Virginia Cooperative Extension

Farm Business Management Update
June-July 2009

To: Extension Unit Directors, Extension District Directors, Extension Program Directors, and Farm Management Agents, and ANR Specialists

Dear Co-Workers:

Farm Business Management Update is a joint effort of the Agricultural and Applied Economics faculty and the area farm management agents. Subject matter areas include timely information on farm management, marketing, tax management, finance, credit, labor, agricultural law, agri-business, estate planning, 4-H and economic education, natural resources, and CRD. Please feel free to reproduce any article. However, please cite the title, author(s), date, and this Newsletter.

Farm Business Management Update is electronically accessible via the Virginia Cooperative Extension World Wide Web site (http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/news/farm-business-management-update.html). To see the articles listed in the reverse chronological order, select "News," then select "Farm Business Management Update" listed under the heading "Periodicals."

Gordon E. Groover
Extension Economist, Farm Management
and Extension Project Leader

Table on Contents **Page**

Consider the Tax Effects before Selling the Dairy Cows

By Eric Eberly (eeberly@vt.edu), Extension Agent, Farm Business Management, Central District

Dairy farmers are experiencing low milk prices and high feed costs. The negative cash flows encourage farmers to take a hard look at their dairy business. Some farmers will decide to liquidate their herds before continued loss of equity forces the sale of the farm. The decision to sell farm assets has income tax consequences that are often not calculated or underestimated. Deferred tax liabilities resulting from depreciation recapture could use up 15 to 40 percent of the value of the assets sold.

Computing the tax liability involves four major steps:

1. Estimate the fair market value of the asset that will be sold;
2. Subtract the basis (book value) and sales fee from step 1;
3. Determine the appropriate tax rates; and
4. Multiply the amount in step two by the rate in step three.

The taxes on an asset sold vary based on the type of asset and the tax strategy used in current and prior years. It is important to know that tax laws and methods of calculating tax change frequently, and individual circumstances may require different strategies.

The following example illustrates how deferred taxes affect wealth and equity. The example for calculating deferred taxes uses a 15 percent long-term capital gains rate and a combined federal and state marginal income tax rate of 30 percent. The family sells farm-raised cows and replacements for $97,500 and dairy equipment for $27,500. The proceeds are used to pay off a $125,000 operating loan. The money earned from off-farm employment is all used for family living expenses.

The balloon bursts when the family has their tax return prepared the following April. When the tax return is complete, the family finds they have a total income tax bill of almost $30,000, plus nearly $1,475 self-employment tax from the sale of calves and other items.

Withholdings on wage income covers about $5,000 of the tax, but there is an outstanding balance of about $26,500 due on April 15. The family has to take out a new loan just to pay the tax. What happened? The money from the sale of their dairy cattle is all taxable. The cattle were all raised, so there was no basis to offset sale price. The remaining basis in the equipment was $10,000, but there were recaptures on the gain from the equipment sale because the sale price was less than the original cost of the equipment. The $17,500 gain on the equipment was taxed as ordinary income.

The family's nightmare is that the earning assets -- the cows and the dairy equipment -- have been sold, but now a new debt that is 22 percent of the original one appears because of the taxes related to the sale of assets to pay off the operating loan.

There are a few options that can alleviate the tax burden of farm liquidation, but most people fail to take advantage of them because they sell assets first and talk to their accountant later. That

process should be reversed. Talk to the accountant first, and sell assets later based on the accountant's analysis of the tax consequences and ways to reduce the tax bite.

What are some ways to reduce the tax burden that can result from dairy liquidation? If possible, spread the liquidation over two tax years to keep the income in a lower bracket. For instance, if mature animals can be sold one year and replacements the next year, it will prevent the surge in taxable income that results from selling everything in one year. In some cases, livestock and equipment can be sold in different years to achieve a similar result.

If the lender agrees, an installment sale might be used to spread income over several years. This will keep more of the income in a lower tax bracket, and it should produce some interest income on the unpaid balance that can be used to offset interest payments on loan obligations.

If the farming operation will continue with a change in enterprises, consider exchanging some assets for property that will be needed in the new farming operation. For example, a family quitting dairy farming but planning to invest in a beef operation might consider an exchange of dairy breeding animals for beef breeding animals. This 'like-kind' exchange is accomplished tax-free -- that is, no gain is recognized and no tax is due, as long as there is no transfer of cash and the property given up has the same value as the property received.

The rules on 'like-kind' exchanges are complex, so be sure to check with a tax accountant that is well versed in the specifics of farm-related like-kind exchanges. Some exchanges do not qualify; for instance, you cannot exchange dairy cows for beef or dairy steers, because they are not considered 'like-kind' property.

If you're seriously considering quitting dairy farming and beginning a beef cattle operation, check the records for historical farm profits earned by beef cattle operations. Be cautious and develop a business plan before reinvesting in a new enterprise just to save on taxes.

References:

- IRS. 2008. Dispositions of Property Used in Farming. IRS Pub 225, Farmers Tax Guide. 57-65

- Harris, P.E. 2004. Agricultural Tax Issues, Fall 2004. 129-140

- Kohl, D. 1996. Planning an Orderly Exit from Business. Farm Management Update Newsletter

- Bragg, L. A. and T. J. Dalton. 2004. Factors Affecting the Decision to Exit Dairy Farming: A Two-Stage Regression Analysis. J. Dairy Sci. 87:3092-3098

- Jenkins, L. 1997. Leaving Dairy Business? Consider the Tax Effects Before Selling the Cows. Penn State University

The Management Calendar

By Gordon Groover (xgrover@vt.edu), Extension Economist, Farm Management, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Virginia Tech

Well, it has been a wee bit damp during May. Blacksburg received 9.54 inches of rain – that's 5.62 inches more than the normal rainfall for May. There are lots of farmers waiting for a few dry days to get in the fields. Overall, in the New River Valley, we are behind our normal hay harvest schedules with limited days of clear skies to allow for cutting, curing, and baling. It is nice to see the rivers, creek, and ponds get back to normal levels.

Listed below are the items that need to be included on the farm business managers' calendar for spring of 2009.

- Half the business year will soon be behind us and a six-month financial record check-up is in order. Updating your records through the month of June allows you to quickly gauge financial progress by comparing the farm's actual expenses and income to your budgeted amounts. If you did not develop a budget, compare your mid-year expenses and income to half the items reported on your 2008 Schedule F. Flag any items that are different from budgeted amounts. These differences are not necessarily problems, just items that need to be examined and explained.
- Watch your line-of-credit and be sure to keep in touch with your lender. They all know that prices of all inputs have gone up and commodity prices are sliding down. Yet it's just good business practice to keep them informed of major changes and that you are managing the situation.
- Production records for livestock and crops should be updated for the first half of the year. Look for big changes from last year, and make sure to cross-reference these with production expenses.
- Even with the time constraints of summer activities, try to plan and hold regular staff meetings with family members and employees to discuss work plans and set priorities for the next day/week. Consider brainstorming about alternative ways to deal with problems.
- Use some of the time to help discuss positive outcomes of previous plans, and recognize individuals for being creative and doing a good job.
- Checking your credit rating in July should become an annual event. Independence Day should remind you that you should be independent from identity theft and credit mistakes. All individuals and business owners should annually check their credit rating. Additional information on your rights to access your credit report and links to the site for obtaining a free copy of your credit report can be found at the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) web site at http://www.ftc.gov/freereports. The FTC cautions consumers to make sure they use the correct site because there are "Imposter" sites.

Selective information available that might be useful for summer reading:

- Interested in information on the federal estate tax issues? Then take look at a paper titled "Federal Tax Policies and Farm Households" at http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/eib54/ by By Ron Durst of USDA-ERS (Economic Information Bulletin No. (EIB-54) 26 pp, May 2009). This paper sheds light on the significant changes in Federal individual income and estate tax policies that have occurred over the last 10 years. Analysis suggests that changes

in Federal tax provisions affecting both individual and business income taxes have reduced average tax rates for all farm households, resulting in the lowest tax burden on farm income and investment in a decade. Similarly, an analysis of the changes to Federal estate tax policies suggests that increases in the value of property that can be transferred to the next generation free of the estate tax, combined with special provisions for farmers and other small businesses, have greatly reduced the number of farm estates subject to the tax and the amount owed. While nearly 10 percent of commercial farm estates could owe tax in 2009, only 1 to 2 percent of all farm estates are estimated to be subject to the Federal estate tax this year.

- Ever considered sharing equipment or machinery with a neighbor? If yes, you'll need to order a copy of this publication form the North Central Farm Management Extension Committee titled *Manual on Farm Machinery & Labor Sharing (*NCFMEC-21*)*. I have a copy and it is an excellent resource for anyone considering sharing machinery. The Farm Machinery & Labor Sharing Manual discusses both operational and organizational issues. It includes sample sharing agreements and worksheets for allocating costs fairly. This manual includes cases studies that highlight the various types of arrangements, identifies potential problems associated with sharing resources, and explains the strategies these groups used to resolve them. Published May 2009, 88 pp., 8 1/2 x 11, color photographs, coated stay-flat spiral binding. Costs about $25.00. The publication can be ordered via the Midwest Plan Service at http://www.mwps.org/ or specifically go this to: http://www.mwps.org/?fuseaction=c_Products.viewProduct&catID=7788&productID=17841&skunumber=NCFMEC%2D21&crow=1.
- The Farm Service Agency administers Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE), a new program authorized by the 2008 Farm Bill that begins in crop year 2009. Through ACRE, USDA offers producers an alternative to Direct and Counter-cyclical (DCP) payments. The ACRE alternative provides eligible producers a state-level revenue guarantee, based on the 5-year state Olympic average yield and the 2-year national average price. ACRE payments are made when both state- and farm-level triggers are met. By participating in ACRE, producers elect to forgo counter-cyclical payments, receive a 20-percent reduction in direct payments, and a 30-percent reduction in loan rates. ACRE sign-up dates will be announced soon, or a producer can choose to stay with DCP. A decision to elect ACRE binds the producer to the program through the 2012 crop year, the last crop year covered by the 2008 Farm Bill. See this web site for information and spreadsheets explaining the ACRE. http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=dccp&topic=landing

Brief Summary: Workplace Community Supported Agriculture Model

By Theresa J. Nartea (tnartea@vsu.edu), Marketing & Agribusiness Specialist, Virginia State University

What is the benefit of this model? The workplace community supported agriculture (CSA) model is considered a low-resource employee wellness benefit. By establishing a one-on-one connection between local farms and employees at large employment centers, local farms have a stable marketplace, and busy employees have an enhanced quality of life (convenient delivery of healthy, farm fresh products, a relationship with the person who grew their food, competitive

pricing, environmental consciousness and job satisfaction). This Extension educational model can be adapted to fit most high population work or living centers, with 2,000 or more individuals at the given site.

The primary development responsibilities are as follows:

1. Determine feasibility. Host company/Host site works with State and County Extension to conduct a web based and/or paper survey of current employees to see if they would like the local farm delivery service;
2. Primary responsibilities on company staff and resources are assigned by Executive staff. Key communications are executed via the internal company webpage, directly from Human Resources Department/Marketing staff's designated responsible personnel;
3. State and County Extension works with interested local farmers to develop individual farm delivery subscriptions for a given Host company/Host site;
4. Host company/site works with State and County Extension to add farm delivery information to their existing website and add appropriate web content/data;
5. Host company/Host site to advertise widely farm delivery program and organize with State & County Extension scheduled "Meet and Sign Up with Local Farmers" Days;
6. Farms deliver at Host company/Host site decided upon times and days;
7. State and County Extension works with Host company/Host site to offer future educational programs that may be of interest to the Host company/Host site employees in the future:
    a. weed and pest management;
    b. cooking with local produce;
    c. health & nutrition, etc.;
    d. composting and garden know-how; etc.

Example project websites: *Please note all administrative costs are incurred by the companies. Participating farmers are advertised, supported, allowed to be at the host site, free of charge***.**

Example 1: http://www.hr.duke.edu/mobilemarket/about.html This self-sustaining project is in its fifth year of operation and has a delivery site at Duke University Gardens (Durham). Six local farmers are currently participating. Pre-paid subscription sales go directly to local farmers of over $75,000 (gross profit annually). Project documentation was collected up to year two. This project is fully self-sufficient.

Example 2: http://www.rti.org/csa/page.cfm/About_CSA This project is in RTP (Durham), and is in year eight. Seven local farmers and a seafood vendor are participating, with pre-paid subscription sales average gross sales over $90,000 annually. Project documentation was collected up to year three. This project is fully self-sufficient.

Is this model robust? The workplace CSA model is a flexible and well-balanced extension outreach model. It builds a unique, reciprocal relationship between two different societal segments: farmers and busy employees. The workplace CSA model has an immediate financial and societal impact on both rural and urban communities. In addition, this model is not considered to be either a financial or labor sink on the workplace host, and it builds a tangible and innovative link between Cooperative Extension and local large employers in the community. In this system, there is no need for a permanent building to be built; rather, it builds an

independent relationship between customers and farmers instead of a dependent relationship between Host company/Host site and farmers. This system can be easily adapted to meet an interested workplace site's vision and primary goal of improving employee well-being, job satisfaction, and health.

Hay Costs

By Gordon Groover (xgrover@vt.edu), Extension Economist, Farm Management, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, Virginia Tech, and Peter Callan (peter.callan@vt.edu), Extension Agent, Farm Business Management, Northern District

We have been asked to make a number of presentations on the costs of making hay over the last year. We've gleaned a few items that might be helpful as livestock producers plan for the future. The process of getting prepared for these talks has been an eye opener for us. Some of the commonly held assumptions now need to be reconsidered. What do we mean? First, consider that more than half of the total costs of producing a ton of hay are spent on fertilizer (Table 1). In the past our focus has been on total machinery costs as the most important factor in producing hay, but that is no longer the case. Second, alfalfa hay costs less per ton to produce than nitrogen fertilized grass hay. This is a major change, when previously alfalfa was considered a premier crop with a premier cost, and was reserved for lactating dairy cows. Third, our traditional ways of feeding hay to beef cattle (typically 6 months of the year) are not financially sustainable under current conditions.

The high costs of hay production are driven by the increased costs of energy and its effect on fertilizer manufacturing and transportation. Of course, we all wish that these high costs would go away and prices would settle down to the good old days of $0.25 per lb. for nitrogen. We do not think this will happen, so we are left to ask, "What should I do"? Listed below are seven items to consider or mull over while making hay this summer.

Table 1. Example Costs of Hay

Major Cost Categories	Grass-Clover Hay (3 ton yield) $/ton	Alfalfa (5 ton yield) $/ton	Grass Nitrogen Fertilized Hay (3 ton yield) $/ton
Establishment and Over-Seeding	14	12	13
Pesticides 0		9	0
Other 9		8	10
Harvest 22		26	22
Fixed Machinery	12	16	12
Fertilizer costs based on nutrient removal			
N	N met by legumes		33
K	40	48	40
P	14	10	14
Land rent/land charge	8	8	8
Total Costs per Ton	$119	$137	$152

See VCE enterprise budgets for details at: http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/446/446-047/446-047.html

1. All informed decisions start with information or data. The starting point has to be farm-level production and financial records to support estimating your per-ton costs of hay production. Combining the financial records with production/field records (yield, soil tests, cropping and management data) will provide information to make field or farm-level decisions to lower costs and increase profit levels. For example, efficient allocation of purchased fertilizers on the most productive fields will lower total costs of producing hay and in turn lower total feed costs for the beef herd. These economic determinations can only be made on the basis of field level yield and cost data.
2. Table 1 points directly to one important factor that has been known for decades. That is, using clovers and/or legumes in your grass hay stands can replace nitrogen fertilizer applications. In this example, a small investment in clover seed saves $33 per ton in on-farm hay costs and subsequently lowers feed costs.
3. Alfalfa should be produced on highly productive land instead of on nitrogen-fertilized grass hay. The cost savings are not quite as high as with clover-grass hay, yet the savings and the higher quality hay may make alfalfa a more cost-effective hay crop, thus lowering winter feeding costs. An added benefit of alfalfa is that it is more productive in dry conditions and provides forages during the cool-season forage "summer slump."
4. Some considerations from the beef cow side of the feed bunk first: animals harvesting their own forages are (under current prices) more cost-effective than mechanical harvesting, hauling, storing, and then hauling the hay back out for feeding. In most cases, it is very dubious to assume that beef cattle producers can get by with no hay feeding. However, stockpiling and efficient use of rotational grazing can reduce the number of days that stored forages are fed to cattle and can greatly reduce total feed costs.
5. As you look at the cost of making hay for livestock, also consider total feeding costs. That is, what does it cost to feed a cow including hay, supplemental feeds (corn gluten, soy hulls, etc.), and minerals? Make sure that you look at the feed costs to meet the animal's total nutrient needs; for example, compare alfalfa and minerals versus feeding grass hay, corn grain, and minerals. Choose the feeding system that meets the animals' needs at the lowest costs. Work with your local extension agents to develop an annual feed budget or look at one of the VCE cow-calf budgets to assist in developing a feed budget (http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/446/446-048/446-048.html#BeefCowCalfBudgets).
6. Consider the following: feed a spring calving beef cow for 6 months requiring about 2.8 tons of hay (including a 10% feeding loss) for the cow and her proportion of the bull and replacement heifer. Using costs in Table 1 yields a range of annual on-farm hay costs to carry a cow-calf unit from $333 per head ($119/ton) to $426 per head ($152 per ton). Using the VCE spring calving beef budget (http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/446/446-048/XLS_BeefCowsSpringCalving_HayRation.xls) demonstrates that nitrogen-fertilized hay makes up more than 60% of the total costs per cow-calf unit.
7. Hay quality does not impact production costs. It costs the same to make lower quality (patriotic hay – harvested around the 4th of July) as it does to make top quality hay.
8. Finally, if you make hay, consider storage. Table 1 provides information to make an informed decision about storage. Using the costs of the grass nitrogen-fertilized hay at $152 per ton, how much savings can be expected from protecting the hay? Consider if storing hay in a barn or under a trap saves 20% more than bales left outside, then a cost-conscious farmer will save $30 per ton. Savings on grass-clover hay would be $24 per ton. Thus, annually storing 300 tons (about 100 acres of grass hay) would save a farmer more than $7,000 per year. This savings would quickly pay for costs of storage (such as barns, tarps, and wrapping).

This simple discussion is intended to spark the process of asking questions about how you consider the true cost of hay used to feed the cow head. Consider pushing the pencil or working the keyboard to calculate your own costs of making and harvesting hay and to begin considering alternatives that save money and reduce feeding costs.

Financial Profile of the Valley Dairy Industry

By Bill Whittle (wwhittle@vt.edu), Extension Agent, Farm Business Management, Northwest District

The dairy farm is an integral part of Shenandoah Valley agriculture, but in today's economic climate it is difficult for farmers to remain profitable and viable. Because most of these farms are family owned and operated, a division of management is often nonexistent. The same person is responsible for the production, labor, and financial management plus a good portion of the manual work that must be done. This is not to diminish the role of the rest of the family, but it is unusual to divide management responsibilities among multiple persons on the family farm. Because management is stretched thin, it is vital for the manager to use all available tools.

For the past nine years, Virginia Cooperative Extension has partnered with Farm Credit of the Virginias to conduct the Dairy Management Institute. The DMI provides financial data to participating dairies so that they can track farm progress over years and compare their farm to the average of other Valley dairies.

For tax year 2008, the DMI aggregated the financial records of the 40 participating dairies to determine the profile or benchmarks of expenses, income, and certain production and efficiency measures. Benchmarks are nothing more or less than averages which allow a dairy to judge progress or lack of progress against the average. Maintaining the DMI records over several years allows a dairy to judge its progress when compared to the previous year's standing.

For tax year 2008, the DMI was conducted in three locations in Virginia (Valley, Franklin area, Southwest) for a total of 68 dairies participating. Though statewide DMI aggregate benchmarks were compiled, this article is dealing with only the 40 Valley herds that participated.

Valley dairies have many similar traits but no two are the same. Benchmarks are management tools, not definitive numbers. One dairy may have high labor costs while the next uses only family labor that does not draw a paycheck. Another dairy may have high purchased feed expenses but low fertilizer, chemical, and other expenses associated with growing feed. If your farm's records don't match a particular benchmark, it does not necessarily mean that there is a problem. It does mean that there is a difference and, as a manager, you should determine if the difference is actually an indicator of a problem or just of different management objectives.

The aggregate paints a picture of an average Valley dairy during 2008. If you understand that no dairy is average in all categories, these numbers can become very useful to the farm's Chief Financial Officer as decisions are being made. In 2008, the average DMI herd consisted of 146 cows selling 20,363 pounds of milk per cow at an average price of $21.31 per hundredweight. The first important number to compare is the average price of $21.31 in 2008 to the average

price of $20.93 in 2007 and $14.82 in 2006. It should be no surprise to dairymen that milk prices was better in 2008, but it is difficult to judge how much better and how it affects the entire operation without having a comparison. A take-home point is that milk price fluctuates tremendously and one must prepare for the times of low milk prices (see Table 1).

The average Total Cash Income per Cow in 2008 was $4,828, up $1.334 from 2006 while the aggregate for Cash Operating Expenses per Cow (not including Interest and Depreciation) was $3,784, up $874 from 2006. This leaves the average Valley dairy $1,044 to pay debt, cover family living expenses, and make any improvements to the farm. This may seem like a lot of money but if the farm is carrying a lot of debt, the required interest payments can rapidly consume this amount.

On the expense side of the ledger, the top five expenses for the average farm were Purchased Feed, Labor, Milk Haul & Marketing, Repairs, and Fertilizer & Chemicals. These five line items accounted for 67.2% or $12.56/cwt of the total Cash Operating Expenses. The cost of Purchased Feed accounted for $6.92 of the average milk price received of $21.31/cwt. See Table 2.

These financial benchmarks are interesting to note but they become a management tool when a dairy can put its information in a similar format and compare its progress. The DMI allows participating dairies to do just that. Any dairy interested in the DMI can contact me at the Page Extension Office, or my counterpart, Tom Stanley, in the Augusta Extension Office (see textbox information on the page 10)

Table 1. Profile of Valley Dairy Farms Participating in DMI For 2008, 2007 and 2006 Tax Years*

	2008	**2007**	**2006**
Average Cows per Herd	146	130	134
Labor-Fill Time Labor Equivalents	3	2.6	3.0
Pounds of Milk Sold per Worker	1,001,699	1,033,825	901,907
Pounds of Milk sold Per Cow	20,363	20,312	19,869
Milk Price per Cwt	$21.31	$20.93	$14.82
Milk Sales as a % of Total Cash Income	89.9% 90.5%		84.3%
Net Operating Income per Cow	$1,045	$1,440	$584
Cash Operating Expense per Cwt	$18.58	$16.03	$14.65
Cash Operating Expense Ratio	78.4%	69.3%	83.3%

*Source: 2006, 2007 & 2008 Tax Year Shenandoah Valley DMI Data

Table 2. Top 5 Cash Operating Expenses per CWT of Milk Price Received by Average DMI Valley Dairy Farm For 2008, 2007 and 2006 Tax Years*

(Interest and Depreciation are Not included) Labor Expense was adjusted to account for management and unpaid family labor by adding $30,000 to reported labor expenses.				
Cash Operating Expenses	**Rank**	**2008 $/CWT of Average Price of Milk**	**2007 $/ CWT of Average Price of Milk**	**2006 $/ CWT of Average Price of Milk**
Purchased Feed	1	$6.92	$5.73	$4.38
Hired Labor	2	$2.32	$2.22	$2.61
Milk Marketing & Haul	3	$1.17	$1.03	$1.00
Repairs	4	$1.09	$0.95	$0.92
Fert, Lime & Chemicals	5	$1.06	$0.90	$0.76
Total Of Top 5 Expenses		**$12.56**	**$10.83**	**$9.67**

*Source: 2006, 2007 & 2008 Tax Year Shenandoah Valley DMI Data

Dairy Management Institute-Summer Session Offered at a Location Near You

Extension and Farm Credit are conducting a second round of the 2008 Tax Year DMI. Dairies wishing to participate should contact one of the people below by June 10, 2009.

Harrisonburg Area:

Tom Stanley: Extension FBM Agent (540) 245-5750
Bill Whittle: Extension FBM Agent (540) 778-5794
Patti Craun: Farm Credit (540) 434-5385
Scot Lilly: Farm Credit (540) 434-5385

Franklin/Pittsylvania County Area:

Beverly Cox: Extension Area Dairy Agent (540) 483-5161
Eric Eberly: Extension FBM Agent (434) 292-5331
Rick King: Farm Credit (540) 483-4572

Southwest Virginia

Chase Scott: Extension Area Dairy Agent (276) 233-6040
Matthew Miller: Extension FBM Agent (276) 783-5175
David Cuddy: Farm Credit (276) 628-5191

Individual farm data will be collected and compared against the 2008 Tax Year DMI Class for the Shenandoah Valley. Your individual herd information is kept confidential. This mid-year session will give participating dairy farmers a leg up in joining the regular DMI program scheduled for next March, 2010.

June 10, 2009 - Registration Deadline for all Locations.

Competitive Measures Session:

June 22, 2009 – Harrisonburg
June 23, 2009 – Southwest Virginia
June 24, 2009 – Franklin/Pittsylvania County Area

DMI Analysis Session
July 10, 2009 – Roanoke Area

VIRGINIA GRAIN PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 16402 :: Chesapeake, VA 23328 :: 757.421.3038 office :: 757.421.2776 fax

For Immediate Release

Media Contact:
Molly Pugh, Executive Director, 757-421-3038
Molly@virginiagrains.com
Rhondalee Dean-Royce, Media Relations Director, 703-342-8286
Rhondalee@virginiagrains.com

Virginia Ag Expo Returns to King William County in 2009

Chesapeake, Va. - Plans are underway for the 2009 Virginia Ag Expo; the Commonwealth's leading agricultural event. The Ag Expo annually showcases Virginia's diversified agriculture industry and provides information for consumers and producers on agricultural services, production, equipment and more.

The 2009 Virginia Ag Expo will be held August 6, 2009 and hosted by the John N. Mills & Sons farm in King William County. The farm features a diverse grain and beef cattle operation including corn, soybeans and small grains. The event is sponsored annually by the Virginia Grain Producers Association and the Virginia Soybean Association in cooperation with Virginia Cooperative Extension.

"As leaders in the agriculture industry, we are proud to offer educational opportunities like the Virginia Ag Expo to further benefit our producers as well as Virginia's agriculture industry," said John Smith, Virginia Ag Expo Manager. "With new farm programs, volatile commodity markets and ever-changing policies, these types of opportunities and events are even more important. We are grateful to our host, John N. Mills & Sons, for providing a beautiful home for the 2009 event. From technology to fellowship, this event always presents the best of the industry for the entire family."

For exhibit and sponsor information for the 2009 Virginia Ag Expo, please contact the event manager, John W. Smith at vaagexpo@aol.com. All other details will be posted at www.virginiagrains.com once available.

Please visit www.virginiagrains.com for pictures of previous Virginia Ag Expo events.

Calendar of Events

June

15-18 State 4-H Congress. Blacksburg, Virginia. Contact Katie Lafon at (540) 231-3360 or by email at kapatter@vt.edu.

22 Dairy Management Institute Competitive Measures Session. Harrisonburg. Registration deadline is June 10, 2009. Contact Tom Stanley at (540) 245-5750; Bill Whittle at (540) 778-5794; Patti Craun at (540) 434-5385; or Scot Lilly at (540) 434-5385.

23 Dairy Management Institute Competitive Measures Session. Southwest Virginia. Registration deadline is June 10, 2009. Contact Chase Scott at (276) 233-6040; Matthew Miller at (276) 783-5175; or David Cuddy at (276) 628-5191.

24 Dairy Management Institute Competitive Measures Session. Franklin/Pittsylvania County Area. Registration deadline is June 10, 2009. Contact Beverly Cox at (540) 483-5161; Eric Eberly (434) 292-5331; or Rick King at (540) 483-4572.

July

10 Dairy Management Institute Analysis Session. Roanoke area. Registration deadline is June 10, 2009. Contact Chase Scott at (276) 233-6040; Matthew Miller at (276) 783-5175; or David Cuddy at (276) 628-5191.

August

6 Virginia Ag Expo. King William County, Virginia. Contact Molly Pugh at (757-421-3038 or by email at Molly@virginiagrains.com. Also, see website: www.virginiagrains.com.