

**From:** "awright@fastol.com%inter2" <awright@fastol.com>  
**Subject:** Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 12/31/2005 01:03 PM CST  
**Date Sent:** 12/31/2005 01:03:09 CST  
**Date Received:** 12/31/2005 01:03:42 CST

---

Email: awright@fastol.com

FirstName: a

LastName: wright

Address1: po box 144

Address2:

City: church creek,

State: Maryland

zipcode: 21622

Question1: treat the "whole" farm..not just the crop fields. encourage forestland improvement, Provide better tax legislation to SMALL farmers. Eliminate "death " taxes for good. Better education in the areas of efficiency and finance management. Encourage mentoring programs.

Question2: reduce payments for various crops.....sugar, especially.

Encourage forest land owners to better manage their land through more fair cost share programs. Establish green payments for forestlandowners. CSP only addresses forestry from a standpoint of a few trees in a buffer. Established forests and new planted forests provide for significantly more long term air and water quality protection than farm fields with a few buffers planted with tree whips as provided for in CRP.

Question3: Look at the overall goal and distribute the funds accordingly. There are surplus products in warehouses yet the growers of these products get government payments for the over production. Further reduce the dollar amounts available to individual and corporate producers. Encourage small producers with unique products by incentives to them instead,

Question4: Again, forestry is the answer to many goals yet it is taken for granted in the doling of money for practices. There are not enough technical resources for advising the forest land owner of proper management. Forests provide long term benefits for air and water quality, wildlife and recreation benefits. Yet forestry doesn't even get addressed when it comes to land rental. CRP and CREP pays millions ( perhaps billions) for establishment and rent dollars for farmers to plant grasses near ditches and streams. Timberland owners receive perhaps a 50% cost share to for a few limited forestry practices and then we are expected to not receive any return for up to 80 years.....no yearly rent payments for us. Is this fair ?????? I think not and yet it continues year after year. And then you wonder why forestland is sold to developers who remove the pollution protection and replace it with pollution creators.....and government then wrings its hand that there is too much pollution. Well you and the urban politicians support this behavior so when you change your direction, perhaps not so much forest land will be sold.

Question5: Provide markets for standing timber and pulp. The mills are leaving the US for foreign locations that provide cheaper raw materials and labor with less regulations. There are many tax incentives that could be made available to local mills. States could provide the same tax incentives for ecosensitive harvesting equip that they provide for manure distribution equipment ( ie...manure spreaders) Again the WHO makes it necessary to review prop-up payments for crops but they do not discourage green payments for long term pollution containments or avoidance practices.

Question6: Renewable energy at the farm level.....manure sites,

wind farms, solar collection and energy storage credits.