

AFW-4 Comments Recommendation 42

Incentives for Enhancing GHG benefits of conservation provisions of Farm Bill programs

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

stop promoting the concept that it is more profitable to farm the government than to produce a crop.

Keeping land in CRP is paid for through our tax dollars. Is this the best use of tax dollars?

There should be a cost/benefit analysis required. The benefits do not justify the costs using sound science. More taxes, regulations and red tape is not what will help Montana.

Excellent idea.

Perhaps our Dept. of Agriculture could provide this education in a cost efficient manner.

Perennial grains, organic farming. Less reliance on corporations more on the community.

Retaining current levels of natural land mass is essential. Incentives to agriculture will be necessary - especially to the small farmer/rancher.

Education yes - indoctrination no.

Do we need more commodity production capacity to accomplish AFW-2 and AFW-3?

The education and training programs already exist. Let the free market forces lead farmers to decide whether they want to take advantage of them.

Do everything possible to discourage renewed sod-busting in CRP lands, which are, by definition, all highly erodible and never should have been plowed in the first place.

Education - always better than mandates!

individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

Who pays?

Extend program for long-term commitment to growing trees.

Look to the UN-intended consequences. Let the market do it's job. Like most government involvement in an issue, it is well intentioned, but will ultimately make the situation more cumbersome and expensive.

The Farm Bill is an institutionalized disaster; a shameless giveaway to Big Corporate Ag that does very little for the small farmer.

The pseudoscience behind "carbon sequestration" will here result in not only lost productivity but also in other indirect economic losses.

Again, get the facts from real scientists not the likes of Steve running a Forester, not a Atmospheric Scientist.

This could easily be made in to a money maker if coupled with development of an agency that funneled money to such projects via carbon credits.

who would pay for this? my guess is more taxes. we do not need taxes to make government work. we could get rid of 75% of government and still be fine.

Now you are talking!

No vote now. I have a problem with industrial farms getting hundreds of thousands of dollars from gov't for any reason, including to do nothing. Maybe carbon credits would give large land owners incentives on their own.

tricky area...must look holistically at all impacts, both fiscal and environmental on this source for energy. the trade-offs can be extremely harmful and detrimental!!!

STOP USING PESTICIDES THAT KILL BY HORMONE DISRUPTION AND CHROMOSOMAL DAMAGE.I AM TOTALLY IN FAVOR OF CRP OR OTHER PROGRAMS THAT PROTECT THE WILDLIFE HABITAT AND SOIL MICRO-ORGANISMS.

Where are we going to grow our food? Wheat prices are a huge cost factors in most products now-who will pay for the added costs for low income people?

NO more ag welfare

The GHG effect of this is nebulous.

Studies show that there is zero climate benefit to such investments. Clearly there is no concensus on any benefit to GHG reduction. CO2 is too small in % of atmosphere to drive climate.

Less education and training; more direct effects.

Non-agenda driven - what is the cost and what is the benefit to the farmer??

The key to maintaining this C base is the cellulosic biorefinery development, as then the material being grown can be harvested without plowing and used as feedstock thus maintaining the soil C stored.

support with NO increase in Gov't spending.

Waste of money. More land needs to be converted to farming, not less. Promoting Hemp production (for industrial uses) would be more apt at increasing/protecting "soil carbon".
stop giving farmers welfare not to grow food, this country was the bread basket of the world, now we can not feed our selfs,we must import food .

Extension service responsibility

Carbon sequestration is going to be a disaster

The world is hungry and you want to limit production to save soil carbon. This is crazy! It seems that political correctness is more concerned with the "vision" of quality of life rather than the saving of life.

GHG is a myth!

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states. I doubt whether any Montana farmers had any input in this section.

This would be a good idea, but it will take quite a bit more money with the current incentive to farm these acres due to the high price of wheat.

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.aspx>

This assumes farmers are stupid and don't already consider these practices.

This is nothing more than a back door approach to conservation easements taking away the rights of Private property owners.

There is that word again "Incentives" How many incentives are there in this report. How much will it cost the taxpayer for all these incentives. We will not be able to retain the land in the conservation programs we will need it to grow corn for ethanol. This year it is estimated that the highest corn acres are being planted at 88 million. but where will we get 482 million need to replace all gasoline. That more than 5 times the size of the State of Montana

* U.S. gasoline consumption was 134 billion gallons in 2003.

* The USDA says that each bushel of corn is now producing about 2.7 gallons of fuel, and U.S. corn crops have averaged 138 bushels per acre over the past decade, for an average per-acre yield of about 375 gallons of ethanol.

* Thus, if ethanol and gasoline had the same energy content per unit volume, replacing all U.S. gasoline consumption with ethanol would require 357 million acres of cropland.

* However, the energy content of ethanol is lower than that of gasoline

Your going to have to pay for it. I mean we are going to have to pay for your program...

Offer incentives to farmers to grow food naturally.

Farmers can educate themselves and do quite well at keeping up on best practices.

Largely the state doesn't have the WATER resource available to make a measureable change to the carbon content in soil.

education is good

We have enough farm program give aways now.

With \$12.00 wheat, get out the check book.

farmers do not need P.C. interference

I like the idea of educating people, then letting them lead the way.

Land could be used for biofuels

Already being done by private groups.

Good idea.

Farmers will not see a benefit- better to wean them from synthetic industrial chemicals and promote local markets for their products.

Do not support carbon taxes, offsets, credits, nor sequestration. Reduce carbon output!!!

I fully support the extension and expansion of the CRP.

See comments to RC II-1 above. If this means continuation of CRP under another name, or for different reasons, however, consider the financial costs the program has had on rural communities. CRP has helped the land in some instances, but also hurt local economies.

Conservation on farms and riparian habitats, etc, YES. I don't think carbon sequestration is supported by science as being the answer.

I don't believe this should be our concentrated effort, although this information is important.

con games

No. More junk science.

Cultivated land is not the best source of carbon sequestration.

Again, who writes the propaganda?

CRP is ideal in areas that are marginal for agriculture.

The CRP program was missued and not set up for carbon sequestration. Just how much food do you want to buy from foreign countries and other states?

This is a good approach.

See the German program for alternative energy resources

Government telling landowners what to do. Another case of invasion of private property rights.

As lands come out of the bogus CRP program let's spend more taxpayer money to put them back in some other.

Money, money, money! Where will it come from?

Too costly.

It has always been my idea that government was to run the State; not the lives of its individuals.

Propaganda of Junk Science.

Sure, but don't sneak in a cap and trade.

There is no need to do anything about a problem that does not and will ever exist.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls**t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate. Nonsense

So you are going to educate farmers and ranchers. I guess the method is to give them money so they will sequester.....?

MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING IS BASED ON JUNK SCIENCE. PLEASE DO THE RESEARCH AND DON'T STEAL FROM THE PUBLIC THAT YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT!

CRP SHOULD ALL BE TAKEN OUT. IT AS KILLED OUR SCHOOLS SMALL TOWNS.

Why? Cost? Who pays the higher prices?

More welfare????

Our farmers need to be heard and helped in anyway they can without loading the cost on the consumer.

I would prefer planting fencerow-to-fencerow. Afterall, we'll need the extra acres to grow switchgrass & oilseeds for ethanol & biodiesel, right? Your points are beginning to contradict eachother.

carbon is not the problem.

Who is educating? Al Gore??

The CRP program was not set up for carbon sequestration and was missued. Cutting down production in this country encourages buying from foreign countries - why?

Agriculture is already aware of these benefits and programs that are part of the Farm Bill.

What the heck is "soil carbon"?

Sounds like you are trying to sew up more recreational land.

Some land should remain in CRP, but some should come out to provide use as feedstock for biodiesel or ethanol. Smart decisions must be made.

Excellent, but also work toward getting additional land into CRP. Establish a program similar to CRP for Montana.

Again, education, not propaganda.

Education is key...our universities can be instrumental in carrying this out.

This proposal fringes on invasion of private property rights and is unrealistic given the current price of grain.

How about protecting the soil carbon from volatilization from holocaustic forest fires on Federal land that invariably result in losses on private land also.

There is some scientific evidence that carbon sequestration actually harms the environment more than it helps. Let's wait for a little more research before we jump on this bandwagon.

Whatever you do has to provide the farmer with as much or more dollars than they would recieve through another farming practice.

Education is the best investment

This is important on many levels for environmental reasons and soils rebuilding purposes.

ARN'T WE DOING THIS ALREADY???

Preferably, put the CRP land back into CRP.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

I am worried about carbon sequestration. We have better options. Lets not go there.
utilize what is already available

Great idea!

It's already out there. You do not need to spend tax dollars on education. The market does that when it is profitable.

This recommendation is sound in my opinion and long overdue.

CRP ?

This should also include native grasslands that store a huge amount of storage. Support expansion of GRP.
This will do more to offset carbon loss than any other effort.

use farmland to grow food.

Only if private funds are used, no tax payer dollars.