

**WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF  
MR. GARY COOPER,  
COOPER FARMS OF OAKWOOD, OHIO**

**ON BEHALF OF THE  
NATIONAL PORK PRODUCERS COUNCIL**

**EXAMINING THE CONSEQUENCES OF EPA'S  
ACTIONS ON AMERICAN AGRICULTURE**

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE**

**JULY 10, 2024**

**Written Testimony of  
Mr. Gary Cooper  
Cooper Farms, Oakwood, Ohio**

**Introduction**

I am Gary Cooper, and with my brother Jim and sister Dianne, we are the 4<sup>th</sup> generation to operate Cooper Farms, a family-owned, diversified livestock and poultry company in its 86<sup>th</sup> year of business. Headquartered in Oakwood, Ohio, Cooper Farms is the 7<sup>th</sup> largest turkey producer, 16<sup>th</sup> largest egg producer, and the 29<sup>th</sup> largest pork producer in the United States. Over the past nine decades, and with the help of our 2,500 team members, we've become a leading food supplier, selling a variety of fully cooked and ready-to-cook turkey, ham, and chicken egg products to customers throughout North America. Our company takes compliance and environmental performance seriously, striving to always go above and beyond. On our hog operations, for instance, regardless of size, we require all our farms to meet the most stringent regulatory requirements set forth by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the state of Ohio.

I am testifying today on behalf of the National Pork Producers Council (NPPC), which represents 42 affiliated state pork associations, working to ensure the U.S. pork industry remains a consistent and responsible supplier of high-quality pork to domestic and international markets. Through public policy outreach, NPPC fights for reasonable legislation and regulations, develops revenue and market opportunities, and protects the livelihoods of America's more than 66,000 pork producers, such as myself, my family, and many neighbors and friends.

The U.S. pork industry is a significant contributor to the economic activity of U.S. agriculture and the broader U.S. economy, marketing nearly 150 million hogs annually. Those animals provided farm-level gross cash receipts of more than \$27 billion in 2023.

To produce those hogs, pork producers used roughly 1.7 billion bushels of corn and soybean meal from 462 million bushels of soybeans in 2023. The industry also purchases more than \$1.6 billion in other feed ingredients.

Economists at the NPPC and Iowa State University estimated that in 2023 the U.S. pork industry was directly responsible for creating more than 36,000 full-time-equivalent jobs on hog farms and generated roughly 112,000 jobs throughout all of agriculture. In addition, the pork sector was responsible for 145,000 jobs in meatpacking and processing and 38,000 jobs in professional services such as financial services, insurance and real estate. In total, the U.S. pork industry supports 573,000 mostly rural jobs in the United States and adds more than \$62 billion to the country's GDP.

Most importantly, U.S. pork producers provided more than 27 billion pounds of safe, wholesome, and nutritious meat protein to consumers worldwide in 2022.

Today is a challenging time in the U.S. pork industry. Last year, hog producers lost an average of \$30 per head on each hog marketed due to lower hog prices and significantly higher production

costs that increased more than 50 percent over three years. Lower feed costs have brought some relief for producers in 2024, though the roughly \$4 billion in cumulative industry losses incurred in 2023 continue to put a pinch on the pork industry, and this economic reality may force producers to exit the industry and drive consolidation at the farm level. This only adds to the uncertainty that already exists with the credit market and the presence of African swine fever (ASF) in the Western Hemisphere.

Environmental regulations are important. However, when poorly conceived or implemented, that can add significant burdens to the other headwinds that pork producers currently face. NPPC and its members welcome the opportunity to provide this Committee with our views on matters involving pork producers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). These comments will focus on the EPA's current ongoing work on the following matters:

- The pending rulemaking under the Clean Water Act (CWA) on Effluent Limitation Guidelines (ELGs) applicable to the Meat and Poultry Processing (MPP) sectors, which we believe carries a risk of significantly disrupting packing capacity in the U.S., especially for smaller and mid-size packers and processors such as ourselves, and carries with it the risk of both forcing further concentration in the industry and causing producers to lose access to local markets to harvest and process their animals;
- The ongoing status of EPA's implementation of its definition of the CWA's Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS).
- Implementation of the CWA Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) rulemaking and the associated National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements, where applicable.
- The continuous legal challenges regarding the Lake Erie Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) in Ohio.
- The crafting of air emissions estimation methodologies (EEMs) and emissions factors for swine and other animal species from data collected by the National Air Emissions Monitoring Study (NAEMS) and other sources, and the related steps taken on a new Emergency Planning Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) reporting requirement.
- EPA's registration review under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) of the rodenticide products commonly used on swine and poultry operations to control rat and mouse populations.
- EPA's registration review of formaldehyde under FIFRA is being done at the same time as the agency is also doing an extensive review within its Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) risk evaluation process.

### **General Working Relationship with the EPA**

Before going into these details, it is helpful to discuss our general working relationship we have had with the EPA. NPPC represents pork producers that are regulated by the EPA.

As a producer-led organization, when regulations are necessary, NPPC advocates practical and affordable measures that solve real and important problems. To the extent that the EPA has, in our view, shared that objective in concretely observable ways, our working relationship has been generally quite constructive.

A recent example of this has been the EPA's formation of the Office of Agricultural and Rural Affairs (OARA). This office, which reports directly to the EPA Administrator, was formed to serve as the primary liaison between rural and agricultural stakeholders and the EPA. The OARA maintains close contact with the EPA's other program offices and regions for the purpose of (in EPA's wording) "to forge practical, science-based solutions that protect the environment while ensuring a vibrant and productive agricultural system." OARA's Director will be the person formerly serving as Senior Agricultural Advisor to the Administrator, but that Director will now have a staff of ten or so people.

We look forward to working with OARA and this commitment by the EPA to science-based solutions that will work for American agriculture and rural America. The initial efforts of OARA's Director and Deputy Director are promising in this regard.

We also note, with appreciation, the EPA's Office of Enforcement taking the common-sense step of establishing in 2016 an extensive set of detailed, required procedures and guidelines to minimize the risk of EPA personnel transmitting animal diseases from livestock or poultry farms, ranches, dairies, feed yards, sale yards, slaughterhouses, and other facilities where animals are housed or processed to other such facilities<sup>1</sup>. Unfortunately, endemic outbreaks of swine, poultry, and cattle diseases still occur in the U.S., as evidenced by the ongoing highly pathogenic avian influenza outbreak affecting both the poultry and dairy sectors. For livestock farmers, maintaining rigorous biosecurity protocols to protect the health of their herds and flocks is our highest priority. We greatly appreciate the EPA's help in finding an effective solution to keeping the biosecurity of our facilities while the agency conducts its import inspection and oversight roles.

### **EPA's ELGs Applicable to the MPP Sectors**

Unfortunately, we have significant concerns regarding the EPA's development of revisions to the ELG applicable to the MPP sectors.

While NPPC's membership is generally not the meat and poultry processors whose CWA water discharge permits will be shaped by the MPP ELG, this regulatory effort could have direct and enormous consequences for the stability and reliability of the marketplace for the animals NPPC's producer members raise and market. NPPC's sole charge is to protect the livelihood of pork producers in the U.S., and its analysis of the MPP ELG leads to the conclusion that this rulemaking will significantly disrupt packing capacity and inflict additional severe financial harm on producers. The industry fears that this MPP ELG, if finalized without the changes that the livestock industry has proposed, will lead to further industry concentration and the loss of independent producers and small and medium sized processors.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-05/documents/biosecuritysop.pdf>

NPPC fully supports the CWA goal of reducing pollutants in the country's surface waters to restore and maintain water quality. The ELG program, including any changes to the MPP ELG, is one of the critical elements under the CWA that will drive the federal and state regulatory agencies and the regulated communities' efforts to achieve the CWA's goals. As I've noted, NPPC firmly believes that updates and revisions to the MPP ELG can be crafted to further the MPP sector's achievement of those goals without sacrificing the stability, reliability, and economic soundness of the pork products' marketplace.

Our concerns began with the unreasonable 60-day period set for public comments on what is a highly complex and technical proposal and the EPA's denial of industry's request for an extension to that comment period. This was the case despite the obvious need for more time for the animal agriculture community to properly review the rule and respond constructively and thoughtfully to the questions the EPA posed and topics requested to be considered. It is also consistent with past EPA precedent for such complex rulemakings, such as the EPA's previous MPP ELG in 2004. It merits noting that animal agriculture and the meat processors were not alone in calling for an extension of the comment period. Indeed, the EPA accomplished something uncommon. At a public hearing on this rulemaking, both environmentalists and livestock farmers agreed with each other – that the EPA needed to provide significantly more opportunity for public review and understanding of what was proposed.

EPA's proposed changes and supporting docket, published in the *Federal Register* in January 2024, was extensive and highly technical. It included the following, in relevant part:

- A 64-page Federal Register notice (89 Fed. Reg. 4,474; January 23, 2024);
- A 174-page Technical Development Document for Proposed Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Meat and Poultry Products Point Source Category (TDD);
- A 147-page Environmental Assessment for Revisions to the Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Meat and Poultry Products Point Source Category (EA);
- A 142-page Benefit-Cost Analysis for Revisions to the Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Meat and Poultry Products Point Source Category (BCA);
- A 107-page Regulatory Impact Analysis for Revisions to the Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Meat and Poultry Products Point Source Category (RIA);
- A docket containing 660 documents, including 657 additional support documents that were only added on January 23, 2024; and
- A request for specific comments on at least 43 different major topics, including variations on all of the options that the EPA is proposing; confirmation from industry sources that the EPA's assumptions or analyses are consistent with how the various industries operate; requests for data that the EPA needs to assess various options or considerations; impacts on small businesses and how they should be assessed and considered; and other technical information that may vary by subindustries within the MPP umbrella.

From our perspective, the future financial health of pork producers and the pork processing sector is at stake here. We remain concerned that no time extension was provided to allow for thoughtful responses to be submitted. We had a mere 60 days to review, understand, and

comment on these materials. In denying our request for more time, the EPA's Office of Water indicated that it is now their policy not to grant any extensions of time on rulemakings. This is despite the clear requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and the relevant executive orders to ensure an adequate time is provided for meaningful comments to be submitted. The EPA also indicated that because this rulemaking resulted from their settlement of a lawsuit filed by environmentalists, the need to expedite the completion of the rulemaking process was of paramount importance. Yet, under that settlement, the rulemaking doesn't need to be completed until August of 2025. By comparison, the last time MPP ELG revisions were proposed, the EPA provided 120 days for comment, followed by an additional "Notice of Data Availability" with its own comment period. The result was a final revised ELG issued 29 months after the initial proposal. While this is admittedly a considerable amount of time, that regulation has been in place for 20 years. It is our view that the size, scope, and economic importance to agriculture, our food system, and the economy of this rulemaking merits providing an adequate amount of time for proper and thorough analysis and understanding of the proposal's implications.

Beyond these obvious procedural deficiencies, on the substance the proposed ELG has significant problems that led us, along with several others in animal agriculture and the MPP sector, to call on the EPA to do the following:

1. Provide additional information and conduct adequate research to confirm the validity of the assumptions made by the EPA and to correct errors that were discovered; and
2. To either:
  - a. Focus specifically on direct discharging facilities (dropping all standards for indirect dischargers), and then publish a "Notice of Data Availability" in the Federal Register with an additional 90-day comment period; or
  - b. Withdraw the proposed rule completely and reissue a new, corrected proposed rule in the future regarding appropriate revisions, if any, to the 2004 MPP ELGs nationally appropriate technology-based standards applicable to direct discharging facilities.

The reasons we called on the EPA to take these steps were because our analysis led us to conclude the following:

- The EPA had seriously underestimated the number of MPP facilities that would likely see closures under proposed Option 1 – it would jump from 16 facilities that the EPA estimates to 74 facilities.
- The projected number of near-term job losses associated with these facility closures would increase from 17,000 to nearly 80,000 direct job losses.
- The projected closures and job losses for the more stringent regulatory Options were similarly underestimated (Option 2 would increase to 139, and 340 closures for Option 3).
- The proposed rule harms the unique relationship between MPPs and local publicly owned treatment works (POTWs), whose national association, the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, has argued to the EPA that the rule itself is unnecessary and not an environmental priority for its members.

- The EPA’s analyses of pollutant loadings are inconsistent with its cost analyses.

NPPC has concluded that if the EPA’s proposed rule goes forward, it could once again drive considerable consolidation in the livestock and poultry community. Not only would small meat processors suffer significant harm due to the inability to afford the changes the EPA is calling for, but the farmers that rely on those markets would once again be faced with losing additional markets to sell their products. We believe this rule is wholly inconsistent with the Biden Administration’s commitment through USDA to help finance the launch and expansion of meat and poultry processing facilities in the US and to provide more markets for meat and poultry products.

## **WOTUS**

Implementation of the EPA’s WOTUS changes continues to be a source of confusion and angst for pig and other farmers across the country. NPPC continues to be engaged in a large, diverse coalition focused on the legal, legislative and regulatory aspects of this issue. The biggest concern at this moment is the EPA and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) ongoing implementation of the rule and the lack of publicly available information being shared by them during that process.

On March 29, 2024, NPPC joined almost thirty other national trade associations in a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) letter to the EPA and the Corps, sharing specific concerns and questions regarding the agencies' implementation of the revised rules regarding the definition of WOTUS. Specifically, the coalition asked several questions regarding the public availability and details of guidance documents being utilized by agency staff. In particular, the coalition sought details on the interagency coordination and elevation process of certain draft Approved Jurisdictional Determinations and "Headquarters Field Memos Implementing the 2023 Rule as Amended." Now it’s the beginning of July – over three months after that letter – and we still have received copies of the guidance documents that the federal government is using to make jurisdiction determinations, even though we know they exist. Why do these federal agencies continue to hide public records and keep this information out of the hands of individuals seeking to ensure their compliance with the law and the ability to make decisions on the use of their land across our country?

## **Lake Erie TMDL Legal Challenges**

In my home state of Ohio, we are now seeing the fourth lawsuit filed by Lucas County, Toledo, and Environmental Law and Policy Center seeking to compel the EPA to do more with respect to Lake Erie. This latest lawsuit is claiming that both Ohio EPA and the U.S. EPA have failed to fulfill their responsibilities under the CWA to address nutrient pollution.

The agency’s action in this most recent lawsuit is the EPA’s approval of the Maumee Watershed nutrient Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The EPA issued its approval decision in September 2023. The plaintiffs are asking the Court to invalidate the EPA’s approval of the TMDL plan. In doing all this, the plaintiffs take aim at livestock operations in the watershed.

This lawsuit paints pig farmers and our fellow agricultural operations in an unfavorable and inaccurate light, and it does nothing to respect the years of significant work done by all stakeholders involved. These stakeholders include local officials, the U.S. EPA, Ohio EPA, and the state of Ohio, which has made significant investments, as well as agricultural stakeholders and individual livestock and row crop farmers taking steps to protect water quality. I highlight this issue because it is important for the EPA – through the Department of Justice - to defend its work – independently and with its partners – in this most recent lawsuit.

### **Implementation of the CAFO Rulemaking**

Last fall, in denying a request from environmentalists to reopen the CAFO rule and fundamentally change how livestock farms are regulated in the country, the EPA pledged to study the impact of livestock production on water quality and included in that process the formation of a new advisory committee focused on Animal Agriculture. This new effort, the Animal Agriculture and Water Quality (AAWQ) Committee is being housed under the EPA's longstanding Farm, Ranch and Rural Communities Advisory Committee (FRRCC), a committee I was once a member of.

As articulated by the EPA, the AAWQ is to provide recommendations to the Administrator that will inform the agency's decisions regarding how to improve the implementation of the CWA's CAFO NPDES permitting program to more effectively reduce nutrients and other types of water pollutants from Animal Feeding Operations, including determining whether any revisions to the regulations are warranted, and whether the EPA can otherwise support the efforts of AFO operators to protect water quality.

Earlier this spring, the EPA announced the appointees to the AAWQ Subcommittee. Nominated agricultural representatives bring a variety of perspectives and experiences and include farmers, engineers, agronomists, former state environmental regulators, and experts on renewable energy. On the other hand, representatives of animal rights and environmental activist groups include – lawyers. Some of these same lawyers have also sued the EPA over the existence of this committee in litigation that is currently underway in California before the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals.

Throughout all this, the EPA has remained steadfast in its commitment and defense of its strong CAFO program and has shown great leadership in doing so. Those of us in animal agriculture remain committed to working constructively with the EPA's staff and anyone else to find effective solutions to protect water quality while creating opportunities for the next generation of our rural communities.

### **Air Emissions Estimation Methodologies, Air Consent Agreements, and EPCRA Rulemaking**

Since the early 2000s, the EPA has been working to develop scientifically credible Emissions Estimation Methodologies (EEMs) for animal feeding operations. This process included extensive emissions monitoring and research designed by the EPA, paid for by producers, and



undertaken by university researchers under the EPA guidance at multiple poultry and livestock farms across a number of states over two years.

In 2024, the EPA continues to work on the development of these long delayed EEMs and has noted their imminent release for public comment. That date continues to slip month by month. The EPA's own website on this issue shows that the public comment was expected to occur in "Early 2024" with the finalized EEMs done in "Summer 2024." See <https://www.epa.gov/afos-air/national-air-emissions-monitoring-study>.

While NPPC recognizes the herculean task before the EPA, the continued delays are causing confusion and angst among the pork industry and preventing individual farms from preparing for next steps. When the EEMs are eventually finalized, compliance will be triggered under the ACA for many farms, and several logistical and substantive questions continue to remain for producers across the country. NPPC has appreciated the EPA's willingness to take our questions and is awaiting answers to the same.

Despite this ongoing work, environmental activists continue to use litigation and sue-and-settle tactics to seek to impact the EPA's implementation of reporting requirements for manure emissions at farms under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA). That lawsuit was filed in response to the EPA's implementation of the strongly bipartisan 2017 FARM Act, which was designed to clarify reporting requirements for livestock farmers.

At the end of 2023, the EPA issued an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to solicit comment and information about reinstating the reporting requirement. NPPC believes that the EPA has considered the significant challenges such a requirement would have on livestock producers, first responders, and local communities, as well as Congressional intent, and has so far held off on moving forward with such a proposed rule. We appreciate the EPA's efforts to consider this requirement in the context of the other regulatory burdens on livestock producers and the continued development of the EEMs that will be released and mentioned above.

## **Rodenticides**

The EPA is currently undertaking a registration review under FIFRA of the rodenticide products commonly used in swine operations to control rat and mouse populations. The agency is also looking at this issue through the lens of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In a recent public comment period regarding the Biological Evaluation of the products, the EPA received approximately 2,500 public comments. In many of its proposals, the EPA has considered making rodenticide products restricted use pesticides (RUPs) and adding significant mitigation measures that would essentially take the products out of the hands of livestock producers.

Livestock farmers are constantly focused on managing and controlling rodent populations in and around their barns while simultaneously taking all biosecurity measures to protect against food safety risks. Farmers need effective rodenticide products to which they can have affordable and reliable access. NPPC has appreciated the EPA's willingness to continue to meet with the livestock community on this issue and their willingness to accept ideas for alternative approaches

that would work to protect non-target species and keep the rodenticide products in the hands of livestock producers.

### **Formaldehyde**

Finally, EPA is also undertaking a FIFRA registration review of formaldehyde, which is concurrently undergoing extensive review by EPA's Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) under TSCA's risk evaluation process.

On several occasions, NPPC and other livestock groups have communicated to EPA during its TSCA review process and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Office of Policy and Pest Management on the important uses of formaldehyde in key agriculture operations. As the agency is aware in its general overview of the industry uses in the April 10, 2024 Draft Risk Assessment and elsewhere, formaldehyde is utilized as an essential tool for the industry in a range of areas including, among others, as:

- Pathogen control in animal feed production;
- Disinfection for live production operations on poultry farms and swine operations; and
- To prevent infections such as coryza, a serious bacterial disease in poultry that affects the respiratory system and is manifested by inflammation of the area below the eye, nasal discharge, and sneezing.

Formaldehyde-based products can be used to inactivate highly contagious viruses, such as African swine fever (ASF). Credible estimates indicate that an ASF event in the U.S. could result in an economic loss of nearly \$50 billion and would be catastrophic to the nation's swine industry. The current EPA proposal includes data deficiencies, concerns regarding risk and exposure, incident reporting, and existing mitigation measures. NPPC encourages EPA to continue working with the livestock community to understand the impact of their parallel decisions on formaldehyde on livestock production across the country.

### **Conclusion**

NPPC and our members are thankful to this Committee for its leadership and consideration of these important issues and for giving us the opportunity to describe our experience and perspective on our engagement with the Environmental Protection Agency on these important issues for agriculture.



### **Biography of Gary A. Cooper**

Gary Cooper is the Chief Operating Officer of Cooper Farms. Mr. Cooper joined the family operation of Cooper Farms in 1974, after attending Bowling Green State University. He assumed operational control, along with his brother James R. Cooper, upon the retirement of his father in 1980.

Cooper Farms is a model of modern, efficient family-owned production agriculture as a producer of hogs, turkeys and eggs. Cooper Farms is a vertically integrated turkey operation, controlling their product from egg to market. They raise and process over 355 million live pounds of turkey each year. Cooper Farms also raises and markets over 250 million live pounds of hogs and produces over 155 million dozen eggs each year. To raise all 21 million animals that go into their products each year, Cooper Farms works with nearly 450 family contract farmers across all three species.

Cooper Farms was founded in 1938 by Mr. Cooper's parents, Virgil and Virginia Cooper, in Oakwood, Ohio. Since his start, Gary has played an indispensable role in helping the company to constantly look toward the future. He is always seeking to improve processes, products and methods at this innovative company, helping customers to receive the highest quality products possible.

Today, Cooper Farms is the largest turkey producer in Ohio and seventh largest in the United States, as well as the 29<sup>th</sup>-ranked hog producer and 16<sup>th</sup> largest egg producer in America. Cooper Farms owns and operates four divisions located in northwest and west central, Ohio; a Hatchery Division, Feed and Animal Division, Processing Division and Cooked Meats Division. Since Gary's start with Cooper Farms in 1974, they have gone from 35 team members to the nearly 2,400 employed today.

Gary is a Past-President of the Ohio Poultry Association and previously served on the Legislative Committee for the National Pork Producers Council. He is a past Chairman of the National Turkey Federation and serves as Past-Chairman of the U.S. Poultry and Egg Association. He is also a past board member of the American Feed Industry Association, the Midwest Poultry Consortium and the U.S. Farmers and Ranchers Alliance.

Gary has four adult children and seven grandchildren.

To learn more about Cooper Farms please visit [www.cooperfarms.com](http://www.cooperfarms.com).

---

<b>Hatchery</b> P.O. Box 547 Oakwood, OH 45873 419.594.3325 Fax: 419.594.3372	<b>Feed &amp; Animal Production</b> P.O. Box 339 Ft. Recovery, OH 45846 419.375.4116 Fax: 419.375.4200	<b>Processing</b> #1 Cooper Farms Drive St. Henry, OH 45883 419.678.4853 Fax: 419.678.3734	<b>Cooked Meats</b> 6793 US Route 127N Van Wert, OH 45891 419.238.4056 Fax: 419.238.1587
---	--	--	--

# Truth in Testimony Disclosure Form

In accordance with Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5)\* of the *Rules of the House of Representatives*, witnesses are asked to disclose the following information. Please complete this form electronically by filling in the provided blanks.

Committee: Agriculture

Subcommittee: \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date: 07/10/2024

Hearing Title :

“Examining the Consequences of EPA’s Actions on American Agriculture”

Witness Name: Gary Cooper

Position/Title: Chief Operating Officer

Witness Type:  Governmental  Non-governmental

Are you representing yourself or an organization?  Self  Organization

If you are representing an organization, please list what entity or entities you are representing:

National Pork Producers Council

## **FOR WITNESSES APPEARING IN A NON-GOVERNMENTAL CAPACITY**

Please complete the following fields. If necessary, attach additional sheet(s) to provide more information.

Are you a fiduciary—including, but not limited to, a director, officer, advisor, or resident agent—of any organization or entity that has an interest in the subject matter of the hearing? If so, please list the name of the organization(s) or entities.

Cooper Farms Inc.  
Cooper Hatchery Inc.  
G & C Farming, LLC

**Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) related to the hearing's subject matter that you, the organization(s) you represent, or entities for which you serve as a fiduciary have received in the past thirty-six months from the date of the hearing. Include the source and amount of each grant or contract.**

HPAI Bird Value Indemnity Payment, USDA, \$978,771.66  
HPAI Bird Value Indemnity Payment, USDA, \$471,243.04  
HPAI Bird Value Indemnity Payment, USDA, \$5,981,627.93  
HPAI Depopulation & Disposal Indemnity Payment, USDA, \$700,566.01

**Please list any contracts, grants, or payments originating with a foreign government and related to the hearing's subject that you, the organization(s) you represent, or entities for which you serve as a fiduciary have received in the past thirty-six months from the date of the hearing. Include the amount and country of origin of each contract or payment.**

None

**Please complete the following fields. If necessary, attach additional sheet(s) to provide more information.**

- I have attached a written statement of proposed testimony.
- I have attached my curriculum vitae or biography.

\* Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5), of the U.S. House of Representatives provides:

(5)(A) Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof.

(B) In the case of a witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include— (i) a curriculum vitae; (ii) a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts, grants, or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the past 36 months by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (iii) a disclosure of whether the witness is a fiduciary (including, but not limited to, a director, officer, advisor, or resident agent) of any organization or entity that has an interest in the subject matter of the hearing.

(C) The disclosure referred to in subdivision (B)(iii) shall include— (i) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(D) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form 24 hours before the witness appears to the extent practicable, but not later than one day after the witness appears.