

**From:** "DRDUK37@aol.com%inter2" <DRDUK37@aol.com>  
**Subject:** Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 08/23/2005 08:20 AM CDT  
**Date Sent:** 08/23/2005 08:20:28 CDT  
**Date Received:** 08/23/2005 08:21:18 CDT

---

Email: DRDUK37@aol.com

FirstName: James

LastName: March

Address1: N3406 Verde Valley Road

Address2:

City: LaCrosse

State: Wisconsin

zipcode: 54601

Question1: Require that land prices are based on actual value of the land as agriculture w/o program benefits. Program benefits should not "run" with the land if sold and there should be no expectation that Ag program benefits will be continued with new ownership.

Question2: Don't include farm program benefits to "prop up" prices of products that world demand expects to increase greater production

Question3: Phase out farm subsidies and let the market determine production and prices, except where environmentally sensitive lands are concerned

Question4: Continue existing "conservation" programs and expand them to allow enrollment of additional environmentally sensitive acres. Let production take place on lands that are best suited for it and retire marginal/environmentally sensitive acres. I currently have 55 acres enrolled in CRP. It is nearing end of current contract. Without CRP incentives, these acres would need to be cultivated or pastured to pay taxes, insurance and other costs associated with owning the property. Acreage is highly erodible and adjacent to blue-ribbon trout water. Prior to CRP, runoff and sediment went directly into the stream from our land. Now after being idle in CRP for 17 years (2nd CRP contract), gulleys are healing and negative effects of heavy rainfall are mitigated. Without CRP or similar program, this land will again be cropped, at least partially.

Question5: Continue to invest in new technology, innovative crops, etc. Develop a program such as that currently used to buy development rights on prime Ag land, especially near urban areas. This program needs greater funding and be expanded to more locations. Only way agriculture can continue near rapidly developed urban areas.

Question6: All of the above are good and should be expanded. Move \$\$ from subsidizing the more common "cash" crops into this area.