



# National Association of Wheat Growers

## Policy Resolutions

adopted February 28, 2009, Grapevine, TX  
amended September 4, 2009 by conference call  
amended October 23, 2009, Snowbird, UT

### Table of Contents

Operations and Planning .....	3
I-A Membership .....	3
I-B Political Affairs .....	3
I-C Conference .....	3
I-D Farm Safety.....	3
Operations & Planning Committee Goals .....	3
Domestic and Trade Policy.....	6
II-A Farm Programs Generally.....	6
II-B Stocks & Loan Programs.....	6
II-C Risk Management Generally .....	6
II-D Risk Management – Yields & Units.....	8
II-E Risk Management – Adjusting & Deadlines .....	8
II-F Taxes Generally.....	8
II-G Taxes – Capital Gains & Deductions .....	9
II-H Taxes – Employment & Health Insurance .....	9
II-I Transportation - Taxes.....	9
II-J Transportation – Water.....	9
II-K Transportation – Rail.....	10
II-L Transportation – Truck.....	10
II-M Farm Credit.....	11
II-N Commodity Futures.....	11
II-O General Domestic Policy.....	11
II-P Trade Generally.....	12
II-Q Trade Sanctions.....	13
II-R Trade – Compliance with Agreements.....	13
II-S Promotion.....	13
II-T Food Aid .....	13
II-U Marketing.....	14
II-V General Trade Policy .....	14
Domestic Policy Goals .....	14
International Policy Goals .....	15
Environmental and Renewable Resources Policy.....	17
III-A Crop Protection Generally .....	17
III-B Crop Protection – Labels & Registrations .....	17
III-C Conservation Generally.....	17
III-D Conservation Reserve Program.....	18
III-E Conservation Stewardship Program & EQIP .....	19
III-F Wetlands .....	19
III-G Water and Air Quality.....	19
III-H Endangered Species .....	20
III-I General.....	21
Environmental Policy Committee Goals.....	21
Short Term Goals .....	21

Long Term Goals .....	22
Recommendations .....	22
Research and Technology Committee.....	24
IV-A Research.....	24
IV-B Grain Quality .....	24
Research & Technology Goals.....	25
Other research projects can be added as needed.....	26
Long Term Goals .....	26
Joint Biotechnology Committee.....	28
Biotechnology Position Statement .....	28
Biotechnology Principles for Commercialization .....	29
Resolution of Support for Syngenta’s Fusarium tolerance trait.....	30

## ***Operations and Planning***

*Note: the Operations & Planning Committee replaced the NAWG Membership Committee in March 2005. The O&P Committee will have responsibility for the former Membership policies and tasks, and also a responsibility for longer term strategic planning for NAWG.*

### ***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-B POLITICAL AFFAIRS***

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 2009)

### ***I-C CONFERENCE***

--	--

### ***I-D FARM SAFETY***

I-D-1	NAWG will cooperate with other farm organizations, the extension service and state and federal agencies to promote farm safety. (Mar 2008)
-------	--

## ***OPERATIONS & PLANNING COMMITTEE GOALS***

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

- The NAWG 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President will serve as Vice Chair of the Committee.
- NAWG shall continue to monitor and implement its strategic plan. Continue to provide additional return on investment examples (such as the benefit calculator) in order to show the benefits of membership.
- Develop a list of proposals to the Commodity Classic planning committee to better serve the needs of wheat growers
- NAWG will work with state associations to best communicate the benefit to grower's affiliation with the national association

**Long Term Goals (Feb 2009)**

- Make the Wheat PAC event a premier event and stay in contact with Wheat PAC donors
- NAWG and the NAWG Foundation shall continue to conduct strategic planning sessions.
- Pursue funding sources to expand the resources of NAWG

**Recommendations (Feb 2009)**

- 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 short term and long term goals 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:** Melissa Kessler  
**Last Updated:** October 23, 2009

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Communicate vision, mission, CSFs and strategies to state organizations / growers – industry partners		Daren, Melissa and officers	Marked Complete Oct 2009
Communicate improvements in US Wheat relationship and set goals for further improvement		Officers	
Provide information to state organizations to replicate Wheat Summit locally and create communication linkages with states	Improve frequency and impact of communications	Melissa, CEO	completed
Provide and regularly assist with key talking points / messages		Melissa, CEO	
Develop a unified wheat industry web site		Melissa	
Develop Communication that describes Australia / Canada producer relations		CEO	
<b>Success will be determined by:</b>			



## ***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 Resolution]
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 2007) [Kansas]
II-A-8	NAWG opposes any effort to re-direct a portion of direct payments to market development programs. (Mar 2007) [Texas]
II-A-9	NAWG supports a permanent disaster program as long as it is not funded with current farm bill funds. (Mar 2008) [Minnesota]

### ***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 2007) [Kansas]
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 2007) [Texas]
II-C-7	NAWG supports RMA coverage of grain crops that are harvested for hay. (Mar 2008) [Montana]
II-C-8	NAWG challenges the use of "pack factors" in determining grain volume for crop insurance payment calculations. (Mar 2008) [Montana]
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) (Colorado)
II-C-10	NAWG supports speedy implementation and use of the new 508h regulations as proposed in the 2008 Farm Bill. (North Dakota)
II-C-11	NAWG supports USDA-RMA regulations that support beginning farmers. (North Dakota)
II-C-12	NAWG supports equitable and timely adjustments in RMA audit procedures. This may include Indexing of crop insurance audit triggers Partial payment of claims on claims subject to audit Holding interest in abeyance on premiums until claims are settled (Feb 2009) (North Dakota)
II-C-13	NAWG opposes RMA audit provision when a producer exceeds a 150% production fluctuation. (Feb 2009) (North Dakota)
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) (North Dakota)
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) (North Dakota)
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) (Texas)
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) (Texas)
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) (Minnesota)
II-C-19	NAWG opposes limits on how much revenue assurance harvest price can fluctuate from revenue assurance spring price. (Feb 2009) (Minnesota)
II-C-20	NAWG opposes any RMA rule which restricts the use of any sound and proven agronomic practice. (Oct 2009) (Nebraska)

### ***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. [South Dakota] (Feb 2009)

### ***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) [Washington]
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 E. 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) [Texas]
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) (Montana)
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) [Montana]
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) (Minnesota)

### ***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 2007) [North Dakota]
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 2007) [Minnesota]
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) [Oklahoma]
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) [Oklahoma]
II-L-12	NAWG supports securing a US DOT farm truck bumper exemption. (Mar 2008) [North Dakota]

### ***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) (Minnesota)

### ***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. (Board, Feb 2009)
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. [Kansas] (Feb 2009)
II-O-8	NAWG encourages FSA to adequately staff current state FSA offices to levels that meet the needs of producers in all counties. [Texas] (Feb 2009)
II-O-9	NAWG supports creating a separate market classification for hard white wheat. [Idaho] (Feb 2009)
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 resolution]
II-O-11	NAWG supports the timely appointment of State FSA committees. (Oct 2009) (Texas)

## ***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. (Committee) (Feb 2009)
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] <i>(moved from II-N Commodity Futures)</i>
---------	---

### **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 world wide 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 US food aid programs that do not interfere with U.S. commercial sales. (Mar 2008)
II-T-2	NAWG supports the expansion of Agency for International Development (AID) food aid and agricultural development programs, but not at the expense of other U.S. food aid programs. (Mar 2008)
II-T-3	NAWG opposes the use of AID funds for the construction of facilities that would encourage imports of non-U.S. commodities. (Mar 2008)
II-T-4	NAWG supports meeting the U.S. obligations under terms of the food aid convention of the FAO. (Mar 2008)
II-T-5	NAWG supports replacing traditional foreign aid with food aid programs and the substitution of commodities for currency where applicable. (Mar 2008)
II-T-6	NAWG supports greater cooperation and coordination among all U.S. foreign aid programs and agencies. (Mar 2008)

II-T-7	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-8	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-9	<p>NAWG supports the resolutions recommended by the USW Food Aid Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NAWG urges the US Government to provide a minimum of 6 MMT of food aid annually, of which 3 MMT should be wheat. (Already adopted by US Wheat in March 2002).</li> <li>• NAWG will work with the U.S. administration to protect U.S. Food aid programs when negotiating in the WTO Doha Development Round. The current language is sufficient and continues to work well. WTO currently requires that food aid must be consistent with the guidelines of the legitimate food aid organizations and as currently monitored by the Food Aid Convention of the United Nations. Further, NAWG opposes any attempt to change the Food Aid Convention to require money-only donations.</li> <li>• NAWG opposes withholding food aid for political purposes.</li> <li>• NAWG opposes the release of reserves from the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust without full and immediate public disclosure and timely replacement of released stocks. (Feb 2009) (Montana)</li> </ul>

### ***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 – Oklahoma)
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) [North Dakota]

### ***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) (Oregon)
--------	---

## ***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 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:**           Cori Wittman  
**Last Updated:**        October 23, 2009

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
-------------	--------------------	-----	----------

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Charge DP Committee with increasing involvement in crop insurance issues	Work with representative of insurance industry at no expense to NAWG	CEO	
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-A-4	NAWG supports the continued classification of Anhydrous Ammonia as a compressed gas and the labeling thereof. (Oct 2007)
III-A-5	NAWG supports federal funding for chemical disposal programs. (Oct 2007)
III-A-6	NAWG opposes requiring pre-notification of crop protection product application. (Oct 2007)
III-A-7	NAWG supports federal preemption for the establishment of crop protection product use restrictions. (Oct 2007)
III-A-8	NAWG supports restoring full patent protection rights to manufacturers of crop protection products at the time their products receive full registration. (Oct 2007)
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 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)

### ***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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-B-3	NAWG opposes holding farmers liable when crop protection products are applied, stored or disposed of in accordance with label instructions. (Oct 2007)
III-B-4	NAWG supports continuation of the Section 18 process. (Oct 2007)
III-B-5	NAWG encourages EPA to use NAFTA registration provisions to develop common labels and registrations for crop protection products. (Oct 2007)
III-B-6	NAWG supports that all pesticide removals should be based on sound science. (Oct 2007)

### ***III-C CONSERVATION GENERALLY***

III-C-1	NAWG supports allowing incidental grazing in riparian areas. (Oct 2007)
III-C-2	NAWG supports giving local conservation districts greater authority in shaping conservation programs to the needs of the local community. (Oct 2007)
III-C-3	NAWG supports the continuation of state and regional producer advisory committees to

	provide guidance to NRCS programs. (Oct 2007)
III-C-4	NAWG opposes any conservation program that encourages farmers to report on the actions of their neighbors. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-C-8	NAWG supports conservation compliance exemptions for special problems (such as jointed goat grass and rye). (Oct 2007)
III-C-9	NAWG supports making all conservation programs equitably available on a statewide basis. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-C-16	NAWG encourages NRCS to distribute all conservation money in a timely manner to the state with consideration being given to the planting season. (Jan 2007, 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. (Oct 2007)
III-C-19	NAWG opposes permanent conservation easements which retire productive agricultural land. (Oct 2007)

### ***III-D CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM***

III-D-1	NAWG supports timely emergency haying and grazing on land enrolled in CRP under federal guidelines. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-D-5	NAWG supports landowner retention of cropland designation and property rights when the CRP contract expires. (Oct 2007)
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 2007, 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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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 included in the new rules. (Oct 2007)

### ***III-F WETLANDS***

III-F-1	NAWG supports providing remuneration or tax credits for producers who voluntarily take action to protect wetlands. (Oct 2007)
III-F-2	NAWG supports allowing producers to bank mitigation credit. (Oct 2007)
III-F-3	NAWG supports a more aggressive use of minimal effect authority in the swampbuster program. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-F-5	NAWG opposes requirements for certification of wetlands based on re-delineation of previously identified wetlands. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-F-7	NAWG opposes any effort to remove the term “navigable” from the definition of “navigable waters of the United States.” (Oct 2007, 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. (Oct 2007)
III-G-2	NAWG supports federal funding of cooperative programs for voluntary water quality projects. (Oct 2007)
III-G-3	NAWG opposes any quality standard that is not scientifically based and economically viable to achieve. (Oct 2007)
III-G-4	NAWG opposes user fees on water used for irrigation. (Oct 2007)

III-G-5	NAWG opposes any requirement for water quality monitoring as a criterion for farm program eligibility. (Oct 2007)
III-G-6	NAWG opposes mandatory nutrient management. (Oct 2007)
III-G-7	NAWG opposes the use of any federally mandated total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-G-10	NAWG opposes current EPA regulations on diesel fuel emissions and recommends that the current administration rescind these regulations. (Oct 2007)
III-G-11	NAWG opposes EPA classifying the application of fertilizers and pesticides as point sources for water quality. (Oct 2007)
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 2007; EP 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. (Committee, Sep 2009).

### ***III-H ENDANGERED SPECIES***

III-H-1	NAWG opposes the removal, destruction or drawn-down of any dams. (Oct 2007)
III-H-2	NAWG opposes requirements that mandate efforts to return fish pools to “harvestable levels”. (Oct 2007)
III-H-3	NAWG opposes the use of “harvestable levels” as a criterion for delisting of endangered species. (Oct 2007)
III-H-4	NAWG opposes the differentiation between “wild” and “artificial” species or evolutionary significant units (ESU). (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
III-H-6	NAWG supports requiring a thorough economic analysis of any proposed ESA activity before it is allowed to go into effect. (Oct 2007)
III-H-7	NAWG supports requiring local consultation before the implementation of any action done under the authority of ESA. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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/renewable energy standard. (Feb 2009)
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 2007, 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 2007; EP 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; EP Committee)
III-I-13	NAWG endorses the goals of the 25'X25' project. (Oct 2007)
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. (Oct 2007)
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 supercede 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:** Mark Gaede  
**Last Updated:** Amended 2/26/09 by ERR Committee

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
Develop carbon offset legislation	Quantify: fees collected Need: Business plan by 2/08 that articulates the opportunity for wheat growers and the cost (funding required) – delivered by NatSource at committee on 11/1  Begin Carbon Credit aggregation and monitoring policy creation – creation of subcommittee to continue discussion and work with Natsource (completed)	Mark/EER committee  Subcommittee	Ongoing
Report to committee on economic model from NatSource  Determine whether benefits outweigh costs for a		Mark  Committee	due to Board October 2009

Action Step	Resources Required	Who	Timeline
recommendation to NAWG Board on participation			
Monitor and influence biomass components as RFS is implemented	NAWG staff time	Mark	Ongoing
Encourage energy exploration and drilling	NAWG staff time	Mark	Ongoing
Fuel and Fertilizer: Support lowering of the tariff on imported urea from Russia (Berry bill).	NAWG staff time	Mark	Ongoing
Cellulosic Ethanol: Monitor progress of cellulosic pilot plants planned or under construction	NAWG staff time	Mark	Ongoing
<b>Success will be determined by:</b>	Carbon Partnership developed and implemented Commercial cellulosic facility opened and operating; loan guarantees distributed Carbon legislation introduced and passed. Active offshore drilling Implementation of lower tariff on Russian urea; increased supply in United States		

## ***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** (One Year)

- Invite and encourage industry participation in committee meetings to report on specific research systems for wheat and dedicated energy crops. (Oct 2007)
- Identify needs and secure public funding for:
  - Appropriations for ARS/CSREES programs and facilities
  - DOE and USDA loan guarantee programs for cellulosic ethanol facilities (Oct 2007)
- Request membership on the Biomass Research and Development Technical Advisory Committee for DOE. (Oct 2007)
- Priority should be placed on funding for refilling the Science & Technology position on the NAWG staff as soon as possible. (Feb 2009)
- 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 Department of Animal Science Oklahoma State University gerald.horn@okstate.edu	2/17/09 report	March 27, 2009
National Wheat Improvement Committee research initiatives	Jim Peterson, Oregon State University <a href="http://cropandsoil.oregonstate.edu/wheat/reports/NWIC/">http://cropandsoil.oregonstate.edu/wheat/reports/NWIC/</a>	FY2010 research funding priorities	February 10, 2009
Managing Invasive Weeds in Wheat			
Sun Grant Initiative	Kevin Kephart, Kevin.Kephart@sdstate.edu		March 5, 2009
North American Barley Genome Mapping Project	Patrick Hayes, Oregon State University <a href="http://barleyworld.org/northamericanbarley.php">http://barleyworld.org/northamericanbarley.php</a>	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	October 2009 presentation	October 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:** Daren Coppock  
**Last Updated:** February 28, 2009

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 [other steps? Discuss at Fall 2009 meeting]	\$500-1000/yr	Daren	Complete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 CSREES appropriations, stakeholder input opportunities, peer reviews and advisory committees</li> </ul>	Staff or volunteer to carry it out “ “		Ongoing

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>• Get more than one tech provider engaged in biotech trait development for wheat by 2010.</li> </ul>			

## ***Joint Biotechnology Committee***

### ***BIOTECHNOLOGY POSITION STATEMENT***

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).”

---

*Adopted with revisions by: USW Board of Directors on 2/4/06; NAWG Board of Directors on 2/6/06; WETEC Board of Directors on 2/5/06.*

## ***BIOTECHNOLOGY PRINCIPLES FOR COMMERCIALIZATION***

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***

Passed 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."