

# *The Whole Farm Planner*

---

VOLUME VI, NUMBER 1

AUGUST 2001

A note from the editor:

After a one-year pause in publication of the Whole Farm Planner, we are pleased to be back with a new focus on policy. Watch for three issues a year bringing you news and information about national farm policy and how the benefits of whole farm planning can be incorporated into the next farm bill.

For five years we brought you stories on whole farm planning, including current research, programs, farmer profiles, and thoughtful analyses. During that time The Minnesota Project coordinated the Great Lakes Basin Farm Planning Network, and convened diverse groups in each of seven States and Ontario to develop and disseminate information about whole farm planning. That project has now been successfully completed.

We acknowledge and thank our previous editor, Jill MacKenzie, who has moved on to a position in the Department of Horticultural Science at the University of Minnesota. Congratulations to John Lamb, who has retired from his position at The Minnesota Project to take over the family farm in Iowa, where he is now engaged in developing a real life whole farm plan.

As we turn to a new phase of our work focusing on national conservation policy, exciting ideas and new partnerships are in the air. The Whole Farm Planner will continue to keep you informed and involved. As always, we mail this newsletter with our compliments. Please let us know if you would prefer to have your name removed from the list.

We welcome story ideas and submissions. We hope you enjoy the **new** Whole Farm Planner.

--Loni Kemp

## **Conservation Security Act Reintroduced by 54 Cosponsors Incoming Senate Chair Says Green Payments Certain**

The Conservation Security Act of 2001 was reintroduced into Congress in late May. This important legislation, again led in the Senate by Tom Harkin (D-IA) and Gordon Smith (R-OR) along with 17 senators, was also carried in the House by John Thune (R-SD) and Marcy Kaptur (D-OH) and 33 Representatives.

The Conservation Security Act of 2001 rewards producers who implement resource-conserving conservation practices on working lands. Through a voluntary, incentive-based individual farm plan, producers will have the opportunity to address a full range of conservation concerns related to agriculture, including soil, water and energy conservation, wetland and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement, and greenhouse gas emissions reduction and carbon sequestration.

For many farmers, the Conservation Security Act offers a fresh new approach to federal farm

assistance. It provides annual payments to producers who implement conservation practices without idling productive land. Many producers who have been largely ignored by past commodity and conservation programs will benefit from this program.

The stewardship incentives in the Conservation Security Act will complement other conservation programs already in place. Participants in the new program will have the opportunity to develop conservation security plans that identify targeted resources, with maximum flexibility for choosing land management practices suitable for their individual farms.

Only days after reintroduction of the bill, the shakeup in the Senate suddenly made prospects for the bill even brighter. Iowa Sen. Tom Harkin said his appointment as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee would help assure passage of his proposal

*(Continued on page 6)*

# Farm Profile: Implementation of the Conservation Security Act:

## *Developing a Conservation Security Plan for a Corn & Soybean Row Crop Farm*

*Editor's note: This is the first in a series exploring hypothetical implementation of conservation security plans on several real farms. Names and some details have been changed.*

**Farm Location:** Fillmore County, Minnesota.

**Farm Size:** 1100 acres

**Geographic Setting:** Hilly karst limestone area of highly erodible soils. Drainage is into the South Fork Root River, about 45 miles west of its confluence with the Mississippi River.

### **Farm History**

Jerry Smith is what many might call the new generation of conventional farmers. He and his two brothers have followed their father into farming to maximize their income by raising the commodity crops of corn and soybeans for domestic and export markets. Jerry's thousand acres is matched by the rest of his family's 3000 acres of corn and soybeans.

All their land is located in an area of Fillmore County in Southeastern Minnesota that was once characterized by 240-acre size diversified family farming operations. In the 1960s, a diversified farm in this area consisted of a rotation of corn, alfalfa and small grains such as oats, barley, wheat, and possibly some soybeans. The rotations maximized soil nutrition and minimized disease. Most farms also had a herd of beef or dairy cows, finished several hundred hogs a year, and raised some chickens for the family and neighbors. Times have changed.

As a young farmer trying to support a family in the world of modern, industrial agriculture, Jerry has learned to farm for the federal commodity subsidies. The part of the family operation that he manages includes 1000 acres of row crops and 100 acres of alfalfa hay. His crop sequence consists of two years of corn, followed by a year of soybeans. According to Jerry, his farm plan is driven 100% by what the USDA will pay him to grow, and a quick look at his USDA payments will indicate why this is the driving force.

In the year 2000, Jerry received \$56,000 from the government in crop subsidy payments and emergency market payments. Of this amount, \$28,000 was his annual AMTA (Agricultural Marketing Transition Act) payment, and the remaining \$28,000 was from emergency payments that Congress allocated to producers facing low market prices. In addition, the government subsidized the price he received for his corn and soybeans through the Loan Deficiency Program.

### **Current Production Plan:**

The profiled farm currently has 650 acres of corn and 350 acres of soybeans. The one hundred acres of alfalfa/grass hay is sold to local farmers and some is fed to Jerry's own cattle. These fields are not contiguous, but are a collection of owned and rented fields in various nearby locations.

To maximize production with a minimum of labor, the Smith farm has embraced the use of genetically engineered Roundup-Ready soybeans to allow for maximum use of herbicides in weed suppression.

In a feedlot located next to the farmstead's barns, Jerry feeds his grain to about 150 Holstein steers for the commercial beef market. These steers are purchased at about 400 pounds at the nearby livestock auction, and are sold at the same livestock arena when they are ready for butcher. During the winter months the steers are confined to the feedlot, but during the growing season they have access to a very small pasture that straddles a dry run drainage behind the farmstead.

On the Smith family land, nearly all of the brushy small woodlots and windbreaks have been removed to expand the boundaries of the cropland. The only remaining wooded land on the Smith Farm is a stand of burr oak occupying the steeper slopes, where Smith's father grazes a small herd of beef cows and their calves.

### **Current Conservation Plan**

To comply with commodity program requirements, the operator currently implements the following **erosion control** conservation practices on his Highly Erodible Land.

- No use of moldboard plow except when converting ground from hay to a row crop.
- Fall tilling must leave 40% to 60% residue in the field.
- The operator must use minimum till practices in the spring.
- Grass waterways must be established and maintained. All row crops must be planted on contours.
- Operator must conduct soil nutrient testing every three years.

### **Implementation of Conservation Security Act: Development of a Conservation Plan**

If the proposed bill were law today, development of a

*(Continued on page 3)*

(Farm Profile Continued from page 2)

**Conservation Security Plan** on this farm would offer the following opportunities:

- Enhanced conservation of on-farm resources.
- Increase environmental benefits for the public.
- Provide the farm operator with annual payments to develop and maintain the practices.

The operator of this farm could choose to implement a **Conservation Security Plan** at any of the three Tiers that follow, and could opt to phase in the practices over time. The actual amount of the annual payment, up to the maximum level, would be based on the environmental benefits expected; the number, costs and timing of management practices; income forgone due to land use adjustments; and several other factors.

**Tier I: Increasing Conservation Practices. Maximum annual payment: \$20,000.**

A Tier I Conservation Plan for this farm would start with rewarding Smith's current erosion-control conservation practices.

- Soil testing and nutrient management.
- Soil conservation/erosion control: continued fall residue management, minimum till spring soil preparation, and maintenance of grass waterways.
- Contour planting of all crops.

**New conservation practices could be added to the plan.**

- Increase the width of grass waterways from 10 feet to 30 feet, and construct sediment dams.
- Control invasive species such as buckthorn and box elder on field perimeters.
- Leave a few rows of corn for the deer and wild turkeys each fall.
- Explore opportunities for integrated pest management and control, including on-farm pesticide training and education programs.
- Keep accurate conservation records and monitor impact of practices.

**Tier II: Making land-use changes on the entire farm. Maximum annual payment: \$35,000.**

The successful implementation of a Tier I Conservation Plan could be expanded to the **Tier II** level, which would include the full range of practices in Tier I applied to all fields, and incorporate one or more of the following land use adjustment or protection practices:

- Develop a plan of resource-conserving crop rotations on land currently used only for corn and soybeans. Rotations might add a year of oats, providing the straw for the strong local market, into which beans could be "stubble planted" for a

second crop. Adding two to three years of hay is a good option, if attention is paid to marketing the hay.

- Convert 40-80 acres of the 1000 acres of cropland currently producing soil-depleting corn and soybeans to a soil-conserving use such as permanent pasture. The lowest land in the swales and drainage ways could be seeded into pasture, and grazed in the fall after surrounding grains are harvested.
- Incorporate fall/spring cover crops into planting schedule on soybean ground.
- Install partial field conservation practices such as filter strips and contour buffer strips for erosion control and wildlife habitat. Consider hazelnut plantings on the strips, purchased from a local breeder of native hazelnut varieties.

**Tier III: Total Farm Resource Conservation: Maximum annual payment of \$50,000.**

The successful implementation of a Tier III Conservation Plan would include **all of the conservation practices listed in the Tier I and Tier II levels**, and integrate a full complement of conservation practices that would foster environmental enhancement and the long-term sustainability of the entire natural resource base of an agricultural operation.

- Expand new permanent pasture acreage to 150 acres, establishing native grassland species to favor wildlife. Put in fencing and access to water to develop new naturally raised beef for niche markets, incorporating rotational grazing.
- Begin transition to organic certification on some crop fields.
- Implement a new pesticide program aimed at zero-use of chemical pesticides. Implement a weed control program that incorporates use of rotary hoe and other mechanical methods in conjunction with crop rotations and cover cropping.
- Plant alternative soil-building crops – like buckwheat, canola, or sunflowers -- to diversify marketing opportunities.
- Establish new permanent woodland on marginal soils such as the burr oak hilltops, drainage ways, and certain areas hard to reach with the tractor. Restore the original oak savannah habitat and fence the cattle out.
- Develop on-farm energy conservation programs that incorporate alternative energy systems such as putting in a wind power turbine, and converting equipment to bio-diesel fuels.

--Mike McGrath

*Mike McGrath is a consultant to The Minnesota Project, as well as a journalist and farmer from Lanesboro, MN.*

# A Watershed Alliance Advocates Farm Policy Change

It is not unusual for a watershed organization to identify strategies to solve agricultural pollution; after all, agriculture is the dominant land use in many areas and it is not surprising that it leads in contributions to pollution. What is a bit unusual is for a watershed organization to look to the underlying causes of change in agricultural systems. And it is the rare watershed organization that actually takes a stand on federal farm policy, recognizing how it drives the problems in their own local watershed. Yet that is exactly what BALMM, the Basin Alliance for the Lower Mississippi in Minnesota, has done.

The landscape of southeastern Minnesota is a patchwork of cultivated fields, forested slopes and deeply cut river valleys that drain into the Mississippi River. This lower Mississippi River basin encompasses the watersheds of four rivers that drain over 4 million acres of agricultural lands.

In the eastern part of the basin, the rolling hills that give way to steep, valley slopes are capped with highly erodible soils. In the more level, western part of the basin, years of intensive agricultural production have eliminated nearly half of the original wetlands that once dotted the landscape in pre-settlement times.

Recent studies by the Natural Resource Conservation Service through its National Resource Inventory show that there has been a shift occurring in the basin's agriculture production away from diverse rotational cropping and pasturing of livestock, towards an increase in intensive row crop production, specifically corn and soybeans.

The impact of this change on the landscape has led to an increase in soil erosion, a decrease in water quality and the degradation of a rich ecosystem in the alluvial floodplains of the Mississippi River.

Soil and water resource professionals are increasingly challenged to find solutions to these impacts upon the landscape. More and more, efforts to protect and improve water quality are being organized by major drainage basin, bypassing traditional political boundaries so that greater resource coordination can be achieved. Resource management professionals realize that no one agency alone can provide all the technical assistance needed to mitigate the environmental impacts that derive from modern agricultural systems.

## A Basin Alliance

Addressing water quality issues in this karst topography region of Southeastern Minnesota requires planning, education and cooperation among multiple resource agencies and private landowners.

The Basin Alliance for the Lower Mississippi in Minnesota (BALMM), formed in 1999, is a locally led alliance of land and water resource agencies that serves

to provide coordination on an entire basin level to unify efforts to protect and improve water quality throughout Minnesota's Lower Mississippi River Basin.

This new Basin Alliance is comprised of resource professionals from Minnesota's Board of Water and Soil Resources, the Minnesota Departments of Health, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Pollution Control, field staff of local Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) offices and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and local Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) offices.

## A Strategy for Action

Within its first year, this ad-hoc alliance of resource conservation professionals has developed a Lower Mississippi River Basin Plan that identifies pollutant-specific water quality goals and strategies for achieving those goals.

This plan focuses on broad areas: watershed management, aquifer protection, and floodplain management. Within the context of these broader goals, the Alliance identified seven land-use strategies that can be implemented to achieve the comprehensive area strategies. These include:

- Perennial Vegetation: Increasing acreage of hay and pastureland, vegetative buffer strips, and woodland.
- Wetland Protection: Working with landowners to restore wetland functions in critical parts of the landscape.
- Soil Conservation on Row Crop Land: Promoting conservation tillage, contour farming and installing needed structures to keep erosion at or below replacement rate of soil erosion.
- Urban and Rural-Residential Land Management: Reducing impacts of urban storm water and wastewater, while managing urban development.
- Nutrient and Pesticide Management: Promoting optimal use of fertilizer and chemicals to minimize runoff and leaching from farm fields and urban land.
- Animal Feedlot Management: Supporting the implementation of new state feedlot rules to reduce feedlot runoff and improve manure management.
- Aggregate Mining Activities Management: Minimizing the potential impacts on ground water and surface water from quarry activities.

Current Midwest farming systems are contributing to surface water pollution, groundwater pollution, a zone of hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico, increased flooding, loss of wildlife habitat, degradation of natural ecosystems,

*(Continued on page 7)*

# **Absentee Owners Incorporate Conservation Planning on the Family Farm**

## **An Opportunity**

“Whenever there is an opportunity to tie conservation to farm payments there is a tremendous opportunity for advancement,” states Rick Hansen, supervisor of the Pesticide Licensing Program at the Minnesota Department of Agriculture. Rick is not only an MDA employee he is also an owner of a farm located in southeastern Minnesota. Rick was speaking of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), in which his family farm has been enrolled in since 1997.

He was most attracted to the program because it, offered an incentive to combine conservation practices with responsible farming. EQIP was established in the 1996 Federal Farm Bill in order to provide a voluntary conservation program to farmers who recognize natural resource problems on their farm. Rick realized that through EQIP he had the opportunity to address resource concerns present on the farm and at the same time improve the quality of the land.

## **Developing A Plan**

Prior to 1997, the Fillmore County farm had been on Rick’s mother’s side for two full generations, operated by Rick’s uncle. When he died, Rick became the personal representative for the estate. Rick owns 50% of the land and two of his cousins each own 25% of the remaining land. A local farmer, Bob Phillips, rents the land from Rick and takes care of the daily operations on the farm. Rick and his cousins are actively involved in the planning and management of the farm.

When Rick was asked if he had developed a whole farm plan for his acres he said, “The plan that has been implemented is, in essence, a whole farm plan. But when my cousin and I were looking at which resource needs were greatest, the term ‘whole farm plan’ was not quite yet articulated. We had examined all the resource problems on the farm. We developed plans and have begun implementing them in order to improve the quality of the farm.”

He enrolled one tract of 114 acres in the program. Another tract of 157 acres is in organic production. Rick received a 5-year, \$10,000 EQIP contract to develop best management practices. “The largest advantage in the program is that the flexibility of a five year contract allows you to schedule practices

over time. Big projects can be started at the beginning of the contract and you are able to spread out costs. You don’t have to get all the projects done at once,” says Hansen.

## **Plan Implementation: Rotations in Action**

The first step for Rick and his renter were to get soil samples tested, which had never been done before. Of the 114 acres only 75 are tillable. The farm is located in the Karst region where thin soils overlie fractured limestone. A good portion of the land is on very hilly ground and erosion is high if the soil is not protected. A number of gullies on the acres contribute to soil erosion. Noticing that heavy rainfalls, increased the width and depth of the gullies to cause large amounts of soil erosion, Rick knew that this problem needed to be examined immediately.

The chosen course of action was to enroll 8.8 acres into a 10-year CRP contract, and 5.8 acres into a 15-year tree planting CRP contract. “After the most vulnerable areas were retired, EQIP really helped on our farm because it allowed us to protect the rest of the resources immediately. Of the acres that were tillable, EQIP helped us to put the land back into production,” Hansen states.

Another advantage of EQIP is that the contract is flexible and is able to change over time, a necessary element, according to Hansen. “On my farm there are some gullies that become larger with an increase in rainfall. These slopes or gullies might have not been noticed when I first drew up my contract, but I have noticed them now and I want to install best use practices to prevent erosion.”

Projects are also being developed to get the land back into a crop rotation. The first year after his uncle’s death, all the land was in corn production. The second year a rotation was done with corn and small grains. The rotation that is on the farm today is still in the process of being worked out. The main crops are alfalfa or small grains into which is seeded alfalfa. Rick’s hope is that with a crop rotation consisting mainly of alfalfa, a grazing system is soon to follow.

Rick and his cousin have already developed plans for placing fence around the farm to get the livestock out to the field to graze. Recognizing that there are parts of the fields that are not tillable, Rick has implemented a rotational grazing system in the hilly

*(Continued on page 7)*

*(Conservation Security Act Continued from page 1)*

to pay U.S. farmers up to \$50,000 a year for making conservation a part of their operations. Harkin took over the chairmanship as a consequence of Democrats assuming control of the Senate.

"This (becoming chairman) really does mean the conservation program that I've been pushing for a couple of years now will be enacted," Harkin said in remarks released by his office. "It will be in the chairman's mark (the leading proposal to rewrite farm law). As you know, we've got good bipartisan support for it. So I think we're going to have a new day for conservation in America."

"We will have some hearings this year. We'll begin to shape and fashion some things," Harkin said. "The bulk of the work on redrafting and rewriting and moving a new farm bill will take place next year, not this year." Harkin, like his predecessor Senator Lugar (R-IN), is committed to passing a complete farm bill as one package.

Meanwhile, marching to a different timetable set by House Agriculture Committee Chairman Larry Combest (R-TX), the House is holding hearings in June and aiming for action on a limited House farm bill dealing only with commodities and conservation by August 1. The Conservation Security Act, along with all existing conservation programs, transition and emergency payments to farmers, and crop loan programs would be under consideration.

Whether the House can write even a limited farm bill on such a fast track remains to be seen. But if they do manage such a feat, the Senate would be put in a responsive, rather than proactive, role, similar to what happened in 1996.

Harkin's conservation program was endorsed by two influential farm groups, the National Corn Growers Association and the American Soybean Association. National Farmer's Union supports it strongly, and the American Farm Bureau Federation has announced conditional support.

-Loni Kemp

## What They are Saying About the Conservation Security Act:

"Our private lands are a national treasure, and conservation on farm and ranchlands provides environmental benefits that are just as important as the production of abundant and safe food. The Conservation Security Act will help secure the economic future of our farmers and ranchers by providing them the means to increase their income while conserving our natural resources, the environment, and wildlife habitat for today and for future generations."

*Senator Tom Harkin, as he introduced the bill to the US Senate*

The bill isn't just another federal farm subsidy; its payments would buy what are called "public goods" in the form of a healthier environment. "Clean water, clean soil, wildlife -- these don't return a profit to the farmer, but they do benefit the general public," says **David Minge**, the southern Minnesota Democrat who helped write the bill before losing his seat in Congress last November.

*"Rural Stewards: A Plan for Earth-friendly Farming," editorial in the Minneapolis StarTribune June 1, 2001*

"This legislation is a win-win for both farmers and the environment, allowing farmers to embrace good conservation practices and receive fair payment for their good work. The bill not only encourages farmers to adopt new conservation practices, it rewards those farmers who have already put these important practices to use. As Congress begins to rewrite a new farm bill, I want this type of initiative to be a central part of our national farm policy."

*Minnesota Senator Mark Dayton, a co-sponsor of the bill*

"This legislation gives farmers a solution – financial assistance for doing good things on the farm to protect the earth – things that farmers might not otherwise be able to do because of cost considerations. This bill will help farmers think beyond production. Funding to implement conservation practices on working land will benefit our communities, our states, our nation, and ultimately the world."

*Tom Trantham, a dairy farmer in Pelzer, South Carolina*

*(Watershed Alliance Continued from page 4)*

loss of soil quality, and soil erosion.

### ***Endorsing a Policy for Action***

Recognizing that the successful outcome of their work is directly impacted by the incentives, or “disincentives” inherent in federal farm policy, BALMM has adopted a federal farm bill position that supports the Conservation Security Act and the continued funding of existing conservation programs such as the Conservation Reserve Program, the Wetlands Reserve Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program.

The BALMM farm bill position is founded in four premises: 1) A farmer’s choice of resource management practices is affected by economic incentives in the market place and public policies for agriculture. 2) There is a need to determine if existing conservation programs effectively appeal to the full range of agricultural producers and landowners. 3) There is a need to test new forms of incentives for conservation besides traditional cost sharing. 4) Incentives must provide long-lasting changes in conservation practices.

Current federal farm programs that provide huge incentives for the production of row crops, and subsequently contribute to soil erosion, chemical runoff and leaching, and improper nutrient management, discourage the production of perennial grass cover, small grains and hay.

These financial incentives for row crop production are actually disincentives to resource management, and severely impact the ability of conservation professionals to encourage landowners and producers to implement conservation practices on working lands.

According to BALMM Chairman Kevin Scheidecker, SWCD Supervisor for Fillmore County, Mn., BALMM is endorsing the Conservation Security Act because it provides incentives for producers to change their production planning to incorporate conservation practices. It encourages the diversification of crops including hay and perennial grasses, and it rewards farmers who are already implementing resource-conserving practices on their farms.

“Our work is traditionally to help people who are doing wrong,” explained Scheidecker. “We never reward people already doing a good job.”

Rewarding producers who are doing a “good job” is exactly what the Conservation Security Act is all about. For resource professionals who are constantly challenged to produce results amid shrinking conservation program funding, this new legislation will provide the incentives that produce long-lasting changes in conservation practices.

--Mike McGrath

*(Absentee Owners Continued from page 5)*

parts of the acres. “We try to establish best use practices for the fields.”

### **Wildlife Habitat**

Hansen has also paid attention to other parts of the farm. “A major emphasis for the farm has been to reestablish wildlife. A pond structure that has been placed is a magnet for wildlife. The increase in deer tracks and wood ducks in the area is a visible sign. There is enough water in the pond to provide a resource for wildlife. Wildlife restoration has been the conservation practice given the most emphasis. However, all resource concerns deserve attention and we have been working hard to ensure all natural resource problems get addressed,” he says.

Practices that are currently being implemented on the farm to reverse environmental degradation are: tree planting, wildlife planting, water retention structures, nutrient management, fencing for grazing, and erosion control.

Even after the five-year contract has expired with EQIP, Rick plans to continue whole farm planning and carry out the conservation practices that he has established on his farm. Rick is determined to make best use of resources and maintain those best use practices even after the contract ends. Rick would like to continue farming the land, expand the wildlife on the farm and protect resources long-term.

### **Conservation Security**

Rick believes that to sustain payments to farms there needs to be accountability for practices implemented on the farm. A program that is now being developed at the national level, The Conservation Security Program, is similar to EQIP in that it rewards farmers for implementing conservation practices. Rick feels that, “The Conservation Security Act is a good change. Public funding without any public responsibility like we have in the commodity program gives a farmer a reward for doing nothing to help his community. The Conservation Security Act provides a reward for implementation of conservation practices.”

--Amanda Bilek

*Amanda served a summer internship with the Minnesota Project, and just graduated from St. Thomas University in St. Paul, MN, where she studied farm policy and sustainable agriculture.*

<b>Co-sponsors of the Conservation Security Act</b>		<i>As of August 2, 2001</i>		
<b><u>Senators</u></b>	Kohl (D-WI)	<b><u>Representatives</u></b>	Cooksey (R-LA)	McKinney (D-GA)
Harkin (D-IA) <i>lead co-sponsor</i>	Leahy (D-VT)	Thune (R-SD) <i>lead co-sponsor</i>	Emerson (R-MO)	Murtha (D-PA)
Gordon Smith (R-OR) <i>lead co-sponsor</i>	Reed (D-RI)	Kaptur (D-OH) <i>lead co-sponsor</i>	Evans (D-IL)	Napolitano (D-CA)
Boxer (D-CA)	Sarbanes (D-MD)	Allen (D-ME)	Farr (D-CA)	Oberstar (D-MN)
Clinton (D-NY)	Schumer (D-NY)	Baldacci (D-ME)	Frank (D-MA)	Pascrell (D-NJ)
Daschle (D-SD)	Stabenow (D-MI)	Baldwin (D-WI)	Gordon (D-TN)	Ramstad (R-MN)
Dayton (D-MN)	Torricelli (D-NJ)	Bereuter (R-NE)	Hinchey (D-NY)	Sabo (D-MN)
Dorgan (D-ND)	Wellstone (D-MN)	Boswell (D-IA)	Kolbe (R-AZ)	Schakowsky (D-IL)
Durbin (D-IL)		Boucher (D-VA)	Lofgren (D-CA)	Shimkus (R-IL)
Johnson (D-SD)		Brady (R-TX)	McCollum (D-MN)	Slaughter (D-NY)
Kennedy (D-MA)		Brown (D-OH)	McGovern (D-MA)	Thurman (D-FL)
Kerry (D-MA)		Calvert (R-CA)	McHugh (R-NY)	Wynn (D-MD)

*The Whole Farm Planner* is published by The Minnesota Project. The Minnesota Project is a nonprofit organization dedicated to environmental protection and sustainable development in rural Minnesota. For more information, contact write to us at: 1885 University Avenue West, Suite 315, St. Paul, MN 55104; email: mnproject@mnproject.org; 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.