



March 13, 2009

Opportunity for Public Comment on Animal ID

USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA APHIS) recently released a proposed rule regarding official animal identification numbering systems. This proposed rule, published in the Federal Register on Jan. 13 (Volume 74, Number 8, pp. 1624-1643), is entitled USDA APHIS "Official Animal Identification Numbering Systems" and will directly affect NCBA producers.

APHIS says that this proposed rule is the next step in their development of a nationally integrated, modern animal disease response system and is intended to create greater standardization and uniformity of numbering systems and eartags used in both official animal disease programs and the National Animal Identification System (NAIS).

APHIS states that this proposed rule is following its NAIS business plan. This business plan outlines the overall NAIS program goals and strategies for the next 3-5 years: the immediate focus is on APHIS increasing the quantity of animals identified and traceable to their premises of origin, especially for cattle.

Comments are due on the proposed rule by March 16. The proposed rule can be found by visiting <http://www.regulations.gov/fdmspublic/component/main?main=DocumentDetail&o=090000648081c664>.

NCBA recommends that states and producers submit comments to this proposed rule based on how this will affect your operations. In particular APHIS is requesting information regarding economic and other implications to small entities and producers.

Major points of the proposed rule are below. For more information, call NCBA's office in Washington, D.C. at 202-347-0228.

Brief Summary:

Standardization of the AIN/840 tag requirements

This proposed rule will not technically require the use of the animal identification number (AIN). However, it would require that when AINs are used, only those numbers beginning with the 840 prefix will be recognized as official for use. This will be effective for all AIN tags applied to animals one year or

more after the date of the finalization of this proposed rule.

Animals that are already tagged will not have to be retagged - APHIS states that it will not be necessary to retag animals that have been officially identified prior to the yet unnamed "one year or more after the finalization of this proposed rule."

Premises Identification Numbers (PINs)

This proposed rule would remove the PIN format that uses the state postal abbreviation and proposes to create a single national format for PIN. All new PINs that are issued on or after the effective date of this rule will be required to use the seven-character alphanumeric code format instead of the state postal abbreviation that is currently allowed.

Animals that are currently identified with a premise-based numbering system that uses a postal-code PIN would not have to be retagged because the proposal is intended to be applied going forward. If the owner of the premises has obtained a new seven-character PIN, older eartags employing the postal-code PIN as a means of identifying animals will be cross-referenced with the seven-character PIN in the premises registration system maintained by the state that issues the postal-code PIN.

New Requirements for Official Eartags: U.S. shield use, eartag numbering systems and correlation of numbering systems with PINs

The use of the U.S. shield will be allowed only on official identification devices approved by APHIS and all official eartags would be required to bear the U.S. shield. This requirement applies to official eartags issued one or more years after the date of the finalization of this proposed rule, with the intent being to allow producers adequate time to work through existing inventories of eartags.

Going forward, official eartags used in animal disease programs could only be issued to registered premises that have PINs.

When AIN eartags are used, the AINs would have to be correlated with the PINs of the premises to which they are issued (i.e., AIN eartags could only be issued to registered premises that have PINs). AINs would be correlated with PINs using the AINMS.

National Uniform Eartagging System definition change to codify existing practices

This system is an APHIS means for identifying individual animals in commerce. APHIS is proposing to add a National Uniform Eartagging System definition to certain sections of the Code of Federal Regulations. This change would define the System as a numbering system for the official identification of individual animals in the U.S. providing a nationally unique identification number for each animal. The proposed definition would also note that individual APHIS disease control programs may specify which National Uniform Eartagging System format to use.

Need for information regarding economic and other implications to small entities and producers

APHIS states that they currently do not have all the data necessary for a comprehensive analysis of the effects of this proposed rule on small entities. APHIS is particularly interested in determining the potential costs to eartag manufacturers and livestock producers.

APHIS states that since it is not the intent of this proposed rule to set a date by which AIN eartags for all adult animals must conform to the 840 format, they believe that there should be few, if any, animals that

would need to be retagged.

While APHIS does not expect requiring the use of the 840 prefix for the AIN to have significant economic effects on the livestock industry, they do not have data to quantitatively estimate potential costs at this time, and are requesting public comment. Potential costs would include reformatting expenses for eartag manufacturers as the USA and manufacturer's code numbering systems are eliminated. Other potential costs are the costs to producers who may, because of this proposed rule, have obsolete inventory costs in the form of eartags that were imprinted with one of the eliminated numbering systems.

Released by NCBA Member eUpdate 3/9/09.

Farmers in 33 Counties in Missouri Eligible for Ag Emergency Loan Assistance

The Missouri Department of Agriculture (MDA) has been notified of a disaster designation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) for two additional Missouri counties. The declaration designates qualified counties as natural disasters and eligible for physical and/or production loss loan assistance. The counties included in the declaration are St. Louis and St. Louis City. These counties are in addition to the recent announcement from MDA stating the following counties were eligible for assistance: Barry, Bollinger, Butler, Cape Girardeau, Carter, Dunklin, Howell, Madison, McDonald, Mississippi, New Madrid, Newton, Oregon, Ozark, Pemiscot, Reynolds, Ripley, Scott, Shannon, Stoddard, Stone, Taney and Wayne. The contiguous counties eligible for assistance includes Christian, Dent, Douglas, Iron, Lawrence, Perry, St. Francois and Texas.

"We are dedicated to providing Missouri farmers with information they need to help them recover from losses from natural disasters," said Dr. Jon Hagler, director of the Department of Agriculture. "The agriculture industry is at a crossroads and there is definite opportunity for growth and expansion in our state. Gov. Nixon is dedicated to seeing farm families thrive - even in these uncertain economic times. We continue to work with folks in every corner of our state to help move agriculture forward."

Notification of the loan assistance came from USDA's Farm Service Agency's (FSA) Acting State Executive Director Gerald Hrdina. His letters informed the state Department of Agriculture that FSA emergency loan assistance was now available due the severe winter storm which occurred Jan. 26-31, 2009.

For more information, contact your local FSA office or call the Missouri State FSA office at (573) 876-0980.

Released by the Missouri Department of Agriculture.

Upcoming Cattlemen's Events & Meetings

Newton County- March 17, 6:30 PM
Crowder College, Neosho
BQA Injection Site Demonstration by Fort Dodge

Greene County- March 19, 7:00 PM
Golden Corral, Springfield
Sponsors: Empire Bank of Fair Grove and Turf Supply of the Ozarks

Johnson County- March 19, 6:30 PM
Phelp's Ranch, Holden
Sponsor: APEX Financial

Warren County- March 21, 5:00 PM
First State Community Bank, Warrenton

"15th Anniversary Celebration"

Crawford County- March 26, 6:00 PM
Bourbon Community Center
Sponsor: Nutrena Feed

Randolph County- March 26, 6:30 PM
Nelli's Restaurant

Lewis-Marion County- March 26, 7:00 PM
Highland High School Cafeteria
Sponsor: Pfizer Animal Health

U.S., EU eye possible fix to long-standing beef war

The United States will hold off on new retaliatory duties for European products while the two countries work on a possible fix to a dispute over beef trade that dates back to the 1980s, the U.S. Trade Representative's office said on Thursday.

The duties, set to take effect on March 23, will be held back for a month while discussions on a "possible interim solution" take place, USTR spokeswoman Nefeterius McPherson said in a statement.

"The settlement will provide benefits for U.S. beef producers, but it would not be appropriate for me to get into any more details about an ongoing negotiation," McPherson told Reuters.

Several issues remain to be resolved in the discussions, she said. "USTR has decided to delay the trade action in order to give this process every possibility of success," she said.

European Trade Commissioner Catherine Ashton welcome the USTR decision to postpone sanctions.

"The EU and U.S. are engaged in negotiations to find a way forward on this issue, and I am confident we will find a solution very soon," Ashton said in a statement. An EU spokesman said Ashton was heading to Washington on Monday for talks with Obama administration officials and key members of Congress.

A spokesman for the National Cattlemen's Beef Association declined to comment on Thursday.

The beef ban is one of the oldest and most famous sources of trade friction between the farm trade superpowers. The EU also bans U.S. chicken treated with a bacteria-killing chlorine rinse, and genetically modified crops like corn and rice.

On Thursday, the EU slapped tariffs on U.S. biodiesel exports which it says are dumped and subsidized, hurting European producers.

The European Union banned U.S. and Canadian beef in 1988 because of fears growth hormones fed to cattle by U.S. and Canadian farmers could cause cancer.

The United States and Canada complained to the World Trade Organization, which agreed the ban was not supported by scientific studies. The WTO battle has continued.

The United States was allowed to impose sanctions worth \$116.8 million per year on EU goods starting in July 1999.

The Bush administration changed the list of products facing duties just before leaving office in January, adding meat, chewing gum, chocolate, certain jams, and some fruit.

Mineral water and chestnuts from France were added, and the duties on Roquefort cheese were to be hiked to 300 percent.

That prompted outrage from French producers and U.S. consumers with a taste for the already-pricey imports.

The new action was slated to take effect March 23. The EU had threatened to challenge the move at the WTO.

But the USTR's office said it would delay the new tariffs until April 23 to allow for renewed negotiations.

More than a dozen goods were slated to be dropped from the list, including tomatoes, onions and yarn. Those items will proceed to be dropped as of March 23 to respect sales made since January 15, the USTR's office said.

In written replies to questions from the U.S. Senate Finance Committee on Thursday, USTR-designee Ron Kirk said officials were in discussions with the EU "that could result in at least an interim solution" to the beef dispute.

"I support these efforts, and will take whatever steps are necessary to achieve a prompt resolution of this dispute," Kirk said.

Written By Roberta Rampton; Editing by Christian Wiessner, Richard Chang and Carol Bishopric; Released by Reuters.com 3/12/09.

Activists Fear Wetlands Ruling May Expand Property Rights Protections

Environmentalists are concerned that a recent trial court ruling could significantly expand property rights protections provided by the Supreme Court in cases where wetlands and other environmental regulations result in a taking of private property, providing landowners with significant new leverage to challenge regulatory decisions.

In a Jan. 23 ruling in *Resource Investments Inc., et al. v. USA*, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims held that a property owner can seek compensation for a taking if a regulatory decision "leaves the landowner without economically viable use of his land, that denial of use is a per se taking for which the landowner must be compensated."

While the trial court must still resolve factual issues in the case, such as how much compensation to provide, environmentalists say the court has weakened the high court's standard for determining whether a regulatory taking has occurred. The opinion is a "strikingly pro-property rights decision," according to an environmental lawyer following the case. "Even though [the judge] hasn't reached any conclusions, some of the points ... represent a fairly extreme viewpoint," the attorney says.

The ruling is one of a series of recent decisions from federal and state courts that have backed property rights positions in interpreting whether government actions are considered takings requiring compensation under the Constitution's 5th Amendment. In its landmark 1992 case, *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, the Supreme Court established the so-called "total takings" test, holding

generally that a regulatory taking has occurred when a property's entire value has been destroyed by a regulatory action. "When the owner of real property has been called upon to sacrifice all economically beneficial uses in the name of the common good ... he has suffered a taking," the high court held.

An environmental lawyer familiar with the Resource Investments case says the federal claims court has set a new standard for determining whether a regulatory taking has occurred by requiring "the elimination of profitable land uses, not the destruction of all property value" as the high court held. "Under Lucas ... the Supreme Court has said that in the rare case where a regulation eliminates all economic value [of a property] ... a taking almost automatically follows," the source says. The recent ruling saying that "that rule is extremely narrow and only applies in a situation where property has literally been rendered valueless," the source says, saying that the judge "arguably disregarded a lot of binding precedent."

The attorney says that while the court declined to grant summary judgment to either side, the holding could serve as a guide for lower courts managing the issue, and should the government lose this case, it could be ripe for appeal.

At issue in the case is a dispute over the relevant permitting authority for a landfill the company was seeking to construct on wetlands. Initially, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers declined to grant the company a permit under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The dispute was complicated because even though the company sought to construct the landfill on "soil with low hydraulic conductivity," which "made the contamination of groundwater extremely improbable," EPA had designated the site as a "sole source aquifer," meaning that it is the main drinking water source for that community.

The company sued, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit eventually held in a 1998 ruling in *Resource Investments Inc. v. Army Corps of Engineers* that because the company is already required to seek a municipal solid waste permit from the state under subtitle D of the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act, the company was not required to obtain a 404 permit from the Corps.

The 9th Circuit's ruling was significant in its own right because it was one of two precedent-setting cases at the time that required EPA to narrow its definition of "fill material" that is subject to wetlands permit requirements. The Clinton Administration even considered appealing the ruling to the Supreme Court, but eventually declined.

Now the plaintiff is arguing that the Corps' denial of its permit request amounted to a regulatory taking. The plaintiffs argued in this case that until the 9th Circuit ruled in *Resource I*, the first version of the case, they were left without economically viable options for their property. "Plaintiffs also contend that once the Corps denied their Section 404 permit application to use the project site as a landfill, it was without any other economically viable use precisely because of the hydro geological characteristics that made it so appropriate for a landfill," the ruling says.

The plaintiffs further argue that they went through "extraordinary delay" in awaiting jurisdictional response from the Corps, the ruling says.

In its reading of the case law, the court says that "if the landowner owns a use interest that is not prohibited by the background principles of the state's law of property and nuisance, and the taking of which leaves the landowner without economically viable use of his land, that denial of use is a per se taking for which the landowner must be compensated."

The claims court's ruling is the latest in a series of takings rulings that have been decided against the government's positions. In *Casitas Municipal Water District v. United States*, the U.S. Court of Appeals

for the Federal Circuit rejected government arguments that water diversions are regulatory takings not physical takings, subjecting the government to strict liability for physical takings. "[I]t is clear that the government has not merely burdened, impounded, restricted in use, temporarily impaired, or otherwise regulated Casitas' water," the court says. "Rather, it has appropriated it, and where, as here, the government action is 'the functional equivalent of a practical ouster of the owner's possession,'" the court says, "physical takings analysis is appropriate."

The ruling rejected government efforts to expand the Supreme Court's 2004 decision in *Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, which limited the number of government actions that can be considered physical or categorical takings. The court denied an en banc rehearing of the case Feb. 17.

And in *St. John's River Management District v. Koontz*, the Florida Court of Appeals Jan. 9 held that a landowner was eligible for compensation in a case where he was barred from developing on wetlands because he declined to accept mitigation requirements. Environmentalists say the ruling is an expansion of high court precedents in *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* and *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, which require that permit needs and conditions have to be significantly related to state interests in order to avoid a taking.

The Florida ruling says the *Nollan/Dolan* tests apply even when the landowner refuses to accept government requirements, though a dissenting ruling says the test only applies when requirements are actually imposed, not when application is denied because the landowner refuses to accept them.

Meanwhile, the high court Feb. 23 disappointed some property-rights activists when the justices declined to review another takings case, *Charles A. Pratt Construction Co. v. California Coastal Commission*. The court's decision lets stand a lower court ruling that barred granting compensation for a landowner who was kept from using nearly 80% of his land, the source says, without a trial on the facts of the case to determine exactly how much of the land is rendered unusable by regulatory action. The courts ruled that if the landowner still had a viable option to use the 20% portion of the land, then it is not a full regulatory taking.

A property rights advocate says the high court's decision violates the letter and spirit of the Supreme Court's holding in *Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City*, which denied a takings claim by the owner of Grand Central Terminal after denial by the city's landmark commission to permit a skyscraper to be built over the station. The high court held that denial of the air space was not a taking or would not affect reasonable investment expectations. At its heart, the so-called *Penn Central* test says that takings determinations should be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the number of factors relating to economic viability of the property in question.

By denying cert, the high court appears to agree that whenever a government allows up to 20% of the property to be used, the property owner will not be able to get compensation for the 80% left, the source says.

Released by NCBA Member eUpdate 3/9/09.

Missouri Farmer Today

Happy Cows Come From CattleSeller!

Buy, Sell & Advertise Your Cattle On CattleSeller.com

Home | News | Weather | Featured Ads | Classifieds | Features | Subscribe | Advertise | About Us

Search Ads | Search News

Farm Cooks
Recipes from the best country cooks

CropWatch Blog
Crop specialists with the ISU Corn and Soybean Initiative track the growing season and answer questions.

Corn Cam
Check out CornCam for a current photo of a cornfield

Clear the way with new snow equipment!

FARM EQUIPMENT CENTER
www.farmequipmentcenter.com

Local News | Regional News | Nat'l News | Comments | Most Popular

Local News

Budget cuts threaten agency

Ed's Machinery
Annual Spring Inventory & Consignment Sale

Missouri Farmer Today

www.missourifarmertoday.com
for more industry news and events

Baby Calf Health: Nervous Coccidiosis In Calves

A variety of clinical neurological syndromes exists in stocker and feeder cattle. Causes may be infectious, nutritional/metabolic, or toxins. A less common syndrome is referred to as "nervous" coccidiosis, named so because of the observation that many of the calves that experience this neurological syndrome concurrently exhibit clinical enteric coccidiosis. This entity was first reported in 1921.

Nervous coccidiosis can occur at any time of the year but appears most often in the fall and early winter, coinciding with the time of the year when many calves move to feedlots. This syndrome reportedly can occur in up to 30% of the calves affected with enteric coccidiosis. As many as 10,000 cattle die annually in the U.S. from this problem. The pathogenic mechanisms for nervous coccidiosis, however, are not clearly resolved. Coccidial organisms or microscopic lesions consistent with coccidial infection cannot always be found in affected calves. Researchers have not been able to experimentally reproduce this syndrome. The absence of significant brain lesions eliminates infectious and some nutritional factors and toxic agents as primary causes.

Clinical signs of nervous coccidiosis may vary in severity and frequency and may range from minor muscular incoordination, twitching, and loss of balance to intermittent or continuous seizures. During seizures, affected calves collapse into lateral recumbency and exhibit a variety of signs, including opisthotonos, tetany, medio-ventral strabismus, nystagmus, paddling movements, exaggerated snapping of the eyelids, salivation, star gazing, nervousness, occasional bellowing, and rapid and irregular respiration. Affected calves may get up and experience periods of apparent normalcy between seizures. Seizures often recur when the calves are stressed or handled.

Conflicting theories have been proposed to explain this syndrome:

1) One school of thought proposes that this malady in calves and yearling cattle is not due to the coccidia per se but to a combination of stressors, including the damage by the coccidia to the intestinal tract, which results in tissue magnesium and serum calcium depletion and the production of the neurological syndrome observed. To support this theory, proponents point out that treatment of affected animals with intravenous and subcutaneous calcium, magnesium, and dextrose solution, balanced electrolyte solutions, oral magnesium oxide and sulfamethazine has been relatively successful when given early, while the animal is still able to stand and appears normal until disturbed. In the later stages, however, whether the animal is standing or recumbent, treatment has been disappointing.

2) Recently, researchers demonstrated that calves with nervous coccidiosis had a lower liver copper concentration than calves experiencing coccidiosis without neurological signs. The results of this same study suggest that the following entities are not involved in the pathogenesis of nervous coccidiosis: disturbance of serum Na, K, Ca, P, and/or Mg concentration, vitamin A deficiency, thiamine deficiency, anemia, lead intoxication, uremia, Hemophilus somnus meningoencephalitis, severity of coccidial infection, gross alterations in intestinal bacterial flora, and hepatopathy.

3) In a subsequent study by the same researchers, a neurotoxin reported to be present in the serum of calves with nervous coccidiosis was not found in the serum of control calves or calves with only enteric coccidiosis. These authors state that the significance of this labile neurotoxin with respect to pathogenesis of the neurological signs associated with bovine enteric coccidiosis is unknown. This neurotoxin causes muscle tremors, tachypnea or dyspnea, star gazing, loss of righting reflex, seizures and death in mice when serum from neurologically affected calves is inoculated intravenously. Serum from control calves and from calves with enteric coccidiosis, but not exhibiting neurological signs, does not cause these alterations in behavior when inoculated into mice at the same dosage.

Other proposed hypotheses for causes of nervous coccidiosis include: uremia, anemia, lead toxicity, thiamine deficiency, vitamin A deficiency, hypoglycemia, electrolyte imbalance (Mg, Na, K, P, and/or Ca), absorption of a toxic material through the damaged gut wall, toxin production by coccidia, host immune response to coccidia, gross alterations in intestinal bacterial flora, hepatopathy, and toxemia. The clinical signs of nervous coccidiosis are similar to those of other neurological diseases that affect the function of the cerebral cortex. Differential diagnoses include lead poisoning, polioencephalomalacia, TME, listeriosis, rabies, sporadic bovine encephalomyelitis, and salt poisoning. Consideration of history, clinical examination, necropsy, laboratory tests, histopathology, and response to treatment should differentiate these diseases.

Multiple etiologies appear to be involved and must be present at the same time or in proper sequence to see clinical "nervous" coccidiosis. Some form of large bowel disease/inflammation, usually associated with enteric coccidiosis, and the absence of significant brain lesions are the only constant features of the disease. Placing the affected animals in a warm, quiet environment reportedly helps to alleviate clinical signs and may facilitate recovery. The recovery rate is quite low, especially in severely affected cases. In spite of therapy and supportive management, the mortality rate has been reported as 72% in one part of the U.S. and 90% in another area.

The author's experience with this problem in the field closely parallels that cited in the literature except that I would emphasize the virtues of early treatment and the pessimism associated with late treatment. Treatment of choice consisted of parenteral sulfonamides the first day followed by oral administration of sustained release boluses; antibiotics to treat and prevent secondary infection; plus 250-500 ml calcium solution with magnesium and glucose, often repeated on the second day. A non-steroidal anti-inflammatory product was given to control toxin absorption from the gut.

This is extra-label use and must be administered by or under the supervision of the attending veterinarian and requires a veterinarian-client-patient relationship. The most logical approach to the problem of nervous coccidiosis is the prevention of all coccidiosis through good herd management, sanitation, reduction of stress, and the use of coccidiostats. My personal preference is to start all incoming feeder cattle on a coccidiostat in the diet for 28 days.

*Source: Larry D. Hauptmeier, DVM, Extension Veterinarian - Iowa State University
Released by CattleNetwork.com 3/13/09.*

Cattle Feeding: Protein Supplements

Protein supplements are available in many forms. High-quality forages, commodity coproduct feedstuffs, range cubes, protein blocks, and liquid supplements are some examples. Examples of feedstuffs (and their typical protein concentrations on a dry matter basis) that can serve as effective protein supplements include soybean meal (48%), cottonseed meal (41%), whole cottonseed (24%), corn gluten feed (24%), dried distillers grains (27%), and brewers grains (26%). Dried distillers grains have the added benefit of containing relatively high in undegradable intake protein (bypass protein) levels.

Consider cost per unit of protein and convenience of various protein supplements. Base purchasing decisions on the cost per pound of protein instead of the price per pound of supplement. Product labels indicate the protein percentage and how much protein is in the form of non-protein nitrogen. Convenience products often contain non-protein nitrogen (NPN) and are generally higher in price per unit of protein.

Be sure to read all feed tags checking for NPN content in range cubes, protein blocks, and liquid supplements in particular.

The molasses content of liquid supplements is usually not high enough for proper NPN utilization when supplementing low quality forages. Similarly, while protein requirements are often met by both liquid supplements and protein blocks, these supplements rarely provide adequate amounts of supplemental energy for lactating cattle fed hay. Mississippi forage test results indicate that energy more often is the limiting nutrient in meeting beef cattle requirements than protein.

Monitor body condition or average daily gains and adjust energy supplementation as needed.

Consider using high quality forages such as vegetative legumes and cool-season forages to supply protein in beef cattle diets when possible. Use commodity-based coproduct feedstuffs to supplement forage-based diets for stocker calves and lactating cows for the best supplement values if the operation is set up to store and handle these feeds.

Source: Mississippi State Ag Extension; Released by CattleNetwork.com 3/12/09.



Checking in on the Checkoff

Working with Chefs & Restaurant Owners
to Encourage more BEEF on more MENUS!

February Foodservice Specific Activities in Missouri Include:

- American Culinary Federation Conference
 - Demonstration on New Cuts/ New Recipes
 - "Pasture to Plate" Forum
 - Adding Value with Beef Workshop
- Missouri Restaurant Association Pro Start Cookoff
 - Over 120 students competing in a cooking competition- all using BEEF.
 - All students are pursuing a food career.
- Missouri Grape and Wine Conference
 - Food Pairing Information



Learn more at www.mobeeff.org or email dawn@mobeeff.com

Student Essay Contest Expands, Awards reach \$20,000

The second annual student essay contest sponsored by Syngenta Crop Protection and Farm Press Publications is upping the ante and expanding into more states.

The Future of Southern Agriculture Student Essay Contest

(<http://www.farmassist.com/promo/fosa/index.html>) is now offering a total of \$20,000 in scholarship awards to winning entries. Four prizes will be awarded with two \$6,000 winners and two \$4,000 winners. In addition, the contest will expand to now include 11 universities from the Mid-South, Southeast and Texas.

Participating universities have been divided into two regions - Southeast and Delta/Southwest. One undergraduate essay and one graduate essay from each region will advance to the national final. Of the four finalists, the undergraduate essay and the graduate essay writers with the highest cumulative score will be awarded \$6,000, and the runners up will each receive \$4,000.

Michael Boden, head of the Syngenta Southern Field Crops business unit said Syngenta "is pleased to be a sponsor of the Future of Southern Ag Student Essay Contest. We are committed to the southern agriculture industry and its future success, and additionally, we support and promote education of students with links to the industry.

"It is our goal to build on the momentum established last year with the Future of Delta Cotton Student Essay Contest. We are asking students to share their vision of the future of southern agriculture and what steps should be taken now to turn this vision into reality.

"We encourage all graduate and undergraduate students at the eligible universities across the southern

region to visit the Future of Southern Ag web site for more information and to submit their essay online."

"We are proud to be a sponsor of the Future of Southern Agriculture Student Essay Contest," added Farm Press editor Elton Robinson. "Asking students to share their ideas is a novel way to identify new perspectives and create debate that could help shape the future of southern agriculture."

To enter, submit an essay of 750 to 1,000 words on the following subject: By 2050, the world's population is expected to increase to more than 9 billion, up from the estimated 6.7 billion as of January 2009. Taking into account commodity price fluctuations and variable input prices, what is the best agricultural business model to deal with this environment? How can the U.S. southern farmer continue to compete in the export markets and/or against foreign imports to sustain agriculture as a viable business? What processes should be put into place to ensure the safety, quality and availability of U.S. food, feed and fiber production?

All undergraduate and graduate students currently enrolled for the spring 2009 semester at Louisiana State University, Mississippi State University, University of Arkansas, University of Tennessee, University of Missouri, Texas A&M University, Auburn University, University of Georgia, Clemson University, Virginia Tech University and North Carolina State University are eligible to apply.

Essays and entry forms must be submitted electronically. Visit Future of Southern Ag online for complete information on the contest. For a list of grand prize and honorary prize winners, check the site after Aug. 15.

Essays are being accepted online now through April 15, 11:59 p.m. CST. Judging will take place May through early July, and winners will be determined in late July. Judges will include Farm Press editors Paul Hollis of Southeast Farm Press, Ron Smith with Southwest Farm Press and Elton Robinson, Delta Farm Press, along with other industry experts.

Scholarships Available thru NCF for Graduate and Veterinary Students

W.D. Farr Scholarship

The National Cattlemen's Foundation is honoring the successful career of the late W.D. Farr of Greeley, Colorado through two annual \$12,000 graduate scholarships bearing his name. We lost a true industry leader and friend with W.D.'s passing on August 13, 2007, at the age of 97. Farr, a third generation Coloradan, pioneer rancher, statesman and banker is known for his extraordinary vision. His dedication to improving agriculture, livestock and water development has resulted in significant changes in farming methods that have influenced the practices of ranchers and farmers throughout the nation. All submissions must be postmarked by April 15, 2009.

More information and applications are available at

<http://www.nationalcattlemensfoundation.org/schoW.D.FarrLegacyScholarship.aspx>

Fort Dodge Animal Health Legacy Scholarship

The National Cattlemen's Foundation and Fort Dodge Animal Health are proud to announce the 2009 - 2010 Fort Dodge Animal Health Legacy Scholarship. Through producer participation, Fort Dodge Animal Health will sponsor five scholarships of \$5,000 each. Three scholarships will be directed to veterinary school students who have designated an emphasis in beef production. Two scholarships will be directed to undergraduate students enrolled in an animal science program. The 2009-2010 Fort Dodge Animal

Health Legacy Scholarship applications must be postmarked by April 15, 2009.

More information and applications are available at

<http://www.nationalcattlemensfoundation.org/schoFortDodgeAnimalHealthLegacyScholarship.aspx>

Missouri Beef Leadership Conference Registration Open Now!!

The Missouri Junior Cattlemen's Association will be hosting the first Missouri Beef Leadership Conference "Show Me Beef Leadership" on June 4th through 6th in Columbia, Missouri. The conference will have a leadership and industry focus and will be open to teens entering the 8th grade through 12th grade.

Registration open until May 1st but is limited to the first 60 applicants so get registered TODAY!

If your business or county organization is interested in help sponsoring this youth event please contact Rachel Bartholomew at (573) 499-9162 Ext. 235 or by email at rachel@mocattle.com.

Be watching for more information and registration on the MCA website www.mocattle.com.

As always, MCA Membership is the key to the success of the organization. Without producers who back our association our voice is not as strong. Ask your friend, neighbor and fellow cattlemen to join the thousands of cattlemen in supporting the Missouri Cattlemen's Association.

For more industry news visit:

[Missouri Cattlemen's Association Website](#)

[Missouri's Cattlemen Foundation Website](#)

[Missouri Beef Industry Council Website](#)

[National Cattlemen's Beef Association Website](#)

[Missouri Department of Agriculture Website](#)

This newsletter is a publication of the Missouri Cattlemen's Association. All rights reserved - this newsletter may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, without permission of the Missouri Cattlemen's Association.

Do you have questions, comments or suggestions?

Would you like to advertise in our newsletter?

If so, please contact Maureen Hamill at (573) 499-9162 (Ext. 233) or maureen@mocattle.com.

[Forward email](#)

✉ **SafeUnsubscribe®**

This email was sent to maureen@mocattle.com by maureen@mocattle.com.

[Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).

Missouri Cattlemen's Association | 2306 Bluff Creek Drive | Columbia | MO | 65201

Email Marketing by

