

**From:** "jbryant@awwwsome.com%inter2" <jbryant@awwwsome.com>  
**Subject:** Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 12/06/2005 06:45 PM CST  
**Date Sent:** 12/06/2005 06:45:05 CST  
**Date Received:** 12/06/2005 06:46:55 CST

---

Email: jbryant@awwwsome.com

FirstName: Jeffery

LastName: Bryant

Address1: 3067 Rush Ceek Ct.

Address2:

City: Redding

State: California

zipcode: 96002

Question1: Farm Bill funded practices should focus on improving effency of farm lands and/or protection of lands treated under the Farm Bill from onsite or off site environmental or catastrophic damage.

Appropriately selected projects will more than likely have an unintended consequence of increasing the value of the land involved in the Farm Bill Contract. The increase in value should reflect the economic efficiency improvement and the risk reduction in environmental or catastrophic degradation. If you make something more efficient you increase it's value. You cannot change the free market place, so don't worry about it.

Question2: Develop new and efficient ways that farmers can deal with regulatory oversight. The cost of meeting regulatory requirements and the regulatory burden creep in California is the most onerous burden on farmers and ranchers.

Question3: Limit program benefits to farmers that reside on the lands where they are proposing the project.

Question4: Farm policy should focus on community safety throuh fire reduction and water quality. It should also set standards for carbon sequestration. If the USDA funds practices that increase tree growth they fund a carbon sequestration project. The US government should get the credit for the increase carbon sequestration as oposed to the landowner.

Question5: Require the applicant and recipient to be a resident on the lands where the funding is spent. At least make it a major selection criteria.

Question6: Focus on the basics. Do not delute your efforts on a broader program. Looks like non producers want to get their fingers in the till.