



*Building Rural America*  
**National Association of Credit Specialists**  
of the  
**USDA – Farm Service Agency**  
**Farm Program Committee**

**THE FARM PROGRAM COMMITTEE MET AT THE PATRIOTS PLAZA III, IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ON JULY 11 – JULY 13, 2016 TO REVIEW RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP.**

**THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS ARE RECOMMENDED FOR ADOPTION:**

**Resolution 1**

**CONCERN:**

Current FSFL regulations (Notice FSFL-135) does not include silo unloaders and feed grinder/mixers as eligible equipment for the FSFL program. Livestock producers depend upon this equipment to move the silage from the silo to the feed bunks, just as a grain farmer relies on an auger to move grain from a grain bin into a truck of which both are eligible equipment.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:**

Update 1-FSFL to include silo unloaders and feed grinder/mixers as eligible equipment for the FSFL program.

**Resolution 2**

**Concern:**

Farms with less than 5 acres of vegetables, insurance is often unattainable since NAP insurance becomes more expensive based on income margin. It causes undue hardship on staff (FLP & FP) and producers, due to many newer fruit and vegetable microloan operators operating on a small scale basis, resulting in an uninsurable commodity, leaving loans barely secured.

**Solution:**

Create a micro-NAP pilot program to compensate for the growing number of fruit and vegetable farms operating on a small-scale basis. Create a simplified application, crop reporting system and process for these small scale producers. Program would benefit producer, time requirements of Farm Program office and often burdensome process for small scale producers. Program would expand participation and promote NAP program to many small scale fruit and vegetable operations.

**THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS ARE RECOMMENDED FOR NON-ADOPTION:**

**Resolution 3**

**CONCERN:**

The State Office in my state has established a FLP-only listserv to cut down on unnecessary emails to Farm Programs, however they have not done the same. It takes up time and server space to send out all these emails when they only apply to part of the agency.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:**

Direct Farm Programs to set up a separate listserv in each state.

**EXPLANATION FOR NON-ADOPTION BY THE COMMITTEE:**

The committee believes this is a state issue and not a policy issue.

**Resolution 4**

**CONCERN:**

In the case of an entity, when an entity applies for a loan the individual members are required to fill out their individual information under part C. This section does not ask for the marital status of the individual. When you go to put the individual into MIDAS, marital status is a required field.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:**

Either put marital status on the FSA-2001 or make it not a required field in MIDAS.

**EXPLANATION FOR NON-ADOPTION BY THE COMMITTEE:**

The committee recommends submitting this to the Technical Forum on USDA Connect which was established to address these types of resolutions.

**Resolution 5**

**CONCERN:**

3-FLP provides guidance to process applications based on complete application date. There is no guidance for FLP processing of FSFL loan requests when there are existing Direct FLP applications on hand. There are states that are requiring FSFL requests to be moved to the front of the line even though there may be a backlog of direct FLP requests.

**PROPOSED SOLUTION:**

Update handbook to show that FSFL applications will be processed by complete application date the same as FLP direct loan requests and that neither one will get a priority to be processed in front of another.

Respectfully submitted by the 2015/2016, Farm Program Committee:

Jessica Davis, Zone A

Rebekah Martin, Zone B

Tiffany Grody, Zone C, Chairperson

Charlean Smith, Zone D