

## **Operations and Planning**

### ***I-A Membership***

- I-A-1 NAWG shall continue to publish activity reports that outline accomplishments and provide updates on important national issues. (Mar 2008)
- I-A-2 NAWG will continue its efforts to organize more state associations and send staff or officers to potential new member states. (Mar 2008)
- I-A-3 NAWG shall maintain an Internet site that will serve as a source of information for the entire wheat industry. (Mar 2008)
- I-A-4 NAWG strongly supports the consolidation of USW and NAWG into ONE national wheat organization. (Feb 2009)
- I-A-5 NAWG strongly encourages all agriculture producers to cooperate with the USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) by completing survey forms when contacted by mail, telephone, or personal interview. (Mar 2008)
- I-A-6 NAWG will work with state associations to best communicate the benefit to grower's affiliation with the national association. (Mar 2010)

### ***I-B Political Action Committee***

- I-B-1 NAWG urges that each state association host events throughout the year to raise funds for WheatPAC. (Mar 2008)
- I-B-2 NAWG will maintain a WheatPAC education and promotion effort including direct mail materials that can be distributed by state associations. (Mar 2008)
- I-B-3 NAWG will seek input from state associations on the distribution of WheatPAC moneys to elected officials. The WheatPAC report shall be reviewed annually by the NAWG Operations & Planning Committee. (Oct 2006)
- I-B-4 NAWG will make the auction to benefit Wheat PAC a premier event and develop donors before and after the event.(Mar 2010)

### ***I-C Conference***

- I-C-1 NAWG will develop a list of proposals to the Commodity Classic planning committee to better serve the educational needs of wheat growers.
- I-C-2 NAWG Foundation will sponsor at least one educational session for wheat growers at the Commodity Classic each year.
- I-2-C The NAWG representative to the Classic Affiliate Council be the outgoing Past President.

## ***Operations & Planning Committee Goals***

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

- NAWG staff will develop a committee meeting scribe checklist, minutes template and training document by October 2010 and distribute to scribes two weeks prior to the committee meeting.
- NAWG staff will develop a simple, effective procedure for attaining input from state associations on the distribution of WheatPAC moneys to elected officials.
- The PAC fundraising goal will be \$80,000 for the 2011-2012 election cycle.
- NAWG will conduct a strategic planning session by July 2011.
- NAWG Foundation will conduct a strategic planning session by December 2010.

**Long Term Goals (Mar 2010)**

- Pursue funding sources to expand the resources of NAWG
- Develop state wheat grower organization members from Illinois, Michigan and Missouri.

**Recommendations (Mar 2010)**

- Seek volunteers from state associations to serve as administrative hosts at the winter conference. NAWG staff should put together a list of duties and tasks and ask people from state associations to volunteer for each duty.
- NAWG 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President serve as the O & P committee vice chair
- All committee action items should be summarized at the top of the minutes presented to the board
- Committee chairs report progress toward their Strategic Initiatives at the annual meeting

**Strategic Initiative #4: Create a Unified Voice Supporting U.S. Wheat Growers that Results in Positive Action**

**Objective:** 1) *Improve NAWG / U.S. Wheat Relationships*  
 2) *Unify organizations (other commodity groups)*

**Assigned to:** NAWG Operations & Planning Committee

**Staff Lead:** Director of Communications

**Last Updated:** March 2010

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Communicate vision, mission, CSFs and strategies to state organizations, growers, industry partners		CEO, Director of Communications and officers	Complete Oct 2009
Communicate improvements in US Wheat relationship and set goals for further improvement	Meeting with USW Officers	Officers	July 2010
Provide information to state organizations to replicate Wheat Summit locally and create communication linkages with states	Improve frequency and impact of communications	CEO, CEO, Director of Communications	Complete
Provide and regularly assist with key talking points / messages		CEO, CEO, Director of Communications	Ongoing
<b>Success will be determined by:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No identifiable areas of improvement at the NAWG/USW Officer meeting in 2010.</li> </ul>		

## **Domestic and Trade Policy**

### ***II-A Farm Programs Generally***

- II-A-1 NAWG opposes any type of means testing to establish eligibility for or restrict participation in federal farm programs. (Mar 2008)
- II-A-2 NAWG supports the continuation of separate identity rights for spouses actively engaged in farming. (Feb 2009)
- II-A-3 NAWG opposes further payment limitation reductions. (Feb 2009)
- II-A-4 NAWG opposes the opening of the 2008 Farm Bill. (Feb 2009)
- II-A-5 NAWG supports the preservation of domestic support within the commodity title at no less than authorized in the 2008 Farm Bill while recognizing the importance of moving all countries toward less trade-distorting programs. (Feb 2009)
- II-A-6 NAWG supports Direct Payments and Target Prices at levels established by the cost of production formula, and a commensurate increase in payment limitations. (Mar 2008, Committee)
- II-A-7 NAWG supports government and private programs for crops with marketable characteristics beyond traditional commodity markets that focus on achieving critical mass by area. (Mar 2010, KS)
- II-A-8 NAWG opposes any effort to re-direct a portion of direct payments to market development programs. (Mar 2010, TX)
- II-A-9 NAWG supports a permanent disaster program as long as it is not funded with current farm bill funds. (Mar 2008, MN)
- II-A-10 NAWG believes any 'actively engaged' definition should not hinder farm transfer and/or succession planning. (Mar 2010, MT)

### ***II-B Stocks & Loan Programs***

- II-B-1 NAWG supports the continuation of a non-recourse loan program for wheat. (Mar 2008)
- II-B-2 NAWG supports allowing producers to fix LDP rates up to 60 days prior to harvest. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-B-4 NAWG opposes a government owned food security reserve or a farmer owned reserve. (Mar 2008)
- II-B-5 NAWG opposes allowing CCC stocks to be liquidated on the market in a manner that would affect commercial sales. (Mar 2008)

### ***II-C Risk Management Generally***

- II-C-1 NAWG supports a variety of crop insurance products and regulations that provide the best security for producers. These include:
  - A. effective whole farm insurance
  - B. prevented planting coverage for drought conditions
  - C. coverage in all areas for continuous cropped wheat
  - D. irrigated coverage in times of drought or water stoppages
  - E. a "dollar per acre" option
  - F. coverage on contracted seed stocks that reflect the contract price (Mar 2008)

- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-C-3 NAWG supports the insurability of wheat acres found to contain Karnal Bunt. (Mar 2008)
- II-C-4 NAWG opposes mandatory crop insurance participation as a prerequisite to farm program participation but encourages voluntary crop insurance participation. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2010, KS)
- II-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. (Mar 2010, TX)
- II-C-7 NAWG supports RMA coverage of grain crops that are harvested for hay. (Mar 2008, MT)
- II-C-8 NAWG challenges the use of "pack factors" in determining grain volume for crop insurance payment calculations. (Mar 2008, MT)
- II-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. (Feb 2009, CO)
- II-C-10 NAWG supports speedy implementation and use of the new 508h regulations as proposed in the 2008 Farm Bill. (Feb 2009, ND)
- II-C-11 NAWG supports USDA-RMA regulations that support beginning farmers. (Feb 2009, ND)
- II-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%) of claims on claims subject to audit,
  - holding interest in abeyance on premiums until claims are settled. (Feb 2009, ND)
- II-C-13 NAWG opposes RMA audit provision when a producer exceeds a 150% production fluctuation. (Feb 2009, ND)
- II-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. (Feb 2009, ND)
- II-C-15 NAWG supports production history be calculated and included in a producer's actual production history when that producer experiences a mechanical fire. (Feb 2009, ND)
- II-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. (Feb 2009, TX)

- II-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. (Feb 2009, TX)
- II-C-18 NAWG supports working with the wheat industry to find accurate quality loss data that can be used to reform quality adjustment factors. (Feb 2009, MN)
- II-C-19 NAWG opposes limits on how much revenue assurance harvest price can fluctuate from revenue assurance spring price. (Feb 2009, MN)
- II-C-20 NAWG opposes any RMA rule which restricts the use of any sound and proven agronomic practice. (Oct 2009, NE)

### ***II-D Risk Management – Yields & Units***

- II-D-1 NAWG supports modifying APH calculations for producers who suffer multiple years of loss due to factors beyond their control. (Mar 2008)
- II-D-2 NAWG supports updating t-yields that more accurately reflect actual yields within a production area excluding years of declared disaster. (Feb 2009)
- II-D-3 NAWG urges the use of “reference yields” on units that have less than four years of history. (Mar 2008)
- II-D-4 NAWG supports RMA maintaining zoning by state, county and practice for actuarial purposes. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Feb 2009)
- II-D-6 NAWG supports allowing summer fallow and continuous crop insurable wheat within the same insurable unit to be classified as separate units. (Mar 2008)
- II-D-7 NAWG recommends that the RMA implement new optional unit provisions that are more equitable and fit the needs of producers. (Mar 2008)
- II-D-8 NAWG supports the option of a new landowner using the APH yield from the previous operator regardless of acreage in that county. (Feb 2009)
- II-D-9 NAWG supports changes in the federal crop insurance policy to allow winter wheat and spring wheat to be insured as separate crops. (Feb 2009, SD)

### ***II-E Risk Management – Adjusting & Deadlines***

- II-E-1 NAWG encourages the development of a program including a Farm Savings concept that covers uncovered crop insurance losses. (Feb 2009)

### ***II-F Taxes Generally***

- II-F-1 NAWG supports the establishment of Farmer IRAs. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-2 NAWG opposes federal taxes on agricultural inputs. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-3 NAWG opposes imposing self employment taxes on land or machinery rent. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-4 NAWG opposes the creation of a federal value added tax. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-5 NAWG supports allowing producers to transfer monies received from the sale of agricultural land or assets to tax deferred retirement accounts. (Mar 2008)

- II-F-6 NAWG supports taxing foreign investors on the same basis as U.S. citizens. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-7 NAWG believes that income generated by agricultural properties owned by non-profit or tax-exempt organizations should be subject to income taxes. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-9 NAWG believes that any private land purchased by federal and state agencies should remain on local tax rolls. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-10 NAWG supports full funding of the "Payment in Lieu of Taxes" law (PILT). (Feb 2009, WA)
- II-F-11 NAWG supports raising the minimum reporting level on Form 1099. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-12 NAWG supports allowing recapture income from the sale of tangible personal property to be recognized under the installment method. (Mar 2008)
- II-F-13 NAWG supports allowing all taxpayers in Presidentially declared disaster areas to utilize the casualty loss provisions previously available only to victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma. (Oct 2007, Committee)

### ***II-G Taxes – Capital Gains & Deductions***

- II-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
  - F. a lifetime tax exemption to offset sale of depreciated farm equipment
  - G. deductions for farm vehicles - not based on mileage logs (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Feb 2009, TX)
- II-G-3 NAWG supports a lower capital gains tax for land transfers and capital purchases to qualified beginning farmers. (Mar 2008)
- II-G-4 NAWG supports the full deduction of membership dues up to \$250 per organization. (Mar 2008)
- II-G-5 NAWG supports accelerating the timetable for increasing the maximum amounts of the estate tax exemptions, provided stepped up basis is retained. Ten million dollars should be the maximum upon which no estate tax would be paid. (Feb 2009)
- II-G-6 NAWG opposes changes in tax laws that would unfairly diminish an agricultural enterprise's opportunity to build asset value. (Dec 2007) (Committee) [offered in response to a provision in the Senate Finance package that would adversely affect farm property swapped through a 1031 exchange]

### ***II-H Taxes – Employment & Health Insurance***

- II-H-1 NAWG supports increasing the FICA and income tax withholding exemption to \$500 regardless of total annual agricultural wages. (Mar 2008)
- II-H-2 NAWG supports raising the trigger level for the agricultural unemployment payroll tax to \$40,000 per quarter and indexing it for inflation. (Mar 2008)

- II-H-3 NAWG believes that the agricultural unemployment payroll tax should only be required if the average of the current and three preceding quarters exceed the trigger level. (Mar 2008)
- II-H-4 NAWG opposes any government mandated health care plan that would require employers to provide health insurance for all employees. (Mar 2008)
- II-H-5 NAWG opposes any government mandated health care plan that would not allow for choice of coverage, plan or providers. (Mar 2008)
- II-H-6 NAWG supports allowing producers to form health insurance purchasing cooperatives. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-H-8 NAWG supports a workable Guest Worker Program that secures the borders of the United States and provides a legal, affordable, and stable workforce for agriculture. (Feb 2009) [Idaho]

### ***II-I Transportation – Taxes***

- II-I-1 NAWG supports the federal fuel tax exemption for bio-based fuels. (Mar 2008)

### ***II-J Transportation – Water***

- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-J-2 NAWG supports efforts by the US government and private companies that will enhance the effectiveness of the St. Lawrence Seaway as a system for transporting wheat to worldwide markets. (Mar 2008)
- II-J-3 NAWG opposes all cargo preference and Jones Act requirements governing shipment of bulk commodities. (Mar 2008)
- II-J-4 NAWG supports the work of the Save Our Dams Coalition and will maintain its membership. (Mar 2008)

### ***II-K Transportation – Rail***

- II-K-1 NAWG supports any organization or council whose goal is to provide transportation relief for wheat producers. (Oct 2009, MT)
- II-K-2 NAWG supports requiring a 60 day notice of rail rate increases. (Mar 2008)
- II-K-3 NAWG supports competitive access for all rail shippers. (Mar 2008)
- II-K-4 NAWG supports the right of reciprocal switching at reasonable cost in markets served by more than one carrier. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-K-7 NAWG supports increased STB monitoring of railroad maintenance. (Mar 2008)
- II-K-8 NAWG supports allowing a railroad to sell part of its line for the purpose of maintaining rail service. (Mar 2008)

- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-K-10 NAWG supports funding the local rail services assistance program and similar efforts to preserve rail service on low density lines. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-K-13 NAWG supports maintenance and expansion of intermodal services for agricultural products. (Mar 2008, MT)
- II-K-14 NAWG shall pursue all facets of rail issues that will provide relief to wheat growers on rail rates and service. (Nov 2008, Committee)
- II-K-15 NAWG supports transparency in the secondary rail market. (Feb 2009, MN)
- II-K-16 NAWG recommends that Congress require the Surface Transportation Board to be more receptive to producer concerns. (Mar 2010, MT)

***II-L Transportation – Truck***

- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-L-2 NAWG supports raising the federal cap on truck weights to 129,000. (Mar 2008)
- II-L-3 NAWG opposes requiring producers to keep detailed records for farm use vehicles. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Oct 2009) (Oregon)
- II-L-5 NAWG supports the exemption of CDL requirements for custom harvesters and farm suppliers transporting inputs to and from the farm. [Oklahoma] (Feb 2009)
- II-L-6 NAWG urges Congress to ensure that in the implementation of the US Patriot Act, producers retain their 150 mile exemption from restrictions on the movement of hazardous materials. (Feb 2009)
- II-L-7 NAWG supports passage of Federal legislation that moves the agricultural exemption for hours of service from rule to law. [Idaho] (Feb 2009)
- II-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. (Mar 2010, ND)
- II-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. (Mar 2010, MN)
- II-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. (Feb 2008, OK)

II-L-11 NAWG supports a plan that will allow Mexican trucks to operate in the United States as long as they meet US safety standards. (Mar 2008, OK)

II-L-12 NAWG supports securing a US DOT farm truck bumper exemption. (Mar 2008, ND)

### ***II-M Farm Credit***

II-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
- E. low interest program for farmer owned cooperatives (Mar 2008)

II-M-2 NAWG supports the mediation concept included in the Farm Credit Act of 1987. (Mar 2008)

II-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. (Mar 2008)

II-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. (Mar 2008)

II-M-5 NAWG supports federal banking regulations which account for the different needs of rural and urban banks. (Mar 2008)

### ***II-N Commodity Futures***

II-N-1 NAWG supports the appointment of an agricultural producer as a CFTC commissioner. (Mar 2008)

II-N-2 NAWG supports continued efforts to educate producers about wheat futures, options and other pricing alternatives. (Mar 2008)

II-N-3 NAWG supports improved settlement methods on wheat futures contracts that allow for better convergence of cash and futures markets. (Feb 2009, MN)

### ***II-O General Domestic Policy***

II-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. (Feb 2009)

II-O-2 NAWG believes that USDA should not include income from off-farm sources when reporting farm income. (Mar 2008)

II-O-3 NAWG supports greater empowerment of FSA and NRCS state and county committees to adapt national programs to local needs. (Mar 2008)

II-O-4 NAWG supports the present system of electing farmers to FSA county committees rather than appointed committees. (Mar 2008)

II-O-5 NAWG supports federal legislation, the New Homestead Economic Act, for enhancing rural development. (Oct 2009))

II-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. (Feb 2009, Board)

- II-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. (Feb 2009, KS)
- II-O-8 NAWG encourages FSA to adequately staff current state FSA offices to levels that meet the needs of producers in all counties. (Feb 2009, TX)
- II-O-9 NAWG supports creating a separate market classification for hard white wheat. (Feb 2009, ID)
- II-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. (Oct 2009, Committee)
- II-O-11 NAWG supports the timely appointment of State FSA committees. (Oct 2009, TX)

### ***II-P Trade Generally***

- II-P-1 NAWG supports fair and open trade of wheat throughout the world. (Mar 2008)
- II-P-2 NAWG supports the advancement of comprehensive, multilateral negotiations to expand trade in goods and services. (Mar 2008)
- II-P-3 NAWG supports swift resolution of unfair trade practices that harm U.S. grain exports. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-P-5 NAWG supports establishing a stronger international alliance with other wheat organizations to facilitate grower-to-grower dialogue. (Mar 2008)
- II-P-6 NAWG supports the establishment of an agricultural advisory group to the Secretary of State. (Mar 2008)
- II-P-7 NAWG urges US trade negotiators to protect domestic farm policies from being negotiated away to benefit other sectors of the US economy. (Feb 2009)
- II-P-8 NAWG directs US 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. (Feb 2009)
- II-P-9 NAWG urges international harmonization of scientific standards and trade rules. (Feb 2009)
- II-P-10 NAWG supports the disbanding of export state trading enterprises. (Feb 2009, Committee)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Feb 2008, JITPC)
- II-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. (Feb 2009, JITPC)

II-P-14 NAWG supports legislation to normalize trade relations with Cuba. (Feb 2009, JITPC)

II-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 US Wheat. (Mar 2008, Committee)

### ***II-Q Trade Sanctions***

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

II-Q-2 NAWG opposes any unilateral sanction that restricts the export of food. (Mar 2008)

### ***II-R Trade – Compliance with Agreements***

II-R-1 NAWG supports continued monitoring of foreign compliance with multi-lateral trade agreements. (Mar 2008)

II-R-2 NAWG supports close monitoring and enforcement of China's implementation of their WTO accession commitments. (Mar 2008)

II-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. (Mar 2008)

II-R-4 NAWG supports eliminating barriers which restrict US ag producers access to worldwide crop inputs. (Feb 2009)

### ***II-S Promotion***

II-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. (Mar 2008)

II-S-2 NAWG supports building relationships with newly emerging private sector contacts in grain importing countries. (Mar 2008)

II-S-3 NAWG supports international debt forgiveness programs where applicable. (Mar 2008)

II-S-4 NAWG supports continued legislative authorization of the cooperator program as a line item in the CCC budget. (Mar 2008)

II-S-5 NAWG supports producer oversight of the allocation of cooperator program funds. (Mar 2008)

II-S-6 NAWG supports remedying the FAS budget shortfall for FY09 and increased funding in future years. (Feb 2009, JITPC)

### ***II-T Food Aid***

II-T-1 NAWG supports replacing traditional foreign aid with food aid programs and the substitution of commodities for currency where applicable. (Mar 2010)

II-T-2 NAWG supports greater cooperation and coordination among all U.S. foreign aid programs and agencies. (Mar 2008)

II-T-3 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. (Mar 2008)

- II-T-4 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. (Mar 2008)
- II-T-5 NAWG opposes withholding food aid for political purposes. (Mar 2010)
- II-T-6 NAWG opposes the release of reserves from the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust without full and immediate public disclosure and timely replacement of released stocks. (Mar 2010, MT)
- II-T-7 NAWG supports the U.S. Wheat Industry Food Aid Working Group Principles, stating:
- Support funding of P.L. 480 Title II food assistance programs at \$2.5 billion, the full amount authorized by law.
  - Support a strong, flexible U.S. food aid program that contains both in-kind donations and monetization.
  - Support evaluating lessons from the Local and Regional Purchase (LRP) pilot study prior to implementing additional LRP programs.
  - Support funding and implementation of LRP programs through the Foreign Disaster Assistance Act and USAID, respectively, rather than through USDA.
  - Support USDA administration of Food for Progress programs.
  - Support 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.

### ***II-U Marketing***

- II-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. (Feb 2009, OK)
- II-U-2 NAWG requests that the Minneapolis Grain Exchange remove the restrictions on biotech wheat deliveries from their Spring Wheat contract specifications. (Mar 2008, ND)

### ***II-V General Trade Policy***

- II-V-1 NAWG supports continued funding for international market research conducted by land grant universities. (Mar 2008)
- II-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. (Mar 2008)
- II-V-3 NAWG supports the enforcement of end-use certificate requirements. (Mar 2008)

### ***II-W Food Safety***

- II-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. (Oct 2009, OR)
- II-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. (Mar 2010, OK)

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

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

- Continue to monitor implementation of the 2008 Farm Bill
- 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.

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

- Continue pursuit of improved transportation for growers including rail transportation competitiveness.
- Continue improvements to crop insurance
- Farm Policy Public Education
- 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 (Oct 2009)**

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

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

- Support a comprehensive WTO strategy which:
  - Eliminates export subsidies
  - Preserves flexibility in US 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.

### ***Strategic Initiative #3: Improve the Risk Management Programs to Support U.S. Wheat Growers***

**Objective** (1) *Improve crop insurance programs by lowering the cost to enroll, increasing participation rates and increasing available coverage by 10%*  
(2) *Advocate for improvements in U.S. transportation infrastructure (Rail, Roads, Rivers)*  
(3) *Maximize the opportunities for Wheat Growers with the 2012 Farm Bill*

**Assigned to:** NAWG Domestic & Trade Policy Committee  
**Staff Lead:** Director of Government Affairs, Farm Policy (DGA-FP)  
**Last Updated:** October 23, 2009

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Charge DP Committee with increasing involvement in crop insurance issues	Work with representatives of insurance industry; staff time	CEO, DTP-FP	
Build effective transportation system	Funding: TBD Consider hiring full-time transportation staff if funding is available	David Cleavinger	
Farm Bill	Identify needs of wheat growers and quantify opportunity of each	NAWG staff	2010
<b>Success will be determined by:</b>			

## **Environmental and Renewable Resources Policy**

**Preamble:** The National Association of Wheat Growers supports environmental and conservation policies which 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.

### ***III-A Crop Protection Generally***

- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-2 NAWG supports price and registration harmonization between Canada and the United States on all crop protection products. (Feb 2009)
- III-A-3 NAWG supports the continued and essential use of phosphide. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-4 NAWG supports the continued classification of Anhydrous Ammonia as a compressed gas and the labeling thereof. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-5 NAWG supports federal funding for chemical disposal programs. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-6 NAWG opposes requiring pre-notification of crop protection product application. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-7 NAWG supports federal preemption for the establishment of crop protection product use restrictions. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-8 NAWG supports restoring full patent protection rights to manufacturers of crop protection products at the time their products receive full registration. (Jan 2010)
- III-A-9 NAWG opposes designation of any agricultural crop production as a point source of pollution. (Feb 2009)
- III-A-10 NAWG opposes legislation that requires pesticide application records to be made public. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)

### ***III-B Crop Protection – Labels & Registrations***

- III-B-1 NAWG supports providing reciprocal research, registration and regulation of crop protection and biotech products between the US and other countries. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-B-3 NAWG opposes holding farmers liable when crop protection products are applied, stored or disposed of in accordance with label instructions. (Jan 2010)
- III-B-4 NAWG supports continuation of the Section 18 process. (Jan 2010)
- III-B-5 NAWG encourages EPA to use NAFTA registration provisions to develop common labels and registrations for crop protection products. (Jan 2010)
- III-B-6 NAWG supports that all pesticide removals should be based on sound science. (Jan 2010)

**III-C Conservation Generally**

- III-C-1 NAWG supports allowing incidental grazing in riparian areas. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-2 NAWG supports giving local conservation districts greater authority in shaping conservation programs to the needs of the local community. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-3 NAWG supports the continuation of state and regional producer advisory committees to provide guidance to NRCS programs. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-4 NAWG opposes any conservation program that encourages farmers to report on the actions of their neighbors. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-5 NAWG supports continued funding for conservation cost-share programs. (Feb 2009)
- III-C-6 NAWG supports federal cost sharing for weed control programs on private land which neighbors public land. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-7 NAWG supports resolution of all conservation compliance appeals and the issuing of all “good faith” conservation variances by local county FSA committees. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-8 NAWG supports conservation compliance exemptions for special problems (such as jointed goat grass and rye). (Jan 2010)
- III-C-9 NAWG supports making all conservation programs equitably available on a statewide basis. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-10 NAWG supports that the funding of conservation programs must be separate and in addition to the funding of a commodity support program. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-11 NAWG supports residue burning as a best management practice. (Feb 2008)
- III-C-12 NAWG believes all conservation programs should be production based and not land retirement based. (Feb 2008)
- III-C-13 NAWG shall monitor the development of the Grassland Reserve Program. (Feb 2009)
- III-C-14 NAWG supports local conservation district control of third-party certifications for conservation programs. (Feb 2009)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010, Committee)
- III-C-17 NAWG supports payment eligibility requirements that are recognized by FSA also be accepted by NRCS for all NRCS programs. (Feb 2009; MT)
- III-C-18 NAWG supports capping CRP at 39.2 million acres. (Jan 2010)
- III-C-19 NAWG opposes permanent conservation easements which retire productive agricultural land. (Jan 2010)

**III-D Conservation Reserve Program**

- III-D-1 NAWG supports timely emergency haying and grazing on land enrolled in CRP under federal guidelines. (Jan 2010)
- III-D-2 NAWG supports preserving and restoring original crop base acres previously enrolled in CRP at the conclusion of such contracts. (Feb 2008)
- III-D-3 NAWG supports limiting CRP contract rentals to the average county rental rate. (Jan 2010)

- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-D-5 NAWG supports landowner retention of cropland designation and property rights when the CRP contract expires. (Jan 2010)
- III-D-6 NAWG opposes any future CRP sign up requiring the forfeiture of water rights (Feb 2008)
- III-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. (Feb 2009; TX)
- III-D-8 NAWG supports laws and regulations that allow Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) funds to be used to implement conservation. (Feb 2009; WA)
- III-D-9 NAWG supports past enrollment criteria for extension of existing CRP contracts. (Feb 2009; WA)
- III-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)
- III-D-11 NAWG opposes early release of CRP acres without the penalty. (Mar 2008; OK)
- III-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. (Mar 2008; ND)
- III-D-13 NAWG supports continuation of CRP contracts to heirs of landlords and operators regardless of payment limitations. (Mar 2008, Committee)

### ***III-E Conservation Stewardship Program & EQIP***

- III-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. (Feb 2009)
- III-E-2 NAWG opposes mandatory “whole farm” conservation plans as a prerequisite for receiving an EQIP grant. (Jan 2010)
- III-E-3 NAWG supports utilizing the current FSA system to distribute CSP payments. (Jan 2007; WA)
- III-E-4 NAWG recommends that the new CSP regulations should not regulate or direct distribution of CSP payments between landlord and tenant. (Jan 2010)
- III-E-5 State and federally owned land that is operated by eligible producers should be able to participate in the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). (Feb 2009; WA)
- III-E-6 NAWG will support a continuous CSP sign-up. (Oct 2009)

### ***III-F Wetlands***

- III-F-1 NAWG supports providing remuneration or tax credits for producers who voluntarily take action to protect wetlands. (Jan 2010)

- III-F-2 NAWG supports allowing producers to bank mitigation credit. (Jan 2010)
- III-F-3 NAWG supports a more aggressive use of minimal effect authority in the swampbuster program. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-F-5 NAWG opposes requirements for certification of wetlands based on re-delineation of previously identified wetlands. (Jan 2010)
- III-F-6 NAWG supports giving NRCS (rather than the Army Corps of Engineers) primary jurisdiction over all government decisions impacting wetlands on private property. (Jan 2010)
- III-F-7 NAWG opposes any effort to remove the term “navigable” from the definition of “navigable waters of the United States.” (Jan 2010; ND)

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

- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-2 NAWG supports federal funding of cooperative programs for voluntary water quality projects. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-3 NAWG opposes any quality standard that is not scientifically based and economically viable to achieve. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-4 NAWG opposes user fees on water used for irrigation. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-5 NAWG opposes any requirement for water quality monitoring as a criterion for farm program eligibility. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-6 NAWG opposes mandatory nutrient management. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-7 NAWG opposes the use of any federally mandated total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-10 NAWG opposes current EPA regulations on diesel fuel emissions and recommends that the current administration rescind these regulations. (Jan 2010)
- III-G-11 NAWG opposes EPA classifying the application of fertilizers and pesticides as point sources for water quality. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Feb 2009)
- III-G-13 NAWG supports the delivery of water by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) under existing contracts. (Feb 2009)
- III-G-14 NAWG supports legislative action toward agricultural exemptions from restrictions to the ambient air quality standards. (Jan 2010; Committee)
- III-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. (Sep 2009, Committee).

### ***III-H Endangered Species***

- III-H-1 NAWG opposes the removal, destruction or drawn-down of any dams. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-2 NAWG opposes requirements that mandate efforts to return fish pools to “harvestable levels”. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-3 NAWG opposes the use of “harvestable levels” as a criterion for delisting of endangered species. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-4 NAWG opposes the differentiation between “wild” and “artificial” species or evolutionary significant units (ESU). (Jan 2010)
- III-H-5 NAWG supports compensation and transition programs for landowners whose operation has been impacted by any (Endangered Species Act) ESA activity or designation. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-6 NAWG supports requiring a thorough economic analysis of any proposed ESA activity before it is allowed to go into effect. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-7 NAWG supports requiring local consultation before the implementation of any action done under the authority of ESA. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-9 NAWG encourages EPA to streamline pesticide registration regulations that comply with the Endangered Species Act. (Feb 2009)
- III-H-10 NAWG opposes federal agencies from pressuring state agencies into acquiring water rights. (Feb 2009)
- III-H-11 NAWG opposes the listing of prairie dogs and Sage Grouse as endangered species. (Jan 2010)
- III-H-12 NAWG supports recognition of farm conservation program participation as sufficient compliance with ESA program requirements. (Feb 2008)

### ***III-I General***

- III-I-1 NAWG supports requiring cost-benefit analysis of all laws and regulations before allowing such to go into effect. (Jan 2010)
- III-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. (Jan 2010)
- III-I-3 NAWG supports continued work on exploring how farmers can profit from carbon sequestration. (Feb 2008)
- III-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. (Feb 2009)

- III-I-5 NAWG supports landowner retention of crop land designation and property rights under ESA/Habitat Conservation Program (HCP) rules. (Feb 2009)
- III-I-6 NAWG supports expanded use of the renewable fuel /portfolio renewable energy standard. (Jan 2010)
- III-I-7 NAWG endorses the vision of 25 X '25 and commits to work collaboratively with leaders of the nation's agricultural community to bring this vision to life. (Feb 2008)
- III-I-8 NAWG supports drilling for natural gas in the Area 181 (Gulf of Mexico) to help meet our nations ever increasing energy needs. (Feb 2009; WA)
- III-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. (Jan 2010, Committee)
- III-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. (Jan 2010; Committee)
- III-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. (Mar 2007; Committee)
- III-I-13 NAWG endorses the goals of the 25'X25' project. (Jan 2010)
- III-I-14 NAWG opposes the adoption of the "Sod Saver" proposal; as presently proposed by administration. (Mar 2007, Committee)
- III-I-15 NAWG supports uniformity in CRP regulations across state and county borders. (Jan 2010)
- III-I-16 NAWG supports a 3-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. (Feb 2009; CO)

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

#### **Short Term Goals**

- Seek a 3-year extension of expiring 2009 CRP contracts (Feb 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 (Oct 2006) [from ST]
- Amend ESA and improve regulations associated with its implementation [from ST]

**Recommendations**

- NAWG pursue support of litigation against TMDL's.

**Strategic Initiative #2: Increase the focus on capturing the benefits of the Energy Policy**

**Objective:** *Improve Wheat Grower profitability through benefiting from carbon credits, cellulosic use of wheat & biomass.*

**Assigned to:** NAWG Environment & Renewable Resources Committee

**Staff Lead:** Director of Government Affairs, Environmental Policy (DGA-EP)

**Last Updated:** Amended 2/25/10 by ERR Committee

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Develop a business plan that quantifies the benefits and costs of carbon credit aggregation	Quantify: fees collected Need: Business plan by 2/08 that articulates the opportunity for wheat growers and the cost (funding required)		Complete February 2008
Begin Carbon Credit aggregation as directed by Board Feb '08	Create subcommittee Business plan	ERR Committee NatSource, DGA-EP	Complete Complete November '08
Implement MOU with NatSource on pilot program to provide data & determine feasibility	MOU passed Board February 2009 and signed	NatSource, DGA-EP	Suspended for the time being
Monitor carbon offset legislation	NAWG staff time Potential impacts study by Informa Economics, funded by American Farmland Trust	DGA-EP Committee	Ongoing Complete May 2010
Monitor and influence biomass components as RFS is implemented	NAWG staff time	DGA-EP	Ongoing
Encourage energy exploration and drilling	NAWG staff time	DGA-EP	Ongoing

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Fuel and Fertilizer: Support lowering of the tariff on imported urea from Russia (Berry bill).	NAWG staff time	DGA-EP	Ongoing
Cellulosic Ethanol: Monitor progress of cellulosic pilot plants planned or under construction	NAWG staff time	DGA-EP	Ongoing
<b>Success will be determined by:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon Partnership developed and implemented</li> <li>• Commercial cellulosic facility opened and operating; loan guarantees distributed</li> <li>• Carbon legislation introduced and passed.</li> <li>• Active offshore drilling</li> <li>• Implementation of lower tariff on Russian urea; increased supply in United States</li> </ul>		

## **Research and Technology Committee**

### ***IV-A Research***

- IV-A-1 NAWG supports continued funding for research of Fusarium Head Blight. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-2 NAWG supports continued funding of the wheat genome mapping and international triticeae mapping initiatives. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-3 NAWG supports continued funding for research of direct and no-till seeding. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-4 NAWG supports continued funding for research on root diseases in cereal grain crops. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-5 NAWG supports continued funding for the wheat pasture research project at Oklahoma State University. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-6 NAWG supports the National Wheat Improvement Committee research initiatives and encourages a stable funding mechanism for long term research. ( Mar 2008)
- IV-A-7 NAWG supports the NAWG/USW Joint Committee on Biotechnology's goals and policy statement. (Mar 2008)
- IV-A-8 NAWG supports scientific study of biotech traits out-crossing into crops and weeds. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-9 NAWG supports federal funding of biotechnology research and science-based education. ( Feb. 2008)
- IV-A-10 NAWG supports the Sun Grant Initiative. (Oct 2007)
- IV-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). (Feb 2009 - Committee)
- IV-A-12 NAWG supports educating legislators about the importance of bio-tech research for agriculture. (Feb 2008 - WA)
- IV-A-13 NAWG supports the construction, remodeling and expansion of all ARS wheat research facilities. (Feb 2008 - Committee)
- IV-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. (Feb 2008 - SD)
- IV-A-15 NAWG supports research and education to study the components in wheat that will have benefits for human nutrition. (Feb 2009 – Kansas)
- IV-A-16 NAWG supports ARS bioenergy research priorities to include: 1) develop annual and perennial dedicated biomass crops adapted to a variety of growing regions, 2) determine the best management practices for the establishment, maintenance, harvesting, and transportation of biomass energy crops, 3) determine the potential impact of proposed biorefineries on water quality and water quantity, and 4) research alternative processing technologies that would allow the farmer to convert his biomass crop into energy at the farm level. (Oct 2007)
- IV-A-17 NAWG supports continued funding for research on insect pests in cereal grain crops. (Montana Mar 2008)
- IV-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 (Committee Mar 2008).

IV-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. (Feb 2009, Committee)

**IV-B Grain Quality**

IV-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 describes end use quality. (Oct 2007)

IV-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. (Oct 2007)

IV-B-3 NAWG supports changing the marketing system so that wheat is marketed on a dry matter basis. (Oct 2007)

**Research & Technology Goals**

**Short Term Goals** (Mar 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
  - DOE and USDA loan guarantee programs for cellulosic ethanol facilities
- Maintain progress reports for this committee on the following projects:

Project	Contact	Date of last report	Date distributed to committee
Oklahoma State University Wheat Pasture Research Project	Gerald Horn, Oklahoma State University gerald.horn@okstate.edu	2/17/09 report	Mar 27, 2009
National Wheat Improvement Committee research priorities	To be determined	Jan 23, 2010	
Managing Invasive Weeds in Wheat			
Sun Grant Initiative	Kevin Kephart, SD State University Kevin.Kephart@sdstate.edu		Mar 5, 2009
North American Barley Genome Mapping Project	Patrick Hayes, Oregon State University http://barleyworld.org/northamericanbarley.php	Oct 2008 report	March 27, 2009
U.S. Wheat & Barley Scab Initiative	David Van Sanford, University of Kentucky (co-chair), Art Brandli (co-chair), Sue Canty, Michigan State University (coordinator) www.scabusa.org	Jan 23, 2010 by Bob Bahm	Oct 21, 2009

Note: the project *West Central Great Plains Special Grant Initiative for Viable Dryland Cropping Systems* was removed from this list August 25, 2009. The project contact, Dr. Gary Peterson from Colorado State University, reported that this project had been proposed to Congress for three consecutive years but never funded. Therefore, there has been no work.

Other research projects can be added as needed.

**Long Term Goals**

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

**Strategic Initiative #1: Encourage Investment and Innovation in US Wheat**

**Objective:** Increase Yields for US Wheat Growers 20% by 2018  
**Assigned to:** NAWG Research and Technology Committee  
**Staff Lead:** CEO, Director of Research & Technology Programs (DRTP)  
**Last Updated:** March 2010

Action Step	Specific Tasks	Resources Required	Who	Timeline/Status
Educate producers about the need to invest in new seed every year (curtail saved seed) so that others will invest in our industry	Continue membership in Farmers Yield Initiative	\$500-1000/yr	CEO	Complete
Promote the need for genetic development / improvement through both public and private sector investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Molecular Assisted Breeding</li> <li>• Coordinate discussions with universities, industry allies and seed companies</li> <li>• Staff support for NWIC research visits to Washington</li> <li>• Follow up on ARS and NIFA appropriations,</li> </ul>	Staff or volunteer to carry it out	CEO, DRTP	Ongoing

	stakeholder input opportunities, peer reviews and advisory committees			
Advance Biotechnology <i>Note: Biotechnology specific items were deferred to the Joint Biotechnology Committee's plan</i>	Request updates from the Joint Biotechnology Committee on progress.			Ongoing
<b>Success will be determined by:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National wheat yields grow 20% in 10 years (2018)</li> <li>• Improved relationships and communications with public and private sector</li> <li>• Maintain more than one tech provider engaged in biotech trait development for wheat.</li> </ul>			

**Joint Biotechnology Committee**  
***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 market 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: 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 for Commercialization***

Adopted by NAWG & 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 five 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.

***Resolution of Support for Syngenta's Fusarium tolerance trait***

Adopted by NAWG, USW and WETEC February 2006

"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."

***Resolution regarding Public-Private Partnerships***

Adopted by NAWG, USW January 2010

"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."

***Wheat Biotechnology 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 Council of Australia  
Grain Growers Association  
Pastoralists and Graziers Association of Western Australia (Inc.)