

From: "mbobek@comcast.net%inter2" <mbobek@comcast.net>
Subject: Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 10/26/2005 05:42 PM CDT
Date Sent: 10/26/2005 05:42:22 CDT
Date Received: 10/26/2005 05:43:41 CDT

Email: mbobek@comcast.net

FirstName: Michael

LastName: Bobek

Address1:

Address2:

City:

State:

zipcode:

Question1: Capitalization of program benefits into land prices could be minimized if the value of the benefits were summarily excluded as capital improvements for later federal income tax depreciation purposes.

Question2: #1 Define "Supply Chains" for various U.S. agriculture markets that appear viable to operate within a global market, e.g. ID the minimum size freezer beef operations where global sales feasible. Advise & update beef growers on global pricing structures and assist U.S. based wholesalers coordinate the receipt of beef from independent small to medium size growers, assist U. S. wholesalers identify global buyers and adjust income tax structures on growers according to the purchasing country tax structure.

#2 Previous Cooperative Extension work with farmers has mostly been focused on adapting to regional market opportunities. More information sources are needed on global needs and what ex-U.S. suppliers are able to provide so that U.S. growers can adapt to global trends, not just regional marketing opps.

Question3: Economies of scale are the dog, farm support programs are the tail, not the other way around.

Perhaps those growers that are large enough to economically compete in the global supply chain should declare that and not sell excess in regional markets to the disadvantage of smaller growers. Those that cannot efficiently compete at a global scale should limit their market to meeting only regional needs or at the most, inter-state demands. In other words, each size grower has a geographic market that makes economic sense based on his operation's scale. He knows this and does not try to crowd out the smaller grower with surplus and he does not try to compete in the large markets and cry "unfairness" because he is not of sufficient scale to be profitable over the long-haul.

Question4: #1 Establish economically measurable numeric criteria for soil and water quality goal achievement.

#2 Minimize the availability and/or magnitude of incentive programs where current land use condition is considered environmentally sustainable and acceptable from soil & water quality perspectives.

#3 Require local & state grant programs receiving direct or indirect federal assistance to utilize proposed project scoring and prioritization metrics for award decision-making.

#4 Maintain incentive programs to fix existing problems and not be subordinated by programs based on rewarding.

Question5: Any Federal programs that promotes land "fragmentation" should be eliminated.

Research, support and incentives for promoting acceptable methods for land disposal of agricultural wastes should be accelerated.

Support and incentives for protection and enhancement of private water supplies should be increased.

Programs should increase involvement in supporting economically viable small agricultural operations and less on recreational area

developments.

Question6: Stronger support for the RC&D program where regional scale is required to establish a viable agricultural product market. Stronger support for the CTA program, excluding non-commercial natural resource based recreation interests, primarily to maintain and enhance the potable water resource base.

Increased EQIP assistance for accelerating sound agricultural waste disposal programs.