The current agreement was five years in the making, and it’s a little early to say if the agreement serves everyone’s interest. Over the next few months, IGPA will be reviewing in detail the proposed agreement. Wheat and barley growers statewide need to make a sound evaluation of the proposal.

The editor’s note by Steve Johnson

At just over 20% of Idaho’s economic base, agriculture is still the engine that drives Idaho’s economy. North Idaho and southeast Idaho’s dryland agriculture economy and south Idaho’s irrigated agriculture economy are equally important to Idaho’s economic success. Water is unquestionably the fuel for the agricultural sector of Idaho’s economy.

Idaho’s early leaders recognized the importance of Idaho water and developed one of the best water doctrines in the nation. As good as the Idaho water doctrine is, however, a court ruled that Idaho might hold junior water rights in both north and south Idaho to the Nez Perce Tribe based on the treaty of 1863. As a result of a court mandate, the state of Idaho, north and south Idaho water users and the tribe entered into negotiations to settle the tribal claims.

As I see it, the basis of the agreement provides two basic solutions. The tribe’s water rights are identified and decreed. In return, the tribe is compensated and agrees to cede all further claims to Idaho water. For Idaho, the state will now be able to adjudicate the 180,000 water rite claims on the rivers of Idaho. To get there, solving these water rite claims - tribal and state - is important to the entire state.

The agreement is very comprehensive and there is no question the tribe will receive some tremendous benefits from this agreement. The real question is, what are landowners and growers giving up? To use an old worn-out cliché, “the devil remains in the detail,” and growers need to read the fine print. The following is only a general outline:

The Nez Perce get the following:
- The state will decree 50,000 acre-feet of water to the tribe from Clearwater River sources.
- The tribe will get springs or fountains on federal lands decreed to them. Their claims on nonfederal land would be waived.
- The tribe will get BLM lands valued at $7 million dollars.
- The United States and the tribe will enter into agreement on management of the Kooskia National Fish Hatchery and co-management of the Dworshak National Fish Hatchery. The United States, the tribe and the state will enter into agreement on 200,000 acre-feet of Dworshak Reservoir for flow augmentation.
- The United States will establish stream flow regulations on these rivers for the tribe.
- The United States will provide $23 million for design and construction of sewer and water systems for local Nez Perce tribe communities.

The Salmon/Clearwater component:
- The state will establish stream flow regulations on these rivers for the tribe.
- The agreement adds voluntary riparian/stream bank protection measures to the Idaho Forest Practices Act on both public and private land.
- It also creates a trust fund for habitat improvements.

Snake River component:
- Minimum flows will be defined by the Swan Falls Agreement and decreed by the court to the Idaho Water Resource Board.
- The state of Idaho will extend current leasing terms for the term of this agreement (30 years) to the Bureau of Reclamation for the 427,000 acre-feet currently used for flow augmentation using the willing-seller/willing-buyer concept.
- The Bureau of Reclamation will be allowed to rent an additional 60,000 acre-feet between Milner and Swan Falls for flow augmentation.

This agreement was five years in the making, and it’s a little early to say if the agreement serves everyone’s interest. Over the next few months, IGPA will be reviewing in detail the proposed agreement. Wheat and barley growers statewide need to also ask the tough questions. In the end, we need to answer the question: Does this agreement protect all of Idaho agriculture? As the states No. 1 industry, we need to all be on the same page.
IGPA and NAWG Approve Biotechnology Commercialization Principles

IGPA President Tom Zenner convened a meeting of the IGPA executive board to review the proposed biotechnology “Principles of Commercialization” document. Zenner and the IGPA board agreed that the proposed commercialization principles followed IGPA policy and voted to support the proposal. Following the IGPA meeting, the National Association of Wheat Growers (NAWG) board of directors approved a biotechnology “Principles of Commercialization” document during a conference call. The document lays out the roadmap for commercializing biotechnology traits in wheat from the producer organization’s perspective, and was prepared for consideration by the joint Biotechnology Committee of NAWG, U.S. Wheat Associates (USW), and the Wheat Export Trade and Education Committee (WETEC). USW and WETEC boards voted to support the document during their summer meeting in Bismarck, N.D.

The principles, as presented by the committee and approved by IGPA/NAWG, read as follows:

U.S. wheat producers recognize the benefits and value that 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.

Our organizations will support commercialization of transgenic wheat traits when:

1. The technology provider initiates an informative dialogue with the USW/NAWG/WETEC Joint Biotechnology Committee (JBC) prior to submitting for regulatory approvals in the United States. 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. The primary responsibility for education and outreach for new traits will remain with the technology provider. USW/NAWG/WETEC will help seek buyer acceptance and will provide guidance, assistance and resources where appropriate.

3. Regulatory approval for food, feed and environmental release must be secured in the United States, and regulatory approvals for food and feed use must be secured in major wheat export markets that will be affected. Major export markets are defined as those that represent at least 5% of the normal export volume of any of the separate market classes of exported U.S. wheat. In countries where there is no viable regulatory approval system, technology providers will make regulatory submissions promptly when those systems become functional.

4. Buyers willing to accept the new transgenic trait must be identified.

5. Commercialization of the trait must not impair the ability of non-transgenic wheat to meet commercially recognized thresholds. 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%.

6. An accurate, economical and timely trait-detection test must be provided by the trait developer prior to commercialization.

7. 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. Technology providers will also institute programs to provide grower and industry education to ensure the integrity of the seed supply.

8. The trait should be priced at reasonably comparable levels in all world production markets into which it is introduced. When appropriate, the use of farmer-saved seed should be permitted. The trait should be made available for discretionary adaptation into public wheat varieties.

9. Any technology provider wishing to commercialize a niche market product only in the United States, without first securing major export market regulatory or marketing approvals, must institute a strictly-controlled segregation and limited-release program. The program must prevent market disruption. The technology provider must agree to provide for and bear the cost of an independent performance audit of the program.

We will vigorously oppose commercialization of transgenic wheat traits that do not meet all of the aforementioned principles.

The NAWG Executive Board also approved a draft implementation plan for comprehensively addressing acceptance of biotechnology. This “Read Forward” plan will be acted upon by U.S. Wheat and WETEC later this fall. The plan responds to direction from the NAWG Board given in March 2004 to develop a comprehensive plan and broad coalition to address acceptance of biotechnology in wheat, to prepare markets for eventual commercialization.
IGPA Past President Gordon Gallup Testifies Before Senate Committee on Farm Bill Conservation Programs

IGPA past president, NAWG board member, Chairman of the NAWG Environmental Policy Committee, and Idaho wheat and barley producer Gordon Gallup testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Forestry, Conservation and Rural Revitalization chaired by Sen. Mike Crapo (R-Idaho) regarding the current status of conservation programs authorized in the 2002 Farm Bill.

Gallup delivered his testimony on behalf of the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Cotton Council, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Soybean Association, the USA Rice Federation and the National Barley Growers Association.

In his statement to the committee, Gallup noted that passage of the 2002 Farm Bill had marked a giant leap forward in advancing private land conservation in the United States and pointed out that when President Bush signed the bill into law, he called the conservation title “the single most significant commitment of resources toward conservation on private lands in the nation’s history.”

While pointing to the creation of several new conservation programs, Gallup suggested that the program with the greatest promise, as yet unfulfilled, was the Conservation Security Program. “The Conservation Security Program (CSP) has been one of the most anticipated programs among producers of all the Title II (conservation) programs, and one I had hoped would allow me to embrace new technology to help my farm be more productive.” Gallup observed and went on to state, “Unfortunately, when the draft regulations were published, the program outlined in these draft rules appeared to be far different than the program suggested in the statute. Some have suggested that a person is more likely to win at Lotto than to become eligible to participate in the CSP program, and I myself have not been very lucky at playing the Lotto.”

To correct the present situation, Gallup suggested that beginning in fiscal year ‘05 when the CSP will be returned to its original design as an uncapped mandatory spending program, “I would suggest that the current draft rules remain as interim rules until final rules can be drafted to reflect the program as described in the law.”

Although most everyone on the stakeholders’ panel shared the same perspective regarding the Conservation Security Program as Gallup, it is still unclear what effect this may have on the final implementation of the program.

Under a proposed Natural Resources Conservation Service timeline, final CSP rules were published in mid-June, and the first CSP sign-up was to be conducted in early July.

Those policy priorities are:

Farm Programs and Policy:
1. NBGA supports legislation that authorizes the CCC to collect commodity check-off assessments.
2. Marketing Loan Program - NBGA will work with USDA to insure USDA calculates daily loan repayment rates based on legitimate market locations and actual terminal market values for feed barley.
3. Taxes - NBGA supports the elimination of estate taxes, the reduction in capital gains taxes and re-establishment of the investment tax credit for farmers and ranchers.

Trade:
WTO Negotiations- NBGA supports the July 2002 U.S. proposal for WTO agriculture negotiations.

Transportation:
1. NBGA supports the passage of rail competition legislation.
2. NBGA supports renewable fuel incentives.

Environment and Conservation:
1. NBGA supports pesticide harmonization legislation.
2. NBGA urges USDA to enact rules for the Conservation Security Program that reflect the intent of Congress.

Crop Insurance:
1. NBGA supports preserving the malt barley Option B Endorsement and supports adjusting the malt barley endorsement to more accurately reflect malt industry quality standards.
2. NBGA is opposed to the Standard Reinsurance Agreement as currently proposed by the Risk Management Agency. (Third Draft of May 21, 2004) Immediately following the summer board meeting, Gallup and Evans met with the Idaho congressional delegation to deliver the NBGA policies. ●
NAWG Priority Goals

NAWG’s major policy priorities include rail competition, pesticide harmonization, appropriations for fiscal 2005, crop insurance enhancements, biotechnology acceptance, consolidation of wheat industry organizations, environmental regulations, the Home Grown communications program and new uses development.

Federal Farm Policy

NAWG continually keeps an ear to the ground on federal farm policy issues. At present, crop insurance is front and center in that radar screen. However, the prospects of budget reconciliation and the outcome of Brazil’s WTO cotton case loom over farm bill funding for the next several years.

Crop Insurance

NAWG continues its work to develop refinements to federal crop insurance, though an extremely tight budget climate dictates that any changes be essentially budget-neutral. We’re advancing four key fundamentals: (1) higher available coverage levels; (2) prevent the erosion of Actual Production History (APH) from successive droughts; (3) utilizing risk-management accounts to cover large uninsured deductibles; and (4) not requiring producers to harvest a crop where harvest costs exceed the crop value simply to qualify for insurance indemnities. A full briefing paper on this topic is available on the NAWG Web site, from the NAWG office or from state association offices.

Farm Program

NAWG President Mark Gage testified before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on General Farm Programs at a hearing to mark the anniversary of the 2002 Farm Bill and provide feedback on its policies. Gage pointed to the effectiveness of the 2002 Farm Bill, noting that the program “offers stability to the agricultural community as well as the food supply of the nation.”

Gage also pointed out that despite the good planning of producers and the effectiveness of the program, weather conditions sometimes interfere with production, and neither efficiency nor technology will produce a crop. Thus farmers must have an improved crop insurance safety net.

April information obtained from the House Agriculture Committee shows the cost of the 2002 Farm Bill well below its Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate at the time it was passed into law. For counter-cyclical payments alone, the first three fiscal years of the bill (2002-2004) were $7.1 billion below CBO’s best guess at the time the farm bill was passed (March 2002 CBO baseline). Marketing loan benefits over the same period (including LDPs) are $12 billion lower than CBO’s best estimate. Overall, commodity program expenditures for the first three years are $15 billion below the CBO estimate when the bill was passed (see chart).

Competitiveness

Rail Competition

Considerable effort invested by NAWG and other coalition partners in laying the groundwork for rail competition legislation paid off with a hearing in the House of Representatives on March 31, before the Rail Subcommittee of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Representing agriculture and the Alliance for Rail Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Rail Competition was Steve Strege, executive director of the North Dakota Grain Dealers Association. Other captive shippers on the panel included Chuck Platz with Basell Chemical and Terry Huvla from the City of Lafayette, La.

This hearing was an important opportunity for wheat growers and others to tell our story with respect to captive shipper issues. NAWG contacted each member of the full committee in advance of the hearing, requesting their attention to and support of captive shipper issues. NAWG also posted a sample letter on our Web site for submission by individual wheat growers to their representatives and senators.

Some important points about the bill:

- **HR 2924** is a bill that restores public policy and balance of fairness to the monopolized railroad industry.
- In 1980, when Congress acted to remove major portions of regulatory oversight from the railroad industry, it saw an industry of 40-plus Class I railroads and it envisioned that its public policy would allow the railroad to compete and bring innovation and stability to the industry while serving the U.S. public transportation needs. Those intentions of elected legislators have been skewed over time by business forces and unelected regulators. The law needs fixing to restore balance.

Railroads continue to oppose the bill, service continues to decline, and rates (for the not-provided service) continue to climb; but the coalition formed to advance rail competition is getting real traction and attention drawn to this important competitive issue.

Pesticide Harmonization

NAWG President Mark Gage testified June 23 at a hearing on Senate legislation to provide for access to crop protection products that are available for lower prices in Canada. The hearing was on the Pesticide Harmonization Act S.1406 introduced by Senators Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) and Conrad Burns (R-Mont.). The bill was co-sponsored by Senators Max Baucus (D-Mont.), Kent Conrad (D-N.D.), Michael Crapo (R-Idaho), Tom Daschle (D-S.D.), and Tim Johnson (D-S.D.). The bill would give the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) the authority to register a Canadian pesticide in the United States if it is identical or substantially similar to a product presently registered for use in the United States by the EPA.
Tentative Program Highlights

TRADE SHOW
PRESIDENT’S RECEPTION AND WELCOME – Monday evening
SPEAKERS: SHELLEY THORPE (invited) • LAURIE RICHARDS (invited)
WORKSHOPS/EDUCATIONAL BREAKOUTS: (invited) Global Positioning Systems • Risk Management • Agriculture Certification
DANCING TO: Dorsey and Double Image – Tuesday evening
BEER AND WINE TASTING (invited)
AWARDS • GRAIN ART CONTEST/AUCTION • SILENT AUCTION
FARM PARTNER PROGRAMS
CHILDCARE PROVIDED (tentative)

Hotel Information
DOUBLETREE HOTEL RIVERSIDE
Boise, ID
(800) 222-8733 OR
(208) 343-1871
SPECIAL ROOM RATE: $92
Room rates are valid if reservations are made before NOV. 1, 2004

Convention Registration
ADVANCE REGISTRATION SAVES MONEY…REGISTER BEFORE NOV. 1, 2004

TWO DAY CONVENTION (Indicate the number attending)
Your registration includes all meetings, alternative activities, meals and trade show unless otherwise specified.
_____ Registration: $75 per person • Registration INCREASES to $100 on Nov. 1, 2004

SINGLE-DAY REGISTRATION INFORMATION ONLY (Indicate the number for each event):
Preconvention Charge - $50 each day • (On-Site Purchase is $60 each day)
___ Tuesday All day ___ Wednesday All day

ADDITIONAL MEAL TICKETS (Indicate the number for each meal):
Preconvention Charge - $25 each meal, each ticket • (On-site purchase is $35 each meal)
___ President’s Reception - Monday evening ___ Luncheon - Tuesday
___ Buffet Fun Night - Tuesday ___ Awards Luncheon - Wednesday
___ Banquet - Wednesday

Name_______________________________________ Spouse (if attending)_________________
Business/Company_______________________ Address_________________________________
City/State/Zip_______________________________ Phone______________________________
AMOUNT ENCLOSED ________________
Method of Payment: ___ Invoice Me ___ Check OR (Circle one) MasterCard Visa American Express
Credit Card # _________________________ Exp. Date __________ Signature ________________

CHILD CARE
In order to meet your needs for daycare, the following information is required:
Will you need the CHILD CARE service? _______ Yes _______ No
Name(s): ___________________________________ Age ______
_________________________________ Age ______
_________________________________ Age ______

Please Complete & Remit To:
IDAHO GRAIN PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION
821 West State Street
Boise, ID 83702-5832
(208) 345-0706
FAX (208) 334-2505
FISCAL YEAR 2004 ANNUAL REPORT

Forty-five years of service to Idaho’s wheat producers
s a new wheat crop goes into the storage bins, we turn our attention to the market and ponder how we might help Idaho growers get their best prices. This year the marketplace brings Idaho growers both opportunities and challenges.

One of the opportunities is the prospect of China making significant purchases of soft white wheat from Idaho and other PNW growing areas, after a nearly 30-year hiatus. There is a saying in China, “Mo zhe shi tou guo he,” which means, “feeling the stones on the river bed to cross the river.” This alludes to the Chinese preference for keeping stability while making major changes in a graduated manner. This practice is best illustrated by the different ways China and Russia opened their economies. The more gradual approach taken by China saved them from an implosion in their economy.

There are hints that China will need to begin buying large quantities of wheat, but it will be done in a “mo zhe shi tou guo he” manner. Purchases will begin modestly as they feel their way forward. If they like what they receive and if they are comfortable with all of the people relationships and business connections, then they will venture farther into the water until they have crossed the river, so to speak.

On the domestic marketing front one of the major challenges to increased milling and consumption of wheat has been the popularity of low-carb diets. Low-carb diets are not based on principles of healthy nutrition. As more consumers become aware that healthy lifestyles need to include grain food, the low-carb diets will wane in popularity. The low-carb diets have also caught the attention of the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the CDC is working on publishing accurate information that should help some grain-based food recover in sales.

In the meantime, Idaho wheat growers help support the Denver-based Wheat Foods Council (WFC). The WFC released a media kit in June that spelled out what happens when people cut carbohydrates from their diets. The WFC has also released a series of editorial cartoons, which help highlight the ridiculous nature of the claims made by low-carb diets. A sampling of the cartoons and some of the other low-carb information from the WFC is shown later in this magazine.

One other significant challenge in getting Idaho’s wheat to market is the high transportation costs in southern Idaho. The rail rates from most Snake River Valley communities, from Ashton to Twin Falls, continue to be higher than many other comparable wheat-growing areas. Needless to say, growers living in rural areas with competitive rail rates are able to get their crops to market easier than growers in areas with high rail rates. Idaho wheat growers are helping to fund the Alliance for Rail Competition (ARC), which is making progress on the legislative front toward more competitive rail rates.

At its board meeting on May 26 in Boise, the Idaho Wheat Commission approved a FY’05 budget of $1,801,062. This is down 6% from the FY’04 budget of $1,916,060. Nearly all of the money is spent toward helping the wheat producer grow better crops or in helping the producer get the crop to market. The pages that follow show some of those programs.

Blaine Jacobson
Idaho Wheat Commission
Financial Statement  
Growing for a Changing Market

Budget
July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004

The state of Idaho is divided into five districts. A representative for each district is appointed by the Governor to serve a five-year term on the Idaho Wheat Commission.

**DISTRICT 1**
Joe Anderson
Potlatch
(208) 875-0686

**DISTRICT 2**
Jim McDonald
Grangeville
(208) 983-0278

**DISTRICT 3**
Mark Darrington
Declo
(208) 654-2852

**DISTRICT 4**
Boyd Schwieder
Idaho Falls
(208) 522-8098

**DISTRICT 5**
Hans Hayden
Arbon
(208) 335-2325

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>2004 Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKET DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>546,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN MARKET DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>347,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC MARKET DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>17,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROJECTS</td>
<td>155,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH</strong></td>
<td>466,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIETY DEVELOPMENT - U of I</td>
<td>199,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEST MANAGEMENT - U of I</td>
<td>74,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION PRACTICES/TECH</td>
<td>47,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER - U of I</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROJECTS</td>
<td>60,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION &amp; EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td>507,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCER INFO &amp; EDUCATION</td>
<td>407,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSUMER INFO &amp; EDUCATION</td>
<td>98,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICE OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td>396,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY, BENEFITS &amp; PAYROLL TAX EXPENSE - STAFF</td>
<td>240,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL - STAFF &amp; MISC</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARD MEMBERS - SALARY, BENEFITS, PAYROLL TAX EXPENSE &amp; TRAVEL</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OVERHEAD</td>
<td>70,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL OUTLAY</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>1,916,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For years, the generally accepted view among Idaho wheat industry leaders has been that the places to increase demand for Idaho wheat is in export channels. A large share of the IWC market development funding has traditionally been allocated to the organizations that increase American wheat exports.

The export markets are still important to Idaho wheat, but a lower percentage of Idaho’s wheat is exported now vs. 20 years ago, as world markets have become more competitive. According to recent surveys, slightly more than half of Idaho’s wheat crop ends up in export channels and with the balance now going to domestic users. Twenty years ago, overseas customers bought more than two-thirds of Idaho’s wheat. In general, most of northern Idaho’s wheat is exported through Portland and most of southern Idaho’s wheat is used domestically in Ogden, Blackfoot, or California.

The IWC budget is invested heavily in export market development. About three-quarters of the market development budget is earmarked for Idaho’s participation in U.S. Wheat Associates and other export endeavors. But the IWC is spending more time looking for good investments in ways to develop the domestic market also.

**International Market Development**

U.S. Wheat Associates (USW) is the export-marketing arm of the American wheat industry. Through 17 offices worldwide, USW offers technical information, education, consultation and guidance to wheat buyers, millers and bakers from over 90 countries.

USW is dedicated solely to the American wheat farmer; funds provided by the wheat farmer are matched on a two-to-one basis by the U.S. Department of Agriculture from general tax funds.

**Domestic Market Development**

The Wheat Foods Council (WFC) works to increase consumption of wheat-based foods. The WFC has been instrumental in the effort to educate American consumers of the pitfalls of the popular low-carb diets. The WFC also makes sure wheat industry interests are represented in the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. These guidelines are updated every five years and become the basis for the Food Pyramid, National School Lunch Program and other federal nutrition standards.

The National Association of Wheat Growers (NAWG) gets some of its funding from the IWC and from other wheat-growing states. Major projects currently include rail competition, crop insurance enhancements and biotechnology acceptance. Through its “Home Grown” program, NAWG seeks to promote the farming families who feed the world.

Idaho wheat growers are helping to fund the Alliance for Rail Competition (ARC), which seeks more competitive rail rates. During the 2004-05 crop year, the IWC will continue to examine the transportation issue carefully to try to find some help for the Idaho wheat grower.

Other domestic market development initiatives will include information on emerging niche markets, and education of the grower on the varieties most preferred by the Blackfoot and Ogden mills. Those mills are quite happy with the soft white from Idaho but they import nearly all of their hard red wheat from the Montana or the Midwest. More information about domestic and international markets can be found on the IWC Web site: www.idahowheat.org.
Research covers a wide variety of issues with one goal: to offer growers the opportunity to improve efficiency and the value of their crop. IWC invests grower dollars in many research projects to help find solutions for the ever-changing marketplace, both overseas and domestically. A full description of research projects funded in FY2004 ($466,941) can be found on the IWC Web site: www.idahowheat.org.

Often information gained from several research projects comes together to a common end, such as the development of new varieties. Developing improved wheat varieties that have it all—quality attributes for end users along with yield, disease resistance and agronomic traits that growers want—is a continuing challenge.

Before a new wheat variety is released from the University of Idaho, input has been gathered from many different sources, funded in part with grower dollars, from: the U. of I. breeding programs in Moscow and Aberdeen; the Quality Assurance Lab, Aberdeen; research into resistance from Hessian Fly, stripe rust and other pests; field trials in nurseries throughout the PNW region to test for agronomic traits; and input from industry on quality attributes through the PNW Wheat Quality Council. All work together to make new varieties, like those highlighted below, available to Idaho growers. Changes in markets for end users and growers alike mean growing varieties to meet new demands.

New Varieties, Winter Wheats

Simon—Soft White Winter Wheat

Research supported by: Idaho Wheat Commission and the University of Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station. For additional information, contact: rzemetra@uidaho.edu.

Simon is the first soft white winter wheat released by the Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station with resistance to strawbreaker foot rot (Pseudocercosporella herpotrichoides). It has good to excellent yield potential in the intermediate to high rainfall areas of the Pacific Northwest.

Agronomic Considerations: Simon is a semidwarf wheat that is similar in height to Madsen. Heading date for Simon is two to three days earlier than that observed with Madsen under rain-fed conditions in northern Idaho, and about one day earlier than Madsen under irrigated conditions. Simon has good to excellent straw strength showing a similar lodging response as Madsen under rain-fed and irrigated conditions.

This new variety is high yielding under both rain-fed and irrigated conditions. It equaled or exceeded the yield of Madsen, Lambert and Weatherford in five years of advanced yield testing with a five-year average of 102 bushels per acre rain-fed and a five-year average of 149 bushels per acre irrigated. In the Western Regional Uniform White Winter Wheat Nursery, Simon had a slightly greater yield than either Madsen or Stephens over three years of testing.

End-use Quality: Simon has good end-use quality for a soft white winter wheat equaling or exceeding the end-use quality of Madsen over five years of testing. In the Pacific Northwest Wheat Quality Council testing, Simon was found to have acceptable end-use quality for a soft white winter wheat.

Disease Reactions: Simon has moderate resistance to stripe rust (Puccinia striiformis) based on regional testing. Simon has moderate resistance to strawbreaker footrot (Pseudocercosporella herpotrichoides) similar to that found in Madsen and appears to have an intermediate level of tolerance to Cephalosporium stripe (Hymenula cerealis) based on inoculated field trials. Simon is moderately susceptible to dwarf bunt (Tilletia controversa) and would require the use of a seed fungicide treatment if grown in a region where dwarf bunt can occur.
Moreland—
Hard Red Winter Wheat

Research Supported by: Idaho Wheat Commission, UI College of Ag & Life Science, and Kraft Foods. For additional information on Moreland and Gary, contact esouza@uidaho.edu.

University of Idaho irrigated field trials have shown Moreland to have an excellent combination of high yield and protein with bread quality superior to other current winter wheat cultivars.

Agronomic Considerations: Moreland has good winter hardiness for an irrigated winter wheat. It is between Garland HRW and Boundary HRW in height. The heading date for Moreland has been similar to Brundage (SWW) and at least four days earlier than Boundary and Stephens SWW. The earlier heading has also resulted in earlier maturity, with Moreland reaching hard dough four to seven days earlier than Boundary.

Across all irrigated production regions in the Pacific Northwest, Moreland has grain yield potential similar to Boundary HRW and significantly better than Garland and similar lodging resistance to Garland. It has good grain protein content if fertilized with recommended rates for target yield levels. Yields for Moreland are below top-yielding soft white cultivars like Brundage, yet have been similar to Stephens. It has performed well in higher rainfall zones of Oregon and Washington.

End-Use Quality/Crop Management: Moreland’s requirements for the number of units of nitrogen per acre per bushel of grain are similar to other HRW wheats. Growers familiar with producing soft white winter wheat may have to apply higher rates of total nitrogen per acre than with previous cultivars to achieve the full yield potential of Moreland, and have adequate grain protein for marketing.

As with any irrigated hard red wheat, growers should obtain a soil test and fertilize for target yield levels. In irrigated production and some high yield rain-fed production areas, growers should sample flag leaves at boot stage to measure nitrogen content of the plant tissue. If tissue sampling indicates low tissue nitrate levels, top-dress fertilizer should be applied at boot to flowering. Consult a local cooperative extension agent or crop consultant for recommendations on flag leaf sampling and fertilizer rates.

Disease Reactions: Moreland has adult plant resistance to stripe rust that is adequate for southern Idaho and most areas of Oregon and Washington. However, plant resistance may not hold in certain areas of irrigated production in central Washington where a fungicide application may be needed. Moreland is susceptible to snow mold and dwarf bunt, and should not be planted in areas with recurring snow mold. If planting Moreland in areas with dwarf bunt, a fungicide seed treatment for the control of dwarf bunt should be used.

Gary—
Hard White Winter Wheat

Agronomic Considerations: Gary is adapted to rain-fed production areas. It has been observed to emerge well in stress environments. It is a mid-stature winter wheat, similar in height and yield to Utah 100, and similar to the cultivar Golden Spike. Gary has significantly higher grain yield than Weston and has similar grain yield to Utah 100 and Promontory.

End-Use Quality: Gary has end-use quality suited to both domestic bread use and Asian noodle products.

Disease Reactions: Gary has excellent dwarf bunt resistance similar to Bonneville and Utah 100. It has resistance to races of stripe ruts prevalent in southern Idaho and snow mold tolerance.

Seed for these and other varieties may be obtained by contacting Kathy Stewart-Williams [(208) 423-6655], Kimberly Research and Extension Center, Kimberly.
The IWC supports a variety of programs aimed at providing information to growers, state and federal legislators, and the general public. The IWC receives information from the Idaho Grain Producers Association, the National Association of Grain Growers, U.S. Wheat Associates, and other organizations, regarding farm programs, trade issues, transportation and environmental concerns. Information is communicated back to the producers through the Idaho Grain magazine, cereal schools and workshops. The IWC is committed to educating the public through programs like Bread in the Bag, Ag in the Classroom, and the Wheat Foods Council. A full description of information and education programs can be found on the IWC Web site: www.idahowheat.org.

**Wheat Foods Council Highlights:**

Wheat Foods Council has been the only organization in the grain food industry focused on providing comprehensive grain food nutrition information targeted at audiences such as the media, public policy leaders, and health and nutrition leaders. The council is a unique organization because its leadership derives from a variety of industry segments to focus on common goals. Representatives from milling, manufacturing and wheat producer organizations utilize their specialized backgrounds to determine the best decisions for the industry.

Grain foods are a key part of the solution to a healthful diet and can assist with weight loss and weight management. Wheat Foods Council’s newest campaign, “It’s the Calories, Not the Carbs” has been distributed to leading dietitians, physicians, key trade publications, health/science writers and select consumer publications. The following low-carb poster and cartoons have appeared in national publications and newspapers.

![Cartoon of a scene where people blame each other for being overweight, but realize it's the carbohydrates that are the real culprit.](image)

**Grain Foods, Why Do Without?**

- **Cereal**
- **Grilled Cheese**
- **Spaghetti**
- **French Toast**

![Cartoons showing the cultural differences in healthy eating habits.](image)
stripe rust is the most important disease of wheat in the Pacific NW, "says Dr. Xianming Chen, a research plant pathologist with USDA-ARS in Pullman. "The disease affects all classes and types of wheat and occurs in agronomic zones worldwide."

Chen knows this pathogen well, having studied it for the past 22 years. "What is happening now is that the stripe rust pathogen is reinventing itself by mutating to form new 'virulent races.' Some cultivars that were resistant to the old races can’t fight off the ‘new’ ones."

As part of the Wheat Commission’s FY05 budget, funding was granted to Dr. Chen who is working with University of Idaho wheat breeders Bob Zemetra and Ed Souza to make the Idaho wheat germplasm resistant to the old and new races of stripe rust.

“We’ve been breeding resistance for stripe rust into our wheat varieties for decades, and for many years Chen’s program has assisted us in evaluating the stripe rust resistance,” says Zemetra. "Chen’s stripe rust field ratings appear in every UI cultivar release package."

Recently the new races have been evolving so quickly that testing all early-generation breeding materials for this disease along with the other agronomic and quality parameters incorporated in each wheat seed is more than one facility can adequately handle. With Chen’s help, UI wheat breeders can increase breeding line evaluation and race monitoring work, areas that directly impact growers.

Line of Attack

Wheat stripe rust has occurred sporadically in Idaho over the past 40 years, but has become much worse in the last two to four years. This is the trend worldwide, where today stripe rust is considered the No. 1 threat to wheat production in China, central Asia, Africa, Australia, Mexico and the United States. Nationally, estimates are that over the past four years nearly 145 million bushels of wheat have been lost due to this pathogen - and that is after fungicide applications.

The rust affects more than growers’ yields. Growers can also see a reduction in test weight and flour quality, and an impact on the protein/starch ratio - all of which hurt market acceptance.

Favorable weather conditions allowing a high level of inoculum production and the presence of susceptible cultivars is believed to have been the major cause of the rise in new stripe rust races. A string of mild winters has made a large portion of the PNW germplasm susceptible.

"The strength and tenacity of the stripe rust outbreaks is what surprised everyone," says Souza. "The resistance had been stable for years in many varieties, then it is overcome, almost overnight." Large portions of the Oregon, Idaho and Washington soft white spring wheat germplasm are now susceptible.

Some recent UI releases thought to be resistant are beginning to show signs of susceptibility, such as the soft white spring Jubilee, an irrigated version of Zak, and the hard white winter, Gary. Other varieties appear to be holding up and almost all the hard reds like Bonneville, Boundary, Delors and DW. Others seeming to hold at present are 377s, Lolo, Jefferson and Jerome.

"High disease pressure this year really strained the adult plant resistance of Moreland in the Washington basin," says Souza, ”But resistance is more than sufficient for southern Idaho and eastern areas of the Palouse like Latah County. Climatic conditions greatly impact severity of infection. In southern Idaho, stripe rust, although present, has seldom been a major threat."

Combining Forces

As Zemetra and Souza focus on developing varieties with higher yields, better quality attributes and resistance to a host of other pathogens, Chen will direct his efforts to stripe rust resistance. Working out of his lab in Pullman, he will gather field information on the resistance level in our breeding materials by planting lines in areas where regular infection will occur and evaluating the lines in the greenhouse in inoculated trials. Chen is also funded by the Washington Wheat Commission.

According to Zemetra, "Chen is currently evaluating intermediate- and advanced-generation material for stripe rust resistance in the greenhouse and field. The screening now includes all materials in the F6, F7 and F8 generations. This will help us test more lines and test earlier generations to make the breeding program more efficient."

Chen will also survey the occurrence, distribution and severity of rusts in general, and determine the population variation and epidemiology of wheat stripe rust. This will help create new germplasm for not only improving resistance to rusts in new cultivars, but also help develop new resistance genes to put into varieties already in the marketplace.

Results obtained from the rust survey will provide a better understanding of rust development and control. As information is gathered over time, a more accurate prediction of rust epidemics based on prevalence, distribution and severity of rust, together with susceptibility of cultivars, will help growers make decisions on whether and when to apply fungicides and to make decisions on which cultivars they should grow in the future.

"Even though stripe rust-resistant cultivars are identified this year," warns Chen, "that doesn’t mean a new strain can’t develop next year and make us start all over again."

When asked to list their No. 1 pest, most growers will say the one they are having trouble with today. However, breeders have to try to plan for the "what ifs." Even if weather conditions are not favorable for the fungus next year, recent memory reminds us of how quickly things can change and how important it is to have varieties with resistance to stripe rust - just in case.
Publications of Interest

Thanks in part to Idaho wheat grower dollars, the following publications were developed by Weed Scientists at the UI to address continuing concerns about weed management in Clearfield wheat systems and the impact of herbicide use in wheat production areas. Both are now available. For more information, contact CALS Publications, University of Idaho, (208) 885-7982, e-mail: agpubs@uidaho.edu or contact your local extension agent.

Information on Plantback Restrictions
To reduce the potential of harming rotational crops due to soil persistence of herbicides, growers can refer to PNW 571, Plantback Restrictions for Herbicides Used in the Dryland Wheat Production Areas of the Pacific Northwest. The publication describes what factors contribute to an herbicide’s persistence and which conditions in the field can influence it.

Selective or nonselective herbicides are applied at least once each year to the majority of all wheat, barley, canola, mustard, pea, lentil and fallow acres in dryland wheat production areas. Ideally, soil active herbicides control weeds during the growing season of the treated crop and dissipate to a nontoxic level before the next crop is seeded. However, they potentially can carry over and injure crops that follow. The bulletin condenses rotational crop restrictions from herbicide labels into one table and discusses important factors affecting herbicide dissipation in the soil.

Management Strategies for Clearfield Systems

Another recent publication is Management Strategies for Preventing Herbicide-Resistant Grass Weeds in Clearfield Wheat Systems. Rota
tions in low-, intermediate- and high-precipitation zones are covered. Management strategies for each are outlined. Use of the Clearfield system in winter wheat provides an unprecedented opportunity to selectively control jointed goatgrass and other grass weeds, such as downy brome and wild oat. There is concern that overuse of the technology will rapidly result in the selection of weed populations that are resistant to group 2 herbicides ALS inhibitors. Group 2 herbicides are more prone to select for resistant weed populations because several naturally occurring genetic mutations in the target weeds can produce resistant biotypes.

Hans Hayden Reappointed to Idaho Wheat Commission

Gov. Dirk Kempthorne has reappointed Hans Hayden of Arbon, Idaho, to a second five-year term on the Idaho Wheat Commission. Hayden represents the wheat producers of District Five, which includes: Bannock, Bear Lake, Caribou, Franklin, Oneida, and Power counties.

Hayden and his brother, Twain, grow wheat and hay on the family’s 3,500-acre farm in the Arbon Valley. In an average year, the Haydens raise 2,000 acres of wheat and 200 acres of alfalfa, with the rest of their land in summer fallow.

Hayden has been involved in local and state wheat activities for many years. He currently is the vice chairman of the board of directors for the Wheat Marketing Center in Portland, Ore., and also serves on the board for the Wheat Foods Council in Parker, Colo.

Monsanto Withdraws Biotech Wheat Applications For Roundup Ready Wheat

Monsanto recently announced that it would defer the commercialization of Roundup Ready wheat so that it can focus on other crops and traits. The company has also formally withdrawn all regulatory applications in all countries where submissions have taken place, except the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

Monsanto has asked that the U.S. FDA complete its consultation to confirm the food and feed safety of Roundup Ready wheat. The U.S. wheat industry supports this action, and the submission is technically complete, requiring minimal agency resources to complete.

Rail Rates Available

Have you ever wondered what the cost is to ship wheat by rail from points in Idaho to the Gulf, Laredo, Los Angeles or to PNW ports? Rail rates for these destinations were compiled for the IWC by Whiteside and Associates, Transportation and Marketing Consultants, Billings, Mont. Information is retrieved from freight tariffs lawfully published by BNSF and UP. Actual rates for wheat are published in Sicar in the tariffs. The freight rates have been further defined to represent a cents/bushel calculation based on average car loadings. The calculations provide reasonable estimates of average loadings and are available from the IWC office.
1st Annual PNW Preharvest Wheat Tour

This year marks the first time a "pre-harvest tour" for wheat industry members was held in Idaho, Oregon and Washington. Although Midwest wheat growers have held similar tours for the past 30 years, this was a first for the PNW.

Initiated by the Tri-state Wheat Commissions, the tour brought together a wide range of participants who drove through the countryside viewing the state of the PNW preharvest wheat crop as of the end of June.

Why do a preharvest crop tour? There were three major objectives in holding the tour. First, it was a way to take potential customers out in the field and introduce them to the growth cycle of wheat and the progress of the crop. Stopping in fields and estimating yields helped to reaffirm yield predictions and the overall quality of the crop. Second, it provided a way to increase interaction between all sectors of the wheat chain including growers, millers, bakers, exporters and government personnel. And finally, it provided increased exposure to each of the states and the quality ingredient being grown.

After inspecting nearly 230 fields in the three states, estimates indicated a good crop that should average about 80 bushels per acre. Both irrigated and dryland fields were surveyed. While soft white wheat fields predominated, there were some hard red and durum fields surveyed.

Idaho routes included southern Idaho around Burley and the Pocatello/Aberdeen/Blackfoot areas. Several carloads toured the eastern Washington and Oregon wheat fields, briefly taking note of fields near Lewiston.

Participants included representatives from Horizon milling, ADM Milling, Cereal Food Processors, Columbia Grain, CLD Pacific Grain, Continental Mills, the Consulate General of Japan, along with wheat growers, government and university representatives, and Commission members from the Tri States.

Plans are to expand the tour next year to include more of the wheat-growing areas of southern and northern Idaho, as well as increasing the number of participants. It is especially important to have growers participate in the tour so they can provide firsthand information about the crop and the area.

Boyd Schwieder Elected Vice Chairman of US Wheat Associates

Boyd Schwieder, Idaho wheat commissioner from Idaho Falls, recently began his service as vice chairman of U.S. Wheat Associates. Schwieder began his vice chairmanship during the U.S. Wheat Associates summer board meeting held in Bismarck, N.D., in July.

Moving up the ladder to assume the chairmanship will be Keith Kisling, a third-generation farmer from Oklahoma. Leonard Schock, a wheat grower from the big sky state of Montana was elected secretary-treasurer. Past chairman, Alan Lee from North Dakota, will assume the duties of chairman of the USW budget committee.

USW develops international markets for U.S. wheat on behalf of American wheat farmers. Through its market development work in more than 100 countries, USW works to increase wheat consumption and U.S. market share for all classes of U.S. wheat.

"Should You Be Growing Hard White Wheat?"

MARK YOUR CALENDAR!

Hard White Wheat Conference

November 4, 2004
9:30 to 2:30
Airport Ramada Inn
Spokane, WA

Contact Patricia Dailey at (208) 334-2353 or pdailey@idahowheat.org to register or for more information.

Updates will also be posted on the IWC website: idahowheat.org
Variety Testing

Idaho winter wheat varieties are evaluated each year to provide performance information to help growers select superior varieties for their growing conditions. The tests are conducted using farmer fields or on university experiment stations, and the varieties are grown under conditions typical for crop production in the area. Varieties are included in these tests based on their potential adaptation in an area and commercial use of a variety. The number of entries is limited due to resource availability. Individual plots were planted as 7 rows spaced 7 inches apart for 20 feet to 25 feet in length and replicated three or four times in a randomized complete block design.

Information Summarization

Agronomic performance data for 2003 winter wheat tests are summarized by Idaho districts in Tables 1-5. District I is northern, District II is southwest, District III is south-central, and District IV is southeast Idaho. Yield data is given for individual sites while other agronomic data is averaged over all the sites of each table. Bushel-per-acre yield results are based on 60 pounds per bushel at 11% moisture. Lodging ratings are the percent of a plot area lodged. Date of heading is the number of days after Jan. 1. Kernel hardness is on a 0 to 100 scale, with most soft wheat below 30 and hard wheats above 50. Average values are presented at the bottom of listings and are followed by a least significant difference (LSD) statistic at the 10% level.

Summaries of yield data from variety performance trials for 2001-03 are presented in Table 6 for all districts. These data represent results of 3 to 13 site/years and should be a good indication of long-term adaptability of a variety to a region.

Information Interpretation

Average past performance of a variety is the best indicator available to predict future performance potential. Variety performance can vary from location to location and year to year. The site results reported in this article are for 2003 trials; 1991 to 2002 results can be found in the summer 1992 to 1994, and fall 1995 through 2002 issues of Idaho Grain. Average performance over locations and years more accurately indicates varieties’ relative performance. Try to evaluate as much information as you can when selecting varieties. Yield is a primary characteristic used to select varieties, but disease resistance, maturity, lodging tendency, winter hardiness and quality characteristics such as protein, test weight and kernel hardness are also important variety selection considerations.

Reported small yield differences among varieties and other characteristics are usually of little importance due to chance differences in tests. An aid in determining true differences is the LSD statistic. If differences between varieties are greater than the 10% LSD value, the varieties are considered “significantly different.” This means that there is a 9 in 10 chance that the apparent difference between varieties is a true difference and not due to other experimental factors. If no significant differences are determined for a trial, n.s. is used in place of the LSD.

Further Information

Table 1. Dryland Winter Wheat Variety Performance in District I Near Nezperce, Lewiston, Genesee, Moscow and Bonners Ferry, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Test Weight</th>
<th>Plant Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nezperce</td>
<td>59 106</td>
<td>92 107</td>
<td>36 91</td>
<td>11.4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>62 120</td>
<td>101 102</td>
<td>55 97</td>
<td>11.0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>62 112</td>
<td>95 95</td>
<td>50 91</td>
<td>10.8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>53 102</td>
<td>87 87</td>
<td>53 81</td>
<td>12.0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonners Ferry</td>
<td>58 108</td>
<td>94 101</td>
<td>53 90</td>
<td>11.3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashup</td>
<td>65 126</td>
<td>92 95</td>
<td>40 95</td>
<td>11.2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearfield</td>
<td>70 106</td>
<td>91 106</td>
<td>35 93</td>
<td>11.3 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>76 122</td>
<td>98 97</td>
<td>34 99</td>
<td>10.9 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho 587</td>
<td>62 114</td>
<td>94 96</td>
<td>46 92</td>
<td>11.9 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madsen</td>
<td>56 131</td>
<td>104 108</td>
<td>46 97</td>
<td>11.1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>60 111</td>
<td>104 108</td>
<td>41 97</td>
<td>11.1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>68 125</td>
<td>106 109</td>
<td>51 102</td>
<td>11.1 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>63 154</td>
<td>95 101</td>
<td>41 93</td>
<td>11.2 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Irrigated Winter Wheat Variety Performance in District II at Parma, Weiser, and Grand View, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Test Weight</th>
<th>Plant Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brundage</td>
<td>131 106</td>
<td>96 95</td>
<td>26 89</td>
<td>10.9 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brun+Step Mix</td>
<td>142 114</td>
<td>97 95</td>
<td>41 97</td>
<td>11.6 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDO 587</td>
<td>144 106</td>
<td>94 95</td>
<td>41 97</td>
<td>11.0 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>153 107</td>
<td>95 95</td>
<td>34 89</td>
<td>11.8 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCF-101</td>
<td>126 107</td>
<td>96 95</td>
<td>34 89</td>
<td>11.6 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>138 118</td>
<td>96 95</td>
<td>34 89</td>
<td>11.6 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>135 107</td>
<td>95 95</td>
<td>34 89</td>
<td>11.6 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubbs</td>
<td>143 107</td>
<td>95 95</td>
<td>34 89</td>
<td>11.6 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>138 113</td>
<td>96 95</td>
<td>33 93</td>
<td>11.2 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Dryland Winter Wheat Variety Performance in District II at Midvale, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Test Weight</th>
<th>Plant Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brundage</td>
<td>67 115</td>
<td>64.0 30</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundage 96</td>
<td>65 12.9</td>
<td>59.1 31</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blau+Devar Mix</td>
<td>59 11.5</td>
<td>61.8 33</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>72 11.5</td>
<td>62.6 34</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho 587</td>
<td>66 12.6</td>
<td>61.4 35</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho 531</td>
<td>68 12.9</td>
<td>60.1 37</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>69 12.3</td>
<td>60.5 37</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smok</td>
<td>74 11.8</td>
<td>61.0 38</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabi</td>
<td>71 12.7</td>
<td>57.3 37</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherford</td>
<td>64 13.0</td>
<td>61.1 38</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbred 417</td>
<td>68 12.2</td>
<td>65.7 39</td>
<td>11.5 1.0</td>
<td>6.2 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Spring wheat
### Table 4. Irrigated Winter Wheat Variety Performance in District III and IV at Kimberly, Rupert, and Aberdeen, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Kimberly</th>
<th>Rupert</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NuHorizon</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Spike</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard White Residence</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declo</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (.10)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. 2001-2003 Winter Wheat Variety Average Yield Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Hard White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hard White</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District I</td>
<td>District II</td>
<td>District III</td>
<td>District IV</td>
<td>District V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ute</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohler</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacVicar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub bard</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finch</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Gamma Radiation Variability Assessment in Districts I and II, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard White Residence</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (.10)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. 2001-2003 Winter Wheat Variety Average Yield Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Hard White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hard White</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District I</td>
<td>District II</td>
<td>District III</td>
<td>District IV</td>
<td>District V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ute</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohler</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacVicar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub bard</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finch</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. 2001-2003 Winter Wheat Variety Average Yield Performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Hard White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hard White</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District I</td>
<td>District II</td>
<td>District III</td>
<td>District IV</td>
<td>District V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ute</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiller</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohler</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacVicar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub bard</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finch</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltan</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USDA is projecting record U.S. feed grain production and utilization in MY 2004-05...

In their July projections, USDA estimated U.S. feed grain production in MY 2004-05 (corn, barley, sorghum and oats) at 11.46 billion bushels (289 MMT), up 510 mbu from a year ago. Both harvested acres and yields are projected higher. Total feed grain supply is projected at 12.71 bbu (318 MMT), up 3% from 2003 and the highest since 2000-01.

Feed grain utilization is expected to hit record highs at 11.47 billion bushels vs. 11.19 bbu a year ago (up 2.5%) • Feed and residual – 6.17 billion bushels, down very slightly from 2003-04, accounting for 54% of total use.
• Food, seed and industrial (ethanol) 2.951 billion bushels, up 4.3%. Corn used to make ethanol in 2003-04 was estimated up 20% from the 996 million bushels used the previous year. Usage is pegged at 1.3 billion bushels in 2004-05, up another 9%. Gasoline prices have increased sharply from last year and have raised prices for ethanol, keeping demand strong.
• Exports – 2.35 billion bushels, up 8.4% from 2003-04. Feed and residual use for the four feed grains, plus wheat, is projected to be up slightly from last year. Corn is estimated to account for 92% of feed and residual use. Feed and residual use per grain consuming animal unit (GCAU) is projected at 1.81 MMT, up from 1.79 MMT a year earlier. Total GCAUs are projected 1% lower in 2004-05 at 88.6 MMT. Here is a more detailed breakdown of production by animal species:
• U.S. cattle on feed were 1% higher on June 1, 2004, but placements are expected to decline in both 2004 and 05 due to smaller calf crops.
• U.S. pork production is expected to be 3% higher, up 15 million pounds in 2005 from the 20.5 billion pounds projected in 2004.

• U.S. broiler production is projected to be 4% higher in both 2004 and 2005. Egg production is expected to be 1% higher.

Trade Policy Developments WTO approves Framework Agreement

Trade negotiators from the 147-member World Trade Organization met throughout the summer to meet a July 31 deadline to complete a Framework Agreement on agricultural subsidy reductions and market access commitments. Trade ministers from the United States, European Union, Australia, Brazil and India met several times during the past three months trying to broker an agreement between the so-called developed and developing countries. The late July deadline was driven by the distraction of U.S. elections and a change in EU Commission leadership later this fall. This Framework Agreement will be the starting point of further negotiations in 2005.

The Doha Development Round Framework Agreement included the following elements:
• Export competition – Elimination of export subsidies; elimination of trade distorting element of export credits (reduction of export credit repayment terms to 180 days); disciplines on food aid to prevent surplus disposal; and disciplines on trade distorting practices of State Trading Enterprises.
• Domestic support – Provides for strong element of harmonization, meaning that the largest subsidy levels will be cut the most. A tiered reduction formula will be applied to Amber Box (most trade distorting), Blue Box and de minimus supports, with each member expected to make a substantial and effective reduction in overall level of trade-distorting support. Amber Box supports will be capped on a product-specific basis and reduced from their respective average levels during a representative period. Member countries will be expected to cut all trade distorting domestic support by 20% in the first year.
• Market Access – Substantial improvements in market access will be achieved through a tiered formula that combines tariff rate quota commitments and tariff reductions applied to each product category, with some flexibility for so-called “sensitive” products. Again the principal of harmonization is incorporated, requiring the deepest cuts on the highest tariffs.
• Special and differential treatment for developing countries – Developing countries will be given extra flexibility in designating certain number of tariff lines as “Special Products,” given their need to address unique food security, livelihood security and rural development needs. Lesser tariff reduction commitments will be required from developing countries within each band of the tiered reduction formula.

### Barley Competitors in MY 2004/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MY 2001/02</th>
<th>MY 2002/03</th>
<th>MY 2003/04</th>
<th>MY 2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beg. Stocks</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Malts</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Stocks</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Farm Price</td>
<td>$2.22</td>
<td>$2.72</td>
<td>$2.83</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### US Barley S&D Projections in MY 2004/05

(million bushels, USDA, July 12, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MY 2001/02</th>
<th>MY 2002/03</th>
<th>MY 2003/04</th>
<th>MY 2004/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>5.74 (+4.6%)</td>
<td>0.55 (+4.8%)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-5.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>58.5 (+6.9%)</td>
<td>2.5 (+66.7%)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>(+86.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover</td>
<td>12.5 (+1.6%)</td>
<td>1.8 (-10.0%)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(+17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7.6 (-10.9%)</td>
<td>4.5 (-6.2%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(-11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>18.5 (+2.8%)</td>
<td>2 (-28.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(+11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>9.5 (+38.7%)</td>
<td>2.3 (+76.9%)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(-86.50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Report from the Idaho Barley Commission

Idaho Barley Commission FY 2005 Budget

$434,722 (4.6% less than FY 2004)
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What's New at the IBC...

Expanding markets for Idaho barley

- IBC will sponsor the American Heart Association’s Women’s Forum in Nampa in Fall 2004 to emphasize the heart-healthy benefits of barley.
- Eastern Idaho barley producers hosted a malting barley trade team from Taiwan on July 15. This team was comprised of representatives of the Taiwan Barley Industry Association and the Taiwan Tobacco & Liquor Corporation (TTLC). Taiwan’s brewing industry recently reorganized, moving away from government control to more private sector control. TTLC has expressed interest in evaluating 2-row malting barley varieties produced in Idaho. Until this time, they have used exclusively Australian malting barley and malt from Australia and Europe. Taiwan is a potential malting barley and malt market of 100,000 metric tons a year (4.5 million bushels), up from current demand of 60,000 to 70,000 tons (2.7 to 3.2 million bushels).

Finding solutions to pest problems

The IBC has implemented an aggressive research effort to combat severe crop losses from the Haanchen barley mealybug that was first confirmed in seven eastern Idaho counties in summer 2003. We have contracted with entomologists from the University of Idaho Aberdeen Research & Extension Center and from Livingston, Mont., to conduct research in the following areas:

- Determine overwintering, potential spread and host range for the Haanchen barley mealybug.
- Identify site-specific factors responsible for high mealybug damage.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of seed treatments and foliar chemical controls.
- Evaluate effects/impacts of natural predators (parasites) that will help us develop a biological control approach that will favor natural enemies and disadvantage mealybug populations.
- Evaluate different cultural practices that will be cost-effective in helping disrupt pest populations.

Educating producers on risk management and marketing opportunities

- IBC has received a fourth year of grant funding from the Western Center for Risk Management at Washington State University to sponsor grain producer education workshops throughout the state in 2004-05.
- IBC recently completed an extensive risk-management survey of Idaho grain producers to determine topics of greatest interest for future workshops.

Meet your IBC board members...

Evan Hayes is Chairman and District III Commissioner, representing barley producers from eastern Idaho. Evan is a barley producer from Soda Springs (lives in American Falls) and joined the IBC in July 2002. He is currently serving as Vice President of the National Barley Growers Association and will become President in July 2005.

Clark Kauffman is Vice Chairman and District II Commissioner, representing barley producers from South Central Idaho. Clark is a barley producer from Filer and joined the IBC in July 2000. He is a delegate to the US Grains Council and is past chairman of the Council’s Barley Task Force. He recently was selected to serve on the Council’s Asian Action Team.

Dan Mader is the newest board member, representing barley producers from District I in Northern Idaho. Dan is a barley producer from Genesee and joined the IBC in July 2004. He is serving on the boards of the National Barley Foods Council and National Barley Improvement Committee.

Steve Balster has served as the IBC Industry Representative since October 2002. Steve is Director of US Barley Operations for Busch Agricultural Resources Inc., based in Idaho Falls.
Developing new varieties with competitive agronomics and strong market potential

- IBC is working with barley breeders and geneticists at the USDA/ARS National Small Grains Germplasm Research Facility at Aberdeen on the improvement of barley germplasm in several key areas: high beta-glucan hulless barley for use in human foods; low phytic acid hulless barleys for use in fish and swine feeds; and winter malting barleys.
- IBC and ARS are teaming up to evaluate experimental barley lines at several locations in the state, including Potlatch, Tammany, Craigmont, Parma, Filer, Aberdeen, Soda Spring, Idaho Falls and Tetonia. These nurseries replace the variety trials previously conducted under the University of Idaho’s Barley Enhancement Program. BEP nurseries have been put on hold because of university funding constraints.
- IBC is funding a Specialty Barley Nursery in Parma to evaluate high beta-glucan hulless barleys for use in the barley fractionation/ethanol plant that is being developed outside of Ontario, Ore.

IBC invests in national organizations...

National Barley Growers Association (NBGA) adopts 2004 policy priorities

- Trade Policy – NBGA supports the July 2002 U.S. proposal for WTO agricultural trade negotiations. The centerpiece of the U.S. proposal is harmonization, meaning that the highest levels of import protection (tariffs) and trade-distorting domestic support will be cut the most. The United States also has supported the elimination of all export subsidies.
- Domestic Farm Programs – NBGA urges USDA to calculate daily marketing loan repayment rates based on legitimate terminal market locations and actual terminal market values for feed barley.
- Taxes – NBGA supports the elimination of estates taxes, a reduction in capital gains taxes and re-establishment of the investment tax credit for farmers and ranchers.
- Crop Insurance – NBGA supports preserving the malt barley Option B endorsement and supports adjusting the malt barley coverage to more accurately reflect malt industry quality standards, particularly maximum acceptable protein levels.
- Research – NBGA supports the funding priorities established by the National Barley Improvement Commission, including a $200,000 enhancement for barley research at the ARS National Small Grains Germplasm Research Facility in Aberdeen, Idaho.
- Transportation – NBGA supports passage of Rail Competition legislation. NBGA supports renewable fuel incentives, including ethanol and biofuels.
- Environment and Conservation – NBGA supports Pesticide Harmonization legislation that will help ensure a more level playing field between grain producers in the United States and Canada.
- IBC’s membership dues in 2004-05 are $23,486.

U.S. Grains Council (USGC) receives $10.8 million in federal funding through the USDA’s Foreign Market Development and Market Access Programs

- The USGC is a nonprofit partnership of U.S. barley, corn and sorghum producers and agribusinesses committed to building international markets for U.S. grains. The council is headquartered in Washington, D.C., and has 10 international offices and market development programs in more than 50 countries.
- USGC has invested barley marketing funds in several counties, including feed barley promotions in Japan and malting barley and malt promotions in Taiwan, South Korea, China, Mexico and Latin America.
- USGC and IBC will host three barley trade teams in summer 2004 from Taiwan (July 15), Japan (Aug. 4-5) and Mexico (Aug. 11-12).
- IBC’s contribution in 2004-05 is $36,000.

National Barley Foods Council (NBFC) submits petition to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for cholesterol-lowering health claim

- NBFC is a nonprofit organization that was established in 1989 to promote barley food consumption in the United States and is headquartered in Spokane, Wash.
- 2004-05 program priorities will focus on identifying barley nutrition benefits as they relate to current health issues facing American consumers, including cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes and obesity.
- NBFC will emphasize its “Eat Smart. Eat Well” message by offering practical meal solutions and culinary benefits of barley, including versatility, year-round availability and economical meal stretcher.
- After two years of clinical human feeding trials and extensive scientific documentation, NBFC submitted a petition to the USDA in September 2003 to approve a health claim that barley consumption lowers cholesterol and the risk of cardiovascular disease. Results from the most recent Women’s Clinical Study has been accepted for publication by the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition.
- NBFC maintains current barley food news, recipes and nutrition updates on its official Web site, www.barleyfoods.org, which typically receives 50,000 to 60,000 hits a month.
- IBC’s contribution in 2004-05 is $12,000.
Faster than a speeding bullet...Stronger than a locomotive...and able to leap your expectations in a single harvest.

Introducing the all-new 60 Series Combines...machines so powerful and productive, you’ll practically fly through small grains.

Choose from eight new models, including the new 375-hp Class 8 9860 STS, the largest, most-productive machine John Deere has ever produced. And only John Deere offers you a choice of three threshing/separating systems: proven cylinder/walker technology, Cylinder Tine-Separation (CTS), and innovative Single Tine-Separation (STS).

Together, the 60 Series represents a seismic shift in harvesting technology, with all-new levels of capacity, performance, and efficiency. Some might even say it’s super.

See your John Deere dealer, and take a closer look at the new Super Power in harvesting, today.