

# NAWG POLICY RESOLUTIONS

## DOMESTIC AND TRADE POLICY

---

### ***Section A - Farm Programs Generally***

- DT.A.1 NAWG opposes any type of means testing to establish eligibility for, or restrict participation in, federal farm programs. (March 2011)
- DT.A.2 NAWG supports the continuation of separate identity rights for spouses actively engaged in farming. (February 2009)
- DT.A.3 NAWG opposes further payment limitation reductions. (February 2009)
- DT.A.4 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.A.5 Removed as of January 2012.
- DT.A.6 Removed as of January 2012.
- DT.A.7 NAWG supports government and private programs for crops with market characteristics beyond traditional commodity markets that focus on achieving critical mass by area. (March 2010, Kansas)
- DT.A.8 NAWG opposes any effort to redirect a portion of direct payments to market development programs. (March 2010, Texas)
- DT.A.9 Removed as of January 2012.
- DT.A.10 NAWG believes any “actively engaged” definition should not hinder farm transfer and/or succession planning. (March 2010, Montana)
- DT.A.11 Removed as of January 2012.
- DT.A.12 NAWG supports the policy that, if federal agriculture programs are subject to budget cuts to achieve deficit reduction, then the same percentage of cut should apply to all federal government programs. (January 2011)
- DT.A.13 NAWG opposes the opening of the 2008 Farm Bill until consideration of the next farm bill. (January 2011)
- DT.A.14 NAWG supports the main concepts of the Conrad plan subject to these trigger priorities: First – on-farm trigger, by-

- commodity revenue; Second – on-farm trigger, whole farm revenue; Third – county trigger, by-commodity revenue; Fourth – county trigger, whole farm revenue. (November 2011)
- DT.A.15 NAWG supports the preservation of domestic support within the commodity title while recognizing the importance of moving all countries toward less trade distorting programs. (January 2012)
- DT.A.16 NAWG supports multiple safety net programs, including a disaster program in Title I in the next farm bill. We recognize different production areas of the country rely on a variety of farm programs to provide a multi-legged safety net. (January 2012)
- DT.A.17 Realizing the probability that direct payments may not be a viable option, NAWG supports reallocation of funding away from direct payments to an alternative Title I program safety net. (January 2012)
- DT.A.18 NAWG supports a revenue-based program modeled on programs in the 2008 Farm Bill with an on-farm trigger, and coverage by commodity as part of a multi-legged safety net. (January 2012)

### ***Section B - Stocks and Loan Programs***

- DT.B.1 NAWG supports the continuation of a non-recourse loan program for wheat. (March 2011)
- DT.B.2 NAWG supports allowing producers to fix LDP rates up to 60 days prior to harvest. (March 2011)
- DT.B.3 NAWG supports USDA redefining “beneficial interest” to allow LDPs to farmers who implement a risk management strategy that requires transfer of title prior to the crop actually being sold. (March 2011)
- DT.B.4 NAWG opposes a government-owned food security reserve or a farmer-owned reserve. (March 2011)
- DT.B.5 Removed as of March 2011.

DT.B.6 NAWG opposes allowing CCC stocks to be liquidated on the market in a manner that would negatively affect commercial sales. (March 2011)

### **Section C - Risk Management Generally**

DT.C.1 Removed as of March 2011.

DT.C.2 NAWG supports a milling durum buy-up option to provide insurance coverage for quality losses determined by a table based on durum industry grain standards and/or prices, or actual sales receipts. (March 2011)

DT.C.3 NAWG supports the insurability of wheat acres found to contain Karnal Bunt. (March 2011)

DT.C.4 NAWG opposes mandatory crop insurance participation as a prerequisite to farm program participation but encourages voluntary crop insurance participation. (March 2011)

DT.C.5 NAWG supports the timely development of new and evolution of current risk management products to better meet producer needs (planting and reporting dates, arbitrary lines dividing production management practices, *de minimus* yields), developing risk management coverage for crop quality losses, producer education on risk management alternatives and instituting a state level producer advisory committee. (March 2010, Kansas)

DT.C.6 NAWG encourages RMA to require crop insurance companies to interpret and apply crop insurance rules and regulations in a uniform and timely manner. (March 2010, Texas)

DT.C.7 NAWG supports RMA coverage of grain crops that are harvested for hay. (March 2011)

DT.C.8 NAWG challenges the use of “pack factors” in determining grain volume for crop insurance payment calculations. (March 2011)

DT.C.9 NAWG recommends RMA develop policies to allow the coverage of

continuous crop winter wheat on expiring CRP acres in counties without continuous wheat coverage currently available.  
(February 2009, Colorado)

- DT.C.10 NAWG supports speedy implementation and use of the new 508h regulations as proposed in the 2008 Farm Bill. (March 2011)
- DT.C.11 NAWG supports USDA-RMA regulations that support beginning farmers. (March 2011)
- DT.C.12 NAWG supports the equitable and timely adjustments in RMA audit procedures. This may include:
- indexing of crop insurance audit triggers,
  - partial payment (75 percent) of claims on claims subject to audit,
  - holding interest in abeyance on premiums until claims are settled.
- (February 2009, North Dakota)
- DT.C.13 NAWG opposes RMA audit provision when a producer exceeds a 150 percent production fluctuation. (February 2009, North Dakota)
- DT.C.14 NAWG supports limiting crop insurance audits to the specific year in question; should irregularities arise in the audit year, subsequent years should be subject to inspection. (February 2009, North Dakota)
- DT.C.15 NAWG supports production history being calculated and included in a producer's actual production history when that producer experiences a mechanical fire. (February 2009, North Dakota)
- DT.C.16 NAWG supports the Farm Service Agency (FSA) and Risk Management Agency (RMA) working closely together in order to reach an agreement on acreage reporting deadlines. This would enable the producer to report to the FSA and crop insurance agency more accurately; eliminating acreage reporting errors and discrepancies between the two agencies. (February 2009, Texas)

- DT.C.17 NAWG supports a unified network programming system such as a Comprehensive Information Management System (CIMS) or a single hardcopy paper filing system between the Farm Service Agency (FSA) and the Risk Management Agency (RMA) for crop acreage reporting. This would eliminate a double paper acreage filing system that results in errors so long as RMA, FSA and approved insurance providers all have access to the system that is currently in place. (February 2009, Texas)
- DT.C.18 NAWG supports working with the wheat industry to find accurate quality loss data that can be used to reform quality adjustment factors. (February 2009, Minnesota)
- DT.C.19 NAWG opposes limits on how much revenue assurance harvest price can fluctuate from revenue assurance spring price. (February 2009, Minnesota)
- DT.C.20 NAWG opposes any RMA rule which restricts the use of any sound and proven agronomic practice. (October 2009, Nebraska)
- DT.C.21 NAWG supports the development of “third generation” crop insurance products whereby input cost volatility or an energy index is incorporated to provide enhanced risk management options for producers. Wider swings in fertilizer and fuel cost may reduce that true value of harvest price insurance calculations. (January 2011, Idaho)
- DT.C.22 NAWG supports the government maximizing the premium subsidy for the crop insurance program at a 70 percent coverage level. (January 2011)
- DT.C.23 NAWG supports a variety of crop insurance products and regulations that provide the best security for producers. These include:
- A. effective whole farm insurance separating irrigated and non-irrigated production;
  - B. coverage in all areas for continuous cropped wheat;

- C. irrigated coverage in times of drought or water stoppages;
- D. a “dollar per acre” option; and
- E. coverage on contracted seed stocks that reflect the contract price. (March 2011)

### ***Section D - Risk Management - Yields and Units***

- DT.D.1 NAWG supports modifying APH calculations for producers who suffer multiple years of loss due to factors beyond their control. (March 2011)
- DT.D.2 NAWG supports updating T-yields that more accurately reflect actual yields within a production area excluding years of declared disaster. (February 2009)
- DT.D.3 NAWG urges the use of “reference yields” on units that have less than four years of history. (March 2011)
- DT.D.4 NAWG supports RMA maintaining zoning by state, county and practice for actuarial purposes. (March 2011)
- DT.D.5 NAWG supports RMA providing separate coverage levels and price elections for each class of wheat and allowing differing levels of coverage for varying cropping practices within a unit. (February 2009)
- DT.D.6 NAWG supports allowing summer fallow and continuous crop insurable wheat within the same insurable unit to be classified as separate units. (March 2011)
- DT.D.7 NAWG recommends that the RMA implement new optional unit provisions that are more equitable and fit the needs of producers. (March 2011)
- DT.D.8 NAWG supports the option of a new landowner using the APH yield from the previous operator regardless of acreage in that county. (February 2009)
- DT.D.9 NAWG supports changes in the federal crop insurance policy to allow winter wheat and spring wheat to be insured as separate crops. (February 2009, South Dakota)
- DT.D.10 NAWG requests wheat be included in the re-rating study from RMA to see what it

would do to wheat growers' premium.  
(November 2011)

### ***Section E - Risk Management - Adjusting and Deadlines***

- DT.E.1 NAWG encourages the development of a program including a farm savings concept that covers uncovered crop insurance losses. (February 2009)

### ***Section F - Taxes Generally***

- DT.F.1 Removed as of March 2011.
- DT.F.2 NAWG opposes federal taxes on agricultural inputs. (March 2011)
- DT.F.3 NAWG opposes imposing self employment taxes on land or machinery rent. (March 2011)
- DT.F.4 NAWG opposes the creation of a federal value added tax. (March 2011)
- DT.F.5 NAWG supports allowing producers to transfer monies received from the sale of agricultural land or assets to tax deferred retirement accounts. (March 2011)
- DT.F.6 NAWG supports taxing foreign investors on the same basis as U.S. citizens. (March 2011)
- DT.F.7 NAWG believes that income generated by agricultural properties owned by non-profit or tax-exempt organizations should be subject to income taxes. (March 2011)
- DT.F.8 NAWG supports the use of, and encourages the IRS to allow, IRA and other producer retirement account investment in farmer-owned, value-added cooperatives. (March 2011)
- DT.F.9 NAWG believes that any private land purchased by federal and state agencies should remain on local tax rolls. (March 2011)
- DT.F.10 NAWG supports full funding of the "Payment in Lieu of Taxes" law (PILT). (February 2009, Washington)
- DT.F.11 NAWG supports allowing recapture income from the sale of tangible personal property to be recognized under the installment method. (March 2011)

- DT.F.12 Removed as of March 2011.
- DT.F.13 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.F.14 NAWG supports the revising of the 1099 reporting requirements to those prior to enactment of health care reforms in 2010. (January 2011)

### ***Section G – Taxes - Capital Gains and Deductions***

- DT.G.1 NAWG supports:
  - A. the elimination of capital gains taxes;
  - B. deduction of state sales and income tax for federal taxes;
  - C. increasing the maximum deduction for IRA contributions;
  - D. tax credits for first time investment in farmer owned facilities;
  - E. a lifetime tax exemption to offset sale of depreciated farm equipment; and
  - F. deductions for farm vehicles not based on mileage logs. (March 2011)
- DT.G.2 NAWG supports a federal tax code to be made permanent to allow capital purchases of up to \$250,000 to be expensed rather than depreciated. (February 2009, Texas)
- DT.G.3 NAWG supports a lower capital gains tax for land transfers and capital purchases to qualified beginning farmers. (March 2011)
- DT.G.4 NAWG supports the full deduction of membership dues up to \$250 per organization. (March 2011)
- DT.G.5 Removed as of March 2011.
- DT.G.6 With regards to the estate tax, NAWG supports a \$5 million exemption and a 35 percent rate with indexing. (October 2010, Committee)

### ***Section H - Employment and Health Insurance***

- DT.H.1 NAWG supports increasing the FICA and income tax withholding exemption to \$500 regardless of total annual agricultural wages. (March 2011)
- DT.H.2 NAWG supports raising the trigger level for the agricultural unemployment payroll

- tax to \$40,000 per quarter and indexing it for inflation. (March 2011)
- DT.H.3 NAWG believes that the agricultural unemployment payroll tax should only be required if the average of the current and three preceding quarters exceeds the trigger level. (March 2011)
- DT.H.4 NAWG opposes any government-mandated health care plan that would require employers to provide health insurance for all employees. (March 2011)
- DT.H.5 NAWG opposes any government-mandated health care plan that would not allow for choice of coverage, plan or providers. (March 2011)
- DT.H.6 NAWG supports allowing producers to form health insurance purchasing cooperatives. (March 2011)
- DT.H.7 NAWG supports allowing a full deduction from self-employment tax calculations for health insurance premiums paid for self-employed individuals and their families. (March 2011)
- DT.H.8 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.H.9 NAWG supports a guest worker program that secures the borders of the United States and provides a legal, affordable and stable workforce for agriculture. (January 2011)

### ***Section I – Transportation - Taxes***

- DT.I.1 NAWG supports the federal fuel tax exemption for bio-based fuels. (March 2011)

### ***Section J - Transportation – Water***

- DT.J.1 NAWG supports the improvement and continued maintenance of the Mississippi, Columbia, Illinois and Snake and other navigable river systems as a transportation link for moving farm commodities to market. (March 2011)
- DT.J.2 NAWG supports efforts by the U.S. government and private companies that will enhance the effectiveness of the St. Lawrence Seaway as a system for

- transporting wheat to worldwide markets. (March 2011)
- DT.J.3 NAWG opposes all cargo preference and Jones Act requirements governing shipment of bulk commodities. (March 2011)
- DT.J.4 NAWG supports the work of the Save Our Dams Coalition and will maintain its membership. (March 2011)

### ***Section K – Transportation - Rail***

- DT.K.1 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.K.2 NAWG supports requiring a 60-day notice of rail rate increases. (March 2011)
- DT.K.3 NAWG supports competitive access for all rail shippers. (March 2011)
- DT.K.4 NAWG supports the right of reciprocal switching at reasonable cost in markets served by more than one carrier. (March 2011)
- DT.K.5 NAWG supports maintaining an adequate sized national rail grain car fleet and equity in the allocation of those cars among shipper and regions. (March 2011)
- DT.K.6 NAWG supports allowing railroads to transfer lines they plan to abandon to new owners without the new owner having to assume labor contracts. (March 2011)
- DT.K.7 NAWG supports increased STB monitoring of railroad maintenance. (March 2011)
- DT.K.8 NAWG supports allowing a railroad to sell part of its line for the purpose of maintaining rail service. (March 2011)
- DT.K.9 NAWG supports giving adjacent landowners the right of first-refusal to purchase abandoned rail beds at a fair market appraised value comparable to adjacent property. (March 2011)
- DT.K.10 NAWG supports funding the local rail services assistance program and similar efforts to preserve rail service on low density lines. (March 2011)
- DT.K.11 NAWG opposes any further rail mergers in the United States unless the mergers are conditioned on the offering of open access to all captive rail shippers. (March 2011)

- DT.K.12 NAWG opposes the use of inverse rate structure by railroads and supports nondiscriminatory geographic rates and consistent, timely service for all grain shippers of all areas. (March 2011)
- DT.K.13 NAWG supports maintenance and expansion of intermodal services for agricultural products. (March 2011)
- DT.K.14 NAWG shall pursue all facets of rail issues that will provide relief to wheat growers on rail rates and service. (March 2011)
- DT.K.15 NAWG supports transparency in the secondary rail market. (February 2009, Minnesota)
- DT.K.16 NAWG recommends that Congress require the Surface Transportation Board to be more receptive to producer concerns. (March 2010, Montana)
- DT.K.17 NAWG supports organizations and councils whose goal is to provide transportation relief for wheat producers. (January 2011)

### ***Section L – Transportation - Truck***

- DT.L.1 NAWG supports giving each state the authority to regulate truck weights and urges them to standardize weight limits and bridge formulas between states. (March 2011)
- DT.L.2 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.L.3 NAWG opposes requiring producers to keep detailed records for farm use vehicles. (March 2011)
- DT.L.4 NAWG supports a farm to market exemption from interstate commerce regulatory enforcement to allow the movement of wheat from the farm gate to its first point of delivery where title is transferred within the state of origin. (October 2009, Oregon)
- DT.L.5 NAWG supports the exemption of CDL requirements for custom harvesters and farm suppliers transporting inputs to and from the farm. (February 2009, Oklahoma)
- DT.L.6 NAWG urges Congress to ensure that in the implementation of the U.S. Patriot Act, producers retain their 150-mile exemption

- from restrictions on the movement of hazardous materials. (February 2009)
- DT.L.7 NAWG supports passage of federal legislation that moves the agricultural exemption for hours of service from rule to law. (February 2009, Idaho)
- DT.L.8 NAWG affirms its support of traffic safety but recognizes issues of practicality regarding farm truck safety equipment. Therefore NAWG supports a production agriculture exemption to DOT regulations. (March 2010, North Dakota)
- DT.L.9 NAWG supports an increase in the mileage exemption for heavy highway vehicle use tax from 7,500 miles to 20,000 miles for agricultural vehicles. (March 2010, Minnesota)
- DT.L.10 NAWG supports exempting implements of husbandry and vehicles with farm tags from the definition of a commercial motor vehicle and from interstate commerce definitions. (March 2011)
- DT.L.11 NAWG supports a plan that will allow Mexican trucks to operate in the United States as long as they meet U.S. safety standards. (March 2011)
- DT.L.12 NAWG supports securing a U.S. DOT farm truck bumper exemption. (March 2011)
- DT.L.13 NAWG supports raising the federal cap on truck weights to 129,000 pounds. (January 2011)

### ***Section M - Farm Credit***

- DT.M.1 NAWG supports:
- A. financing program for beginning farmers;
  - B. the FSA guaranteed loan program;
  - C. the FSA reduced interest loan program;
  - D. the Farmer Mac secondary Market; and
  - E. low interest program for farmer owned cooperatives. (March 2011)
- DT.M.2 NAWG supports the mediation concept included in the Farm Credit Act of 1987. (March 2011)

- DT.M.3 NAWG supports increasing the role of the Farm Credit System in financing rural housing, rural home owners and other credit-worthy rural enterprises. (March 2011)
- DT.M.4 NAWG opposes any restructuring of the Farm Credit System that replaces elected farmer-members of system boards with commercial bankers or expands bank access to FCS funding. (March 2011)
- DT.M.5 NAWG supports federal banking regulations which account for the different needs of rural and urban banks. (March 2011)

### ***Section N - Commodity Futures***

- DT.N.1 NAWG supports the appointment of an agricultural producer as a CFTC commissioner. (March 2011)
- DT.N.2 NAWG supports continued efforts to educate producers about wheat futures, options and other pricing alternatives. (March 2011)
- DT.N.3 NAWG supports improved settlement methods on wheat futures contracts that allow for better convergence of cash and futures markets. (February 2009, Minnesota)

### ***Section O - General Domestic Policy***

- DT.O.1 NAWG supports the continuation of USDA as a cabinet-level department and believes it should be the lead agency in all federal programs, policies or regulations affecting farmers. (February 2009)
- DT.O.2 NAWG believes that USDA should not include income from off-farm sources when reporting farm income. (March 2011)
- DT.O.3 NAWG supports greater empowerment of FSA and NRCS state and county committees to adapt national programs to local needs. (March 2011)
- DT.O.4 NAWG supports the present system of electing farmers to FSA county

- committees rather than appointed committees. (March 2011)
- DT.O.5 NAWG supports federal legislation, the New Homestead Economic Act, for enhancing rural development. (October 2009)
- DT.O.6 NAWG supports the work of USDA Rural Development to improve the quality of life and increase economic opportunity in rural America. NAWG also encourages the long-term funding of the grant, loan and loan guarantee programs administered by USDA Rural Development. (February 2009, Board)
- DT.O.7 NAWG supports input from stakeholders (farmers, ranchers, county and state committee members) before changes are considered in the USDA-FSA system to better manage services to farmers and ranchers. (February 2009, Kansas)
- DT.O.8 NAWG encourages FSA to adequately staff current state FSA offices to levels that meet the needs of producers in all counties. (February 2009, Texas)
- DT.O.9 NAWG supports creating a separate market classification for hard white wheat. (February 2009, Idaho)
- DT.O.10 NAWG will support a hard white wheat development project that would focus on achieving critical mass by area. Further NAWG requests that the HWW group draft a plan for NAWG to support that includes a research component and an infrastructure development component. (October 2009, Committee)
- DT.O.11 NAWG supports the timely appointment of state FSA committees. (October 2009, Texas)

### ***Section P - Trade Generally***

- DT.P.1 NAWG supports fair and open trade of wheat throughout the world. (March 2011)
- DT.P.2 NAWG supports the advancement of comprehensive, multilateral negotiations to expand trade in goods and services. (March 2011)

- DT.P.3 NAWG supports swift resolution of unfair trade practices that harm U.S. grain exports. (March 2011)
- DT.P.4 NAWG opposes any attempt to reopen the Sanitary Phytosanitary (SPS) agreement and believes that the SPS and technical barriers to trade agreements are sufficient to address trade of biotech products. (March 2011)
- DT.P.5 NAWG supports establishing a stronger international alliance with other wheat organizations to facilitate grower-to-grower dialogue. (March 2011)
- DT.P.6 NAWG supports the establishment of an agricultural advisory group to the Secretary of State. (March 2011)
- DT.P.7 NAWG urges U.S. trade negotiators to protect domestic farm policies from being negotiated away to benefit other sectors of the U.S. economy. (February 2009)
- DT.P.8 NAWG directs U.S. negotiators to protect non-trade-distorting and minimally-trade-distorting domestic farm programs and to maintain the rights of producers to maintain counter-cyclical payments that provide an adequate safety net. (February 2009)
- DT.P.9 NAWG urges international harmonization of scientific standards and trade rules. (February 2009)
- DT.P.10 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.P.11 NAWG supports the continuation of trade promotion authority to get a successful Doha round provided that U.S. negotiators protect domestic farm policies from being negotiated away. (March 2011)
- DT.P.12 We support our WTO negotiators' position of accepting reductions in Amber Box support to levels no less than \$7.6 billion with reciprocal market access gains. (March 2011)
- DT.P.13 NAWG strongly encourages the Obama Administration and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to avoid engagement in protectionist measures such as the "Buy America" act and to pursue aggressive market opening and

- free trade measures. (February 2009, JITPC)
- DT.P.14 Removed as of January 2011
- DT.P.15 NAWG believes that communications from the Joint Trade Policy Committee should require the signatures of the president of NAWG and the chairman of U.S. Wheat. (March 2011)
- DT.P.16 NAWG supports legislation to normalize trade relations and travel with Cuba. (January 2011)
- DT.P.17 NAWG supports the disciplining of export state trading enterprises, with the long-term goal of disbanding them. (January 2011)
- DT.P.18 We support a comprehensive Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement that provides improved market access and includes ambitious language on 21st Century trade issues. We also encourage Japan, the Philippines and Indonesia to join the TPP framework. (November 2011)
- DT.P.19 U.S. wheat producers urge the Administration to maintain the United States Trade Representative (USTR) as an independent office within the Executive Office of the President. The strong relationship between the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and USTR has a proven success record in addressing U.S. agriculture's unique trade challenges and export opportunities. (January 2012)
- DT.P.20 USW and NAWG call for an open border that provides for reciprocal bilateral wheat trade. USW and NAWG direct our staff to cooperate with Canadian producers and industry to achieve an open border with reciprocal access. (January 2012)

### ***Section Q - Trade Sanctions***

- DT.Q.1 NAWG opposes any protectionist trade legislation or unilateral sanctions that would endanger U.S. grain exports. (February 2009)

DT.Q.2 NAWG opposes any unilateral sanction that restricts the export of food. (March 2011)

### ***Section R - Compliance with Agreements***

DT.R.1 Removed as of January 2011.

DT.R.2 NAWG supports close monitoring and enforcement of China's implementation of their WTO accession commitments. (March 2011)

DT.R.3 NAWG urges the development of markets for biotech crops with customer demand and acceptance. This should be a cooperative effort between consumers, producers, agribusiness and government. (March 2011)

DT.R.4 NAWG supports eliminating barriers which restrict U.S. ag producers access to worldwide crop inputs. (February 2009)

DT.R.5 NAWG supports continued monitoring of foreign and domestic compliance with multi-lateral and bi-lateral trade agreements. (January 2011)

DT.R.6 NAWG encourages U.S. government officials to engage their Brazilian counterparts to implement a 750,000 metric ton, zero-duty wheat quota to bring Brazil into compliance with its Uruguay Round of Agriculture Agreement commitment. (November 2011)

### ***Section S - Promotion***

DT.S.1 NAWG supports full funding and utilization of MAP, EEP, FMD, GSM 102, export credit programs, tax credits and other promotion and marketing programs for wheat. (March 2011)

DT.S.2 Removed as of January 2011.

DT.S.3 NAWG supports international debt forgiveness programs where applicable. (March 2011)

DT.S.4 NAWG supports continued legislative authorization of the cooperator program as a line item in the CCC budget. (March 2011)

- DT.S.5 NAWG supports producer oversight of the allocation of cooperator program funds. (March 2011)
- DT.S.6 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.S.7 NAWG supports building relationships with emerging private sector contacts in grain importing countries. (January 2011)
- DT.S.8 NAWG supports an increased funding in future years for USDA-FAS. (January 2011)

### ***Section T - Food Aid***

- DT.T.1 NAWG supports greater cooperation and coordination among all U.S. foreign aid programs and agencies. (March 2011)
- DT.T.2 NAWG supports producer representation on advisory committees or groups of multilateral development programs as administered through organizations such as the United Nations, IMF and World Bank. (March 2011)
- DT.T.3 NAWG encourages the use of U.S. products for all food assistance purchased by the U.S. government except in the case of an emergency in order to meet humanitarian need. (March 2011)
- DT.T.4 NAWG opposes withholding food aid for political purposes. (March 2010)
- DT.T.5 NAWG opposes the release of reserves from the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust without full and immediate public disclosure and timely replacement of released stocks. (March 2010, Montana)
- DT.T.6 Removed as of January 2011.
- DT.T.7 NAWG supports funding of P.L. 480 Title II food assistance programs at \$2.5 billion, the full amount authorized by law. (January 2011, from USW Food Aid Working Group Principles)
- DT.T.8 NAWG supports a strong, flexible U.S. food aid program that contains both in-kind donations and monetization. (January 2011, from USW Food Aid Working Group Principles)
- DT.T.9 NAWG supports evaluating lessons from the Local and Regional Purchase (LRP) pilot study prior to implementing additional

- LRP programs. (January 2011, from USW Food Aid Working Group Principles)
- DT.T.10 NAWG supports funding and implementation of LRP programs through the Foreign Disaster Assistance Act and USAID, respectively, rather than through USDA. (January 2011, from USW Food Aid Working Group Principles)
- DT.T.11 NAWG supports USDA administration of Food for Progress programs. (January 2011, from USW Food Aid Working Group Principles)
- DT.T.12 NAWG supports the U.S. government's agricultural development initiatives as a supplement to existing emergency humanitarian assistance programs such as P.L. 480 Title II programs. (January 2011, from USW Food Aid Working Group Principles)

### ***Section U - Marketing***

- DT.U.1 NAWG supports Plains Grains, Inc. and its efforts along with the southern Great Plains wheat commissions to develop a regional marketing plan for hard winter wheat. (February 2009, Oklahoma)
- DT.U.2 Removed as of March 2011.

### ***Section V - General Trade Policy***

- DT.V.1 NAWG supports continued funding for international market research conducted by land grant universities. (March 2011)
- DT.V.2 Knowing that a strong U.S. dollar may have adverse effects on exports, NAWG supports a U.S. monetary policy that keeps U.S. exports competitive. (March 2011)
- DT.V.3 NAWG supports the enforcement of end-use certificate requirements. (March 2011)

### ***Section W - Food Safety***

- DT.W.1 Any effort made by Congress or the Administration to strengthen the country's food and feed safety systems should be

risk-based and reliant on sound science.  
(October 2009, Oregon)

- DT.W.2 NAWG will work to ensure that any food safety legislation that moves through Congress does not include unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations for wheat producers. USDA should be the agency that regulates wheat. (March 2010, Oklahoma)

### ***Domestic Policy Goals***

#### **Short Term Goals (October 2009)**

- Work on 2012 Farm Bill.
- Continue improvements to crop insurance
- Support rail competition legislation.
- Support programs important to ag including exemptions during development of the transportation reauthorization bill.
- Advocate for the most beneficial policies possible for wheat growers during the formulation of the next farm bill.

#### **Long Term Goals (October 2009)**

- Continue pursuit of improved transportation.
- Continue improvements to crop insurance.
- Farm policy public education with the resources available to us.
- Increase wheat's share of farm bill spending.

### ***International Policy Goals***

*Preamble:* The U.S. must have an aggressive export policy aimed at expanding world wheat opportunities. Our government must concentrate on trade policy that enhances our competitiveness in world markets.

#### **Short Term Goals (October 2009)**

- Preserve and enhance funding levels for export promotion programs (MAP, FMD, EEP and GSM).
- Support open commercial trade with Cuba.
- Support ratification of pending free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea.

#### **Long Term Goals (October 2009)**

- Support a comprehensive WTO strategy which
  - Eliminates export subsidies.

- Preserves flexibility in U.S. farm policy.
- Disciplines export state trading enterprises.
- Opens new markets by reducing tariffs.
- Support elimination of all U.S. unilateral sanctions.
- Support keeping the food in food aid.
- Support for development of markets for biotech crops.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES POLICY**

---

*Preamble:* The National Association of Wheat Growers supports environmental and conservation policies that maintain and enhance the productivity and sustainability of working agricultural lands while protecting the rights of private property holders and their ability to use the best technology available.

### **Section A - Crop Protection Generally**

- ERR.A.1 NAWG supports research and development of environmentally-sound crop protection products in accordance with the goals and purposes of the Food Quality Protection Act and calls upon all federal agencies to use sound science, transparent procedures and balance in its implementation. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.2 NAWG supports price and registration harmonization between Canada and the United States on all crop protection products. (February 2009)
- ERR.A.3 NAWG supports the continued and essential use of phosphide. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.4 NAWG supports the continued classification of anhydrous ammonia as a compressed gas and the labeling thereof. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.5 NAWG supports federal funding for chemical disposal programs. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.6 NAWG opposes requiring pre-notification of crop protection product application. (January 2010)

- ERR.A.7 NAWG supports federal preemption for the establishment of crop protection product use restrictions. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.8 NAWG supports restoring full patent protection rights to manufacturers of crop protection products at the time their products receive full registration. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.9 NAWG opposes designation of any agricultural crop production as a point source of pollution. (February 2009)
- ERR.A.10 NAWG opposes legislation that requires pesticide application records to be made public. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.11 NAWG opposes EPA requiring buffer zones for new or existing chemical registrations without first providing sound science to demonstrate the need for a buffer. (January 2010)
- ERR.A.12 NAWG will work with coalition partners and EPA to ensure that crop protection risk assumptions and assessments reflect the most up-to-date agricultural practices. (November 2011)

### ***Section B - Labels and Registrations***

- ERR.B.1 NAWG supports providing reciprocal research, registration and regulation of crop protection and biotech products between the U.S. and other countries. (January 2010)
- ERR.B.2 NAWG supports the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OCED) process which promotes compliance of Codex tolerances for residues of crop protection product and testing and opposes the use of default assumptions and/or the cancellation of a registered product when there is not a readily available substitute. (January 2010)
- ERR.B.3 NAWG opposes holding farmers liable when crop protection products are applied, stored or disposed of in accordance with label instructions. (January 2010)

- ERR.B.4 NAWG supports continuation of the Section 18 process. (January 2010)
- ERR.B.5 NAWG encourages EPA to use NAFTA registration provisions to develop common labels and registrations for crop protection products. (January 2010)
- ERR.B.6 NAWG supports that all pesticide removals should be based on sound science. (January 2010)
- ERR.B.7 NAWG strongly supports continuing efforts to clarify that applications of crop protection products do not constitute point sources of pollution under the Clean Water Act when applied in accordance with legally-registered EPA labels. We support and acknowledge the work to pass H.R. 872 as the best means to accomplish this. (November 2011)
- ERR.B.8 NAWG supports a two-year moratorium on implementation of the Sixth Circuit Court decision in *National Cotton Council vs. EPA* and will work to ensure any studies resulting from a moratorium do not impose unnecessary restrictions on crop protection products. (November 2011)

### **Section C – Conservation Generally**

- ERR.C.1 NAWG supports allowing incidental grazing in riparian areas. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.2 NAWG supports giving local conservation districts greater authority in shaping conservation programs to the needs of the local community. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.3 NAWG supports the continuation of state and regional producer advisory committees to provide guidance to NRCS programs. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.4 NAWG opposes any conservation program that encourages farmers to report on the actions of their neighbors. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.5 NAWG supports continued funding for conservation cost-share programs. (February 2009)
- ERR.C.6 NAWG supports federal cost sharing for weed control programs on private land

- that neighbors public land. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.7 NAWG supports resolution of all conservation compliance appeals and the issuing of all “good faith” conservation variances by local county FSA committees. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.8 NAWG supports conservation compliance exemptions for special problems (such as jointed goat grass and rye). (January 2010)
- ERR.C.9 NAWG supports making all conservation programs equitably available on a statewide basis. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.10 NAWG supports that the funding of conservation programs must be separate and in addition to the funding of a commodity support program. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.11 Removed as of March 2011.
- ERR.C.12 NAWG believes all conservation programs should be production-based and not land retirement-based. (March 2011)
- ERR.C.13 NAWG shall monitor the development of the Grassland Reserve Program. (February 2009)
- ERR.C.14 NAWG supports local conservation district control of third-party certifications for conservation programs. (February 2009)
- ERR.C.15 NAWG believes that production agriculture should maintain a majority membership on state technical committees, advisory boards and working groups. We encourage all states to make this a priority. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.16 NAWG encourages NRCS and FSA to distribute all conservation money in a timely manner to the state with consideration being given to the planting season. (January 2010, Committee)
- ERR.C.17 NAWG supports payment eligibility requirements that are recognized by FSA also be accepted by NRCS for all NRCS programs. (February 2009; Montana)
- ERR.C.18 Removed as of September 2011.

- ERR.C.19 NAWG opposes permanent conservation easements which retire productive agricultural land. (January 2010)
- ERR.C.20 NAWG supports residue burning as a best management practice, adhering to current state laws. (March 2011)
- ERR.C.21 NAWG supports reducing the CRP acreage cap through market-based approaches such as rental rates and flexibility of use, allowing contracts to expire on schedule. Enrollment or reenrollment of acres should be prioritized using the environmental benefit index, the highly erodible land designation, consideration of soil type indicators and competitive bidding for re-enrollment. (September 2011)

### ***Section D - Conservation Reserve Program***

- ERR.D.1 NAWG supports timely emergency haying and grazing on land enrolled in CRP under federal guidelines. (January 2010)
- ERR.D.2 NAWG supports preserving and restoring original crop base acres previously enrolled in CRP at the conclusion of such contracts. (March 2011)
- ERR.D.3 NAWG supports limiting CRP contract rentals to the average county rental rate. (January 2010)
- ERR.D.4 NAWG opposes the use of any CRP rent determination that encourages the enrollment of highly productive land over that of highly erodible, marginal or environmentally sensitive lands because of price. (January 2010)
- ERR.D.5 NAWG supports landowner retention of cropland designation and property rights when the CRP contract expires. (January 2010)
- ERR.D.6 NAWG opposes any future CRP sign-up requiring the forfeiture of water rights. (March 2011)
- ERR.D.7 NAWG supports the CRP. We oppose any actions, which would reduce acreage capping or payments to farmers under existing contracts, such as budget reconciliation. (February 2009, Texas)

- ERR.D.8 NAWG supports laws and regulations that allow Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) funds to be used to implement conservation. (February 2009, Washington)
- ERR.D.9 NAWG supports past enrollment criteria for extension of existing CRP contracts. (February 2009, Washington)
- ERR.D.10 NAWG supports utilizing Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) acreage, or land to be enrolled in CRP, for the purpose of planting and harvesting dedicated energy crops including, but not limited to, switch grass. This should be carried out in a manner that maintains the environmental benefits that CRP is designed to achieve. (January 2010, Committee)
- ERR.D.11 NAWG opposes early release of CRP acres without the penalty. (March 2011)
- ERR.D.12 NAWG supports the managed haying and grazing provisions of CRP should revert back to the same provisions that were applicable prior to the National Wildlife Federation lawsuit settlement. This would allow managed haying and grazing once every three years on up to 100 percent of the field. (March 2011)
- ERR.D.13 NAWG supports continuation of CRP contracts to heirs of landlords and operators regardless of payment limitations. (March 2011)

***Section E - Conservation Stewardship Program and EQIP***

- ERR.E.1 NAWG supports the implementation and full funding of the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) as long as it does not come at the expense of full and adequate funding for commodity programs. (February 2009)
- ERR.E.2 NAWG opposes mandatory “whole farm” conservation plans as a prerequisite for receiving an EQIP grant. (January 2010)
- ERR.E.3 Removed as of March 2011.
- ERR.E.4 NAWG recommends that the new CSP regulations should not regulate or direct

- distribution of CSP payments between landlord and tenant. (January 2010)
- ERR.E.5 State- and federally-owned land that is operated by eligible producers should be able to participate in the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). (February 2009, Washington)
- ERR.E.6 NAWG will support a continuous CSP sign-up. (October 2009)

### ***Section F - Wetlands***

- ERR.F.1 NAWG supports providing remuneration or tax credits for producers who voluntarily take action to protect wetlands. (January 2010)
- ERR.F.2 NAWG supports allowing producers to bank mitigation credit. (January 2010)
- ERR.F.3 NAWG supports a more aggressive use of minimal effect authority in the swampbuster program. (January 2010)
- ERR.F.4 NAWG supports revising the definition of a wetland to require a 15-day inundation and 21-day saturation period during the growing season. (January 2010)
- ERR.F.5 NAWG opposes requirements for certification of wetlands based on re-delineation of previously identified wetlands. (January 2010)
- ERR.F.6 NAWG supports giving NRCS (rather than the Army Corps of Engineers) primary jurisdiction over all government decisions impacting wetlands on private property. (January 2010)
- ERR.F.7 NAWG opposes any effort to remove the term “navigable” from the definition of “navigable waters of the United States”. (January 2010, North Dakota)

### ***Section G - Water and Air Quality***

- ERR.G.1 NAWG supports giving state and counties both responsibility and financial support for greater participation in enforcement of the Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act. (January 2010)

- ERR.G.2 NAWG supports federal funding of cooperative programs for voluntary water quality projects. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.3 NAWG opposes any quality standard that is not scientifically-based and economically viable to achieve. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.4 NAWG opposes user fees on water used for irrigation. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.5 NAWG opposes any requirement for water quality monitoring as a criterion for farm program eligibility. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.6 NAWG opposes mandatory nutrient management. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.7 NAWG opposes the use of any federally mandated total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.8 NAWG opposes federal agencies interfering with the use of privately held water, to the extent of non use, by individuals including those holding an authorized water right. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.9 NAWG opposes the designation of any man-made drainage ditch or canal as a blue line waterway which must be surrounded by a buffer zone. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.10 NAWG opposes current EPA regulations on diesel fuel emissions and recommends that the current administration rescind these regulations. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.11 NAWG opposes EPA classifying the application of fertilizers and pesticides as point sources for water quality. (January 2010)
- ERR.G.12 NAWG favors a reasonable threshold level for agricultural operations of farm fuel and oil-based product storage from any spill and containment regulation. (February 2009)
- ERR.G.13 NAWG supports the delivery of water by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) under existing contracts. (February 2009)
- ERR.G.14 NAWG supports legislative action toward agricultural exemptions from restrictions to the ambient air quality standards. (January 2010, Committee)

- ERR.G.15 NAWG is opposed to greenhouse gas legislation or regulation that has a negative impact on production agriculture. NAWG will strive for a net economic benefit to farmers, agriculture and food production. We believe neither greenhouse gas regulation nor legislation should take effect until the major carbon emitting countries of the world have agreed to regulate their own greenhouse gases in a like manner to ours. NAWG urges USDA to do a detailed economic analysis of any legislation or regulation before it becomes law. Furthermore, NAWG will oppose EPA regulation and will work to overturn the Supreme Court ruling. (September 2009, Committee)
- ERR.G.16 NAWG recognizes the importance of protecting water bodies such as the Chesapeake Bay and other waters from nutrient and sediment loadings. We support voluntary measures, including conservation programs to achieve desired environmental goals but oppose EPA efforts to impose mandatory and enforceable requirements for non-point sources of pollution from agriculture lands. NAWG supports the collection of robust data from ongoing voluntary conservation practices to ensure that state and federal agencies have a more accurate accounting of water quality impacts from agriculture. (October 2010, Virginia)

### ***Section H - Endangered Species***

- ERR.H.1 NAWG opposes the removal, destruction or draw-down of any dams. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.2 NAWG opposes requirements that mandate efforts to return fish pools to “harvestable levels”. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.3 NAWG opposes the use of “harvestable levels” as a criterion for delisting of endangered species. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.4 NAWG opposes the differentiation between “wild” and “artificial” species or

- evolutionary significant units (ESU).  
(January 2010)
- ERR.H.5 NAWG supports compensation and transition programs for landowners whose operation has been impacted by any (Endangered Species Act) ESA activity or designation. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.6 NAWG supports requiring a thorough economic analysis of any proposed ESA activity before it is allowed to go into effect. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.7 NAWG supports requiring local consultation before the implementation of any action done under the authority of ESA. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.8 NAWG supports amending the ESA law to provide biologically-sound, scientifically-based, and cost effective measures are developed to protect endangered species in a manner that maintains strong national and regional economies. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.9 NAWG encourages EPA to streamline pesticide registration regulations that comply with the Endangered Species Act. (February 2009)
- ERR.H.10 NAWG opposes federal agencies from pressuring state agencies into acquiring water rights. (February 2009)
- ERR.H.11 NAWG opposes the listing of prairie dogs and sage grouse as endangered species. (January 2010)
- ERR.H.12 NAWG supports recognition of farm conservation program participation as sufficient compliance with ESA program requirements. (March 2011)
- ERR.H.13 NAWG supports an ESA consultation process that is based on best available science using empirical sampling that is transparent, quantifiable and assesses the economic impact to agricultural production. (January 2011, Washington)

### ***Section I - General***

- ERR.I.1 NAWG supports requiring cost-benefit analysis of all laws and regulations before

- allowing such to go into effect. (January 2010)
- ERR.I.2 NAWG supports active management by federal land agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and United States Forest Service (USFS) and similar state agencies for the control of noxious weeds. (January 2010)
- ERR.I.3 Removed as of March 2011.
- ERR.I.4 NAWG supports the full use of all anti-terrorism laws against those who commit acts of terrorism against the food production system or against research into food production. (February 2009)
- ERR.I.5 NAWG supports landowner retention of crop land designation and property rights under ESA/Habitat Conservation Program (HCP) rules. (February 2009)
- ERR.I.6 NAWG supports expanded use of the renewable fuel /portfolio renewable energy standard. (January 2010)
- ERR.I.7 NAWG endorses the vision of 25x'25 and commits to work collaboratively with leaders of the nation's agricultural community to bring this vision to life. (March 2011)
- ERR.I.8 NAWG supports drilling for natural gas in the Area 181 (Gulf of Mexico) to help meet our nation's ever increasing energy needs. (February 2009, Washington)
- ERR.I.9 NAWG supports consolidation of applications for all conservation programs as long as there is no loss of funding or reduction of intent in the original programs. (January 2010, Committee)
- ERR.I.10 NAWG supports a robust producer transition program to encourage the development of potential biomass dedicated energy crops provided however, that funding for this program shall not come from existing farm program payments. (January 2010, Committee)
- ERR.I.12 NAWG supports a robust producer transition program, such as "Vision for Developing Cellulosic Ethanol Biorefinery-Ready Communities," to encourage the development of potential biomass dedicated energy crops provided however,

- that funding for this program shall not come from existing farm program payments. (March 2011)
- ERR.I.13 NAWG endorses the goals of the 25x'25 project. (January 2010)
- ERR.I.14 Removed as of March 2011.
- ERR.I.15 NAWG supports uniformity in CRP regulations across state and county borders. (January 2010)
- ERR.I.16 NAWG supports a three-year extension of expiring 2009 CRP contracts to allow time for a discussion of the future of the program and to develop policies for the orderly transition of CRP acres back to cropland. (February 2009, Colorado)
- ERR.I.17 NAWG supports continued work on exploring how farmers can profit from carbon management and training. (March 2011)
- ERR.I.18 NAWG will support the Keystone XL/Trans-Canada Pipeline. (January 2012)

### ***Environmental Policy Committee Goals***

#### **Short Term Goals**

- Seek a three-year extension of expiring 2009 CRP contracts. (February 2009)
- Develop a robust producer transition program to encourage the development of potential biomass dedicated energy crops.
- Engage in carbon sequestration initiatives in order to insure the greatest benefit to growers at the local level.
- Support renewable energy provisions.
- Monitor EPA activities including the implementation of FQPA, CWA and CAA.
- Oppose any federally mandated TMDL requirement.
- Work to maintain responsible field burning as a best management practice.
- Oppose allowing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to be used to supersede environmental statutes
- Increase funding for conservation cost share programs.
- Explore how farmers can benefit from carbon sequestration.

- NAWG opposes zero tolerance spray drift regulations.

### **Long Term Goals**

- Oppose the global climate change treaty as currently written.
- Require control of noxious weeds on public lands and CRP acreage.
- Actively oppose the removal of hydro-electric dams.
- Pesticide harmonization and equal access. (October 2006) [from ST]
- Amend ESA and improve regulations associated with its implementation. [from ST]

### **Recommendations**

- NAWG pursue support of litigation against TMDLs.

## **RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

---

### ***Section A - Research***

- RT.A.1 NAWG supports continued funding for research of Fusarium head blight. (March 2011)
- RT.A.2 NAWG supports continued funding of the wheat genome mapping and international triticeae mapping initiatives. (March 2011)
- RT.A.3 NAWG supports continued funding for research of direct and no-till seeding. (March 2011)
- RT.A.4 NAWG supports continued funding for research on root diseases in cereal grain crops. (March 2011)
- RT.A.5 NAWG supports continued funding for the wheat pasture research project at Oklahoma State University. (March 2011)
- RT.A.6 Removed as of March 2011.
- RT.A.7 NAWG supports the NAWG/USW Joint Committee on Biotechnology's goals and policy statement. (March 2011)
- RT.A.8 NAWG supports scientific study of biotech traits out-crossing into crops and weeds. (October 2007)

- RT.A.9 NAWG supports federal funding of biotechnology research and science-based education. (March 2011)
- RT.A.10 Removed as of March 2011.
- RT.A.11 NAWG supports a federal research and extension initiative entitled "Managing Invasive Weeds in Wheat" to focus on winter annual grasses in wheat (goatgrass, ryegrass and feral rye). (February 2009, Committee)
- RT.A.12 NAWG supports educating legislators about the importance of biotech research for agriculture. (March 2011)
- RT.A.13 Removed as of March 2011.
- RT.A.14 NAWG supports maintaining the funding for the Hatch Act and McIntire Stennis Cooperative Forestry Animal Health and Disease (Sec. 1433) of the federal budget. (March 2011)
- RT.A.15 NAWG supports research and education to study the components in wheat that will have benefits for human nutrition. (February 2009, Kansas)
- RT.A.16 Removed as of March 2011.
- RT.A.17 Removed as of March 2011.
- RT.A.18 NAWG recognizes Ug99 as a major threat to national and global wheat production and strongly supports additional funding for rust research and resistant variety development. (March 2011)
- RT.A.19 NAWG supports the protection of intellectual property, including education about the importance of complying with PVP or seed contract and stewardship provisions and enforcement of those provisions when necessary. (February 2009, Committee)
- RT.A.20 JBC urges NAWG to develop a producer education program regarding value of certified seed and seed with novel traits for presentation during the 2010/2011 winter grower and certified seed meetings and state grower publications. (October 2010, JBC)
- RT.A.21 USW-NAWG commended Monsanto and Kansas State University for entering into a wheat research collaboration that is consistent with the "Principles for

Collaborations in Wheat Breeding and Biotechnology” and for recognizing the importance of public wheat breeding programs and the producer investment and ownership in those programs.

(October 2010, JBC)

RT.A.22 USW-NAWG urged the biotech providers to use the quality targets developed by the USW Wheat Quality Committee as the standard for the commercialization of non-biotech and biotech wheat varieties.

(October 2010, JBC)

RT.A.23 USW-NAWG urged the National Wheat Improvement Committee to select a chairman of this very important committee as expeditiously as possible. (October 2010, JBC)

RT.A.24 We urge all public universities with wheat breeding programs to adopt the concept behind the Wheat Workers’ Material Transfer Agreement (MTA) being developed by the hard winter wheat region for exchange of germplasm between public breeding programs. (January 2011, JBC)

RT.A.25 NAWG supports the National Wheat Improvement Committee research initiatives and encourages a stable funding mechanism for long-term research including full funding for regional wheat research labs such as the small grains genotyping and wheat quality laboratories. (March 2011)

RT.A.26 NAWG supports the Sun Grant Initiative and its collaborations with other research institutions and ARS on bioenergy research. (March 2011)

RT.A.27 NAWG supports maintaining and improving infrastructure necessary for ARS wheat research. (March 2011)

RT.A.28 NAWG supports continued funding for research on insect pests in cereal grain crops, including but not limited to wheat stem sawfly, hessian fly and Russian wheat aphid. (March 2011)

RT.A.29 When solicited, NAWG will provide letters of support for wheat research grant applications, on a case-by-case basis, for

- projects that have broad national significance. (March 2011, Committee)
- RT.A.30 NAWG supports the creation of a new type of charitable organization devoted to agriculture with an IRS tax structure similar to the medical research organizations. (March 2011, Committee)

### **Section B - Grain Quality**

- RT.B.1 NAWG supports federally-approved grain quality tests that are accurate, consistent, repeatable, simple, fast, inexpensive, can be implemented by grain elevator operators and which objectively describe end use quality. (March 2011)
- RT.B.2 NAWG supports continuation of the current classes of wheat and believes that any objective test should be designed to preserve the integrity of these classes. (March 2011)
- RT.B.3 NAWG supports changing the marketing system so that wheat is marketed on a dry matter basis. (March 2011)

### **Section C - Biotechnology**

- RT.C.1 USW/NAWG/WETEC support continued research and development of Syngenta's Fusarium tolerance transgenic trait in wheat and will work proactively with stakeholders in the food system for the benefit of customers and consumers worldwide, U.S. wheat producers and the whole U.S. wheat industry. (Adopted by NAWG, USW and WETEC February 2006.)
- RT.C.2 USW/NAWG support the 'Principles for Collaboration in Wheat Breeding and Biotechnology' as also supported by the National Wheat Improvement Committee and adopted by the Public Breeder Subcommittee of the Hard Winter Wheat Improvement Committee, and strongly urge state wheat commissions/wheat breeders/universities with public wheat breeding programs to use and further

develop these Principles to guide their collaborations and agreements with private industry. (Adopted by NAWG and USW, January 2010.)

### ***Research & Technology Goals***

#### **Short Term Goals** (March 2010)

- Invite and encourage industry participation in committee meetings to report on specific research systems for wheat and dedicated energy crops.
- Identify needs and secure public funding for appropriations for ARS, NIFA programs and facilities and DOE and USDA loan guarantee programs for cellulosic ethanol facilities.

#### **Long Term Goals**

- Support research efforts in breeding and management that will increase profitability of wheat and dedicated energy crop producers. (October 2007)
- Continue to monitor consumer needs that drive development of wheat products for new uses. (October 2007)
- Continue to unify the industry on commercialization of biotechnology. (October 2007)
- Utilize information on new wheat technologies. (October 2007)
- Identify beneficial biotechnology traits for consumers with USW and WFC and other industry partners. (February 2009 moved to long term goals)

## **BIOTECHNOLOGY POSITION STATEMENT**

---

*Adopted by USW, NAWG and WETEC, February 2006*

Biotechnological research holds great promise for the future, and the U.S. wheat industry recognizes these advancements. In preparation for the future commercialization of biotechnologically-derived wheat, we take the following positions.

1. We support and will work to ensure the ability of wheat producers to make planting and marketing choices based on economic, agronomic and market factors.
2. We support the ability of our wheat customers to make purchases on the basis of specific traits. We commit ourselves to the principle that our customers' needs are vitally important.
3. We support and will assist in the development by all segments of the industry of an orderly marketing system to assure delivery of non-transgenic wheat within reasonable tolerances to markets that require it.
4. We urge the adoption of a nationally and internationally accepted definition of biotechnologically-derived products.\* We also urge international harmonization of scientific standards and trade rules.
5. We support voluntary labeling of food products, provided it is consistent with U.S. law and international trade agreements and is truthful and not misleading. We oppose government-mandated labeling of wheat products in both the U.S. and international markets based upon the presence or absence of biotechnologically-derived traits that do not differ significantly from their conventional counterpart.
6. We support the establishment of a reasonable threshold level for adventitious or accidental inclusion of biotechnologically-derived traits in bulk wheat or wheat food products in both U.S. and international markets.

7. We are confident that biotechnology will deliver significant consumer and producer benefits and we support continued biotechnology research, and product and markets development. We invite valued and interested customers to join with us in a working partnership to explore the emerging biotechnology industry.

*\*U.S. Wheat Industry Definition of Biotechnologically-Derived (Genetically Modified Organisms)*

“Genetically modified organisms (commonly referred to as “transgenic”) are organisms derived from somatic cell fusion or direct insertion of a gene construct, typically but not necessarily from a sexually-incompatible species, using recombinant DNA techniques and any genetic transformation technology (e.g., bacterial vectors, particle bombardment, electroporation).”

## **BIOTECHNOLOGY PRINCIPLES OF COMMERCIALIZATION**

---

*Adopted by NAWG and USW, November 2008*

The U.S. wheat industry recognizes the benefits and value which could be created within the wheat chain through the prudent application of modern biotechnology. U.S. wheat producers will support commercialization of transgenic wheat traits after thorough review and development of a commercialization plan that facilitates commercialization with minimal market disruption. We support the ability of our customers to make purchases based on their preferences for specific traits, classes, qualities and characteristics. We will work diligently to assure that commercially achievable customer preferences are met.

The U.S. wheat industry will support commercialization of transgenic wheat traits when:

1. The technology provider initiates an informative dialogue with the USW/NAWG Joint Biotechnology Committee (JBC) prior to submitting for regulatory approvals in the U.S.

This dialogue will allow our organizations to initiate education and outreach activities to both domestic and international customers, and to provide the technology provider with practical information intended to facilitate commercialization with minimal or no market disruption.

2. Regulatory approvals for food and feed use must be secured in major wheat export markets that will be affected where a functioning regulatory system exists. Major export markets are defined as those which represent at least 5 percent of the normal export volume of U.S. wheat, based on a five-year moving average at the time a provider begins the regulatory process in the United States. In countries where there is no viable regulatory approval system, technology providers will make regulatory submissions promptly when those systems become functional.
3. Commercialization of the trait must not impair the ability of non-transgenic wheat to meet commercially recognized thresholds for the low-level presence of transgenic traits. Appropriate international tolerances for transgenic wheat in non-transgenic shipments must be established and accepted in major export markets. Anticipated thresholds range from 0.9% to 5.0%.
4. An accurate, economical and timely trait detection test must be provided by the trait developer prior to commercialization.
5. The primary responsibility for education and outreach for new traits will remain with the technology provider. USW and NAWG will actively help seek buyer acceptance and will provide guidance, assistance and resources.
6. The technology provider must demonstrate stewardship of the technology, including education and outreach to growers to assure compliance with agronomic and grower stewardship practices specific to the trait.

7. We have examined both certified seed and point-of-delivery value capture models. While there are advantages and disadvantages of either approach, we believe the certified seed model will be most acceptable to the value chain and is the preferred approach. Investment in agricultural technology by private parties requires a return on that investment. We support the protection of intellectual property, including education about the importance of complying with seed and stewardship contract provisions and enforcement of those provisions when necessary. Technology traits should be encouraged for adaption into public wheat varieties.

## **TRILATERAL STATEMENT ON BIOTECH COMMERCIALIZATION**

---

*Statement of Canadian, American and Australian Wheat Organizations, May 14, 2009*

In the interest of expressing support for more efficient, sustainable and profitable production of wheat around the world, the undersigned organizations have approved the following joint statement concerning commercialization of biotechnology in wheat.

1. Wheat is a vital food to all peoples of the world and we believe that by developing higher yielding better quality wheat varieties we can better supply the world with wheat food products.
2. One important tool to help feed the world into the future is biotechnology. Basic agronomic improvements to wheat like strengthening disease and insect resistance, enhancing wheat's use of soil nutrients and water, increasing its tolerance to weather extremes like drought and frost, are all possible with biotechnology. Another critical area for biotechnology is to improve the nutritional aspects of wheat to facilitate healthier living for people all over the world. Biotechnology is not the only answer to these questions, but it will be a significant component in solutions.

3. In many of our production areas, wheat production is under pressure from competing crops which, through the application of biotechnology, have achieved higher productivity, reduced input use, and other benefits not available in wheat. As a result, the historic area of wheat production has declined in many areas and economics are driving producers away from wheat and into other crops if they have alternatives. If wheat continues on a non-biotech course, then farmers will continue to devote a greater share of their acreage to biotech crops, where profitability is relatively greater, resulting in lower world wheat production than would otherwise be the case.
4. In general, wheat yields are on a very slow growth trend in comparison with competing crops, and the longer it takes to increase the growth rate the bigger will be the hole from which the industry must climb.
5. Biotechnology is a proven technique to deploy traits of interest with a high degree of precision in agricultural crops. Crops derived through biotechnology are subjected to strict regulatory scrutiny before commercialization. Over 10 years of global experience with biotechnology has demonstrated a convincing record of safety and environmental benefits as well as quality and productivity gains.
6. Lack of private and public investment in wheat research has left wheat development behind the advances in competing commodity crops, and has also led to a shortage of scientific expertise in wheat research generally. By providing an opportunity for private companies, the level of activity in wheat research will expand and attract a new generation of scientists into the field.

In light of these resolutions, we will work toward the goal of synchronized commercialization of biotech traits in our wheat crops. While none of us hold a veto over the actions of others, we believe it is in all of our best interests to introduce biotech wheat varieties in a coordinated fashion to minimize market disruptions and shorten the period of adjustment.

We are also committed to working with other stakeholders to address their needs and concerns as we travel the road to commercialization.



National Association of Wheat Growers  
U.S. Wheat Associates  
North American Millers' Association



Grain Growers of Canada  
Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association  
Alberta Winter Wheat Producers Commission



Grains Producers Australia  
Grain Growers Association  
Pastoralists and Graziers Association of Western  
Australia (Inc.)