

The Whole Farm Planner

VOLUME IV, NUMBER 3

OCTOBER 1999

Farm Profile—

A Farm System of Continuous Improvement

Whole farm planning often means a formal process of mapping out a farm's course. But just as often, whole farm planning happens over time, in small steps. The development of the farm system is a journey towards farm goals, a route defined by the skills and interests of the farm family and their financial and natural resources. In this kind of planning, farmers use their creativity to come up with an evolving but integrated system. What makes this incremental journey "whole farm planning" is a dedication to finding solutions that address multiple issues, and managing land, plants, animals, marketing, and financial and human resources so farm goals can be achieved.

Eloise Thorson, who with her husband, Mike, farms in central Minnesota, describes the kind of planning she and Mike do as "continuous improvement." "Every year we think we've got it down to a science, and every year it changes," she says. Continuing evaluation and change are built into their system. They keep good records, stay abreast of changes in regulations, markets, and technology, and look for ways to improve profitability each year. While Eloise has an off-farm job as an industrial trainer during the winter, Mike is on the farm, marketing their products, reading up on options for their farm, and designing new systems for the upcoming season.

Mike and Eloise raise vegetables and chickens on 320 acres of very sandy soil in central Minnesota. This is their tenth year of raising chickens outdoors, processing them on the farm, and selling them directly to consumers. Their farm enterprises are profitable, the soil is healthy, farm buildings and machines are in good repair, and the Thorsons enjoy their work and life on the farm, but they are always making changes for the better. This constant desire to keep learning and improving has been their way of farming for 25 years now.

BEEF, HOGS, CHICKENS

The chicken operation is one of several different enterprises they've tried since buying the farm in 1972. During the seventies, they raised beef, growing feed crops in their fields along the Long Prairie River. Pumping water from the river to irrigate the corn on their sandy soil was essential. When they bought the farm, the soil was low in organic matter and fertility, with low water-holding capacity. Mike remembers, "This farm was so poor when we bought it, my dad cried. It was so barren, it was all sandburs." Mike worked to improve his crop and livestock production, changing in the late seventies from beef to a farrow-to-finish hog operation.

The change was mostly to achieve better feed conversion. Since less feed would go into producing each pound of animal, Mike would increase the value of his crops. But in the mid-eighties, he says, "we could see the end of hogs." Fewer family farmers were raising hogs profitably, while there were more and more really big farms.

Then in 1988 came the drought. The Thorsons lost their water rights just when their crops needed the irrigation the most, because of the need to preserve minimum river flows. It was time to make another change. Continuing his quest for more efficient feed conversion, Mike began planning to raise chickens.

He had studied meat science in college, and worked in the Army as a meat inspector, so he felt he had the background to try processing the birds himself. On-farm processing of meats and direct sales of meat to consumers is fraught with bureaucracy and regulations, discouraging many farmers from trying. But Mike saw retailing birds he processed as a way to make the most money from each chicken, while providing his customers with higher-quality food.

"There's a lot of science to farming," he points out. He grinds and mixes his own feed, made of

Continuous Improvement, continued on next page.

Continuous Improvement, from page 1.

corn, soybeans and alfalfa. The chickens live in large fenced yards with automatic waterers, free access to feed, and shelters that allow them their choice of sun or shade. By keeping his birds in comfortable conditions, with a minimum of stress up to seconds before butchering, and by overseeing scalding, plucking, chilling, cleaning and freezing, Mike can be sure the meat will be delicious.

This system of on-farm processing and retail sales is possible because meat processing laws allow up to 20,000 chickens to be processed on-farm with a state license, rather than a USDA license. Mike says that 20,000 is a reasonable number of chickens for a family farm to raise and process. He can achieve some economies of scale, such as buying his feed and wood-shaving litter by the truckload, and buying large numbers of chicks, but the enterprise is still small enough for him and Eloise to manage themselves.

The processing house is built in a former corn storage bin. "It's the only round plant in the state," Mike jokes. Four other bins stand empty, now that he no longer grows corn. Buying feed for the birds makes better financial sense than growing it.

Eloise and Mike bring chickens to farmers' markets, take orders and deliver chickens to other towns, and sell thousands of chickens right on the farm. Their reputation for quality has grown, and they have customers who show up at the farm with large coolers and even chest freezers in their trucks to take hundreds at a time.

FEED CROPS, VEGETABLES

Instead of animal feed, Mike is now growing vegetables. During the dry years, of all the plants in the family garden, winter squash consistently produced a crop for them. So he decided to try growing squash, now that irrigation during dry spells was no longer an option. Mike has found that squash is an excellent crop for his sandy soil, and he grows 50 acres, wholesaling most of the crop.

Like many farmers, he says he has a hard time finding help, "let alone for hard labor." So he spends his time and energy during the winter on designing and building labor-saving devices that increase efficiency and make work more pleasant for his crew. Parts of an old irrigation system and a salvaged conveyor belt are now a squash harvesting

machine. The harvest crew walks behind the conveyor belt, picking squash and placing each one on the belt. This way they have to lift only one squash at a time, rather than lugging boxes of squash through the field.

All chicken wastes, including manure, litter, processing house washwater, and composted entrails and feathers, are applied to the fields to build soil organic matter and fertility. Mike's system also relies on small grains in rotation with the vegetables to reduce pest and weed pressure.

FUTURE PLANS

When Mike and Eloise look at the future of their farm, they have plenty of new ideas. They look for new opportunities that will fit in with their farm resources, desired lifestyle, abilities, and labor pool. By law, their chicken business is maxed-out at 20,000 birds per year, so they won't expand production. Instead, they hope to refine their marketing, possibly selling more birds at the farm or at pre-ordered drop-offs, and reducing the number of long drives they make to farmers' markets.

Mike is planning a possible expansion of his vegetable business. He has enough land to easily add more crops to his rotation, and he's considering drilling a well for center-pivot irrigation, so he can grow vegetables that need more water. Last year, he converted a former piglet nursery into a growth chamber for germinating his cabbage seedlings, and manufactured a plug seeder using salvaged materials, including an old vacuum.

He and Eloise are relaxed as they face changes in their business, because they feel they are in control of their evolving farm plan, not driven by outside forces. They both mention that they have set their sights high, not on just making a living, but on having an enjoyable life on their farm, and they work to support their idea of a good life.

—Jill MacKenzie

Comprehensive Planning for California Ranches

An excellent farm planning program is underway in California. Developed by ranchers, University of California Cooperative Extension, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the Rangeland Water Quality Management Plan is voluntary, comprehensive, and flexible enough to accommodate the diversity of livestock grazing operations in the state.

Ranchers in California, as in much of the West, graze their livestock over large acreages, usually a combination of privately-owned and federal lands. Drinking water in the state is not abundant, and many ranches are in the watersheds of municipal water supplies. In the late eighties, California ranchers became aware of the impact their operations were having on drinking water, and saw a possibility of federal regulators stepping in.

Chuck Pritchard, a cattle rancher who was president of the California Association of Resource Conservation Districts while the Rangeland Water Quality Management Plan was developed, considers that the farming mindset in the western states is different from elsewhere. "There's so much federal land out here, we all have to deal with the government a lot. We've come to have a certain distrust, and a desire to avoid more regulation."

Chuck and others worked to make the planning process a success, so ranchers could solve water quality problems without more regulation. Unlike processes developed for individual watersheds, the Range Water Quality Plan has to work for ranchers in very different situations. California is a large state with varied climate and topography. The chances of a regulatory approach succeeding were slim, because individual ranchers are the only people likely to understand their own ranch's resources. A narrow, prescriptive planning process would also be unlikely to gain acceptance, or to be of real value to ranchers.

TAPPING BRAINPOWER

The program that the group created is more than just an approach to improving water quality for urban populations. It also is intended to help ranchers improve forage quality, soil health, and water quality and quantity on their ranches. Through the process, which includes workshops and individual tasks, ranchers are encouraged to use the knowledge and expertise of conservationists, Extension staff, their families, and other ranchers.

Chuck says it's important to the ongoing viability of each operation that ranchers "tap into all the brainpower and expertise out there," rather than always trying to come up with solutions on their own.

Through the program, ranchers consider long-term sustainability of their businesses, many of which are now in the hands of fourth and fifth generations of families on the same land. Generational transfer is part of many ranchers' plans.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Ranchers participating in the Range Water Quality Plan attend a short course put on by Extension. Chuck notes that the cooperation of Extension and NRCS has been a strong element of the program's success so far. "Extension has the educational expertise. NRCS has the technical expertise. It's a good marriage of talents."

Short course participants begin by setting goals for production, finances, quality of life and natural resources. They complete inventories of their facilities and natural resources. They complete a description of their ranches' livestock and wildlife, and the amount of forage necessary for these animals. The last assessment considers water resources; erosion and other sources of sediment, nutrient or pathogen loading; and any other areas the rancher considers a problem.

Each rancher then goes on to identify changes to be made and to prioritize planned actions. Chuck wrote a ten-year plan for his cattle ranch. He says that plans have to work both for the ranch business and for the environment. A plan must be economically viable, an improvement for more than just one facet of the environment and an overall improvement for the watershed, and private.

PRIVACY

Privacy of information is very important to ranchers and to the developers of the program, yet it's also important to be able to document participation in the program. Ranchers completing a plan file a letter of intent, either at home, with their local conservation district, or with their regional water quality board, stating that they are implementing a water quality management strategy. They don't have to file the plan itself with the district, nor do they specify what it includes. Chuck notes that working with a government agency to devise a

Ranches, continued on next page.

Ranches, from page 4.

plan, then being allowed to keep the plan private, while still committing to implementing it, is a “trust-building thing.”

Ranchers can choose to work with agencies to develop plans that are not confidential. In some cases, these ranchers would be recognized for their conservation work, and could be eligible for cost-sharing for changes they make to improve natural resources on their property. These recognized plans could also serve as legal support against potential nuisance complaints.

SAN FRANCISCO’S WATER

More important than any regulation or inspection could be, Chuck says, is the enthusiasm and commitment of individual ranchers to improving water quality and other ranch resources. “What makes something like this work is people believing it’s going to work,” he says. Ranchers have good reason to believe this voluntary, confidential program could be successful, as do cities, after ranchers in the San Francisco public water supply watershed worked out plans to protect the city’s water. Cryptosporidium had been found in the water, and the city wanted to shut down all grazing in the watershed. Ranchers in the area began researching sources of the pathogen and found that feral pigs, horses, and young calves were the primary sources of cryptosporidium. Due to their immature immune systems, calves tend to harbor more pathogens than older animals.

Shutting down grazing operations would have been overkill. Instead, each rancher made changes to keep young calves out of the watershed, while still grazing other animals within it. This good-faith effort is a model for other ranchers and other watersheds.

NETWORK CRITERIA ALL MET

How does the Rangeland Water Quality Plan measure up to the criteria developed by the Great Lakes Basin Farm Planning Network? In a word, perfectly! This rancher-driven, agency-supported program encompasses goal-setting, environmental enhancement, improved profitability, confidentiality, and ongoing monitoring.

Each ranch will be the subject of different kinds of monitoring, as each rancher sees fit. Some will sample water, some will document in photographs the work they’re doing to improve riparian habitat, some will keep records of vegetative cover in their fields or of changes in stocking rates or wildlife presence. These data will help substantiate what

ranchers and other involved in the program believe will be improvements in water quality and other natural resources.

One of the goals of the program is to avoid an antagonistic relationship between ranchers and agencies. By volunteering to monitor and to make changes as needed, ranchers are meeting regulators half way. By allowing ranchers privacy and assisting them in projects as they wish, rather than dictating actions, agencies and local units of government are meeting the ranchers, too.

CHUCK’S PLAN

Chuck Pritchard acknowledges that the program is derived from many sources of information and inspiration, and “embraces many different philosophies.” But it doesn’t matter where ideas come from if the process works, he says. His ten-year plan, written after attending a workshop in San Luis Obispo County, includes improvement of riparian areas on his 13,000-acre ranch. Rather than completely excluding livestock from streams, he’s putting in fencing to create narrow “riparian fields” along the streams. Cattle will graze these areas only infrequently and for short periods, allowing regrowth of woody species that shade the streams and keep the water cool.

The change in vegetation along the streams will probably encourage more wildlife, such as game birds, coyote and bobcat, to frequent the riparian areas. Small Tule elk are also resident on the ranch. Chuck is planning to open his ranch for recreation, and is designing backcountry shelters to be used by hunters and hikers. These visitors could be a source of income for the ranch.

FURTHER PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Chuck’s plan is one of 314, covering 797,000 acres, completed since 1994. Mel George, an Extension range and pasture specialist working with the program, says that as long as ranchers keep coming to the short courses, the courses will be offered. He notes that the Cattlemen’s Association has been actively encouraging its members to attend the courses and complete plans for their ranches.

Extension researchers are working now to develop monitoring processes that ranchers can use after writing and implementing plans, to document their progress in improving water quality. The program is also being expanded to include croplands. Extension and NRCS staff who work with growers of wine grapes, vegetables, and fruits are organizing short courses to help these farmers write and implement whole farm plans.

—Jill MacKenzie

Balancing Economics and Sustainability on Grazing Lands in Australia: Guidelines for Ranchers

Editor's note: Australia is a hotbed of whole farm planning activity. Government agencies, agricultural organizations, even high school classes, are all involved in developing integrated farm management systems. The following article was submitted by researchers at CSIRO, a federal research and development agency with a facility in Queensland devoted to tropical agriculture. Get out your atlases!

The shift to whole farm planning has been gaining momentum worldwide in the past decade. This shifting emphasis from efficiently running individual farm enterprises (e.g. livestock breeding, cereal cropping) to placing all of the resources available to farm family units within a goal-driven context is certainly alive in Australia today.

There are many models and definitions for whole farm planning, but most have a common theme centered on the purposeful integration of economic, production and environmental concerns within farm decision-making. Decision-making necessarily involves a need to address conflicting interests and objectives, otherwise there would be no decisions to make.

The elements of a successful plan should include information about available resources (including amounts and qualities), alternative options and, finally, a plan that is acted upon and refined to meet ongoing or changing goals. One objective of whole farm planning that is often acknowledged is the desire to have the process enhance natural resources and the environment. However, attaining this goal necessarily requires the ecological options and consequences of different management alternatives to be explicitly recognized and highlighted within the planning and decision-making process.

Many farmers are often incorrectly portrayed as having limited environmental interests. The rapid growth of the Landcare movement is a rebuttal to that idea. [*Landcare is a grassroots movement in Australia that encourages communities to take local action to reduce degradation of natural resources.*] However, moving from a *desire* to maintain the quality of the natural resources that farmers manage, or that constitute the environment within which they live, to *action* on the ground is less assured. Clear guidelines or principles to ensure sustainable resource management within the context of commercial farming are necessary.

THE CSIRO PRINCIPLES

The Grazed Lands Management Group at CSIRO Tropical Agriculture has developed such a set of guidelines or principles. These principles, which are backed up by scientific evidence and practical observations in managing woodlands, balance

resource conservation with property development and management.

In developing the principles, members of the CSIRO team worked with a technical panel, drawing together experts in fields such as soil, wildlife and hydrology. Neil MacLeod, Senior Research Scientist with CSIRO, said there had been some initial skepticism by producers relating to the practical application of the principles. "We recognize that for many producers it is difficult to implement the principles," Neil says. "However, by working with producers, we hope to explore practical ways to achieve better management. In some cases it may be possible to find cheaper alternatives or management compromises."

The six overarching principles cover the main components of production in grassy woodlands, and the team is working on many layers of detail beneath the six principles. The principles will be applied to each of four case-study properties. An economic model incorporating the likely changes to farm management practices is almost complete. This will allow a "before and after" comparison in terms of economics. By early next year, a clearer picture should emerge on how the principles will impact property management.

The six key Land Management Principles are:

- 1 Property planning and management should include a long-term vision, which considers the whole of the property and its place in the catchment. [*Catchment=watershed.*]
- 2 Manage soils to prevent erosion and maintain productive capacity and water quality.
- 3 Manage pastures for production and maintain productive capacity and water quality.
- 4 Maintain native trees for the long-term ecological health of the property and catchment.
- 5 Manage at least 10% of the property for wildlife values.
- 6 Watercourses are particularly important to the ecosystem and grazing enterprise, and require special management.

Moving beyond these principles to strategies has not been tried on a practical scale. The results from whole properties should be more realistic and applicable to producers than research approaches concentrating on smaller scales, such as the trial plots and small paddocks typically found on research

Australia, continued on next page.

stations. Opportunities to adopt new management strategies and barriers preventing change will be identified.

PILOT PROJECT ON FOUR RANCHES

Using the principles, the research group is exploring ways to balance production and resource conservation on four case study properties in southeast Queensland. To achieve these objectives, current management strategies and their impact on property resources and economics were examined. The bottom line for an alternative set of strategies, specifically aimed to balance production and conservation, were also examined. Barriers to, and opportunities for, combining production and conservation were identified. Property profiles were developed using the layout of the properties, their available resources, general condition and the use of pastures throughout the year.

One property, typical of the more southern properties in the study, contains 1765 hectares and is divided into 15 paddocks. A stockroute adjoins the eastern boundary and a creek runs through the middle of the property. The property supports open, grassy, eucalypt woodlands and forests, and layered open forests with a diversity of dominants. The stocking rate is about 1 beast to 6 hectares. [*6 hectares is about 2.5 acres.*]

The soil surface condition is relatively good and, apart from a few sites, is adequately protected from surface erosion. Principle 2 states that “no more than 30-40% of the ground surface” should be exposed. On this property, the proportion of bare sites is low compared with the threshold. Grasses on the property are native, with no intensive development of pastures. Conservative grazing here ensures that tussock grasses, which provide shelter for birds, reptiles, small mammals, and invertebrates, dominate the pastures.

Principle 3 deals with maintaining local native trees to ensure long-term ecological health of the property and the catchment. Maintaining a range of tree species in all the land types on the property conserves the genetic diversity of tree types. By estimating the amount of woodland on each land type, using GIS surveys, we found that although the property reached the 30% woodland cover goal for the whole property, some land types had fewer trees and needed regeneration or replanting. Revegetating the required buffer zones along watercourses in these areas would bring the amount of trees up to 30%. Overall, this property falls largely within the thresholds set down by the Land Management Principles, with issues related to tree density the main areas to be addressed.

After developing the property scenarios, the next

step was consultation with the landholders. One important recommendation in managing watercourses is to fence riparian buffer zones to protect watercourses and to create wildlife corridors. This raised much discussion with the farmers because of the high expense, both immediate and long-term. Costs include installing water points for cattle, the erection and long-term maintenance of fencing, the loss of productive riparian land, and the loss of cattle access to waterways.

The farmers agreed that the ecological and economic sustainability of grazing lands is dependent on meeting the ecological thresholds set out in the principles. However, they feel that the costs should not be incurred by the rural landholders without some form of compensation from government or relevant authorities.

The Land Management Principles developed by the CSIRO team are not regulatory. They are merely guidelines by which to ensure sustainability in grazing lands. Final decision-making must address conflicting interests and objectives in the integration of economic, production and environmental issues.

—Jan Green

Jan is Project Officer for the Grazed Landscapes Management Project, part of CSIRO Tropical Agriculture in Queensland, Australia.

The Whole Farm Planner is published by The Minnesota Project, coordinating organization of the Great Lakes Whole Farm Planning Network. The Network brings together farmers, farm service providers, sustainable agriculture groups and farm organizations to develop and disseminate information about whole farm planning. The project, begun in January, 1995, involves working groups in Ontario and each of the Great Lakes states. The Network is funded by the Great Lakes Protection Fund, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, and the Joy Foundation.

The Minnesota Project is a nonprofit organization dedicated to environmental protection and sustainable development in rural Minnesota.

For more information, contact John Lamb at The Minnesota Project: 1885 University Avenue West, Suite 315, St. Paul, MN 55104; email: water007@tc.umn.edu; 651-645-6159.

Permission to reprint articles is granted in advance; please acknowledge this source. To suggest articles for *The Whole Farm Planner*, contact editor Loni Kemp at The Minnesota Project, RR1 Box 81B, Canton, MN 55922; lkemp@tc.umn.edu; 507-743-8300.

Jill MacKenzie, production editor.

US Ag Policy in Desperate Need of Whole Farm Approach

As Congress goes into final negotiations on another \$7.6 billion emergency bailout for farmers, one has to ask “How could they?”

How could they throw such massive dollars at a problem for the second year in a row without even a glimmer of an attempt to fix the problem?

How could they do nothing to curb production, when prices are shockingly low, surpluses are high, and world markets are stagnant?

How could they spend such vast resources without trying to target those in need? Effectively doubling 1999 commodity payments, and doubling maximum benefits on Loan Deficiency Payments, Congress deems the bigger the farm, the bigger the subsidy, whether they need it or not, and whether the owner is actively farming or not.

How could they forget about tying subsidies to conservation? Payments could have been used to clean up water pollution, for example. Instead, taxpayers will see little public benefit from this handout.

One can only hope that this debacle will be widely recognized as the symbol of a bankrupt farm policy, and become a catalyzing force for new policies.

Helping save farmers in their time of need is surely a worthy goal. But farm policy should also:

- Help farmers protect soil, water, and air quality, rewarding landowners for some of the public benefits they provide to us all.
- Stabilize production and prices to soften wild swings in the market.
- Ensure a fair level of income for small and moderate sized operators, who are least able to survive low prices or bad weather.
- Secure a diverse family farm structure, where independent farmers own most of the land and make their own decisions.

Congress should integrate these goals into a new flexible program, where farmers receive support according to the amount of social and environmental benefits they provide. Whole farm plans seem to be the obvious mechanism for such a needed policy.

The growing recognition that a sustainable farm sector must be simultaneously profitable, protective of a healthy environment, and good for rural communities leads to a policy where farmers are

rewarded at a level that matches their contribution in all three areas.

Another reason to change US agriculture policies is to meet international trade agreements. New requirements call for nations to reduce domestic farm support. Environmental and natural resource farm subsidy programs falling within the so-called “green box” will be the only ones fully allowed in the future.

POLICY PROPOSALS

Fortunately, an abundance of alternative policy ideas is springing from a common longing for sensible farm policies. These proposals each call for a farm plan as a basis for government support.

Stewardship Payments: Replace the commodity program with incentive payments for whole farm plans that meet environmental goals. Support farmers in proportion to conservation benefits provided. Farmers would create a whole farm plan to address multiple conservation objectives, such as water quality, soil quality, and wildlife habitat. This voluntary plan would meet and exceed all requirements of regulatory agencies. Green payments would rise as the plan achieves more benefits. Senator Tom Harkin introduced the Conservation Stewardship Act of 1999 as one version of stewardship payments.

Conservation Farm Option: CFO is a vehicle already enacted into law as a pilot in the 1996 farm bill, though USDA bungled the funding and it has not yet been implemented. CFO combines conservation practices and land retirement into a ten-year whole farm plan. The more a farmer does for conservation, the higher the payment. Farmers could opt to protect water quality, provide wildlife habitat, control erosion, reduce chemical and fertilizer use, adopt integrated pest management, or whatever combination of conservation practices works best on their farm. Funding is all that is needed to launch CFO.

Environmental Reserve Program: Sometimes referred to as a short-term Conservation Reserve Program, this conservation-based supply management program would compensate farmers for two or three year enrollments that provide environmental benefits and reduce crop production. It would give USDA a tool to reduce production in response to depressed markets in a more flexible manner than the 10-15 year CRP enrollments. Farmers would submit bids to either take land out of production or change production

Policy, continued next page.

Policy, continued from page 7.

practices, to both reduce production and provide environmental benefit.

Farm Results Index: Besides food and fiber, farms produce many of the public goods desired by society. These public goods include rural culture, beautiful landscapes, food with regional distinctiveness, wildlife habitat and clean water. Land Stewardship Project proposes an annual awarding of points to each farm according to total benefits provided to society. The more points, the more dollars that farmer receives. This flexible, outcome-oriented program could lead to more successful small farms and a better environment.

National Soil Quality Goal: Producers who implement a comprehensive land care plan would receive a variety of financial incentives, including reduced loan rates and crop insurance premiums. The farm plan would encompass all natural resources

(water, soil, plant, animal, air) in the context of a sustainable farming system. In addition, all agricultural land would have to achieve minimum erosion standards and protect wetlands before being eligible for any benefits, including crop insurance.

Expanded Environmental Quality Incentives Program: Encourage automatic, continuous enrollment in EQIP for producers who apply a whole farm plan, including conservation tillage, nutrient management, pest management, and conservation buffers. EQIP funding would be significantly raised and payment rates increased.

As farmers all across America rally for help in this time of crisis, our leaders need to listen to concrete proposals such as these. Whole farm planning is a tool for achieving integrated goals of agricultural policy, and it is time to put it into action.

—Loni Kemp