

From: "sbring@wiktel.com%inter2" <sbring@wiktel.com>
Subject: Comments
Date Sent: 12/31/2005 04:17:28 CST
Date Received: 12/31/2005 04:17:37 CST

Hope this isn't too late. Just noticed the 30th date.

CRP--Need to be in contact with local committees to redesign the system. The rental value is far out of hand and catering to investors instead of the farmers. It is also driving the farm rental values up so farmers can't afford to compete. Also is driving up land values so young farmers can't afford to start.

We need to look at this for the next generation or we will end up hungry.

Assistance to producers is best done as is now through the FSA records as cuts administration cost and is fair to all. This is the best way to administer disaster programs also. Anything else encourages cheaters to get the checks by beating the system. Is far better to make it fair to all, whether some get a better crop or not. Better crops sometimes aren't only weather related, but extra expense put in by the producer in line of quality seed, fungicides, etc.. These people get penalized on a "proof" system.

Environmental issues are best done through the farmers. I urge you to work with the local programs and farmers before making decisions that cost us all money and even more dollars to "fix". Extension and FSA Committees are a good place to start.

I would recommend requiring them to clip CRP annually as too many are doing cosmetic work and not getting the job done. Area farmers are paying more for chemicals than before the CRP program. Also I would recommend CRP payments of \$25 to \$30 an acre. Any land with more of a value SHOULD NOT be in the CRP program. This would drastically save federal dollars and would put the CRP program back to where it started out--to conserve highly erodible land. It should not be used as a bail out program as was done with the bad FHA loans in the past.

I farm next to CRP ground and the deer and other wildlife including ducks and geese much prefer my crops than dried CRP grass. I don't farm one field that doesn't have a deer path through it. However, I would like to see a compensation program when the fields are wildlife damaged. I've lost as much as 10-15% of my crops to deer and bear on certain years.

I highly recommend not to lower the grain target prices as this is needed to keep the farmers in business. Farmers are not getting inflated \$ for their products and all the expenses are inflated every year. Therefore, the target price should go up if anything is done with them.

Thanks for listening.
Sharon Bring,
Marshall County Commissioner
FArmer
Tax Preparer