

-----Original Message-----

From: jean public [<mailto:jeanpublic@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2004 5:46 PM

To: CIG

Cc: rodney.frelinghuysen@mail.house.gov%INTER2

Subject: public comment on USDA commodity credit corp NRCS - grants - spending tax dollaars

7 cfr part 1466 from fed register of march 29, 2004
vol 69 no 60 page 16391

Please make sure OMB gets a copy of these comments.

there must be a cost benefit analysis for this project. I note right on the first page USDA does not want one, but USDA seems to feel that agribusiness is a welfare industry that U.S. taxpayers love to support. It is time that a cost benefit analysis is done on this proposal. I would like GAO to get involved, which not so recently found a USDA program spending taxpayer dollars very very unwisely and profligately.

this whole proposal appears that somehow tax dollars appeared as part of some politicians pork barrel budget work and now nobody has a clear idea of the purpose of these funds, or the mission of this group. since nobody has such a clear vision in this proposal, I think we should forget this whole project, delete it and save the taxpayers dollars, especially when many americans cant even get jobs to pay their taxes these days.

I think this project should be submitted to the fleecing of america that is on TV nightly.

page 5 comments - I think this whole program should be dumped. Should NRCS provide special consideration for underrepresented individuals or entities _ NO NO NO

page 6 (b) - I think the purpose should have been set in stone before congress voted these tax dollars. Obviously some profiteer in washington dc has his eye fixed on how he can turn this not needed program into supporting him for life.

I think this "storing carbon in the soil" could have negative effects. The best idea is to cut down on the carbon being produced - but nobody in washington seems to have caught on to that and carbon production continues unabated. Kyoto was ignored by Bush. I do not think we need to carbon store.

page 7 this is a boondoggle.

page 10 comment - \$500,000 to state for water quality

trading - WHAT WE REALLY NEED IS EMPHASIS ON WATER USE REDUCTION, BUT AGAIN GOVERNMENT JUST GOES MERRILY ON ITS WAY ALLOWING OVERDEVELOPING BECAUSE DEVELOPERS ARE BIG CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTORS.

\$1,000,000 TAXPAYER DOLLARS FOR ANIMAL WASTE, WELL THE PEOPLE WHO SHOULD PAY TO CLEANUP THE ANIMAL WASTE ARE THE AGRIBUEINSS PRODUCERS MAKING THAT WASTE. THEY MAKE THE PROFITS - THEY SHOULD PAY THE COSTS NOT GLOM ONTO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS TO PAY THE COSTS OF THEIR BUSINESS.

THIS SHUFFLING COSTS BY AGRIBUSINESS ONTO THE BACKS OF ORDINARY TAXPAYERS IS DISTURBING, DISGUSTING AND DEPRAVED.

PAGE 14 - PEER rEVIEW pANEL - please make sure it meets FACA guidelines. I oppose the composition of this panel. I see that plans are to have it be composed of toadies who are all profiting from agriculture so that there will be no brake on the self interest, self profiting activities of this panel. I want a panel that is balanced and fair and that includes people from all walks of life. maybe they should be picked out of the telephone book to get a real cross section. Selection of panels from within the industry leads to biased reporting from the panel, biased actions by these panels and outrageous actions by the panel. FACA law must be brought into play and the general PUBLIC HAS TO BE BROUGHT INTO AGRIBUSINESS ACTIVITIES BECAUSE IT HAS BECOME AN UNSAVORY BUSINESS WHAT WITH MAD COW, AVIAN INFLUENZA ETC BECAUSE OF INHUMANE STANDARDS THAT ANIMALS ARE KEPT UNDER, ETC.

B. SACHAU
15 ELM ST
FLORHAM PARK NJ 07932

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Small Business \$15K Web Design Giveaway
http://promotions.yahoo.com/design_giveaway/