA aerial maps be made public again. I understand that some information should remain private but a simple aerial map allows several sectors of Ag-Business to be more efficient. Whether it is a manager, seed supplier, FS employee, hired hand, *etc., etc.*

The current law only bogs down businesses and allows us to cover less ground during a business day. The more we can do, the more they can do, and it goes on and on.

Thanks for your time.

COMMENT OF DANA WRIGHT, KNOXVILLE, TN

Date Submitted: Tuesday, June 08, 2010, 10:35 a.m.
Name: Dana Wright.
City, State: Knoxville, TN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Policy Director—TN Clean Water Network.
Comment:

Conservation Compliance

This is our first priority. We support the following policy changes:

- Reopen all legacy HEL soil conservation plans (plans approved, applied, and maintained before 3 July 1996) and revise them to at least meet current planning standards on highly erodible cropland.
- Require a setback of row crop planting of 20 feet from waterways—producers who want to plant a buffer that meets technical standards can enroll in CRP or CREP and receive payment for those additional acres.
- Funding for the technical assistance needed to complete plans and conduct status reviews should be provided from funds otherwise made available for covered programs.

Voluntary Program Reform

In regard to voluntary programs, we support policy changes designed to enhance performance, including:

- Increase the scope of the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative:
  - Include CRP in programs affected by CCPI.
  - 60 percent of EQIP funds running through CCPI by 2017.
  - Allow CCPI funding to support planning, outreach, and monitoring costs of the partner organization.

Transparency

- Strike provisions that restrict access to geospatial information regarding voluntary conservation program funding.
- Mandate at least 1 percent of funding for voluntary programs get set aside for monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of those programs.

COMMENT OF MELISSA WRIGHT, REDDING, CT

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:05 p.m.
Name: Melissa Wright.
City, State: Redding, CT.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mom.
Comment: We feel increased federal support for local, organic, diversified agriculture would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF JOHNNIE WRIGHT, SR., VANCE, SC

Date Submitted: Monday, May 24, 2010, 6:35 p.m.

Name: Johnnie Wright, Sr.
City, State: Vance, SC.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Civil Service/County Council Member.
Comment: Please support the Administration's proposed Rural Innovation Initiative Programs of USDA which includes water/waste water Infrastructure, Broadband, Renewable Energy and others that will help transform and grow our Rural communities for the future.

COMMENT OF RUSSELL WYATT, HOT SPRINGS, SD

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 5:06 p.m.
Name: Russell Wyatt.
City, State: Hot Springs, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: I, as a State Certified General Land Appraiser, have been restricted in my ability to write an accurate report because of the lack of information available to me at the FSA Office.

The aerial photos of cropland are very helpful in writing an accurate report.

Please help appraisers to get needed information on cropland.

Please give this your consideration.

Sincerly,

RUSSELL WYATT,
State Certified General Appraiser.

COMMENT OF DEE YEZBAK, STRONGSVILLE, OH

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 11:06 p.m.
Name: Dee Yezbak.
City, State: Strongsville, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Financial Advisor.
Comment: If Congress were to change even a small amount of the World War II era subsidy funding which is currently given to large commodity crops such as corn, wheat and soy and instead put that funding into smaller scale, organic and local agricultural endeavors, the positive effect on child nutrition would be enormous. While these subsidies of so called "staple" crops may have made sense at the time they were first suggested in the early 20th century, the Farm Bill subsidy program as it is currently carried out actually contribute to declining child health due to its support for agribusiness such as the corn syrup producers and industrial meat and dairy production. Increased federal support for local, organic diversified agricultural would go a long way to ensuring that the local school districts have the ability to purchase and use healthier, organic fresh fruits and vegetables and meats in school nutrition programs.

COMMENT OF JOY YOST, HAYES, SD

Date Submitted: Monday, July 26, 2010, 12:05 p.m.
Name: Joy Yost.
City, State: Hayes, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Agriculture-Aerial Crop Sprayer.
Comment: My husband is an aerial crop sprayer. These maps are essential for me to have the maps ready for my husband to spray. The farmer can call with their legal descriptions, I can go on Surety Maps, print them & have them ready for my husband. It is a must to continue these maps so we know exactly what fields are to be sprayed. Please we must continue these maps!

Thank you,

JOY YOST.

COMMENT OF RANDY YOST, HAYES, SD

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 11:35 p.m.
Name: Randy Yost.
City, State: Hayes, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Aerial Applicator.
Comment: These maps are vital to our aerial application business, to assist in locating & identifying customers fields.

We would be greatly handicapped without access to these maps.

Thank you,

RANDY YOST.

COMMENT OF JOSHUA YOUNG, CARLINVILLE, IL

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 1:35 p.m.
Name: Joshua Young.
City, State: Carlinville, IL.
Producer/Non-producer: Producer.
Type: Field Crops.
Size: 500–999 acres.
Comment: PLEASE change Section 1619 to reinstate CLU (common land unit) data to the NRCS Data Gateway. This information does not include any private or personal data and is important to me as a farmer and as a certified general appraiser.

Thank you,

JOSH YOUNG.

COMMENT OF NATHAN YOUNG, LOS ANGELES, CA

Date Submitted: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Nathan Young.
City, State: Los Angeles, CA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: TV Producer.
Comment: Please take this moment to support locally grown fruits and vegetables, farmers markets, and FOOD, rather than commodity crops that support large agricultural corporations. Bio-diversity, food sovereignty and sustainability should be priorities, including erasing the unfair tilting of support towards large scale farmers. In addition, facing down and revising the bureaucracy around small scale meat processing, in order to support small scale ranchers. Locally supported abattoirs should be another focus. Nutrition, nutrition, nutrition, rather than supporting those crops used for the building blocks of processed foods and sweeteners. Please consider school lunch revisions as well. A Big job, but one would hope to simultaneously lower the entire size of the Bill and rejigger the support from large to small. Good luck!!!!

COMMENT OF THOMAS YOUNG, RAPID CITY, SD

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 27, 2010, 1:36 p.m.
Name: Thomas Young.
City, State: Rapid City, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Real Estate Appraiser.
Comment: It is critical for the real estate appraisal industry to have access to the CLU data as it enables the appraisers to understand the physical composition of properties and provide a more accurate estimate of value to producers and lenders.

The information provided in the CLU data (field size and use) is not covered by the Privacy Act and does not infringe upon producer's right to privacy.

As tax payers, we have the right to know where every tax dollar is being spent and that includes farm subsidies.

Please lift the ban on CLU data release.

Thanks,

THOMAS YOUNG.

COMMENT OF CURTIS YOUNT, NEW MADISON, OH

Date Submitted: Tuesday, July 06, 2010, 4:35 p.m.
Name: Curtis Yount.
City, State: New Madison, OH.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: General Appraiser/Agriculture.
Comment: A large percentage of my work is FSA guaranteed self contained work. I pay taxes just like the next person and my taxes support the USDA. The fact that I don't have access to field maps (I don't care how much money the operator is making) showing REPORTED ACRES lowers the credibility of my reports. I turn in reports that are used to loan large amounts of money but do not have access to the data to help support my numbers. I am obligated to the lending institution to maintain confidentiality. The bill needs to give certified general appraisers access, we can show you a license and normally I work in the same area all the time. I know your employees by name, but the pile of paper work must be filled out every time I request a map. Is that a waste?

CURTIS YOUNT.

COMMENT OF KEITH ZANTER, BERESFORD, SD

Date Submitted: Friday, May 28, 2010, 11:05 a.m.
Name: Keith Zanter.
City, State: Beresford, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: FSA.
Comment: I support the ACRE program which limits the direct payment to 80% and provides a very good production and marketing safety net. I support eliminating the DCP program which provides 100% of the direct payment and provides a poor safety net. Also this would simplify the program. Actually the two programs are not that difficult to understand, but by providing two program choices to the farmer creates confusion. I believe the producer would continue to sign up for ACRE—which still provides (a smaller) direct payment and provides a great production and marketing safety net when program benefits are needed to farmers. Also I support going to a county wide trigger *versus* a state trigger would benefit the program.

SURE: Simplify the SURE program to require a 15% production losses on all crops *versus* a 10% loss on a single crop for a producer who has land in an eligible county or contiguous county would benefit the program and would be more feasible (savings) to the Government. This would still create a good safety net to the producer and would be fairer to all producers. Also eliminate the requirement that the producer has to be in an eligible county or contiguous county to be eligible for assistance without having an overall loss greater than 50% on all crops. Just simply go to a 15% loss on all crops.

COMMENT OF PAUL ZEEB, SIOUX FALLS, SD

Date Submitted: Friday, July 23, 2010, 5:36 p.m.
Name: Paul Zeeb.
City, State: Sioux Falls, SD.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Appraiser.
Comment: Please include the CLU information on our maps. Thank you.

COMMENT OF DAVE ZENTNER, DULUTH, MN

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Dave Zentner.
City, State: Duluth, MN.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Retired Financial Services Professional.
Comment: Our agriculture bills have a long history of both good and bad. The dominance of major agribusiness groups must become more balanced with policies that better insure long term productive food production *versus* an extractive production approach that utilizes marginal soils and generates more soil erosion, a bigger carbon foot print, heavy use of herbicides and pesticides, in short, is unsustainable.

In order to do create a health and sustainable farming future we need to have a robust and well funded conservation title as part of the Farm Bill. I recognize the tight budgets we face. We must not, as we have in the past; cut farm conservation programs as the first order of financial priority. Doing that is very costly in the long and, the short run financial, and terms of sustainability.

Emphasis must be on env. benefits *versus* payments over historical crop production. And, high priority should be placed on conservation compliance. The compliance portions of Farm bills has been unfortunately, very weak, this must be changed.

COMMENT OF CONNIE ZIEGLER, OAKLEY, KS

Date Submitted: Saturday, July 24, 2010, 10:05 a.m.
Name: Connie Ziegler.
City, State: Oakley, KS.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Secretary for Aerial Ag Applicators.
Comment: I am a former FSA employee. Providing current field borders, on FSA aerial photos to the public, does not compromise the farmers right of privacy in any way. Our aerial applicators use the FSA maps to guide them to the field or fields that the farmer wants sprayed. We have a computer program that pulls up legals of FSA maps that allows us to find, verify acres, (using the field borders) and outline the field the farmer wants sprayed. Without field borders on these maps they would be pointless. The farmer would have to bring maps to us.

COMMENT OF DIANE ZIEGNER, TALKEETNA, AK

Date Submitted: Sunday, June 13, 2010, 9:35 p.m.
Name: Diane Ziegner.
City, State: Talkeetna, AK.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Mother.
Comment: Please support diversified funding by providing incentives to small and organic farms. It's time for us to start eating local and healthy foods both in our homes and schools.

Thank you.

COMMENTS OF CARYL ZOOK, PEMBROKE PINES, FL

Date Submitted: Wednesday, June 02, 2010, 2:05 p.m.
Name: Caryl Zook.
City, State: Pembroke Pines, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Organic Certification Inspector and Private Chef.
Comment: Please support assistance for transitioning to organic agriculture. Please support assistance for beginning farmers.

Please support research into drought tolerance INSTEAD of chemical and genetic engineering of our vital crops.

I was born on a conventional family farm. I raised my sons on a small organic farm. Now I work as an independent organic certification inspector. I support organic agriculture for my grandchildren's sake.

Sincerely,

CARYL ZOOK.

Date Submitted: Friday, June 11, 2010, 8:35 a.m.
Name: Caryl Zook.
City, State: Pembroke Pines, FL.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Organic Certification Inspector.
Comment: Please support conversion from chemical agriculture to organic production.

COMMENT OF PAMELA ZUCHOWSKI, WELLSBORO, PA

Date Submitted: Saturday, June 12, 2010, 5:35 p.m.
Name: Pamela Zuchowski.

City, State: Wellsboro, PA.
Producer/Non-producer: Non-producer.
Occupation: Teacher.
Comment: A few comments:

I would like to see an end to subsidizing corn—Cargill and Monsanto have all the money they need. What they seem to be after is world domination of the food system. They have a monopoly on the U.S. seed supply. MONOPOLY! Don't we have laws in place to prevent just such an occurrence? Why is happening? If you are going to subsidize anything it should be organics. Bringing the price down to match non-organics would put Monsanto and their Frankenfood out of business. NO GMOs! I don't want them and you can't make me eat them.

Let's do better by our school children. I work in a school and I see the daily garbage we are giving our kids. Most kids at my elementary school eat chicken nuggets five days a week with no vegetables or fruit on their trays. Kids are the future of this country and I've seen dogs who eat better, more nutritious food. It's disgusting.

To sum up: No GMOs, start subsidizing organic practices, do not subsidize corn (Monsanto, Cargill *et. al*) institute school lunch reform.

Thank you for your time.

○