

## APPENDIX H

### VERBATIM COMMENTS: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

#### *VERBATIM COMMENTS FROM MAIL SURVEYS*

##### REASONS TO VOTE FOR THE PROPOSAL: Q14A In Mail Survey

Our natural environment is a precious, often-nonreplaceable asset that must be protected with wise management.

Better quality of living.

The basics of life are valuable to human life - water, air, earth - monitoring is important.

This is something that should be started sooner rather than later.

Protect the environment for future generations. Improve water quality for current and future residents so water is useable.

Mostly because of the environmental reasons. Need to preserve the environment for our children's children and so on.

Good air and water quality are very important to the health and well-being of today's humanity as well as future generations. However, I would not like the livelihood of our farmers to be jeopardized.

In the general scheme of things \$100 is a very small amount to protect our environment.

Without some action we will destroy what we have left.

Farm prices are too low. We must clean up our air and water.

I care about the environment that we live in and I care VERY much about the birds and wildlife. It is important that we all look past the \$100 per year, and think about the future. Of the greenhouse gases and such.

We have neglected our natural resources too long. It is time for us to stop the effects of growth, urban sprawl and greed in the name of commerce on our environment. \$100 a year is a small price to pay to protect the environment.

Improve/preserve healthy water/air condition for ourselves and our children's future. Help maintain/increase wildlife populations.

After reading the information and seeing the effects and the expected result it seems to me that it would improve living quality for everyone.

Installing conservation practices can effectively reduce soil erosion, improve water quality, reduce flooding, and create a more favorable environment for birds and wildlife. The only way farmers will apply conservation practices is by providing financial incentives. They cannot finance them on their own.

Help cut excessive use of chemical ag products, make better use of marginal land. Help to clean up surface and ground water and reduce silting of waterways. Benefits to wildlife.

Because our home is surrounded by farmland and I'd like it to continue to be that way.

The items under discussion are the "hot buttons" for the present and future societies i.e. clean water, greenhouse effect, etc. I'm old school - leave it better than you found it.

We would be for this proposal if all farmers benefit from this program. They are being short-changed now and for the past ten years.

I believe it would be worth the cost to me to help preserve the MN environment. Wetlands are what MN is all about and I love the lake and swamp area I grew up in. I also would like to help preserve wildlife and birds (they'll eat all those mosquitoes that come out of the wetlands!)

The quality of water is important for everyone's health. Everyone should be concerned about flooding.

Long-term costs would be much higher.

It attempts to do something that would improve the quality of Minnesota living for more than just the few and the now - possibly restoring for those still to come.

We need to improve the environment.

The land has to be maintained for future generations.

I feel that we need to conserve our wetlands, reduce nitrogen fertilizer on cropland and encourage the conversion of cropland into woodlands.

Largest source of water pollution in the state is Ag runoff. This runoff has an impact to the Gulf of Mexico.

I support environmental clean up. I hunt and fish and would like future generations to have the opportunity with quality in mind.

I am very concerned about the environment. I want future generations to be able to enjoy the outdoors and all wildlife in a safe pollution-free setting.

Better habitat for wildlife, consistent or improved hunting/fishing, improved water quality, better farming conditions without additional costs to farmers. Farming is vital to Minnesota.

It's time we look to the future generations - and save our future farming for them.

The slight amount of money required to implement this program would help our planet for generations to come, which is very important to me as a green party supporter and environmentalist.

I would identify the benefits to a number of different aspects. This would generate better land use and future resources.

Health concerns, save money through flood control, ensure healthy environment for our future generations.

We must adjust farming practices or the environment we all enjoy will be negatively impacted.

We have always been interested in sustainable agricultural practices and would like to even see more organic products available. Ideally, we would like to be farmers, but can't afford to start from scratch.

We must use "sustainable future" practices, encourage more wildlife habitat, especially songbirds, combat global warming, get useable water.

Good ideas.

We believe in leaving a healthy community for our children and their children's children. While we live in Minneapolis, our "community" extends well beyond the city limits.

It just makes sense to be in favor of programs like these that preserve the environment, as once we destroy it we can't buy or make more. This program will benefit the land, water, and wildlife, all of which are important to me.

The environmental effects of the policy are worth it.

Take care of the environment now, it will take care of future generations.

I don't want a huge desert in the U.S.

A cleaner environment which would be good for everyone. Clean air, water and increased wildlife habitat, not such a bad thing to invest in.

1) I think that \$250 per year is a small price compared to the long-term costs. 2) Also, I think it would increase the quality of life for Minnesotans.

1) Education and environment are the most important legacies we will pass on to future generations and more spending is warranted for both. 2) Benefits both sectors of what typifies Minnesota - farming and the outdoors.

This is a long-range proposal to deal with problems that develop gradually, but certainly. The longer we delay, the greater the problems will become.

I live in an area prone to flooding. Water quality is important to me.

I am a realist. We can afford to keep our environment in good repair. Pay landowners to do the right thing!

Improving and protecting our environment is essential. Improved water quality. Improved game habitat.

The results of the efforts are worth way more than \$300 to me!

1) Americans spend a lower percentage of our income for food than most people on the planet. 2) "Cheap" food is already turning out to be very expensive environmentally and healthwise. 3) \$300 per year is a bargain to cut future costs.

Something needs to be done to protect our environment - these are relatively easy and benefit farmers as well!

I would like to leave the planet a better place for my children and grandchildren. What does the cost matter if we don't have a planet to live on?

Larger feedlots' runoff must be controlled. Larger dairy operations are using grazing which allows runoff to streams. I enjoy hunting and fishing so we need cleaner lakes and wetlands. I buy critical habitat license plates now.

We need to be responsible in preserving a healthy environment for the next generations of people - and all living nations.

We value the wetlands and wildlife. We feel it is critical to return the balance between production, use and natural cycles.

I think spending less than \$1 per day to improve the environment is worthwhile.

Protection of wildlife, environmental control, decrease pollution and erosion, management of land will improve.

We feel the environment and wildlife is very important - if we don't do something now - it will be too late as population grows and habitat decreases. Clean water is crucial.

Because I spend my free time hunting, fishing, hiking, biking, and other outdoor activities, and I enjoy nature immensely. Plus it would help sustain non-game wildlife in the state. And help reduce water and air pollution.

I feel that what we would get out of such programs would far outweigh the cost. We are basically wrecking the land, water and air by taking more out of it, and less willing to put anything back into it. For getting a few more dollars, farmers are taking over large tracks of land with no concern for the future.

Crop rotation is very important. It seems this would help. The need for more wildlife. Take care of the land for the next generation.

I like the idea, however, I would want much more definitive information. The dollar amount could change, but not for generic ideas.

A lot of MN lakes have been so weedy which I believe comes from fertilizer runoff. Pheasant population and waterfowl population need better habitat. Poor water quality.

Possible elimination of life unless action is taken on all pollution.

It seems to be a well rounded proposal, taking in the whole picture, not just one piece of it.

I agree with the soil erosion and water quality sections more so than the other two sections as long as the government does not dictate who, where, and when.

Improved water quality, improved air quality, better hunting and fishing, decreased row crops may increase their value.

Because we'd all be dead if we don't save mother earth and most folks do not understand, are only blinded by money. What good is money if can't raise decent crops?

All the items on sheet.

I'm for anything that would help farmers and the environment.

My family spends a great majority of our leisure time on the water - boating, fishing, and hunting. Efforts to improve water quality to support increased recreation and efforts to improve hunting opportunities is extremely valuable and important.

Better hunting and fishing, better water quality.

For the future generations.

I am a farm-owner and God's caretaker for 30 years and have tried to do one thing each year to help with soil and water erosion. With food prices so low I cannot do it alone and we will all benefit over time.

Any ways to improve the environment benefits everyone and to continue destroying it will only be detrimental to future generations.

We need a good balance in the way we manage our natural resources and use our land to feed the masses. We cannot overlook the importance the land has for all of the creatures of this earth. We should not abuse the land and should have long-term goals to take care of it or our children will pay the price.

We need to protect the land. We need to keep the environment healthy and a good place to live. We need to conserve natural resources to provide habitat for birds and wildlife.

The proposal makes good sense.

Improve water quality, reduce greenhouse gases, increase bio-diversity.

It would benefit generations of people in the future healthwise, and other species also.

Water quality is my main concern.

We must leave the Earth in a better condition for future generations. I have children and grandchildren.

Protecting our environment is of utmost importance. We can't afford to leave this to future generations - we need to act now.

1) The solutions proposed date back to the methods learned in the 1930's and should be followed as a normal procedure. 2) Farmers are already fully tax supported, tie your program to what they already get. 3) An efficient farmer would want to do this for added profit.

I am concerned about the loss of wetlands and the decrease in wildlife that occurs with that loss. Also, additional concerns are: greenhouse gases, soil erosion, and water pollution.

Increased water quality, less erosion (preserve precious topsoil), eliminate harmful emissions, provide better wildlife habitat.

Concerned about air and water quality and loss of diversity in environment. Proposal seems reasonable with positive results assuming 10% is achievable.

Small price to pay to save soil, conserve and improve water quality, reduce flooding, save bird habitats for future generations.

Right things to do.

I like the idea of clean air, less erosion, good water, and more trees. I am a bird and wildlife man and I had my share of floods.

The conservation of the land - figure 4, although attractive probably not practical or attainable - govt. policy of cheap food forces farmers to rely on subsidies and enact practices that are not always land friendly. Support wildlife and marsh restoration. Question subsidies to farmers to cut production or not produce.

I am assuming your study would not be done if your proposals of the shown farming procedure would not be beneficial to preserving our environment. Our opinion has not ever been considered as the proper method. Farming is now a huge business for making profits and if the land is destroyed, the farmers can move to town.

The proposed solutions would only benefit the environment and make it more safe. \$200 seems like a lot of money, especially for households who don't make a lot of money. Why isn't MN's government funding these solutions?

Reduce soil erosion, improve water quality, retain and better wildlife populations.

I believe draining wetlands is very bad. It causes floods downstream. It creates more farm row crops which cause surplus and lowers prices. It causes more wind and water erosion, more pesticide and chemical is washed into the water table, also lowering the water table. We must conserve our water and soil.

Our natural resources are difficult to replace or restore. Deterioration affects all of our wellbeing and health. Poor health and life style costs us much more! I would pay \$500 (or more).

Soil erosion, hunting, drainage.

I want to do my part to protect the Earth. I try to be environmentally conscious. I buy, vote, I try to live using the environment as one of my higher priorities. I am healthier in a clean environment. Life is more beautiful if one can enjoy y clean water, varied wildlife, and clean air. Erosion, flooding, and polluted air are devastating to human life.

Quite honestly \$20/month doesn't seem like much compared to how devastating it would be to lose the ability to share the natural world (as we have had the opportunity to know it) with our children. We are outdoors-people who value the environment.

I would vote for the proposal. I don't think the cost is too much to ask for. The proposal shows many benefits to us and the land.

I have seen some of the effects of water pollution and soil erosion.

We are "subsidizing" our current lifestyles but not reflecting on the true long-term costs of our consumption. These costs will have to be incurred at some point in time - it should be now while we consume, consume, and consume some more.

Farmers have lost track of the fact that they are stewards of the land. They focus on the bottom line and have lost track of that. We feed the world at the expense of damaging our lands beyond the point of maintaining them.

My grandfather was a farmer in MT, and while I think the govt. should stay out of farming, we need to conserve our natural resources before we have nothing left. We also need to prevent chemical exposure.

Any of reasons on colored insert.

It is important to keep our water and wildlife clean and in its natural condition.

In 1955 my grandfather was voted Master Farmer of the year in IA for his conservation practices. Lakes and rivers still need much cleaning up. Farmers and industry must quit polluting. More grassland, waterways, and wooded grassy fencerows need to be planted for stopping soil erosion. Fertilizers are now polluting too.

\$250 per year is a reasonable amount.

To improve each area of the environment as described in the colored insert.

We can afford it and as such we should reallocate our resources for improved water and air quality for all.

Better water, better air.

It makes sense to use the land in a way that would be beneficial to all - man and nature.

Need to look to future generations and provide a better environment.

Makes environmental "sense." More trees = more beauty.

Because I approve of the benefit it would give in all five areas.

Maintain wildlife diversity, maintain water quality.

To help the low-income giving help to give low-income housing, to help the elderly.

I think, my opinion, it important to us, and everyone to lived in this state, to create better proposal for Minnesotans, and make the most of this proposal. I think that is better to ensure everything will be okay for next 50 years. This a hope or wish.

Humans need clean air and water to survive, as well as our wildlife.

Only one earth. We have to take care of it.

Pass laws! Make landowners responsible.

I would really need to see the details, but am generally supportive of less pollution and better water and air quality along with soil conservation. Incentives should be directed to family farms. Corporate agriculture should be taxed for not meeting conservation requirements.

We must do whatever we can to reduce the negative impact humans tend to have on the environment and other animal species. In the long run we will be healthier and maybe environmentally friendly practices will be the norm and not the exception.

The farmers need better prices. Everyone wants cheap food which is not helping our economy.

We need to protect and maintain our land for future productions. The better you treat it the more it will prosper.

Because the earth needs to be cleaned up from the last generation and more importantly preserved for the future generation.

To help farmers to use conservation practices that would help to maintain the quality of their topsoil and in turn help the bird and wildlife populations to increase would be very beneficial to our society as a whole. There is only so much land - "We better take care of what we have."

Cost is minimal - about \$1/day. Would like to see less erosion, better water quality. Lakes are a valuable resource in MN.

I favor all the improvements that are described as potential results of this farming program.

#### REASONS TO FAVOR THE PROPOSAL AT A LOWER COST: Q15B in Mail Survey

Many reasons mentioned in the colored insert show there are some major problems in the environment. I am an avid sportsman and would prosper from increased wildlife. It is important that my children have clean air and water in the near future.

I would like a safe environment for my child.

I think it's important and should be funded. However, the funding should come from elsewhere within the government's budget.

It should pay through food costs, not assessments.

Wildlife preservation, water quality.

1) The \$200 figure sounds rather steep for each household. 2) Some of the cost of this conservation stewardship would lie on the property owners. 3) To help landowners financially provide incentive to change farming and steward techniques.

Stop soil erosion, increase birds and wildlife.

We need to take care of our air, water and roads and our elderly.

\$10 seems reasonable. You are keenly interested in this. There are many other worthwhile needs. We all have our pet ones. Yes- there is benefit for everyone, but within reason.

Water quality needs to be improved.

At my age the cost of living is too high for my income and the upkeep of my home.

Variations in landscape that provide for more species and increased number of birds helps maintain a healthy balance. Decreased flooding - the cost of occasional flooding would far outweigh the program costs. Better water quality - self explanatory.

I believe the proposal is a good environmental program but I am on a fixed income and cannot afford to spend extra money. Lower the tax rebate or extinguish it.

To try and improve living for the generations that will follow my life span.

Drinking water supplies cleaner.

Good ideas for greenhouse effect, water quality.

Would like to have a clean environment. Clean water and air.

Current agricultural practices have a direct impact on everything listed in the colored insert and more. A change has to start some place and this is a good way to begin. Current farming methods are highly destructive to the environment, the economy, and human health!

The proposal is good as it would help improve water quality and the environment for wild animals. The farmers need encouragement of some sort to do this and a tax break would help.

The environment is important but not at such a cost that would impact my paying \$300 per year.

We need to keep improving our environment since population expansion is tearing down our natural resources such as trees, wildlife, and water quality.

For clean drinking water.

To save good soil, to lessen water pollution, to improve food quality, to improve the quality of life.

Long-term positive effects to environment, better habitat for wildlife, enjoy sightseeing wildlife, hunting, fishing; the health effects on pollution.

I would mainly like to see more habitat for birds and wildlife and to see our water stay at least as good as it is now.

Improve wildlife habitat, improve water quality.

To help with air and water pollution for a healthier society.

1) Need to control the damage that "progress" has caused the environment. 2) We need solid plan to ensure the safety of the environment.

Caring for and maintaining the environment is everyone's responsibility. Implementing safe practices can help ensure the maintenance of the environment for future generations.

If the money would be spent wisely we would all benefit.

Given the damage we've already done to the environment, if we don't start doing more to stop the effects of humans, we won't be around much longer to worry where our money is going.

Concern for land, water, and air.

If we all contribute a little the overall benefit of these programs (long term) will be worth it.

A prudent environmental program would offer a good return on investment.

Right now my living spending amount is very limited. If I was older I would probably be able to afford it but right now we're living on one income because I'm going to school full time.

Health risks now, threat to survival of animal and plant species now, danger of global warming.

1) It needs to be done. If we continue to starve the earth we will see more extinction of birds and plants. 2) Human health has suffered over the last two decades as a result of increased toxins in our environment and interfering with earth's natural rejuvenation cycle.

I am retired on a fixed income. My already reduced income through higher fuel heating and other costs could only support the amount above.

Environmental concerns are important but I see lack of concern for using preventive measures by the farmers. Let's not waste money either.

I believe something needs to be done but believe some of the costs could be raised from other areas. Ex: increased revenue from hunting and fishing licenses, watercraft licenses, etc.

I strongly believe in the need for better air and water quality. The need for reducing water and air pollution is of crisis proportion right today.

You do not need \$100 from each household to carry this out.

I like the river and watching birds.

The farmers should be protecting conservation till farming practices because it saves the topsoil which will save them money in the long run.

Need some controls of use of chemicals. Not sure government is the one to do it. MPCA is out of touch with the rural needs.

For our children.

I feel it is important to protect and improve the environment.

I think that \$100 a year would be adequate to get farmers looking at conservation policies in a new way. I think it would be enough to show an improvement in our life.

All things listed would help improve and protect our environment.

I am in favor of the proposal for all the reasons listed in the insert. 1) Reduction of soil erosion. 2) Maintaining water quality. 3) Reduce flooding. 4) Keep wildlife. 5) Control of climate.

To help air quality, to help water quality.

Farmers do need help. Any payment would encourage better conservation. Concerned with flooding in Houston Co. area - lost most of crops in river bottoms. Govt. has been

very unfair to them...govt. takes the landowner rights and refuse to help them keep their land producing.

I am very concerned about the environment for future generations. Birds and other wildlife should be protected. Air and water quality are important.

There is already enough Gov. spending for farm aid. Lets give it back to the people.

I would like to see our land go back to the way it used to be, before the settlers arrived. Pre 1850 style. This proposal would help to encourage wildlife and to make our state even more enjoyable to live in. Willing to pay \$10, MN tax surplus can take care of the rest.

The amount I would agree to pay would be directly related to the effort I see the farmer making to do their part.

Need to best care for our resources. If there was an increase, I would hope it to be more from higher market prices and less from increased tax rates.

We all have to preserve the environment.

\$100 more or less is of no great significance to me. Would like to see lakes and rivers kept cleaner of weeds, etc. "Opposition" is only due to lack of information - as to what the proposed program really is. Don't like to "vote" on an abstract idea.

1) Because license fees for hunting and fishing has not done the trick. 2) Also the only way I would consider this is public access to non-reg. land.

10% improvement seems low!

We need to combat procedures that are causing pollution and decreasing the size of wildlife habitats.

1) Is this a charge to every household? Statewide? 2) Sounds good for the environment. 3) Compensated for loss of production and extra work.

We have to think about what will be available for the future and how our present usage affects the land, etc. We can't keep taking and not give something in return. We need to be better stewards and also recognize the importance of farmers and what they accomplish and give them incentives to be better stewards.

At minimal cost we can help a little bit but your results of 10% are suspect to me and do not deserve much financial support.

Save the environment, clean air, clean water, save topsoil.

I would like to see clean lakes, healthy soil, many more trees, (and put crops in farmland that the government pays farmers not to plant...).

I am in favor of improving the land use in order to preserve the land, support wildlife and improve the environment. I am also concerned about government's propensity to tax and overspend, thus wasting resources.

To make it better for our environment and create a favorable work climate for farmers. Make it easier to attract new owners and workers.

I think it is very important to conserve our environment, protect water quality, and reduce the release of greenhouse gases but it must also be done in a cost-effective manner.

For better water for drinking, swimming and fishing.

I feel that if you are a farmer, then take responsibility for your career and its implications - just as I have to do in my profession.

I would need to know more details on benefits of cost sharing.

It's a good reason to work toward less pollution.

To give farmers incentives to use and conserve environmental practices on their land.

To keep environment healthy.

I believe it is necessary to take care of our land, water and animals, in turn we are caring for ourselves and our children's future.

I would vote for this proposal if it were to favor the small farm families and not corporate farming. I would like to see less fertilizers being used on food crops. Organic farms now charge more for their crops in stores but the farmer doesn't get the same amount of product than someone using great amounts of fertilizer.

I think sound environmental farming practices reduces the cost in farming. The only saving's to poor farming practices is time.

MAIN REASON TO VOTE IN FAVOR: Q14A1 in Mail Survey

See above.

Water, air, and wildlife.

Quality of life.

Protect the environment for future.

Environmental

Air quality.

Continuous protection of the environment.

My health and others health. Farmers.

We need to quit polluting our land.

Birds and wildlife.

The need to protect the environment.

Water and air quality.

Environment

Install conservation practices to reduce soil erosion will do the most.

Help clean up surface and groundwater.

Birds and wildlife.

Future generations - our children/grandchildren's future.

Soil erosion.

The wetlands

Water quality.

Safer water.

Restore MN habitat quality.

My children.

The conversion of cropland into woodlands.

Same as above.

Hunting/fishing/wildlife observation.

Clean environment for my children.

A future in farming - protect what we have.

I want my children and grandchildren to have a healthy, beautiful world to live.

Future resources.

Environment.

There is only one.

Rewarding sustainable and even organic farmers.

Sustainable future.

Cleaner environment = healthier for all living things.

All of the above.

Cost.

So their is a future.

All of the above.

I think \$250 per year is a small price compared to the long-term costs.

Education and environment passed on to future generations.

Water.

Water quality.

Stewardship and Christian values.

Environmental protection.

The environment is paramount!

"Cheap" food is already turning out to be very expensive environmentally.

Protection of the environment.

Saving the earth.

The control of air pollution.

Health - physical, mental, emotional, spiritual

The land balance of use.

Improved environment.

Protection of environment and wildlife.

Diverse wildlife - birds and native animals.

Help sustain clean air and water.

Help preserve and share the land, not just take and use it.

Take care of the land for the next generation.

Health risks.

Possible elimination of life unless action is taken on all pollution.

I've seen too many farms turned into casinos and housing.

Water quality.

Improved water quality.

Respect mother earth as Native Americans did.

Water quality.

Farming.

Improves water quality.

Outdoorsman - better wildlife.

Financial help.

Natural resources require our attention so they do not suffer long term effects.

Keeping the environment healthy.

Better conservation of resources for long term sustainability.

Increase bio-diversity.

Benefit the future of mankind.

Water quality.

There is only one Earth.

Water quality and birds and wildlife.

Farmers are already tax supported.

Bird and wildlife habitat.

Water quality. Water is the base for life.

Water quality.

Same as above.

Water quality.

Health safety.

Preserving the environment, safety to health.

Good well water and clean streams.

All three are important.

When the water, soil, trees, wildlife are gone, the people will be gone also.

Health.

Hunting.

Protect the earth now and for the future.

Sharing nature with our children.

The agricultural, species, and conservation benefits.

Water pollution.

We need to develop and maintain a long-term strategy – one that is sustainable vs. maximizing our short-term interests. We may need to sub-optimize our short-term interests to optimize the long-term. Everything is a trade-off. Maybe we wouldn't be able to consume so much in the short-term. This has a double edge impact. But the

consequences are high. It all begins with our “need” for economic growth, which requires consumption, which puts pressure on prices/costs, etc. We need to be the low-cost producer.

Maintain our world for future generations. Don't blow it!

Conserving natural resources.

Wildlife.

Clean water.

Cleaning up our waterways.

Water quality.

Each is important - soil conservation probably #1.

We favor sharing our resources for the betterment of society.

Better water.

Sustaining all species.

Diversity provides a better environment.

Environment clean and safe.

Water quality.

To provide low-income housing.

To protect our environment, to spent more money as they need.

Potentially could result in an increased quality of life for citizens of MN.

It is the right thing to do to begin the process of change.

I think the farmers need help.

Benefits it will provide to the environment.

Preserving for the future generation.

The quality of the lives of future generations.

Water quality.

Improving the environment and thus my life.

MAIN REASON TO VOTE IN FAVOR: Q15B1 in Mail Survey

Preserving wildlife.

My child's health and future.

Environmental impact.

Wildlife.

#3

Soil erosion.

Our elderly.

Overall good of all.

Water quality.

Birds and wildlife.

Water quality.

Clean air and water.

Water quality.

Clean water and air.

The improvement of the environment.

Environment.

Water quality for consumption and recreation, and decreased pollution.

Drinking water.

To lessen water pollution.

Long-term environment.

Birds/wildlife.

Wildlife habitat.

Air pollution.

We need a solid plan to ensure the safety of the environment.

Preserving our environment for the future.

Our destiny is tied to the environment's future.

Water pollution.

Water quality.

Improve water quality.

Affordable.

Present threat to survival of many species.

Keep humans, animals, and plants healthy.

Water for drinking, fishing, etc.

Cleaner water.

Clean water.

Water pollution.

Control.

For our children.

Looking at conservation in a new way.

Better bird and wildlife habitat.

Control of climate.

To help air quality.

Air and water quality.

This is God's country, put back what has been taken.

Care and resources.

Water quality.

Not significant cost.

#2

Decrease in pollution.

Sounds good for the environment.

The future for our grandchildren.

It may help a little.

Clean air.

Preserving the land.

Create a better work climate.

Protect water quality for our children.

For better water for drinking, swimming and fishing.

Self-sufficiency.

We all need to protect the environment.

Water quality.

Water and soil erosion, pollution.

Water quality.

Our own health.

More equity to the family farmer.

Soil and water.

## REASONS TO VOTE AGAINST THE PROPOSAL: Q15N in Mail Survey

To much state control already - state "DNR" Policies

I would love to say yes but the state would squander the money on something senseless like light rail. I don't understand. We have more money in our budget than we know what to do with. Growing up in central MN on a farm we always did what we could to prevent erosion.

This would be another government program telling people what to do. Once these programs begin they usually continue and increase the cost.

Because the Gov. and the DNR are involved. They do not make good decisions at all there is a lot of land that should never have been farmed but the Gov. let them tile everything. Get the Gov. out of farming and let supply and demand take over - there are way to many Gov. employees that we pay for now that are just milking the system.

Education and law restrictions regarding pollution and strict enforcement will take care of most problems. Fines for not conforming would keep things in line.

Our taxes should not be increased! It should be the responsibility of those using the land to make a living to do so responsibly. It should be mandated that they do so but not at the taxpayers expense. Other businesses are forced to comply with regulations at their own expense, so should farmers.

MN taxes are excessive now. If these programs are adopted, take the money from other revenue source.

I would like to proposal but this on earth so many help need man kind. I am try to helping first human soul. Tell good news (Salvation) to other. Involved much church and community this time my life.

Farmers use too much fertilizer and pesticides. They need to cut production. The government used tax dollars to tile wetlands and now want to use more tax dollars to restore the wetlands.

Higher taxes

Too much government control. More should be done by private business or people on there own.

There are many ways farmers can farm their land and plant seeds/crops that prevent soil erosion.

Minnesota is already one of the highest taxed states and we still don't know how to spend the money.

To much Gov.!

We should be lowering taxes in Minnesota, not increase them. We are currently one of the highest taxed states in the country. It's time to spend the tax money wisely. We already give.

Because we are already subsidizing farmers to grow more than we need (hence low prices for their produce). Now do we want to pay them more to reduce their production?

I'm opposed to government sponsored financial incentives of any kind. Farms are busting their butts as it is to make ends meet and to meet existing government regulations. This proposal isn't going to help them.

Should be taken out of general tax fund.

Isn't interested in these ideas - has "old thinking."

We are one of the highest taxed states in the Union already. Use existing tax money for worthwhile projects.

Minnesota high tax too high, pays for college Prof. like Dr. Pat Welle. No trust in spending for Gov.

Money should be spent on total plan for environment, not just one part without addressing the main issue of crowding our cities with poor and children needing special programs and thus solving our problems. Having rich and well to do send their children to private schools and/or cramping farmland by moving to the country where tax policy favors this solution to our problems.

The idiots in charge of programs frequently don't understand what's going on. It would be just another spend without results venture.

Not necessary.

Most Gov. programs are ineffective and poorly administered. Costs are usually ballooned and overrun. These problems can't be solved by Govt. They have to be solved by people on their own.

If the greed of the American farmer wasn't so predominant they would institute programs on their own, as was done many years ago. Management of large farm corporations is only concerned with large profits.

Although I think these are all good for the environment, I would vote against, because of the cost per household. Some could afford this but there are lots of people who couldn't afford it, including myself. Taxes, I already have \$2000 in taxes a year taken out of my income.

I'm not interested regardless - the monetary involvement is like "bait," without it we're not guaranteed fair and equal treatment. Money involvement - if the program is intended to help there shouldn't need to be money in the agreement.

Proposal is voluntary and does not ensure that there will be enough done to produce the desired effect.

Programs such as this, with no spending limits, tend to escalate too much too fast in the wrong way. Some restraints are needed.

We couldn't pay greater taxes - small amount over several years, yes. Soilbank subsidy was mishandled and not effective. I know runoff of feedlots and farms is damaging. There has to be a possible solution, but we need grains, animals, fruit, vegetables. Not everyone has land to help feed the family.

We're retired senior citizens, and do not receive ample compensation for anything now! And you want money from us! We've paid our dues! Let the rich people pay.

I can't afford it.

I am opposed to the state putting more regulations on farmers. There is no way to have programs like these without some cost to the government.

More agricultural land is being bought by non-farmers as an investment. I would hate to see their investment turned into a government subsidized retirement plan. Turning tilled cropland into alfalfa and pasture unless there was a need for more livestock doesn't make sense.

Enough spent already - results seem ok for now.

Price is too high, for one thing. You could pay a little less for the program.

The proposal only encourages participation. We would be paying for something that the majority would not do because of the need to plant as much as possible to support these farms.

Tax burden is too high. Government should be looking for ways to reduce spending in every area of state spending. Every state dept. believes their area of the budget is "essential" and keep asking for more and more money during each budget cycle. State govt. needs an independent audit by a panel of business executives.

We pay high enough taxes now. It is hard to raise children on my income now.

Money and jobs are tough these days for everyone, each family has their own costs too and shouldn't be punished or have to fork out more money than they can afford. Family first!

We are among the highest taxed states in the nation. We do not need to add more taxes.

Find where we are wasting money and reallocate to work on these proposed programs. This would also be higher cost to the farmers that are already struggling.

If I make changes to my property I pay for it as should everyone else.

Couldn't afford it.

I don't know what kinds of programs would be proposed to accomplish the encouragement of the three outlined programs. Surely more bureaucrats are not needed.

We already pay enough in taxes to support all programs. Waste of money on things not associated with these programs is to high. Administration costs eat too much of the program money.

Around here the State is forcing us farmers to update sewers at a cost of around \$10,000. This is wrong. The current septic systems are ok. Just fix the ones that aren't. It's no different than these city sewer ponds the state backs. Water quality is the same when they empty the pond in the fall.

1) Things appear to be fine the way they are. 2) Farmers will make changes to help themselves. 3) Farmland is covered by Dept. of Ag. 4) DNR covers parkland. 5) Other issues concern me more than this proposal.

All of your "theories and projection" show the same 10% benefit. I tend to discount these types of theories when there is no real proof. I don't have anymore time for this study. Please contact someone else. Thank you.

I favor the proposal but it shouldn't cost me for something the farmer has caused. They've tore out groves of trees, fence lines and built the hog barns that caused the soil erosion, poor water quality. I get taxed every time I open my wallet, let the farmer who gets the tax breaks and govt. checks pay for the program.

The land developers use land for housing even if its for farming.

If it costs money we can't afford it.

Higher taxes, more subsidiary for farmers.

The cost is high enough now so it is hard to keep up on a fixed income.

Higher taxes, lower rebates, only helps land by 10%.

This sounds like it needs to be a federal program, not a state. Also, I think taxes need to be lower anyway, not higher.

I'm tired of the state controlling everything thru programs. I believe we could have independent companies be more efficient. We are already over tax in this state.

There's enough Gov. programs. Shift money from one to another.

I already pay too much in taxes. Why not tax alcohol and luxury cars and boats.

Ridiculous.

Your premise is inaccurate - no way does erosion occur at 4-8 tons/acre/year. Your lying in your premise. Farmland is private and should not be regulated by the government. I believe in lake water quality but with the least amount of govt. intervention.

A swamp across the street and a swamp in the lot north of my home were drained for development. What good does it do to pay farmers to protect the environment when developers can do whatever they want to reach their goals. I invited the Corp of Engineers to inspect the property and protested to the city council but to no avail. Obviously I am very bitter. The swamps drained into the Miss. River.

Funding - NO MORE TAXES - would be "for" this if funding came from cutting back on some ridiculous "entitlements" that are already out there!

We do not live on the farm anymore.

If farmers were getting prices for their products that they should have, they wouldn't need my help for another farm proposal. There are the following organizations: The Grange, The Farm Bureau, The Farmers Union, The N.F.O. All supposed to help the farmers and agriculture - keep in step with times - like labor unions do for labor. Like the phrase "cost of living increase" which farmers never got!

I am retired on a fixed income. COLA does not keep up with health insurance and property taxes and other necessary expenses - gas, heat, light, and food. I live on less than one acre and don't do any farming.

Because the farmers have enough trouble.

Get the money from welfare or tax the cheeseheads that work in MN.

Don't like government involvement deeper in farming. Don't like raising taxes to pay for project. They NEVER go back down.

Tax are high all ready.

On limited income. Cannot afford more taxation.

I would guess the DNR would be involved and I think they do nothing right.

1) Soil erosion is already being tended to. 2) The DNR is already choking off our access to the water. 3) Draining wetlands ties farmers hands as to what they want to do with their land. 4) The birds and animals are doing just fine. 5) Will use more fuel to make smaller patterns, not very effective. 6) Worms do more for the soil than man-made fertilizers. 7) Greenhouse gases, global warming is con.

No money in farming at present time. Can't afford it.

Because we are retired and barely get by every month on our Social Security. Tell me where we are to come up with \$400. Why don't you people use your brains and consider us people. Our fathers were farmers and nobody had to help them with conservation practices.

Taxes would go up.

To much money is being spent now on regulating and paper work. I think the money needed to run the program should come from trimming government waist like tabulating this survey.

MAIN REASON TO VOTE AGAINST: Q15N1 in Mail Survey

Government involved.

There is to much dead weight in Gov.

Cost.

No new taxes!

High taxes.

First need change attitude human soul and mind. Come to Savior Jesus Christ.

Higher taxes.

Too much government control.

Cost.

Already too high taxes.

Lower taxes.

Should be taken out of general tax fund.

Use the tax money the state already has instead of asking for more.

Money.

Cost.

Why not use Minnesota lottery proceeds?

Money.

Not enough to provide the desired effect.

Medical benefits! The state gives foreigners all kinds of benefits!

More regulations.

Age, low income, not a farmer or familiar with farm practices. Sorry.

The price is too high. I'm on a fixed income.

None participation.

\$70,000 in combined taxes in 2000.

Taxes are too high now - need money for raising kids.

Family money.

No new taxes.

The government shouldn't pay for changes/improvements to people's property.

See above.

It means another \$100 added to the \$10,000.

Things appear to be fine the way they are.

Water quality.

If it costs money we can't afford it.

Higher tax.

The cost of living increase in Social Security is not real.

Higher taxes.

Dollars.

Too much tax!

Cost of living.

Funding.

All of the above and more.

Because the farmers have enough trouble.

More government involvement.

Money.

Tax.

Financial.

DNR would be involved - think they do nothing right.  
Help make farming profitable.

**AREAS WHERE PROGRAM WOULD BE MUCH MORE EFFECTIVE THAN  
STATED: Q17 in Mail Survey**

Water quality.

I think that the birds and wildlife could finally keep some of their natural habitat. They are being chased away from the land that they belong on.

It is hard to speculate on the results until more information is available.

We have filter strips on this farm. Flooding causes soil erosion - filter strips really help erosion and benefit wildlife a lot. Stopping erosion will benefit all the others.

Rural farming techniques could learn from other states like South Dakota how to increase habitat for birds and wildlife.

Increased habitat.

Any positive results would be good.

Bio-diversity.

Food costs go up without program more than with.

Birds and wildlife, water quality.

Water quality.

Soil management, water management.

Soil erosion - plant windbreaks.

To the farmers.

The soil erosion/water quality programs.

Encourage the planting of trees and shrubs next to streams and lakes.

Decreased runoff, more marsh/wetlands, cleaner water, better habitat.

Don't have knowledge to know which is true.

Birds and wildlife, soil erosion.

I believe the river system would be helped substantially.

I don't think most people realize how beneficial these things will be, until people had to live more without clean safe water, air and the benefits of wildlife.

Water quality.

Don't feel qualified to answer; my general feeling is quality of water and habitat would be increased by more than 10%.

Water quality.

Birds and wildlife.

I think water quality would be improved more.

I believe it would be more effective for birds and wildlife.

Don't know.

Soil erosion, water quality.

Wildlife: with prices for crops being as they are. You may get more to set aside crop land for natural habitat.

Soil erosion, reduced flooding, increased habitat for birds and wildlife.

I think the expected results would be much higher than 10%. I think we could get 50% results.

Soil erosion.

Water quality and wildlife growth.

The problem is MN is only a MICRO in this issue. It needs to be addressed nationally and worldwide. How can MN maintain L.T. competitiveness if we are "adding" the true long-term costs of our products produced and expected to compete in a global market where no one else does so.

If small farms had money for shelters away from waterways (lakes-rivers) cleaner water would result.

Soil conservation, water purity enhancement.

Might help reduce flooding more than estimated.

Soil erosion, quality of drinking water.

Could reduce erosion more than 10%.

Don't know.

It is impossible to say unless the word "encourage" is explained.

Questions 17 & 18 both depend on what is done to "encourage" these practices (something you do not state in the insert).

I feel that a lot of Stearns Counties land would be much more protected from soil erosion if these practices would be put in place.

AREAS WHERE PROGRAM WOULD BE MUCH LESS EFFECTIVE THAN STATED: Q18 in Mail Survey

Lack of cooperation by rural communities - including farmers and govt. units.

Flooding.

Too many fingers in the pie taking the monies before it gets to be used for what it is designed for.

Why pick on the farmer - why not industrial waste?

I think it would be difficult for the small farmer to maintain a standard of living by cutting back on crop production.

Too tough to implement and too costly.

Soil erosion figures are very suspect.

Same as above.

Birds and wildlife - not practiced since it would take more money to plant a vegetative corner, rather than farm the land. Too much land out of production.

Maybe - it sounds like all the expected results are speculation and hypothesis rather than definitive results.

All areas farmers don't exert much self-control.

Farmers are not generally concerned with conservation.

I think landowners would change to any programs that provide higher financial rewards - thus making it less effective.

I am not sure that the lower gases. I believe that some of the program will cause more gases.

Any area where farmer needs to reduce acreage for crops.

Most large farmers and corporate farmers do not practice soil conservation.

Water quality.

I do not subscribe to the theory of global warming. If it were true, the limited amount of voluntary participants in Minnesota would not affect the total output of such gases on a global scale.

In total.

The use of less nitrogen fertilizer.

Greenhouse gases need to be controlled by innovation in combustion (fossil fuel) engines, not farmland!

It should be a joint effort by all farmers.

Soil erosion: chemically based agriculture kills the life in the soil. Dead soil is not longer cohesive and erodes away. The proposal only addresses part of the problem.

This program would require 100% compliance, which is unlikely with the farmer group.

Flooding, global warming.

Very few farmers will sign up for these programs.

You're asking farmers to do major landscaping changes. This takes higher labor numbers and the use of major equipment. Who will help them to do this when they have farming to do year round?

Soil erosion.

I do not believe that the state of MN solely can reduce the greenhouse effect.

I think the general public would not want to spend excess money.

Water quality - due to other pollutants.

Greenhouse gases. Global warming is a joke!

All areas.

Flooding - not a problem here. Improve the quality of water, lakes, streams - people need to help with control of pollution or contaminants to our land and water. Too much littering, dropping off, etc. (No respect for others).

Greenhouse gases - global warming.

Birds and wildlife - now we have more Canada geese, bald eagles, deer than ever. If there is room for them, small bird species should have plenty of room.

Depends on people involved.

Birds and wildlife. With all the large equipment farmers tend toward larger plots/ easier and less turns around. This will be hard to sell without large compensation.

Don't really know.

Flooding.

Don't know.

Hard to keep budget in line. Keep the money going to where it will do the most good.

Water quality.

Greenhouse effects: Don't feel that you can get rural sector to go along with using less chemicals or change tillage practices.

Water quality, flooding.

It will be hard to sell climate control.

Yes, most areas look at the current amount of land in CRP. We as state taxpayers can't do more than this.

Quality of drinking water, greenhouse gases.

Water quality, flooding.

Persons in this area have less and less trust in aid from the government due to the fact that many times they may be paid - but lose rights over their land.

Erosion, flooding, etc. Natural disasters happen.

Because farming is and has been so unregulated that farmers don't care enough to go "out of their way" to improve the land to benefit all the proposals.

I'm not sure what the long-term value or impact will be. MN has already drained more wetlands than our neighbors - SD and ND and they want to "catch up" with us. We need to do something NOW! Look at MN flooding problems. That could largely be eliminated with proper wetland management.

Reducing carbon dioxide!

Soil erosion, greenhouse gases.

Big corporate farms.

Throwing money at a problem NEVER makes it go away!

I think reducing greenhouse gases will require much more than the proposed solutions listed on the insert.

Big company's will not go for the plan.

Don't know.

How can one tell without more info on what and how people will be encouraged?

None of these proposals should be forced on anybody.

Water quality.

COMMENTS ON HIGHER PRICES FOR SOME FOODS: Q19 in Mail Survey

Possibly.

It is too micro to know. I think it will impact MN economic competitiveness –adversely!

Yes, you convinced me! Q20: Same.

I'm sure farmers would be the sole beneficiary (cashwise). Right?

Unless it was a federal law Minnesota would be at a great disadvantage.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENTS ON FARMING: Q30 in Mail Survey

Most of the above questions have nothing to do with the environment.

I believe you are making this proposal in a vacuum because you have not considered the proportion of impact due to agriculture in relation to the total greenhouse gases generated naturally world wide. Is it 1%, 10%, 50%? While I am sentimentally in favor of rural living, I fail to see why we subsidize agriculture on such a high level.

I would like to see affordable health care plans provided to all people. I'd like to see the government leave the farmers and rural communities alone!

Not relevant to me.

Q30: h) Not realistic. a & b) Family farms are going the way of the family grocery, gas station, etc. Why work to preserve one area and not another. With the larger machinery etc, need to be larger to achieve the profit needed. Farmers are going to become larger or be phased out by the competition.

Q30f: If large polluters quit, yes. h) Same as f.

Sorry, I don't have any experience or much knowledge of farming practices and issues.

Who came up with these! We are no longer in the 1950's . What your asking for is not economically possible or worthwhile. Your wasting your time and mine.

D & E) provided by who? ME. H) - This sounds like we would pay people not to work (soilbank).

Q30 l & m) Don't know what a feed lot is –

#### MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS INCLUDING BACK COVER

Please send this to someone else. I'm 80 years old and don't hunt or fish anymore.

I agree with environmental efforts but I am not sure over regulation - state control will not result. Bureaucrats in St. Paul impacting local questions. Keep the decision making at the grass roots level.

I watched my father become dependent on farm programs like Soilbank, etc. I don't think they need to be. Also anything free was too easy. People will waste a whole day to stand in line. If we can dig up billions of dollars to waste on light rail in the metro there is no reason we can't improve the quality of life and land in the state of MN. Why do we have to settle for trade-offs?

Q15A: We are on a fixed income and cannot withstand too many increased costs. This survey was sent to my husband, but he has Alzheimer's and is unable to answer these questions. I identify with the plight of the farmer as I was raised on a farm in Minnesota and participated in all aspects of the work involved.

There is farmland that should be farmed. Also there is a lot of swamps that have be drained that never should be farmed. If we are going to spend money buy these 2 or 3 acre places up and take them off the tax rolls. Most farmers are good stewards of the soil. The Gov. and there regulations are the ones that generally don't have a clue what is going on. Don't pay big corporate people to farm

Market influences should dictate what to plant, where to plant, farm size, etc. Not government via price supports. Just another form of welfare.

But I think that \$100 per household should give the government plenty of money to make the program work. They always seem to spend the money allotted to one program on other wasted things. Mostly their own rich selfish needs. My grandparents have a nice big farm that was a wonderful place to stay in the summer, and now it is covered with McDonald's, businesses, gas stations, etc. It is a shame.

I strongly agree that measures need to be taken to lessen the environmental effects of agriculture. I hesitate about providing "financial rewards" for farmers that comply with these measures. Farming is already subsidized a lot - even for those who do not need financial help. No other small business owner get money if the income from their product is not what they "should" be paid for it.

No longer capable to fill out any survey. She is 89 years of age.

I believe Bible say put first place our Lord everything come hold together. We have so many problem this world. Most need human to come to Maker this earth and man. Lord gives us this earth to take care, but our sin make all kind problem, even water and air. So this time I want put my money to tell Salvation to others. Help people first.

I am a retired widow. Land in CRP.

Preserve & protect all existing native forests. All decisions involving the use of land in our MN must be regulated concerning the effect it has on the quality of our habitat. Restore damage already done: preserve, recycle, reuse, do without, create. Limit logging. Also, I'm not sure "govt. encouragement with financial incentives" will have any significant effect but cost me money - but try.

Q-28: Cost of \$200 is impossible.

If we pay farmers to improve their practices, will they allow the hunter and nature lover to use some of their land!

Q20: We shouldn't pay higher taxes or receive a lower rebate. The right environmental things should be done. We shouldn't have to bribe people to do the right thing.

I would like farmers to be able to be given stipends, small tax cuts, etc. to keep their income level stable by being involved in such a program - I believe the majority of the profits need to be used to acquire state of public owned land and operate programs like this on it.

I did not fill this out as I'm a South Dakota resident.

Mother, father, father-in-law and mother-in-law, and grandparents all lived on farms and made their livelihood from farming. Its good that we are considering these things. Its too bad that we hadn't done more about it previously. I really hope that the state of Minnesota will demonstrate more genuine care and concern for its residents.

Our needs and much of the worlds needs could be met by wisely managing the best crop land and putting the rest to rest. Those who oppose urban sprawl are resisting the need of everyone to have some land they can call their own. They claim sprawl is eating up good farmland of which we obviously have too much anyway.

I don't want to comment on the environmental effects of agriculture. I do want to comment on the way in which these questions were asked and the way the questions were organized with if/go directions. Was this questionnaire designed by the same people who created the Presidential ballots in Florida???

Q22: The environment must become a higher priority issue.

Deceased.

If everyone lived sensibly and with moderation we wouldn't have these problems. This is too much like taking a test. I don't care to give all this time and effort to it. My interests do not lie in this area as yours do. You make it too difficult.

You have a very nice booklet. Let's get down to the real problem, "imports." We import meat, grain, fruit and dairy products at a very low cost. The farmer cannot compete. Let's put a large enough import tax on imports so the farmer can make a fair living.

Thank you for including me in this survey - I find it very interesting.

1) Should go back to set aside acres in the farm program and leave the some set aside for more than one year. 2) Should limit the amount of nitrogen that farmers put on per acre.

Q19: Yes - but not because of the farmer's price increase, rather increases added by manufacturing (justly or unjustly).

I think this should be a program that concentrates on the larger farms that plant crops to sell and do so by planting acres of land with one type of crop. I grew up on a small farm and we practiced some of the things that the program recommends to save the environment, yet it is the small farm that continues to go out of business, and the larger farms, I believe, are affecting the environment most.

I thought lottery profits were supposed to fund all projects to do with the environment. Actually the lottery profits should almost be able to support all projects mentioned.

Q5-12: This is poor question as it is termed in goal form rather than methodology. Take Q-7 for example. What are you talking about? How and why? AFDC provides income for housing. Is it spent on housing the way you want it. Your whole questionnaire is out of context and continues approval of extended car use, land use, etc. to a great extent.

Q15A: Would pay up to \$500 per year as long as it was part of my taxes. Stop GMO's!

According to 2000 Time Almanac only 2.5% of Americans live on farms. I would like to believe that the vast majority of "tree-hugging environmentalists" do not understand farm life. MN politicians have allowed large feedlots to stink up whole neighborhoods. If understanding agriculture were toilet paper, most of MN's lawmakers would not know how to use it.

Q21: No - virtually all projects come in over budget. Farmers should be given the liberty of farms as efficiently as possible without greatly affecting the environment. I'm guessing there are more cost effective ways to go about achieving these goals than taxing the citizens of MN for a program that is "strictly voluntary." Possible that not one farm would participate.

Not a Minnesota resident.

1) Food is essential. 2) Low cost food. 3) Altered food is out. 4) Farmers should be paid for the free lunch afforded by them to the wildlife animals and bird whatever instead of govt. Mother Nature seems to be in control up or down. Govt. programs don't last too long and don't have a long-term effect. Mother Nature has always come to the rescue of all our great dreams and problem solvers

I just have one thing to say. Since the Minnesota Lottery proceeds are supposed to go for environmental and wildlife concerns, why can't money be used from there for these programs? It might as well do some real good.

I think feedlots are a good thing if properly managed and handled responsibly.

Don't bring the free-market system down! Offer incentives that are fair and reward conservation. Do not take sides on how big "you" feel a farm should be. The market and capitalism will surely control this. Feedlots are necessary and are being built with good stewardship and economic benefits for the producer and his row-crop livelihood. Do some research before changing anything!

I agree with the desired results of the program, but not the methods proposed.

Since short sighted and irresponsible farming methods got us into this mess in the first place I think there should be a proposal for incentives to encourage organic farmers. They already use all the conservation practices in this proposal and understand good land stewardship. We support this proposal 100% and will help pay for it pay for it but \$300 is beyond our means. Use lottery proceeds.

Q30h: Regarding farmland being returned to native condition - how much land? Back cover: No problem! Keep up the good work.

We need to be moving in the direction of more organic farming. That would certainly mean higher costs, more labor intensive methods, etc. but (hopefully) less pollution.

Sorry, but I neither have the time nor the expertise to answer these questions - what a waste of taxpayer's money! No wonder we are over-taxed in this state!!

So what happens to city people? We raised 6 children on land and income of 2,000. Can family today do that, no. I don't know if I could again. You shop wisely and I still do. Small family farms against huge greedy landowners can still make do. It takes work to milk cows, cut hay, grow garden, pick fruit, and can. To look out the window at several birds is beauty.

If this proposal goes thru, it will have to be funded by other means. I feel that we have been taxed way too much and that all the programs we have to support have overburdened the system.

Q38: The family business, now operated by my son, deals wholly with farming.

I would like to see affordable health plans for every MN person, not just for farmers - the same for retirement plans. Farmers are getting to a point where they want to plant one thing or do one thing, be done and go on vacation for the next 9 months. I think farmers should go back to being diversified, doing whatever it takes to be self-supportive.

NO comment!

This questionnaire seems very one-sided and does not explain how much farming has changed over the past 20 years and does not explain how the farmers are already using less tillage, along with reduced fertilizer and chemicals.

Please, I have no opinion on any of your questions. Send to someone else. Sorry.

Any increase in funding does not sound good to us. Fixed, low income rules us out as a dependable, accurate source of info.

Don't know the highest amount I would be willing to pay.

Q19: Not in the long run. Financial savings in not having to clean up, reduced healthcare.

Q21: Do not have to make permanent payments. There are not enough incentives for the small farmer. too many state and federal taxes go to large farming organizations. Though there may be some efficiencies they are far outweighed by the negative consequences on the environment.

Global warming is a theory and is mostly a political issue. I am against increased spending and reallocation of wealth on a global scale to address this perceived problem.

Q28: Trick question. Financially it would be easy but answering "not difficult at all" would be interpreted as an agreement for a tax increase.

Sold my Ottertail County farm 12 years ago. No interest in the survey as I have no farm presently.

The bureaucratic costs of programs in Minnesota usually decreases the benefits to an unacceptable degree.

I am a licensed water and wastewater operator in MN, class C & B resp. I have over 20 yrs. in the field. I have an ag background & also work in the ag industry. I mention this to let you know I understand envr. issues well. I have seen large amts. of money spent with little or no benefit. All money must be well spent. Not on theories but a true cost to benefit analysis must be done.

Q15A: Amount willing to pay depends on what the definitive info proposed. Q21: How extensive are the proposals followed, historical participation.

We Minnesotans are extremely fortunate to have a state full of trees, wetlands, acres of beautiful urban parks, and thousands of acres of state/national parks. As the population of the state increases - a negative impact on our environment is pending. We need to be proactive - as this program does, to increase awareness and preserve this Minnesota wonder.

No colored sheet.

Q15A: Politicians would spend it all even if it was \$500/month.

I've seen small farms 200 acres or less gobbled up by big concerns, casinos, housing, etc. Small farmers cannot make it today. The big farms don't care about environment or the quality of the product they produce. Why can't I as a citizen buy direct from the small farmer and get a better quality product. We never had pollution problems when we recycled our own manure etc.

Q28: Somewhat difficult because everything is increasing. The farmers should be educated and encouraged to take pride and plant trees and grass in areas not used for farming. Government pays farmers not to grow. If a fact, farmers should take care of open fields. Farmers are suffering in MN because food and all are coming from other parts of USA and other countries.

In the greenhouse gases section they talk about climate change or "global warming." There is no such thing! Over the life of our planet (millions of years) they have only been keeping track of temperature for the past 150 years or less. This should not be a gauge to verify increases in the earth's temperature or to attribute any change to fertilizer!

We or none of my family have been farmers. I have no idea how to answer any of the following questions. I am a widow and live in an apt.

If we kill mother earth this will seriously hurt our environment. We as a species will also die. It is basic. Without a healthy mother earth we can't be healthy. Loan givers have pushed farmers into bigger and bigger farm operations. Without change that failure is possible. Seriously look at lending entities.

Q19: Not sure because of all the imported food. Q21: No - \$100 per household seems slightly high. Why try to stop the inevitable?

Over population throughout the world is the major cause of water and air pollution problems. The use of water to dispose of human waste needs some kind of study for discontinuation of this practice. Automobiles and airplanes pollute - how to solve I do not know. With houses all over former farmland we have eliminated the family farm.

Corporate farms will be the death of us all.

Deceased since 1998.

Q5-12: These are difficult to answer because I have no idea how much is now being spent. Also, spending more in some cases does not improve or get results. I think too much money is wasted on govt. programs in the administrative areas. Not enough flows thru to actually do the projects. Clean air, water, etc. are very important to all Minnesotans, but more money is not always the answer.

Q21: More. Farming or any kind of business should be done in the most efficient and cost effective manner without having to pay any kind of incentive.

Farmers love their land, but at current prices they can't afford to think about environment unless govt. does it for them.

I'm sorry but I have no educated opinion on these questions. I have not lived on a farm for 60 yrs and have no family or close friends involved in farming.

Q21: Very unclear. Q22: I believe the DNR and Fish and Wildlife are failing.

I believe that the cheap food policy of this country is the biggest contributing factor for these environmental problems. Being a dairy farmer in this century is like being an American Indian of past.

We can't continue to see all our farmlands being turned into housing developments. We need to keep a balance with nature and our desire to build homes. We need to support farmers and make farming worth their while. We need to encourage farmers to realize the importance farmland, that is properly maintained, is of benefit to all of us and all the animals/birds. Farming should be respected.

Q21: Don't know.

We are not interested in this program and would not pay any amount if it is passed.

This survey was to vague.

As already stated this is old information learned in the "dirty thirties." The farmer that does not do these things is a poor businessman and will soon go broke. If the offender does not correct their methods they should be fined or put out of business like any real business that does not comply with environmental laws.

Q21: Yes, but not enough info on cost of proposal. I would like to see any policy decision arrived at through involvement at local levels. This would include Ag. input from universities, farmers, state agencies. Decisions should be based on long term benefit so that air & water quality are improved for our children & their children.

Controlling the environmental impact of agriculture is a worthy goal and should not be the impetus for a grand scale of increasing governmental bureaucracy. Use of some tax funds maybe appropriate providing the funds actually reach the problem. Government does not have a great record in this regard.

Please note: I regret that I'm unable to answer this questionnaire. My father bought those 20 acres about 80 years ago, and I inherited them. So for about 50 yrs. I've rented them to farmers in the neighborhood. Sometime in the future I may sell them. Sorry!

Q21: Higher. We can't ask our state farmers to do anything that would make them less able to compete with another state or countries farmers. These are not decisions to be made by state Gov., they need to be made by federal Gov. Look how CRP has hurt the small rural economies. Why should the state keep up with the federal Gov. when hurting the economy. Don't do anything!

Farm practices have improved. Realize we are depending on farms for food, clothing, and much more for our way of life. Due to economics - bigger is only way to survive.

Farmers will protect land and environment especially if economically rewarding to them.

I was very pleased to receive this survey. I found it very interesting and eye-opening, and also informational. Thank you.

I believe that you are on the right track!

There is to much tilling and ditching going on. Neighbor wanted the ditch cleared, county board okayed it, bulldozed 3/4 mile of the ditch on their property, lost over 100 trees. Ditch bank is now higher than the field so they put culverts in. Now it rains and all the water washes from the field directly into the ditch causing terrible erosion. Three of the six culverts wash out completely.

Go for it!

Farmers - not person in govt. know their land. Passing laws is fine but in the past the total picture has not been looked at. I feel spending in rural areas has not been a priority for years. Just look in the cities road projects and city works. Rural areas and farmers keep them going and get very little in return! Q20: No, at least I hope not.

Yes, take the money out of Congress' pension, health care, and retirement funding and use that to cover Ag. issues!

Q20: I would give my rebate. I really would be willing to pay a bit more in taxes and food costs AND give up my rebate check if it would help to provide a better and cleaner environment. Could this program lead to fraud on the part of some farmers? Who would watch this program? I really want feedlots ABOLISHED NOW! We need more family farms.

Q16: Somewhat effective if enforced! Q29: Probably against, based on family income and excessive state taxes. I am sad to see so many swamps, marshes, lakes etc. being drained for farmland. The effects are devastating to wildlife! When canoeing the Crow River, I have seen piles of pesticide cans lining the river. Should act as a big "hello."

Q14B: Amount willing to pay depends. The farmer needs to be encouraged to help as well as educated on the effects of their practices. I would do my part if I knew they were doing theirs.

I think there is potential to improve the position of green-house gases by encouraging and/or providing \$ incentives for "tree-farming." The trees will help reduce carbon in the atmosphere at least medium-term the lives of the forests. Is this being considered as part of your study? Q21: It wouldn't have much impact on MN "consumers."

Intended respondent deceased since 2-5-01.

I'm sorry. My eyes are very bad. I can't begin to read all the info in the book and inserts so I wouldn't be honest in answering the balance of the questions. Forgive me.

Q5-12: "More" or "less" than WHAT? e.g. I have no idea how much is spent to "reduce water pollution." Back cover: Plant grass and let the family farmer go to work somewhere else.

Q22: Pork Barrel.

We need to keep local tax dollars at home and cut down on the number of people on the Gov. payroll.

I have neighbors who are farmers that winter beef within 100 yards of a lake and 25 yards from a marsh and river. There must be a considerable amount of water polluted by these animals. We need to educate these farmers and give them incentives to move and house their animals away from our waterways. I would like to see a law passed immediately to remove such pollution sources.

Q20: \$250 per year in higher taxes. Q21: No, it will go higher.

Q15A: Difficult to answer this question without more data. I hope you receive a valid number of these questionnaires back. Good luck.

Q29: Definitely against, based on how it is funded - NO MORE SPENDING!! Cut some other govt. program spending, then I would be for it! Soil erosion, water quality, and flooding are important to me. Birds and wildlife, no. I don't believe in the "global warming" theory so that enters into my opinion re: Greenhouse Gases section.

I'm all for it but we need to look at other spending and justify it before spending more of what we don't have. I.e. The other day I was in a Federal Building that was around 90% empty, but was being heated at a cost of \$3,000 - per HOUR, 24 hours a day! What a waste.

Q39: (Or the results of farming?) Food, clothes, medicine. Very dependent! Back cover: I would like to see a lot less use of chemical fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides, using more natural means of control. Also, the use of hormones in animals so they produce more milk, etc. may not be so healthy for us over the long term.

I am sorry I cannot do this survey. I am living on a fixed income (S.S.) There is not way I could cover \$300 or even much less. All the things you ask about are important but at my age I do not practice many outside pleasures. I am sorry I couldn't give you answers to your questions. I feel there are others that would cover these questions better than I.

Q39: We all must eat! I think your practices will mess up the works. You should stay out of agriculture and let the market forces prevail. Environmental issues will come into play from the market point of view before too much damage is done.

Keep family farms affordable.

Q29: I am struggling to survive as it is - \$300 is out of the question for me. I was a poor person to select for this survey. I work 3 jobs and have serious health issues and found this survey lengthy and inappropriate for me. I am poor - broke and sick and this seems like a waste of money to me.

This person no longer lives at this address! And we don't care to fill this out!

Dear sir: I am sorry that I wasn't home when the letter came. I did not answer the questions as I am ninety-two years old and my eyesight is not very good. You can give the booklet to someone else to fill out. Yours truly, -

I am 76 years old and can't answer your questions about farming.

Person is deceased.

With the cost of living prices going up and fuel, medical, medicine, housing, and insurance some of us just make it from payday to payday. To increase taxes will hurt. The state of MN has the highest taxes and some cannot put money away for emergencies. I understand we need to help with all that are listed but we also need to live.

I am a retired truck driver, 1980 on for the past 20 years. Sorry these questions do not pertain to my way of life. I started driving in 1938. These questions are not in my line.

Q3 and Q34: Laws of this state do not require me to give my age. I have been a victim of age discrimination in the workforce.

Intended respondent deceased.

I am strongly in favor of the steps listed in this proposal, however, in order to spend \$400 per household on this, we must reduce some other spending. (Or forgo the tax rebates we have all come to expect.) Thank you for asking my opinions. I appreciate the opportunity to express my views.

Intended respondent has been dead for 22 years. Wife not qualified to answer most questions.

I think that if more education to farmers via books recommended, internet, etc. that farmers would voluntarily implement these changes.

Deceased.

Why would you think I wanted to fill this out? Don't EVER send again!

I think describing an off-white grayish insert as "colored" is confusing.

Have the government out of farming.

I think any proposal needs to pass the cost-benefit test. But I also believe the benefits should be broadly defined. I strongly disagree that changes in farming practices in the state of MN would have an impact on the cost of food given the types of crops produced in MN. Obviously any incentive is considered on the cost side but the effect at the grocery store would be limited.

It's of dire importance to clean up water and air, but it doesn't do much when just a few participate. It's a matter of the whole world - or else it's a small contribution to the whole problem. Our water in northern Minnesota is more polluted from acid rains, and illegal practices by big business who pollute and don't clean up their messes than farmers. Tax those who pollute.

Q28: I'm on a very strict budget and now with energy costs going up it is very difficult. If the farmers could use the needed chemicals for higher yields but NOT affect the quality

of the water (lakes, rivers and sub-table) it would be great. More studies need to be done to promote environmentally safe herbicides etc.

Q29: I would protest, write and call any politician who would listen to me. The DNR has too much uncontested power that needs to be reigned in. They make laws that even Congress doesn't approve of. Also the govt. in general is systematically eroding away our rights. Big Brother is watching everything we do. Leave the farmers alone - without them we will have no food to consume.

Non-resident.

I believe many of the issues in this booklet deserve increased spending - but I believe tax dollars are wasted in other areas that would be better served by these issues.

Family farms sound nice but are not realistic in our world today. This farming program would be a good tool to get big farming interests/businesses more attuned to environmental degradation.

### ***COMMENTS FROM INTERVIEWS***

#### **COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT VARIETY OF EFFECTS DESCRIBED: Q1-4 IN INTERVIEW**

Drainage ditches, irrigation dikes.

Nitrogen level in well after 20 years of former farms. Referred to dry run he had running into Wells Creek. Had CRP "reserve" plantings.

Rule - stay 15 ft. away from drainage ditch. Lived the dust bowl in SD in 38-39. Drained too many wetlands. Farmers too greedy, producing too much.

Should do something about the water. All need clean water to drink.

Used to farm, knows this.

How would you do that? Cut in half? Should go back to way things were. Streams that are green.

4-8 tons?

Quick way to solve, drainage ditches are a problem. Level dams so water doesn't all go out at once.

4-8 tons per acre per year is interesting.

Concerned about farmers cheating system and being paid!

What about towns on the MS and stored water runoff. Also, street plowing in towns along river. Why permit land application of sludge? Red Wing sewage sludge. Also mentioned proposal on nuclear plant storage.

Sewage disposal required but not for Mpls. 50-60 years ago was livestock fertilizer.

Statewide? It's scary, just don't think about it.

Pay farmers, family farms vs. corporate farms.

The water situation is horrible.

If federal government hadn't funded farmers to drain sloughs there would be no problem. Shelter belt was the norm as a child.

#### COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT VARIETY OF EFFECTS DESCRIBED: Q1-5 IN INTERVIEW

Familiar with all of it. Saw Des Moines area covered with water.

Have to give farmers something for this tougher laws on poachers.

Still way above me. Son owns farm in Miland. Grandson applied for position in watershed office.

How get this done being farmers. Have govt. set up to plant fence row.

Why ditches flooding farmers field. Sees wildlife, bald eagles.

They paint the land black in the fall. Less abundance of pheasant and no prairie chicken. Buffer dams and gate dams. Tile goes into drainage ditches.

Pheasants decreased about when started to drain sloughs. Sightings of bald eagles along MN River in September.

Pretty clear.

People going hungry but worry about feeding birds.

Old way was to have fencing - standard practice - now it's in the way.

#### COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT VARIETY OF EFFECTS DESCRIBED: Q1-6 IN INTERVIEW

Pretty familiar.

Could do that by quitting entering farmers to provide what we have no use for.

Hasn't been on farm since '39. Grew sweet clover and plowed it under in spring for fertilizer after it came up. Dad used to plant red clover in SD.  
Noted 70% NOx is surprising. Daughter and nephew work for DNR.

When he was farming never thought of it. Had hog situation running into ditch. Now cleaning up, should've been done a long time ago.

Wasn't aware of nitrous oxide release from soils. Knows about anhydrous ammonia use.

Carbon from soil vs. reason for CRP. Father has farm near Bellingham in CRP (near Ortonville).

How to measure the carbon trapped? Doesn't like fall application of urea, done because of competition between co-ops. Convenient for farmers but lot of it lost.

Talked about greenhouse gases.

Instead of nitrogen?

For global warming, likes mild winters, thinks it's more from cycles.

Up to farmers to choose.

Read methane articles. Nitrogen in wells.

Unsure how prices of food will change.

Hard to know facts. Have to be a politician. Carbon and industry a drop in the bucket. Go after the big ones.

How are you going to monitor where the money goes?

REASONS TO VOTE FOR THE PROPOSAL: V-1FOR1, 2 AND 3

Helps environment. Must think about future generations of farmers. Most people would probably do it for free.

\$500 is ok to spend on such a positive program. Really important to protect the environment.

Improve our environment. Maybe it would lead to less chemicals into our environment.

Groundwater should be good, cleaner lakes and rivers, reduce flooding. Wouldn't bother me if \$450 for typical person. Don't drive, don't spend, come out of charitable contributions.

Know what's going on out there, it's scary. Water coming into Chippewa and Redwood Rivers. So much sediment. Way too much erosion and other nutrients coming into river. Global warming scares me too. Heard too much on glaciers.

Grew up on dairy farms, value of wetlands, pheasant hunting with family. Want kids to be healthy.

Reduce flooding, better water and air quality, better fish and wildlife. Greenhouse effect a concern in grandchildren's lifetime. "I'm basically a conservationist."

\$200 over a year not a whole lot of money. Drinking water, you only have so much and you've got to have drinking water period. Clean water to make beer, soup, whatever else. Better ag. practice there'd be more wildlife. Likes to see them.

Improving water quality and soil would be helpful to everybody. Good for wildlife. Very funny.

Environmental protection. Environmental run-off, bird and wildlife, water contamination. Hesitate on anything higher than \$400.

Maintain water quality, maintain bird number/habitat

Low daily cost. Reduction in erosion. Improved air quality.

Only way ag. can be reigned in, if farmers not compensated for these reductions. Can afford, only way to get change.

See soil erosion. Think it's an important issue.

Erosion and pollution, the water streams runoff, everything else circles around that. It can't keep going the way it is.

Improve water quality, good soil stewardship, cut down air pollution.

Not too expensive, farmer education, strip planting easy to create.

Drinking water, concerns about local farmers getting cancer, testing of wells going on to see if safe drinking water.

Quality of life, willing to pay more for environmental quality.

Environment: less air and water pollution. More birds and wildlife, more sensible farming.

Benefits everyday life.

Bring out-of-line people in line.

Soil erosion, water pollution, simply need to stop pollution.

Controlling sprays, benefit birds and wildlife, water quality, especially for drinking.

Whole thing makes it worth it - like birds, plants, trees and farmland.

Increased wildlife, water quality.

Cleaner water, less runoff, less soil erosion, less nutrients, help carbon area.

Cut down on greenhouse gases, help to reduce flooding, wetlands holding water and gradually releases.

Environment for all of us very important. Some scary things happening in the environment. Scared about deformed frogs.

Concern about soil and water quality. People should preserve what we have.

Old practices didn't have applications of chemicals. New practices apply too much. Water quality and soil erosion. Neglected in past so must be addressed.

If it worked.

Great ideas. Drinking water. A little bit of everything.

Would not notice payment over the year. Would like to see old way of rotation farming and leaving some land green.

Help environment. Help wildlife. Reduce greenhouse gases.

Cleaner air, better water, less flooding.

Future generations, thinking long-term. If we do not have water we don't have anything.

Help the land, habitat. Sound agricultural policy.

Vote for if they followed through...a way to monitor. It would benefit the state.

Environmental reasons.

Right now flooding is of great concern because it is supposed to be 10 years between floods and '97 feels like yesterday!

Help environment  
Help the farmer. Help prevent floods.

Must do something soon or it will be too late. State has to make firm environmental laws. Environment and our health is too important. We need to account for our children 's wellbeing - we have made a mess out of things.

Flooding.

It would directly benefit me and the community.

Save things like flooding from happening. See more birds.

Strong belief in maintaining the land for the future.

Wildlife benefits, flooding, need to stop the programs currently going on, for example, Lake Emily is affecting the Chippewa because of drainage - then the Chippewa drains into local rivers.

We need to do some of these things.

This needs to be done - simply put. Pisses me off that I have to pay the farmer to do what is right.

Environmental reasons - I watch wildlife.

Need the grass and trees to hold the soil from blowing.

Need to get some things back like birds and stuff. Clean up the water.

Long term benefit to the state custodian.

All good things.

Environmental worth.

Helping wildlife.

Soil erosion, global warming, better environment.

\$200 is nothing compared to the environmental costs.

It's logical. Price/benefit ratio is good.

Low cost.

Worth it to take care of the environmental future.  
Soil conservation. Soil retention is not impossible even on hills.

To help the environment.

Already doing it as a farmer.

Erosion.

Doesn't till now so money would support. Soil erosion benefit. Sounds good.

Dollars for a better sustainable future.

Rewarding farmer is worth it. For conservation.

Future generations, retaining the "green," quality of life.

Environmental concern.

Need to do something for the environment.

Being a farmer and we're underpaid.

Important to our kids and environment.

Definitely for ecological benefits.

MAIN REASONS TO VOTE FOR THE PROPOSAL: V-1ForM

Would improve the environment.

Protect environment.

Less chemicals.

Clean up water and environment. Needs to be done. Could cut back more in other areas.  
Keep lakes so people can swim. Young people go hunting and fishing. Little dams to  
hold creeks back and release a little at a time. Clean up streams so fish can live in them.

Global warming because that in turn affects everything else.

Long-term health

Reduce flooding

All good programs

Drinking water.

Birds and wildlife.

Wildlife management and soil erosion.

Wildlife.

Can't give to everything, budget stretches thin (expenses, insurance). Don't know much about farming practices.

Water quality.

It is for good reasons. Even townspeople reap benefits. Worry about water quality (drinking water).

Low daily cost.

Encourages more farmers to practice conservation. Always been for conservation, she and husband practice. Hay and pasture in this hilly area. Supports conservation practices.

Lump sum, all are important.

Important issue.

Runoff.

All important.

Feedlots at risk of closing, these measures will allow feedlots to continue.

Drinking water quality, cancer and farmer's water supply.

Would depend on what % of costs was administrative fees. Farmers breaking the law by polluting - why pay them? Just enforce law. Corporate can't pollute, why let farmers. As a household of one, unfair to pay \$200. Must see money going to farmers. Envision money going to administration - robbing farmers of more money.

Soil erosion (used to farm), merits of proposal.

Sees a danger in water pollution.

Soil erosion.

Keep soil where it belongs. Pro-conservation.

Wildlife and conservation.

% of what I pay now, local govt. has to have from other sources, have to pick it up.

Protection of water table, air quality. Protection of water table.

Zoning laws.

All of it.

Groundwater, drinking water, surface water, atmospheric quality.

Increased wildlife, but it's all important.

Protects wells, cleans up the environment. Both important.

Keep clean water and air, protect the soil. Too much wildlife, not important to reward.

Keep the soil.

Cleaner water.

Back to '93, help to reduce flooding, a lot of wetlands gone.

Something has to change. MN is leader but is it really that much more? Likes subsidizing all the green movement.

For humans and animals/wildlife - will benefit all of us.

Water quality.

Too much chemicals.

Both water quality and soil erosion.

Mostly quality of surface water and less on drinking water.

Everything.

Go back to old way - environmental awareness.

Know must keep up for ag. Keep ag going.

Environment - carbon - air pollution cleaned up.

Better, cleaner air.

Future generations.

Environmental.

Environmental.

Very supportive but the amount of money is too high.

Environmental reasons.

Flooding.

Clean water and air.

Help the environment.

Must start sometime.

Right now the main reason is the flood we have in Montevideo.

Flooding.

It would directly benefit me and the community.

Conservation of the land.

If farmers do not get the money no one gets anything.

Remembered what farms used to be like - country side has radically changed.

Get wildlife back - many birds are no longer around.

Get birds back.

Custodial

Preservation of the land.

Change is coming - this may be good.

Children's future.

Environmental betterment.

Future of the environment.

Improvement in quality of life makes it worth it.

Low cost.

To protect environment and wildlife.

Retention of soil and water quality.

To help the environment.

Improve the environment.

Preservation.

Farmer reward.

Future generations.

Environmental concern.

Extra income.

Kid's and planet's future.

#### REASONS TO VOTE AGAINST THE PROPOSAL: V-AG

Strictly opposed to government interference. Price doesn't make a difference. I'd still be against it, even if it cost me nothing. Price doesn't make a difference. I don't want the government telling me what to do.

All these issues are important but why subsidize them for this. They're raising too much. Subsidy program. Farmer needs practice as own responsibility to keep land in shape. They don't subsidize me.

Only on social security.

Concerns about household budget. Hard to know what can afford. Got to watch everything we do.

Hard to make ends meet. Prices high, farmers don't get nothing. Ex-farmer, can't see paying farmers not to plant.

Already have some programs in effect. Can't afford - pay enough damn taxes. Why pay farmers to do what they should do in the first place.

\$250 a year or \$20 a month could take from spending on other things. Govt. paying them not to erode soil. Double payments to farmers as govt. already pays farmers not to plant.

Don't believe the program would work.

Fixed income.

Shouldn't pay farmers more money from taxpayers.

Effect on dairy farm. Money spent with no returns realized.

Don't think we should pay farmers for conservation.

Can't see giving farmers money for these things, can see helping if disaster. Friend from town bought farm and set aside - paid for his home. No one subsidized his business (grocery store owner for 40 years). Ever see word "mandate" in dictionary?

Past programs have not worked well.

People should farm according to conservation ethic without money or financial incentives.

I would never hear about this information to know if it's really happening, so I do not agree.

I am concerned about farmers and if they will lose any income on this. It's hard enough to make a living as it is.

Because of my age it's not worth it.

Don't see that they will ever be able to replenish the land. Things are too far gone.

Fixed income.

COMMENTS ON WHETHER COSTS LIKELY TO BE HIGHER OR LOWER: 2-9

Probably about the same.

Not sure amount. Sure it would be more. It's always more.

\$250, Five hundred seems like a lot to charge people.

\$350 sounds high for each household.

Not his household. Not paying as much in taxes at his age.

Doesn't pay taxes any more - gets back rental rebate.

Lower social security.

No income taxes, disability. Real estate value increase due to less flooding.

Probably pay roughly same dollar amount.

Wouldn't like it.

\$200

Lower after up and running.

Higher taxes.

Less, too much.

Whenever program going not funded enough. Cleaning water up is a long-term thing. Wouldn't pay \$ amt. stated. Fed. or state funded. Food fends for itself.

Higher - inefficient government.

Lower - \$200.

It's possible.

Figures don't lie.

It's just an experiment.

Higher - administrative costs.

Price of oil up, price of corn up, farm all possible acreage.

Higher - these sorts of things always seem to cost more than planned.

Even higher.

Costs roll on.

Higher.

Lower - distribution and value added.

Lower - fair sharing and working together.

Lower - depends on how you live.

#### COMMENTS ON WHETHER INTERVIEW PUSHES ONE WAY OR OTHER: 2-11a

To vote for conservation.

#### COMMENTS ON THINGS THAT PUSHED IN ONE WAY: 2-11b

I don't feel like the farmers are going to be treated fairly, will lose the farm.

It slants you toward acceptance.

#### INTERVIEWER COMMENTS ON ATTENTION OF RESPONDENT AND QUALITY OF INTERVIEW:6-2b AND 6-3

Respondent was angry and skeptical about the government "telling me what to do." Had strong feelings about the issues and was impatient and rushed his answers, despite any attempts to calm him down, explain different scenarios.

She was very understanding of the questions. Well educated and pleasant.

Two relatively brief interruptions.

Man 87 years old but very knowledgeable and clear headed. Made many comments, frequently mentioned aspects before I had covered them.

Respondent 95 years old.

Cards only. In hurry and not inclined to participate. Said she didn't understand the material but obviously did.

Relatives in DNR and MET council.

Wife present - agreed as household.

Most cards. Used to be farmer.

Wife came in 15 minutes into the interview and responded, questioned, elaborated on most questions.

Very thoughtful. Said, "I even learned something about this stuff." Two teenagers and one phone call during interview.

After night shift so read cards only.

Cards only - daycare. Toddlers distracting.

Mental distraction, digressing, moved cards around so difficult for me to read, follow-up responses would have been questionable. Partially completed interview, wandering across topics.

Cards only. Concerned with expense.

This person didn't seem to care and became easily bored during descriptions. Seemed to want to get it over with.

Very thoughtful, gave great consideration.

Concern about Metro, rain and things got to pieces into sewers, lakes and rivers, don't blame the farmers for everything. Lots of comments. Said she knew all the material.

Seemed to be concerned about the environment, but only somewhat interested in the program.

Seemed to want to get the interview over with.

Read cards on soil erosion and carbon. Made thoughtful comments. Interrupted by two phone calls.

Worried about development of big ag. with bureaucratic nature.

Had environmental training.

Asked for highlights, read through but had many questions. Talked it through.

Answers based on knowledge of the local situation only.

Person was watching a group of young children and was very distracted. Person was not the homeowner but was the 25 year old daughter.

Retired farmer who was well informed on current issues about farming. Has sons who continue to work his lands.

Stated that he was a conservationist to an extent. Had kids around and was distracted. Not a farmer.

Good questions. State thoughtful cautions. One person present when respondent voted - at table in back of his bar and grill.

On planning commission, he told me about local issues.  
Respondent seemed like she knew very little of the issue and her responses seemed like guess work.

Noted job at wastewater plant, knows about pathogens, etc.

She thought the interview had loaded questions and was not very confident in the results. She thought the descriptions were too long.

Very concerned about environment. Does not trust government programs.

Very interested in the program. Wants to see positive change.

Very thoughtful old man. Family has owned farm since 1860's.

Wants an explanation on how this would affect food prices.

Cards only.

Noted \$100 wouldn't be too bad. Noisy at first, commotion from grandkids.

She did not understand all of the questions, especially section 2. She is generally concerned with quality of environment, but does not understand her role in it. Financial contributions impossible. Has farmed herself, lived on one.

Grew up on a farm - very mixed (diverse) farming practices. This is how she feels it should be.

She felt she had not much to offer because of her background and age. Felt the tax was incredibly high. Was confused by section two questions.

Very cooperative.

Was a farmer - very insightful and concerned - very aware of environmental impact on land. Very concerned about community as a whole, not just on an individual level. Grew up on a farm - had read or heard about environmental farming issues. Very concerned about health issues and air quality.

Very aware and interested. Very concerned about drainage. They are pilots and have watched land degradation over the last 50 years. Scary!

Questions in section two were very confusing and are actually asking two questions so they may not be valid.

Very knowledgeable and thoughtful about the issue. Really understands the study and supports local agriculture.

She talked about the Depression and old farm practices (diversified) – very knowledgeable.

Sold off his land to farmers and is concerned about farming impact on environment - is very aware of issues, especially flooding and the detraction young people have entering the farming profession.

Young mother with very small children - lots going on. Was concerned but not very aware of environmental issues on the community - just moved from Waconia. Finally - a younger person! Just to balance the scales a bit! Very politically minded. Was very good about making sure we understood her view.

Very happy to be a part of the study - very active in the community.

Was happy to be a part of the project.

Very concerned about environmental degradation caused by large scale farms. Very aware of the negative impact on community, wildlife, and health.

Did not like "government handouts" for farmers.

He is directly impacted by the assessment. He is a corn and soybean grower and he sees this as traumatic to the environment. He was very supportive of tax benefits to farmers and improvement to the environment.

Was from the area and understood environmental impact, but seemed unsure of what role large industry plays in this area.

Very educated about the social, political, and economic forces in agriculture. He is putting into practice many - if not all - recommendations for land sustain ability...

Young male - a new perspective! Is a hunter and very concerned about wildlife habitat - find farming practices lethal. He is surrounded by large soybean farms and very frustrated about river water quality - and drinking water.

Was a past "small" farmer. Was concerned about environmental impact – commented a lot about loss of bird species. Another person present, gave some input and may have swayed opinion.

Owns farm and renting some land - practices land stewardship.

Notices environmental and wildlife changes around his land. Concerned about viability in small rural communities if only larger farms exist.

Very aware of environmental and social issues in the community of Watson. A fourth generation farmer - very knowledgeable. Operated a mixed farm which has now been rented to a soybean/corn farmer. He really understood the economic and environmental impact that large scale farms are having.

Grew up in Northern Minnesota and is shocked by the lack of trees and open spaces. Can't imagine her child swimming in the river because of poor water quality.

Not intended respondent. He seemed to have no concerns about long term impact of farming on the environment.

Commented mostly about decreases in wildlife - very disconnected to farming and farm practices even though she lives in a farm community.

Seemed to be somewhat uninterested except for being able to support more bird life - said so many programs had come and gone and was not sure this would be any different.

Very thoughtful, already has conservation methods in place.

At first, respondent didn't want to interview, said he had to plant, but then agreed and was thoughtful and wanted to talk at the end.

Was very attentive - brushed away a phone call to participate, saying, "I'm really busy right now."

Very good interview, understood the proposal well.

Very attentive, much side conversation, and 20 minutes at the very end wanted to know the bottom line.

Very interested. Noted degradation in his lifetime.

Respondent was at first hurried but then talked for a long time.

Sees change coming.

Respondent was thoughtful and considerate.

Seemed to want the interview over with quickly.

Respondent told interviewer some of his farming practices, was very thoughtful, weighed the ideas carefully, was a conservation tenant farmer.

Respondent has land in the CRP program so is already in step.

Had to hurry the interview towards the end so the respondent could make an appointment.

Wasn't sure how this applied to her but I pointed out why in particular it did.

Was a gracious interviewee.

Thoughtful, forward thinking farmer.

Brought pertinent local issue into discussion.

The husband and wife both sat at the table with me but he gave all of the responses except one, yet he often consulted his wife's opinion before giving his answers.

Lots of household comings and goings but she was well-tuned to the survey.

Retired farmer and renting to farmers in town.

#### MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS ON INTERVIEW

I could pay up to \$500/yr. It might be difficult for others to pay around here. I'd be willing to pay that much to protect our environment.

I'm mostly retired now. \$200 is too much for me to pay now. It sounds like an awful lot. People are good about protecting the environment around here anyway.

Q2-1: Much in place already in Wells Creek. Q2-6: Temporary, if program ends - destroy reserve, tree line etc. Q2-7: Local. Q2-8: Unless cut back elsewhere. Q2-10: State wastes an awful lot. General: Had small farm, now works golf course.

Q2-3: Need more than that due to fish kills. Q2-4: Has seen it. Some food prices - potatoes, carrots way too low. Guy has the land should be responsible to take care of it. Q4-6: More farmers getting their own markets.

Q2-5: Put bounty on coyotes. Q2-6: How many sign up. Farmers stubborn, want every corner of land. Q2-7: Wouldn't make much difference. Young men can't start farming no more. Equipment too high, need financial backing.

Grandson in agronomy, dad trying to talk him out of it.

Daughter works for MET council - sees mess in MET watersheds. Paying \$250 depends on what kind of year we have - run poultry farm, years vary. Q2-10: Wasn't following environment. laws. Q2-1: Daughter and CREP some success.

Q4-17: Payments much lower. Q4-8: Some local markets now. Would like to see increased production of corn used for gas.

Would like to see these things happen. Brings it to attention. Q2-4: How long would it take to get to 1/4 flooding reduction?

2,700 miles of drainage ditches in Chippewa Watershed. Grain farmers - drain to plant early and then get frozen out with late spring frost. Livestock farmers are different than this.

Q4-14: People too independent. Clarkfield losing high school, hospital, and now elementary school.

Q2-4: Too large to culverts let water loose at one time in flood of '97. Q2-6: With most farmers it would be pretty effective. Money is a pretty effective motivator. Q2-8: Money's got to come from some place.

Q2-6: CRP - some go for it, some don't. Q2-15: License and shot too expensive. Land not accessible. Q4-8: Already have.

Q2-6: Incentive being what it is. Q 2-8: What other programs do. Q3-13: Worth it in the long run. Q3-14: Benefits it might produce.

Q2-6: Got to have funding for it. Got to pay more for vegetables. Q1-2: a)subways in cities b)efficient purification c)afford by many families living together d)jump in hole

Q2-6: Depends on farmer. Q2-12: Husband fished and hunted, sons still do. Q2-15: Husband hunted game birds. Q:3-11: Main occupation.

Q2-15: Used to hunt game birds a lot.

Q4-17: Per year?

Q3-14V: Probably against if that high. Q 4-8: Have local markets now. Q4-17: Some farmers take advantage of payments. Q2-10: Trust govt. almost never because of DNR and park things. Q1-1: Park wants to take over land, bought neighbor's.

Federal policy concentrate so much on corn & soybean, will be hard to state to reduce or combat this. Q2-5: SE MN already has much of this terrain, more statewide. Q2-1: Familiar with practices described, 50% achievable.

Q2-1: Will take time to get 50% reduction. Less people to deal with could make a difference. Q2-2: Somewhat more improvement if 50% decrease in runoff. Q2-6: If they're going to pay, need assistance to do waterways.

Q2-1: Need more education, especially about not tilling. Q3-13: Not difficult at all to pay - but upsetting.

Q2-3: They'll pay more attention. Q2-5: More buffer strips. Q4-18: Wants to see better management of existing feedlots. Fewer feedlots is a knee-jerk reaction by state currently.

Q2-4: Hope for 1/4 reduction in flooding. Q3-13: He noted his hesitancy or careful thinking about it.

Worried about top-dollar for fixed income, retired person. Not sure what highest cost he would be willing to pay is. Q2-4: Less flooding here over last 10 years, more dams storage basins. Q3-14: Needs to see how bill is written, concept good. Would support the proposal, but prefer it costs less than \$350.

Q2-2: Must use filter system and have deep well. Q2-3: Get after people with other sources of pollution - people throwing junk in river. Q2-10: Right now don't trust any of them. Q 4-4: 140/week for health insurance.

If it costs farmers money, don't advocate it. State tax increase? or city tax increase?

Q2-1: Waterways would help. Q2-7: Too many other things factor in. Q3-11: Noted importance of tourism to Lake City. Q4-11: Already doing a lot.

Q2-2: Mentioned limestone. Q2-6: Depends how many go into it, some think too much work. Crop production? Q2-16: People complain now about dirty lake - 40's

Q3-13: Not difficult to pay, but angry.

Q2-5: Law wants to increase wildlife but township fine if don't cut ditches - hit five deer. Q2-6: In SE MN, implement in 10 years or farming gone. Need more info on cover crops or stubble. Buying organic not just for food quality but better farm production.

Q2-1: If monitored, not just people's word for it. Q 2-6: Want to know for sure they're doing this practice.

Need to know more about the program before he can decide how to vote.

Seemed like a good idea, but who's causing it and correcting those problems. Ways to make others pay. \$15/month/household plenty of money. Change people's attitudes - put on news.

Should have a tax reduction for farmers. Can't afford to pay more than \$250 because she is on a fixed income. Q4-4: Why only farmers? Everyone needs it. Q4-19: Needed for everyone.

Would pay no more than \$100.

Q3-14: For the proposal if they actually did something.

Q2-6: There are so many programs for farmers - some are even conflicting so this is a negative.

Q2-10: Big business is what influences govt.

Q2-6: Who is involved would make a difference. Q2-7: Who cares! Would be willing to pay more.

Q2-11: Gives me information.

Q2-6: Live off government anyway.

Q2-6: It is a Band-Aid for people - does not teach. Q2-7: Higher food prices in the short term, not the long term. Q2-8: Not because of policy.

Q2-6: Too many variables between farmers, need a standardization. Q2-10: Too much business money influencing politicians.

QV-1For2: Not sure, but would go higher.

Q2-7: Prices will fluctuate. Q2-8: Go up some. Q4-4: For everyone.

Q3-11: Used to be very dependent on farming. Q3-13: Morally it would be difficult! Q4-3 and 4-4: For everyone! Q4-17: No more than \$50,000 limit. Q4-19: Not big industry!

Q4-14: Has changed so much, less realistic. Q4-20: Not going to happen.

Q2-12: Fishes less than once a year because of poor water quality from local feed lots.

Q3-13: Won't pay. Q4-11: It won't happen.

Would be willing to pay a little more than \$200.

How much willing to give depends on one's needs.

Q26: Depending on price paid.

## OCCUPATION

Semi-truck driver

Semi-retired farmer

Cosmetologist

Sales

Golf course supervisor and ski area manager

Retired

Retired road construction and truck driver

Retired homemaker

Teacher assistant

Poultry farmer, egg producer

Retired  
Retired farmer, disabled  
Personal banking rep  
Retired, disability  
Plumbing, heating, and AC  
Retread technician  
Maintenance mechanic, turkey factory  
Daycare  
General laborer - Jennie O  
Grocery store worker  
Retired homemaker, widow  
Semi-retired  
Accountant  
Housewife  
Pharmacy technician  
Retired  
Retired, Red Wing shoes and farming  
Dairy farmer  
Retired  
Millwright  
Dairy farmer  
Retired RN  
Veterinary technician  
Retired  
Retired  
Computer software  
Retired clergyman  
Retired  
Factory  
Retired farmer  
Farmer  
County maintenance  
Machinist  
Self-employed, small business owner (auto repair shop)  
Factory worker  
Small business owner - exercise club  
Graphic designer  
Union organizer  
Red Wing Shoe factory worker  
Farmer  
Asst. operator, public utilities  
Farmer  
Maintenance mechanic  
Retired  
Driver  
Self-employed, dairy farmer

Treasure Island worker  
Wood worker, retired farmer  
Housewife  
Retired credit counselor  
Retired township clerk  
Building contractor  
Electrician  
Manager of convenience store  
Retired  
Retired  
Homemaker  
Adult Foster Care Coordinator  
Retired (railroad)  
Retired  
Part time sales clerk  
Retired  
Retired (railroad)  
Teacher  
Retired  
Service repair person  
Homemaker  
Teacher/Homemaker  
Mother - not "homemaker"  
Homemaker  
Retired printer  
Teacher  
Businessperson  
Registered Nurse  
Farmer  
Supervisor  
Farmer  
Signal worker - works for Burlington Northern  
Corp of Engineers  
Retired salesperson  
Farmer/auto mechanic  
Professional mayor  
Retired farmer  
Teacher  
Farmer  
Retired from coaching  
Retired  
Electrical contractor  
Retired/hobby farming  
Farming/trucking  
Administrator  
Production worker

Farmer/contractor  
Manager  
Retired  
Farmer  
Machine operator  
Heavy equipment operator/engineer  
Retired  
Factory worker  
Public works employee  
Retired  
Farmer  
Retired  
Sales  
Retired  
Laborer/fork life operator  
Farmer  
Retired teacher  
Farmer/partially retired  
Self-employed (cleaning)  
Retired