

Dear Sir:

My name is Dale Teske  
17588-453<sup>rd</sup> av. Watertown South  
Dakota - 57201.

I have farmed in south  
Dakota all my life.

I install contours &  
terraces on my land forty  
years ago, 25 years ago I  
started no till farming. In  
1990 I installed an ag  
waste system on my farm.

I also rent land from  
my neighbors and also no  
till their land as well.

It will not work for  
me to comply with tier III  
because my landlords do not  
want to give me a 5 year  
contract because land values  
are going up so fast  
please consider this part of  
the CSP so I can comply

I feel the former test  
are taking care of their  
land as well as the land  
they rent should be intitled  
to qualify for the program.  
We have been promised  
something like this for a  
long time. Hope you will  
change this part for us.

Sincerely

Dale Hart

Conservation Farmer

2-20-04

Attn: David McKay

Pertaining to the rules on CSP, as brought forward by NRCS. This program is the most important legislation to ever come forward. It is finally conservation minded, and much overdue! Some rules need however to be changed as proposed.

A) You must reward pre-existing Conservation practices, these have kept soil in place. The Corn base payments(AMTA) were based on corn production in the 80's so should CSP benefits be rewarded for pre-existing conservation bases as such.

B) Farmers who graze (rotational especially) should be rewarded for conservation measures. Cropland taken out of production & grazed is totally payable, as "T" on these fields becomes very minimal. Others who till marginal land or non graze this land have much higher erosion possibilities. C) Rotations should be honored to the full extent, as these are strong measures against erosion, insects, weeds etc. Book at 200 acres of beans on a slope it is not pretty. D) Organics production should be honored as well, as these farmers are very conservation minded and should be rewarded justly.

E) This program should be implemented to all areas of the country not just hand picked watersheds. Erosion control is needed everywhere and fairly addressed, in its intent across the nation in all watersheds.

(3)

I have farmed in Rotations, pastures and  
substantial forages planted. I have built  
5 ponds, and do rotational grazing. My \$  
rewards from USDA are minimal due to a  
very low corn base & soybean base. The  
payments for CSP should be comparable to  
Corn ADITA payments, this only makes  
sense. The funding should be at maximum  
payments. This is an important part of  
this to keep payments somewhere around  
corn & soybean payments or what would the  
incentive be. The contracts should also  
be renewable so farmers could establish  
a program and stay with it. After all  
you are the N.R. Conservation B. Please  
implement these rules as the law was  
intended. This can and should be  
a great program for our country

Sincerely,

John  
Worther

USDA / NRCS

David McKay

Conservation Operations, NRCS

P.O. Box 2890

Washington, DC 20013-2890

Attention: CSP

70 Long Drive 467  
Eaton, OH 45320

February 20, 2004

Dear Sir:

My letter is in response to changing the rules for implementing the Conservation Security Program.

I strongly endorse a full, nationally implemented CSP. It is important to meeting our resource conservation goals for working agricultural lands. I believe this was the original intent of the U.S. Congress for the implementation of this program. Two significant shortcomings are that the rule doesn't provide for the rewards system for conservation farmers as originally intended by the law, and it doesn't provide for a program nationwide.

Also the funding cap limitation needs to be removed. In the 2002 Farm Bill CSP was authorized as an entitlement program. Congress has removed the appropriation cap limitation and now NRCS should amend the rule to reflect the actions of Congress to make it an entitlement program.

Another key issue concerns watershed limitation. The CSP rule states that NRCS will identify and offer CSP only in high priority watersheds, chosen at the national level. This is not locally led conservation as was so widely promoted in the 2002 Farm Bill, and creates the opportunity for the program to be politically driven as opposed to being available to all eligible producers nationally.

According to the law, all resource concerns in the USDA Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) such as soil, air and water quality, wildlife and plant habitat, and forest stewardship, are eligible for participation. The proposed rule requires soil and water quality to be addressed for all three tiers and places a lower priority on all other resource concerns.

Also the proposed rule requires cost-share payments to be less than EQIP. The original authorization provided a cost-share limit of 75 percent, which is the same as EQIP and WHIP and other cost-share programs.

The proposed rule also changes the rental rate language. The original law requires that 2001 national rental rate, or an appropriate rate where the national rental rate does not accurately reflect local conditions, be used to establish CSP base payment. The proposed rule uses state and local rental rates, but reduces the base payment down to 10 percent of the already reduced rate in the law. The original language stated "the Secretary shall not provide a rate lower than the national average rental rate."

Also NRCS proposes to offer a substantially reduced list of eligible practices. The law only provides two limits: animal waste transport and storage, therefore all other practices are eligible.

The Congress and the constituents they represent believe the Conservation Security Program to be a good law and so do I. This law addressed the many concerns that had been neglected for so many years, so please follow their recommendations. Please keep it in tact. Thank you.

C.C: Senator George Voinovich

Senator Mike DeWine

Representative John A. Boehner

Sincerely,

Lewis E. Jones

70 Long Dr.

Eaton, OH 45320

**Acevedo, Jose**

---

471

**From:** Robert Jones  
**Sent:** Monday, February 23, 2004 10:25 AM  
**To:** Acevedo, Jose  
**Subject:** Tribal Lands EQIP

Jose -

Are there designated EQIP funds for states with tribal properties? Alabama's funds did not indicate that.

We have worked very closely with the Creek tribe in South Alabama. They have several thousand acres of land that we are working with them on.

Bob

*Report  
Jri*