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Even more so than in days past our board will be a key to the success of our industry and operations.

Remember watching a movie with your parents when you were a teenager and that unexpected R-rated scene made everyone a little bit uncomfortable? All of the sudden everybody got hungry, or thirsty, or had to make a phone call. Fast forward ten years, and somebody brings up succession planning. Oddly enough the lawn needs to be mowed, we’re behind in the plowing, it’s a spray day, or we bring up whatever other diversion we can muster. I would like to take a few lines to discuss this popular subject and combine it with another blockbuster hit, serving on industry boards.

If you’ve attended a Wheat League Conference in the last fifteen years, you’ve heard every pitch imaginable for the necessity of having a transition plan in place. We hire big money people to use humor, logic, pride, wisdom, guilt — all in the hopes that if they cast a big enough net they may just get a few people caught. And I think it’s getting through … to some. My hope is that it will get through to all as we next-generationers seek the reigns. Personally, I am very proud that both my and my wife’s family have engaged the process and look to provide a path forward for us, while making sure our parents and grandparents are duly respected and rewarded for their toil in building the operations. I can tell you that while we have had some bumps along the way, I have had some of the best conversations with my parents, my brother, and our spouses about putting some structure on how we move forward. It has been a tremendous asset to further understand their goals and expectations and have a forum to outline mine. In working through the process and listening to the professionals, I have come up with a few headlines I would like to share:

1. It’s only a problem if it’s a problem and it is rarely a problem if it is dealt with in advance.
2. Your relationship with your neighbor is as good as the fence you build, as is the quality of your partnership related to the document which spells out the relationship.
3. Owners get paid dividends and employees get salaries. There is a HUGE difference in getting paid for what you do and getting paid for what you own.
4. Attorneys usually spend a lot less time helping you sort out what you are going to do than they do helping settle issues over what you did.

So, there you have them, my words of wisdom. Often times succession planning is a difficult topic, but there are lots of professionals that can help you tackle the issue and lots of examples of what not to do!

Now from the conference table (in the attorney’s office) to the board table; I became the Umatilla County President of the Wheat League at the first county meeting that I attended. It was a similar story with my movement into the Environment and Regulations Committee Chair.

Just as succession planning is important to the future success of your farm, it serves an equally important role in the Oregon Wheat Growers League and the agricultural industry as a whole. We need to seek out and identify growers and engage them before we have a seat to fill on the board. It’s imperative that we cultivate an understanding of the issues within the grower community as a first step in creating a succession plan for the organization. This requires that we first make our issues attractive enough and prove their relevance to their bottom line that someone not on the board would take an interest in them. Second, we need to have a structure in place so that people engage in and learn the topics. Even more so than in days past our board will be a key to the success of our industry and operations.

And it’s not just a Wheat League issue. The number of farmers has been on a steady decline for decades. Consequently, ag organizations are faced with recruiting a higher percentage of their constituents to serve in a representative capacity, all while a smaller number of people are doing a larger share of the farming. Local co-ops, the Farm Bureau, Oregonians for Food and Shelter, Farm Credit, FSA — they are all competing for quality, reasoned farmers to sit on their boards. The only way that these boards and others will continue to be effective in the long term is to broaden the pool of QUALIFIED applicants.

We often get asked, “how are we going to stand up to these regulatory agencies or environmental groups?” How do we keep our tools in place or get our story told? I have found there are two choices — a really good, really expensive attorney or a really effective industry board.

See you at the next board meeting and good luck with harvest. ◆
Responding to assessment questions

Blake Rowe, CEO, Oregon Wheat

In the last few months, the Commission staff has fielded several calls from our growers about the details regarding the assessment on wheat and barley grown in Oregon. There has been significant confusion about the assessments application on organic production and wheat or barley sold for feed. As a result, I thought it might be useful to use my column to review some of the facts about our assessment system.

Our statutes and rules were revised and updated in 2011 when the Oregon Grains Commission was merged into the Oregon Wheat Commission. The general statutory provisions that create the Commission and authorize the assessment are found in the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) chapter 578 and can be found on line at http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/578.html. The rules, Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) sections 678-010-0010 through 678-010-0050, online at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_600/oar_678/678_tofc.htm, provide an amplified explanation of the law, so it is important to look at both to gain a full understanding of our system. For those of us that are not aspiring lawyers, I have tried to pull out some of the key language for your consideration.

ORS 578.211(1) authorizes the Commission to “… assess, levy, and collect an assessment … on all units of wheat … and on units of any other grains grown or produced in this state and sold in commercial channels.” Currently we only levy assessments on wheat and barley, but other grains could be assessed if their production volumes increased and there was a need for investments in research or marketing for those crops. Commercial channels are defined in ORS 578.010(1) as “… any commercial buyer, dealer, processor, cooperative, or to any person, public or private, …” Sales include “… the sale of wheat or other grains for use as food, feed, seed, or any industrial or chemurgic use, …”. The definition of commercial channels also includes any person “…who resells any wheat or other grains or product produced from wheat or other grains.” This clause includes anyone who converts wheat or barley, that has not been previously assessed, into another product for resale, like flour.

While the statute creates the Commission and authorizes the assessment, the rules contain the process the Commission follows to set the assessment rate and the mechanics of how the assessment is collected. OAR 678-010-0020 contains definitions needed for the assessment program. Many are the same as those in the statute, but they also cover additional details like how the assessment applies to crop share arrangements and lienholders. The “first purchaser” is defined as “any person, corporation, association or partnership that buys wheat from the grower in the first instance, or any lienholder, public or private, who may possess wheat, barley, or both from the grower under any lien, or any handler who receives wheat, barley, or both in the first instance from the grower for resale or processing.” This definition is particularly important because the first purchaser is generally responsible for collecting the assessment and reporting it to the Commission when they purchase wheat or barley from growers.

The current assessment rates for wheat ($0.05/bushel) and barley ($1/ton) are found in OAR 678-010-0030 and the payment provisions in OAR 678-010-0040. The latter section (0040) also contains a provision for growers to self-report their sales and pay their assessment directly to the Commission, if the first purchaser doesn’t meet this responsibility.

It is clear that the wheat and barley assessment in Oregon is intended to be very broad-based. There is no exemption for organic production or for sales for feed or biofuels. The only significant exemption from the assessment is found in OAR 678-010-0040(6), which says that the assessment doesn’t apply “where a grower uses their own production for personal use (i.e. seeding, feeding livestock, destruction).” The broad-based assessment makes sense, given that the research, marketing, and educational programs supported by the assessment are of benefit to all growers.

The commodity assessment provides the funds needed to promote the interests of growers through market development, research, and public education. The Commission administers these funds and works with long term partners like Oregon State University, US Wheat Associates, the Wheat Marketing Center and the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Research and marketing programs take years of sustained effort to be successful and the grower dollars have become vital parts of these efforts. The varieties we grow, our agronomic practices, the markets we serve, and a grower’s profitability have all been greatly and positively affected by the investments made possible by our commodity assessment.

Please keep in mind that this is intended to be a general overview of our system and not legal advice. If you have specific questions about the application or payment of the assessment in any particular situation, please contact the staff at the Commission office in Portland (503-467-2161) and we will do our best to get answers for you.

◆
Regional approaches to climate change for Pacific Northwest agriculture: Climate science NW farmers can use

Steve Petrie

The topic of climate change is filled with questions: How much will the climate change over what time span? What effects will the projected climate changes have on my wheat crop? What effect will climate change have on the pests like diseases, insects, and weeds that hinder my crop? What kind of regulations might we face? Might I really get paid to manage nitrogen fertilizer or soil carbon? The list could go on for pages.

A host of climate models for the Pacific Northwest (PNW) all project overall warmer temperatures, especially in the summer, and many project drier summers as well. On the other hand, winters may be wetter in the future. These projected changes in temperature and moisture will affect dryland wheat and barley crops as well as the pests that attack the crops. Climate models also predict changes in the timing and availability of water for irrigated crops in some areas in the region.

Scientists from the PNW have joined together to begin to answer some of these questions as they relate to wheat production systems. REgional Approaches to Climate CHange for Pacific Northwest Agriculture (REACCH-PNA) consists of a team of more than 30 scientists from Oregon State University, the University of Idaho, Washington State University, and the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This $20 million, five-year project aims to ensure the long-term viability of cereal-based farming in the inland Pacific Northwest amid a changing climate and to identify farming practices that can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We are conducting field research at eight research farms and various private farms in northeastern Oregon, southeastern Washington and Idaho’s panhandle. The long term experiments at the Pendleton and Sherman Stations of the Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center will be important resources for this project because they are the oldest crop management experiments in the western US and they represent a range of practices from burning to manure application and plowing to no-till. We are using a holistic approach to study the following:

- the relationship between climate change and cereal crops, primarily winter wheat
- how production practices might contribute to or help mitigate climate change
- what farming methods might help these crops be more resilient to changing climate conditions
- factors that influence decisions about crop management

The scientists represent a broad array of disciplines including agronomy, climate science, computer science, economics, entomology, geography, plant pathology, rural sociology, soil science, weed science and more. REACCH-PNA builds on the teamwork and collaboration fostered by Solutions to Environmental and Economic Problem (STEEP) and other regional research projects and includes all three aspects of land grant institutions: research, Extension, and teaching. A number of OSU scientists are involved in the REACCH-PNA project including:

- John Antle, Agriculture and Resource Economics
- Susan Capalbo, Agriculture and Resource Economics
- Stephen Machado, Dryland Cropping System Agronomist at CBARC
- Phil Mote, Oregon Climate Change Research Institute
- Steve Petrie, Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center
This project was funded by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) starting in February 2011.

One of the first steps in our project is to collect baseline data on various greenhouse gas emissions as well as various indicators of water quality so that we can assess the impacts of any changes that come about as a result of this project. Monitoring will continue throughout the project.

Integrating existing computer models is a key part of REACCH-PNA, including regional climate modeling, crop modeling, and economic modeling. Testing, validating, and integrating these various models should help us understand how the climate is projected to change in the PNW and how these changes may affect crops and cropping system profitability.

Much of our field work addresses two broad goals; first, figuring out how to reduce the potential impacts of various farming practices on the emission of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO2) and nitrous oxide (N2O) (referred to as “mitigation”), and second, reducing the effects of the projected climate changes on agricultural production (referred to as “adaptation”).

Our work on mitigation includes increasing our understanding of how various production practices such tillage and cropping intensity affect the potential of the soil to sequester or emit CO2, primarily through the loss or gain of soil organic matter. Production practices such as direct seeding may reduce or even halt the decline of soil organic matter, especially when coupled with more frequent cropping and the addition of supplemental organic materials. Improved soil organic matter, particularly at or near the soil surface, can pay dividends to growers through reduced soil erosion, increased water infiltration, and increased yields. Finally, various ‘green payments’ may be available to growers, which make these practices even more financially attractive.

Nitrous oxide is a potent greenhouse gas and the primary source of N2O is nitrogen (N) fertilizer. Practices that increase N fertilizer use efficiency (NUE) such as precision applications and more accurate recommendations can reduce the potential for N loss as N2O, a win-win situation for growers.

Research related to adaptation includes evaluating cropping systems or management strategies that are more suitable for the conditions are likely to occur under the projected climate changes. We will evaluate cropping systems that include more crops and less fallow, greater cropping system diversity including oilseed crops, increased use of amendments that promote greater nutrient cycling, and practices that increase water and nutrient use efficiency. The success of many of these factors will be determined by the environmental conditions throughout the region.

Biological stresses on cereal production such as diseases, insects, and weeds are likely to change as the climate changes. An important part of our work is designed to anticipate these changes, predict the implications for crop management, and begin to develop strategies to address these biological stressors.

Farming systems are more than simply weather and climate and biology — they are managed by people who make decisions based on economics, policies and other factors. A significant part of REACCH-PNA is to better understand the social and economic factors that growers face and how public policy can affect these factors. Growers will be surveyed about their farming operations, and this baseline information used to help assess our success.

REACCH-PNA also includes an education component which has the goal of showing K-12 teachers how agriculture can play a role in climate change mitigation and adaptation. REACCH-PNA is also preparing curricula for undergraduate and graduate education so that citizens and professionals are better prepared to address climate-related challenges and understand the role of agriculture in these challenges.

Finally, one of the most important aspects of REACCH-PNA is communicating the results of this work to stakeholders so that improved farming methods are put into practice. A key to our success will be actively involving stakeholders including farmers, state and federal agencies such as state departments of agriculture and EPA, wheat grower organizations such the Oregon Wheat Growers League, input industries who supply fertilizers and chemicals, and environmental organizations that are working to reduce climate change. Our Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) has been actively involved in REACCH-PNA from the initial meeting to the preparation of the proposal to our Launch Meeting in March of 2011 and the first Annual Meeting held in Pendleton from February 29 to March 2, 2012. The SAC members provided key input that helped shape the successful proposal and their on-going involvement is essential to the success of REACCH-PNA.

Members of the SAC from Oregon include:

- Blake Rowe, administrator of the Oregon Wheat Commission and Oregon Wheat Growers League
- Walt Powell, Vice President of OWGL
- Jeff Newtson, Farmer and former President of OWGL
- Jerry Zahl, Chair of the Pendleton Station Liaison Committee
- Lori Brigotti, Board of the Pacific Northwest Direct Seed Association
- Steve Campbell, NRCS state office in Portland
- Kevin Hudson, Farming Manager for the CTUIR
- Jim Petersen, VP of research at Limagrain
- Ben Vitale, The Climate Trust, Portland
- Patrick Mazza, Climate Solutions, Portland

The three land grant institutions and the USDA-ARS share a long history in the PNW of collaborative efforts that have benefitted cereal crop farmers. REACCH-PNA continues and expands on this tradition. I invite you to visit the REACCH-PNA website at http://reacchpna.uidaho.edu to learn more about the project.
Technology rules. Oregon’s wheat country is no exception. Today’s farmers use precision electronics for site-specific applications of seed, fertilizer and pesticides. Many of the advances are geared toward ecosystem protection. But farmers are nothing if not pragmatic. Few would invest in the expensive, environmentally friendly equipment if it didn’t pencil out on their balance sheets.

So says Walter Powell, vice president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League (pictured). On his farm, which rambles across 380 acres in the hamlet of Condon, tractors are fitted with the latest in electronic sensors and GPS software. His “auto-steer” and “auto-boom” devices are fine-tuned to prevent over-use of chemicals.

Powell is more than happy to give nature a break. But in his day-to-day operations, new technologies have to make sense economically. Turns out, they do. Adopting precision equipment has saved Powell significant costs on fuel and “inputs” — materials that growers add to soils and crops to boost yields, repel pests and block weeds.

That’s what he told Oregon Sen. Jeff Merkley when they sat face to face in Merkley’s Washington, D.C., office last spring. With the new Farm Bill making its way through Congress, Powell was lobbying for continued government support for EQIP, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Environmental Quality Incentives Program, which he regards as a life-support system for precision agriculture.

“Sen. Merkley is a tech guy,” Powell says. “He got really interested when I started telling him about the impact of precision technology for cutting down on pesticide residue and nitrate leaching. All of a sudden, this grower from Eastern Oregon and the senator from Portland were speaking the same language.”

On climate change, Powell is equally forward-looking. “I’m less skeptical about climate change than most growers,” he says. Off the top of his head, he cites recent climate studies by the International Energy Agency and “ex-skeptic” Richard Muller of the University of California, Berkeley. Then he chuckles. “ Farmers do read, you know.”

Any other name

Steve Petrie has worked with Powell and other growers for decades. A soil scientist and director of OSU’s Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center, which has experimental farms at Pendleton and Moro, Petrie knows wheat like the back of his sun-browned hand. He also understands the staunchly conservative community that produces that wheat, which in Oregon grossed $354 million in 2010. On climate change, he reports, their attitudes range from “full acceptance to healthy skepticism to outright rejection.”

But the range of views doesn’t worry him. Even though growers are key participants in a $20 million USDA-funded study of climate impacts on cereal crops in the Pacific Northwest, they don’t have to buy into the science or terminology of global warming in their role as stakeholder advisers, argues Petrie, who served on the Agricultural Technical Committee of the Oregon Global Warming Commission. After all, adapting to nature’s fluctuations is what farmers do every day to survive. It’s in their DNA.

“We’re doing research into better farming practices under changing conditions,” says Petrie, one of the managers for the Oregon portion of the three-state study. “If some of our stakeholders are skeptical about it, that’s OK because they’ll still benefit from the practices that are developed through this research.”

Stephen Machado agrees. “The term ‘climate change’ has been so politicized,” says the OSU agronomist and crop
physiologist who grew up in Zimbabwe. “Growers have been adapting to changing conditions all along. Right now we just have a fancy name for it.”

The growers on the stakeholders advisory committee aren’t shy about challenging the scientists. “The stakeholders come to our meetings and ask really tough questions,” says Petrie. “It helps ground us. In our world of science, sometimes we forget about the practicality of things. For the growers, everything is really down to earth.”

Amber waves
The Palouse is an ancient landscape of ice-carved hummocks and hollows rippling across northeastern Oregon, southeastern Washington and north-central Idaho. In all but a few spots, native grasses long ago gave way to fields of wheat, along with some dry peas, lentils and alfalfa.

For 80 years, OSU has studied wheat from every angle. Disease resistance, yield potential, milling and baking qualities, soil erosion and pesticide use are just a few. Now, along with neighboring land grants Washington State and the University of Idaho, OSU is expanding those experiments to look at how grain crops will fare under future climate conditions. By feeding their data into WSU-designed computer models, the researchers will generate a range of possible scenarios.

Petrie anticipates that growers could wind up with more invasive plants, more destructive pests and new disease outbreaks as winters become warmer and summers become wetter.

“We can begin to make inroads in our understanding with this five-year study,” says Petrie. “But we really have to look at this as part of a 50-year process or, actually, a forever process — always adapting our cropping practices to fit the world in which we’re growing crops, whether the conditions are due to climate change or some other factor.”

Reprinted with permission – terra: a world of research and creativity at Oregon State University, Special Issue: Oregon’s Climate, Winter 2012
Identifying federal farm programs’ potential overlaps

Because farm program designs and purposes vary, producers may participate in, and receive benefits from, multiple programs on the same farm, increasing the potential for overlap.

Erik J. O’Donoghue, Anne B. Effland, Joseph C. Cooper

- ERS researchers have defined how overlap among farm safety net programs can occur and developed a revenue-based approach to identify and measure overlap among programs.
- As an example of measuring overlap, researchers explored ways that the Federal crop insurance revenue program can interact with the Average Crop Revenue Election program and found evidence of potential overlap for certain types of farms in select locations.
- The availability of various combinations of programs can alter producers’ farm management and production decisions in complex ways that may require case-by-case analysis, for example, when policy provisions link benefits across programs.

The Nation’s current fiscal crisis has generated increasing demands for cuts from all portions of the U.S. budget. Despite their relatively small share of the total U.S. Federal budget (less than one-half of 1 percent), farm programs are drawing attention from both the media and Congress. This has been spurred partly by observations that farmers continue to receive some Government support even though commodity prices and farm income have been high since 2007. The focus has intensified in recent months as many support programs authorized under the 2008 Farm Act will expire in 2012. Farm groups, legislators, and other stakeholders have proposed various options for reorienting programs to replace the current Farm Act within the context of a declining Federal budget.

Producers typically participate in multiple programs

A growing number of policies have been put in place over the years to provide U.S. farmers some form of an economic safety net. The resulting complexity has given rise to public concern about possible duplication in the farm safety net.

In general, the farm safety net focuses on farm business viability and includes the various commodity, risk management, and disaster assistance programs. Conservation programs, though often involving direct payments to producers, are generally not considered safety net programs because they are designed to address environmental concerns rather than farm business viability. Federal farm safety net programs that provide payments to farmers can be divided broadly into two categories—income support and risk management.

USDA’s Farm Service Agency (FSA) administers income support programs, including direct payments (DP), counter-cyclical payments (CCP), and marketing loan benefits (MLB). Risk management programs include the relatively new Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program along with all forms of disaster assistance (both administered by FSA), as well as crop insurance (administered by USDA’s Risk Management Agency (RMA)).

This wide array of programs can support either specific commodities or whole-farm revenues. Program expenditures can vary across regions and time, depending on factors such as market conditions, weather patterns, and pest infestations.

Because program designs and purposes vary, producers may participate in, and receive benefits from, multiple programs on the same farm. For example, FSA administrative data show that more than 99 percent of farms growing cotton in Texas in 2007 received direct payments, more than 99 per-
cent received countercyclical payments, 13 percent received marketing loan benefits, 23 percent received crop disaster payments, and 2 percent received livestock disaster payments. (Note: the above payments could be from any program crop grown on the farm, not necessarily cotton.) Because producers can—and often do—participate in multiple programs, they may receive both higher levels and a wider array of program benefits when commodity prices drop or crop yields decline, increasing the potential for overlap. However, simply receiving support from multiple sources does not mean that overlap is occurring among programs within the farm safety net. Identifying overlap requires defining overlap, analyzing the interactions among programs, and measuring how those interactions may lead to overlapping support.

Defining and measuring overlap
Suppose for the sake of simplicity that the Government desires to provide farmers a guaranteed revenue, defined as the minimum dollar amount the farmer is guaranteed to receive through a combination of farm product sales and Government support programs. Under this hypothetical goal, if a farmer receives support from more than one program and total revenue (the dollar amount received from the sale of farm output and farm programs) exceeds guaranteed revenue, overlap has occurred. The next step requires determining how to calculate farm revenues. ERS researchers developed a method of calculating farm revenues based on the methods used to determine payments under USDA’s new Supplemental Revenue Assurance (SURE) program, linking their research directly to Government payment provisions.

The SURE program, which provides a revenue-based supplement to crop insurance, contains a unique set of provisions that researchers could adapt to determine the potential for overlap among programs. The SURE program considers the broad suite of USDA’s farm program support mentioned earlier as part of actual farm income when calculating the whole-farm income to compare against the expected market revenue guarantee. Expected market revenue refers to the dollar amount the producer expects to receive from the sales of the farm output given expectations of prices and yields. Based on the principles of the SURE payment calculation, researchers developed methods to calculate total revenues that can be compared with the guaranteed level of expected market revenue. This approach also allows researchers to determine the extent of overlap and which combination of programs could potentially lead to overlapping payments. ERS researchers employed the method in a simulation model to examine the likelihood that producer participation in selected combinations of programs would lead to this type of overlap.

The potential for overlap
The ACRE program provides payments to a farmer if a program commodity’s State and farm-level revenues both fall below guarantees that are determined using recent prices and yields. Because ACRE insures revenues, it has the potential to target some of the same revenue losses as Federal crop insurance programs, thereby generating overlapping support within the farm safety net. ERS researchers simulated the interaction between the ACRE program and revenue-based insurance (assuming the producer elects 70 percent revenue coverage) for average corn, soybean, and wheat farms in four counties: Logan County, IL; Butler and Finney Counties, KS; and Barnes County, ND. Data sets of prices and yields were simulated from 1975 to 2008 yield data from USDA’s National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), futures prices at planting and harvest over the same period, and farm-level yield variability information derived from RMA crop insurance premiums. These simulated data sets then served as the basis for calculating gross revenue, ACRE payments, crop insurance indemnities, and SURE payments for representative farms in each county examined.

While a farmer’s ACRE revenue support payment is based on the extent to which State crop revenues fall below guaranteed levels, findings from the simulations suggest that the ACRE program covered a significant portion of the farm-level revenue risk. Not treating the ACRE payment as part of a farmer’s crop revenue exaggerates the year-to-year changes in total farm revenue, making it larger than it would be if ACRE were considered part of revenue, and effectively
causing ACRE to overlap with some of the benefits provided by purchasing Federal crop insurance. For the representative farms studied in these select locations, policy designs that explicitly account for overlapping coverage provided by participation in ACRE may lower a farmer’s actuarially fair crop insurance premium by an estimated 10 to 41 percent. (The magnitude of the reduction depends on how closely the farmer’s revenue moves with the average State revenue—the more closely they move together, the larger the potential premium reduction.)

Further ERS research extended the analysis to corn, soybean, and wheat farms in Minnesota and South Dakota and examined how overlap could change if ACRE were altered from a State-level program to either a national-level or a county-level program. Findings again suggested overlap between ACRE and revenue-based crop insurance. If the overlap between the two programs was accounted for, insurance premiums could drop between 6 and 29 percent with a national-level ACRE trigger, between 20 and 38 percent for a State-level trigger, and between 29 and 45 percent for a county-level trigger. Because researchers only explored the interaction between these two programs for certain types of farms in select locations, however, these results cannot be generalized for all U.S. farms.

Simulations also showed that producers may alter their management decisions (such as crop insurance coverage levels and the number of planted acres) in response to the availability of different combinations of programs. For example, because SURE benefits rise (up to a point) with increased levels of crop insurance coverage, making SURE available in conjunction with a crop insurance revenue program tended to induce a farmer to select a higher level of crop insurance coverage.

Simulations involving more complex combinations of programs, however, led to some surprising outcomes. Results show that, even in the absence of overlap (since the SURE provisions work to preclude overlap with other programs), the use of different combinations of programs to address farm business viability could have unexpected effects on farmers’ decisions. For example, making a second risk management program available to farmers enrolled in a crop insurance program induced them to plant more land, not an unexpected result, since adding additional protection against revenue variability reduces the risk of planting. However, when a third program that linked benefits to those provided by other programs was made available, farmers chose to plant fewer acres rather than further increase the amount of land planted (although farmers did still choose to plant more than when only crop insurance was available). In this last case, the policy provisions of the third program limited the additional protection against revenue variability from the other programs, reducing the previous incentives to increase plantings. The complexity of programs and the way farmers make planting decisions make it difficult to anticipate outcomes, and any attempt to integrate programs to eliminate potential overlap may have unintended consequences on production.

Identifying Federal Farm Programs’ Potential Overlaps / Amber Waves / March 2012 www.ers.usda.gov/AmberWaves • Economic Research Service/USDA
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Two big changes are coming that will affect how Oregon wheat growers pay for new wheat varieties: (1) the decline in public research funding and (2) the dramatic increase in dollars being invested into wheat breeding by private companies — e.g., Limagrain, Monsanto, Syngenta, and Bayer.

**The block grant**
The main job of the Oregon Wheat Commission (OWC) is to decide how to invest the dollars it collects from us. The biggest part of the wheat assessment has always gone to research aimed at developing new varieties — wheat with higher yield, better disease resistance and improved end-use quality. The OWC is currently making a yearly investment in wheat research of about $1 million — 2¢ of our 5¢ assessment.

Until recently, the OWC relied on state and federal funding to provide the wheat research infrastructure, i.e., to pay the salaries of the faculty scientists at OSU and the operating expenses of the statewide system of experiment stations and laboratories. With public funding of the infrastructure, the OWC has long been able to use our assessment funds to pay only for projects.

When the financial crisis hit in 2008, tax revenue began declining and one of the Oregon Legislature’s responses was to cut the funding of the College of Agricultural Sciences (CAS) at OSU. Over the last two years, the CAS has seen its budget cut by over 25%. At the same time, federal funding for our experiment stations (Hatch Funds) has stopped growing and may soon decline. With cuts this large, the CAS’s ability to maintain its wheat research faculty and facilities is threatened. It decided not to fill a key genetics position when Oscar Riera-Lizarazu resigned and started looking for experiment stations to close. To offset declines in funding and show support, “local sources” were asked to provide 25% of each station’s operating funds. The main wheat experiment station in Oregon is the Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center (CBARC) with sites outside of Pendleton and Moro. Since CBARC serves such a huge area, I had difficulty figuring out who could provide this “local” funding.

After much discussion, the OWC decided last June to provide a $300,000 block grant to the CAS to help backfill its infrastructure deficit. In return, the CAS agreed to keep CBARC and wheat research at other experiment stations operating at full capacity and to do what it can to prevent further reductions in wheat faculty positions at OSU. Since it’s doubtful the decline in public funding will be fully reversed, wheat growers are likely to face this same difficult choice in future years. Are we willing to accept a slow erosion of the research capacity at OSU or do we want to step up and devote part of our assessment dollars to keeping up the infrastructure at OSU?
The new elephant in the room — the private wheat breeders
The second big change is the growing investment in wheat breeding by private companies. The reality of this change hit home two years ago when OSU’s great wheat breeder, Jim Peterson, suddenly jumped ship and joined Limagrain. The spending of private companies on wheat breeding has exploded and now amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. It will soon dwarf the amount available to our universities. My fellow wheat commissioners and I recently flew to St. Louis to tour Monsanto’s two massive crop-breeding facilities. We were impressed. By the end of this decade, most new wheat varieties may come from private companies.

Private companies are investing in wheat breeding because they expect to earn profits from royalties collected when they sell you seed. They have taken over the market for corn and soybean seed (mainly with their GM varieties) and undoubtedly expect to do the same in wheat.

Is the new investment in wheat breeding by private companies a good thing? The OWC has spent a good deal of time recently examining this issue and still has much to learn. However, I believe the answer is yes. We now gladly pay royalties to OSU and BASF for the Clearfield varieties developed by their collaboration. Private companies will be able to sell their new varieties only if they are sufficiently better than existing varieties to justify the royalty. Competition among the private companies should provide a powerful incentive to expedite release of new and better wheat varieties.

If the private companies are successful and start providing most of our seed, what will happen to wheat research at OSU and to the OWC? For at least the next decade, OSU’s non-royalty varieties (Goetze, Skiles, Mary, and several new varieties that will be released in the next two years) will remain competitive and will provide an important cap on the royalties that the private companies are able to charge. OSU may start releasing more of its varieties with royalties. Some of these new OSU royalty varieties may be collaborations with private companies. With increased royalty income, the OSU breeding program will need less funding from the OWC. The OWC may then be able to reduce the wheat assessment and concentrate its efforts on funding market development and grower education. Royalties are likely to become more important and the wheat assessment less important — at least for wheat breeding.

What do you think? The OWC would love to get your ideas.

The Oregon Wheat Commission was created in 1947 by the Oregon Legislature, at the request of Oregon wheat producers. The Commission carries out research, marketing, and public education programs on behalf of the industry, with funds from an assessment on all wheat produced in the state. OWC programs are directed by an eight-member board of Commissioners, appointed by the Director of Agriculture.
Managing stripe rust in 2012 and beyond

Michael Flowers, Chris Mundt

Managing stripe rust has been difficult the last two years. The wet, cool weather along with race changes and susceptible varieties has meant that Oregon growers have had to apply multiple applications of fungicide to control the disease and maximize yield. This article is meant to provide growers with some background information on stripe rust, the impact stripe rust can have on grain yield when uncontrolled, and what Oregon State University is doing to assist growers now and in the future to better manage this foliar disease.

Stripe rust has been an important foliar disease of wheat in the Pacific Northwest for several decades. In the last 10 years, however, a new population of wheat stripe rust races has moved around the globe, making control of this devastating disease much more difficult. These new races are much more aggressive than the old ones and are more tolerant of temperature extremes. In addition, these new races overwinter much more effectively than the older races. As a result, stripe rust epidemics now are beginning months earlier than in the past. Because the stripe rust pathogen can increase approximately ten-fold per generation, early initiation of epidemics has greatly increased levels of stripe rust in the PNW in recent years.

For the past 40 years, wheat stripe rust in the PNW has been controlled primarily through use of varieties with higher temperature adult plant resistance (HTAP). This resistance is expressed only as plants enter the reproductive stage and if temperatures rise above a critical level. However, HTAP does not protect wheat plants early in the season, making the crop very vulnerable to the earlier epidemics caused by the new races. As a result, stripe rust epidemics now are beginning months earlier than in the past. Because the stripe rust pathogen can increase approximately ten-fold per generation, early initiation of epidemics has greatly increased levels of stripe rust in the PNW in recent years.

The interaction between the current races of stripe rust and the cool, wet weather the past two growing seasons has changed the way we must manage this disease in both the short and long term. Long term, the wheat breeding programs of the PNW will incorporate more and better stripe rust resistance genes into commercially available varieties. Hopefully, these efforts will provide growers with wheat varieties that have enough genetic resistance to the disease that applications of fungicides will not be required. In the interim, the wheat industry should anticipate faster turnover of wheat varieties as we learn how to counter the adaptability of the new stripe rust population with new varieties.

These breeding efforts will take time. So in the short term growers should plant wheat varieties such as ORCF-101, Legion, Skiles, WB Junction and other similar varieties that have higher levels of stripe rust resistance. Growers should avoid planting highly susceptible varieties like Tubbs 06, Goetze, and Xerpha whenever possible. In addition if the environment continues to be conducive to over wintering and early stripe rust infection, growers will need to rely on fungicides to control the disease in many instances (even in moderately resistant/susceptible wheat varieties).

Recent research has found that we must change the way we manage stripe rust with fungicides. Prior to 2011, fungicide research found that the best management strategy was to control the disease with early (jointing) and mid-season (flag leaf emergence) applications of fungicides. Late season (heading) applications were not found to statistically increase grain yield (Table 1). These results were likely due to the increased activity of HTAP resistance genes during the relatively warm late season that controlled the less aggressive, older stripe rust races. However, in 2011 these HTAP resistance genes did not provide enough control of the disease during the extended cool, wet season combined with the newer, more aggressive stripe rust races. Thus unlike previous years, late season (heading) applications of fungicides were very effective and significantly increased grain yield (Table 2). This new data has led to a change in the recommendations for 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Fungicide Timing</th>
<th>Yield bu/ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goetze</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>143.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence</td>
<td>155.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence + Heading</td>
<td>149.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>149.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubbs 06</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>149.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence</td>
<td>144.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence + Heading</td>
<td>152.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>148.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The effect of fungicide timing on grain yield for two commonly grown wheat varieties in 2009. Stripe rust was present at low levels due to less conducive weather and epidemics that began later than in 2011.
This year, active stripe rust has been found in western Oregon and eastern Washington (no reports in eastern Oregon as of this writing). While these first sightings are later than in 2011, we continue to be in a relatively cool, wet weather pattern that is very favorable for disease development. Therefore, we have recommended that growers apply a fungicide at jointing (preferably in a tank mix with their spring herbicide application to save costs; otherwise at the first sign of infection in the field). This application is a preventive step to reduce the amount of inoculum that may have over wintered and to allow growers time to assess the disease severity in their region. As the growing season progresses, we recommend that growers scout their fields for stripe rust and apply fungicides as required. Generally, growers should consider additional fungicide applications around flag leaf emergence and heading if active stripe rust is found. Late season (heading) applications may be very important to maximize grain yields if we have another cool, wet grain fill period similar to 2011.

In addition to modifying our stripe rust management recommendations, agronomists and plant pathologists across the PNW are adjusting trials and collaborating on new research to provide growers with improved management recommendations for controlling stripe rust. For example, the Oregon State University, the University of Idaho, the Agricultural Research Service, and private industry partners are collaborating on a new tri-state project to evaluate fungicide efficacy and optimum fungicide application timing to control stripe rust in the PNW. This project will look at the timing of application, genetic resistance, and fungicide class so that management recommendations can be refined to improve the control of stripe rust throughout the region.

To keep abreast of the current stripe rust situation and learn more about the new stripe rust research we encourage growers to attend an OSU field day or crop tour this season. These events are a great way to access the latest research and information provided by OSU Extension agents and agricultural researchers.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Fungicide Timing</th>
<th>Yield bu/ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goetze</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointing</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence</td>
<td></td>
<td>117.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointing + Flag Leaf Emergence</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence + Heading</td>
<td></td>
<td>129.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointing + Flag Leaf Emergence + Heading</td>
<td>125.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td>Tubbs 06 Control</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointing</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence</td>
<td></td>
<td>130.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heading</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointing + Flag Leaf Emergence</td>
<td>126.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag Leaf Emergence + Heading</td>
<td></td>
<td>157.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jointing + Flag Leaf Emergence + Heading</td>
<td>164.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>122.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2. The effect of fungicide timing on grain yield for two commonly grown wheat varieties in 2011. Stripe rust was present at very high levels and consisted of newer, more aggressive races.**

This year, active stripe rust has been found in western Oregon and eastern Washington (no reports in eastern Oregon as of this writing). While these first sightings are later than in 2011, we continue to be in a relatively cool, wet weather pattern that is very favorable for disease development. Therefore, we have recommended that growers apply a fungicide at jointing (preferably in a tank mix with their spring herbicide application to save costs; otherwise at the first sign of infection in the field). This application is a preventive step to reduce the amount of inoculum that may have over wintered and to allow growers time to assess the disease severity in their region. As the growing season progresses, we recommend that growers scout their fields for stripe rust and apply fungicides as required. Generally, growers should consider additional fungicide applications around flag leaf emergence and heading if active stripe rust is found. Late season (heading) applications may be very important to maximize grain yields if we have another cool, wet grain fill period similar to 2011.

In addition to modifying our stripe rust management recommendations, agronomists and plant pathologists across the PNW are adjusting trials and collaborating on new research to provide growers with improved management recommendations for controlling stripe rust. For example, the Oregon State University, the University of Idaho, the Agricultural Research Service, and private industry partners are collaborating on a new tri-state project to evaluate fungicide efficacy and optimum fungicide application timing to control stripe rust in the PNW. This project will look at the timing of application, genetic resistance, and fungicide class so that management recommendations can be refined to improve the control of stripe rust throughout the region.

To keep abreast of the current stripe rust situation and learn more about the new stripe rust research we encourage growers to attend an OSU field day or crop tour this season. These events are a great way to access the latest research and information provided by OSU Extension agents and agricultural researchers. > CONTINUED ON PAGE 18

**Chris Mundt**

*Professor, Cereal Pathology*

**2010-2011 Grant Title:** Screening for Resistance to Major Wheat Diseases in Oregon, $40,006

**2011-2012 Grant Title:** Screening for Resistance to Major Wheat Diseases in Oregon, $42,601

**Grant Summary:** A combination of locations, production practices, and inoculation techniques have been used to provide high levels of disease pressure in separate trials of stripe rust, Cephalosporium stripe, Fusarium crown rot, strawbreaker foot rot, Septoria tritici blotch, and barley yellow dwarf virus. Resistance levels of entries in elite and advanced yield trials have been determined to evaluate potential varietal releases and to allow growers to make the best varietal decisions when new varieties are first available to them. Evaluation of disease resistance in two mapping populations with high yield potential and resistance to multiple diseases will contribute to the next generation of disease resistant, higher yielding winter wheat varieties for Oregon growers, and to identify molecular markers that may improve selection in the future using DNA technology. To obtain this information, 12,000-15,000 plots are evaluated yearly in the course of the research. The studies strongly emphasize a team approach among OSU wheat researchers and Extension personnel. The studies are crucial to continued progress in the OSU Wheat Breeding Program, increased profitability for Oregon wheat growers, and ability to adopt conservation tillage practices.
Michael Flowers  
**Associate Professor and Extension Cereal Specialist**

**2009-2010 Grant Title:** Agronomic Evaluation of Winter and Spring Wheat in Oregon, $50,000

**2010-2011 Grant Title:** Agronomic Evaluations of Winter and Spring Wheat in Oregon, $30,000

**2010-2011 Grant Title:** Variety Testing and Agronomic Evaluation of Winter and Spring Wheat in Oregon, $67,661

**Grant Summary:** The Oregon statewide variety testing program provides growers with performance information on commonly grown and newly released wheat varieties from the public and private breeding programs. Wheat varieties are split into three categories (Oregon Winter Elite Yield Trial or OWLEYT; Hard Winter Elite Yield Trial or HWEYT; and Oregon Spring Elite Yield Trial or OSEYT) for evaluation. Each year the testing program has approximately 14 winter and six spring locations throughout Oregon. Trial locations are chosen to capture a range of environmental conditions and/or cropping systems in the wheat production areas of Oregon. Trial results are reported through email alerts, web publications, grower meeting, crop tours, and field days.

Agronomic studies provide growers with critical information regarding variety selection and management. Study objectives include the development/refinement of varietal recommendations for early and late planted wheat, the evaluation of agronomic management practices for no-till/direct seed systems, and the development of nitrogen management guidelines for spring wheat in western Oregon. Trial sites will be located throughout Oregon and will represent a range of environments. Study sites may also be used in field days and demonstrations to increase grower awareness of new varieties and management practices. This research will provide growers with important new information and management recommendations for winter and spring wheat in conventional and no-till/direct seed cropping systems. 

---

**Tri-State Grain Growers Convention**

**November 12, 13 & 14, 2012**

Held at the Coeur d’ Alene Resort in Coeur d’ Alene, Idaho

**Oregon Wheat Association**

**States Without Borders**

---

**MARY BURROWS, MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BUGWOOD.ORG**

---

**Save the date!**
Bushels for Betsy
Feeding Oregon’s Hungry

2012 Bushels for Betsy Campaign Update
As a result of growing levels of long-term unemployment, 260,000 people per month eat meals from emergency food boxes. Of those, 85,800 are children. For the first time ever, Oregon Food Bank distributed more than 1 million emergency food boxes in fiscal year 2010 –11.*

In January, Foundation Chair Tom Winn and Vice Chair Ben Holdman sent a plea to all wheat producers in Oregon, challenging them to match their $500 contributions to help address the hunger problem in Oregon.

You have responded resoundingly! The Foundation has received numerous matching donations, and and many more in various amounts. The Foundation applauds each producer who stepped up to help those less fortunate in our state, and as a result, the funds will be sent this week to turn wheat grown in Oregon into pancake and baking mixes to be distributed through the Oregon Food Bank’s network of hunger-relief agencies state-wide.

Will this contribution solve Oregon’s hunger problem? Certainly not, but through continued support from generous Oregonians like you, the efforts can continue.

It’s not too late to contribute! Simply complete the form below to fax or mail your contribution.

*Oregon Food Bank stat

Bushels for Betsy Contribution Form

☐ Check  ☐ MasterCard  ☐ Visa

Credit Card Number  Expiration Date

Name on Card

Signature

Please make checks payable to Oregon Wheat Foundation. Mail your contribution with this form to the OWGL office, 115 SE 8th, Pendleton OR 97801, or fax to (541) 276-1723. OWF Tax ID#93-0785430

The OWGL welcomes the following growers and associate businesses:

- Ag Teq, Inc., The Dalles
- Ag West Supply, Rickreall
- Robert Duncan, Leavenworth, WA
- Will Ford, The Dalles
- Hattenhauer Energy Co., LLC, The Dalles
- Cecil Holmes, Pendleton
- Klamath Basin Equipment, Klamath Falls
- Linn-Benton Tractor Co., Albany
- MachineryLink, Kennewick, WA
- Oregon Trail Insurance, The Dalles
- Patton & Associates, LLC, Walla Walla, WA
- Marie Rietmann, Washington DC
- SureCrop Farm Service, Junction City

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT

Check us out at www.facebook.com/oregonwheat

MCP Mid Columbia Producers

Our mission is to provide value to producers and end users.

MCP offers Grain handling and marketing tools — Seed Grains — Complete line of supplies for your fencing needs — Petroleum products and delivery — Hardware and Auto Parts.

Call us: (800) 325-9327
Main Office: (541) 565-3737
Seed Plant: (888) 442-5555
(541) 442-5555
Wasco Farm Store: (800) 442-5703
(541) 442-5701
Goldendale Farm & Home Store: (509) 773-4906
www.mcpcoop.com
2012 Committee Priorities of the Oregon Wheat Growers League

Environment and Regulations Committee
Committee Chair, Tanner Hawkins
1. Pesticide Legislation & Regulatory Enforcement
2. Pesticide & Water Quality Management —
   a. Proactive Grower Education Campaign
   b. Begin to develop a database of standard agricultural practices related to air/water quality
   c. Develop Watershed Monitoring System
   d. Cultivate a relationship with DEQ — Core group of producers
3. Clean Air Act — Air Emission Standards (Dust, Particulate Matter)
4. Clean Water Act — Navigability
5. Invasive species — equal enforcement

Research and Technology Committee
Committee Chair, Suzi Frederickson
1. Develop clear and measurable 2, 5, and 10 year research and Extension Structure Vision
2. Structure of Wheat Breeding Programs
3. Research Priorities and Appropriate Funding — Public Awareness Campaigns
4. Education, Research and Extension Funding — OSU Structural Changes
5. Carbon Footprint and Climate Change Research Priorities
6. Bio-products research — Bio Fuels Introduction; Gluten Project Proposal

Farm Policy Committee
Committee Chair, Paul Bracher
Farm Policy
1. 2012 Farm Program Development
2. Crop Insurance Uninsured Loss (Admin. Rules); Combo Plan Implementation; Support NAWG Effort to identify appropriate quality adjustment protocols.
3. Available Legal Workforce
4. Educate growers, county commissioners, FSA county committees on SURE program and process of county disaster determination.

Marketing
1. Educate Producers on existing Marketing Opportunities utilizing the statewide community college based satellite system
2. Encourage Customer (Domestic/Foreign) Acceptance to introduction of Bio-Tech Wheat
3. The OWGL supports the agreement between the US, Australia and Canada for the simultaneous release of Biotech wheat into the commercial marketplace.

Transportation
1. Transportation Issues Specific to Movement of Wheat/Barley by Growers
2. Jetty Repair — Federal Funding Request
3. Dam Breaching — Educate Policymakers and Public about benefits of Navigable Waterways

Farmers have been a big part of our 60 year history, and that is why we support farming throughout the west. At Les Schwab, we appreciate your hard work!

Serving you at these locations:
LA GRANDE • 541-963-8411
MILTON-FREewater • 541-938-5507
PENDLETON • 541-276-1571
Sprayer Packages Available
www.LesSchwab.com
Join the Oregon Wheat Growers League today!

These are exciting times for the Oregon Wheat Growers League! The League has begun a new phase in advocacy, leadership, and grower governance, and we invite you to join the organization that may prove to serve Oregon wheat producers better and more efficiently than ever.

Join the efforts of the OWGL today by returning this form with your check to support the ongoing efforts of the organization that works to enhance your bottom line. Thank you!

---

**Annual Dues Schedule**

- **Producer/Landlord**
  - □ Member: Less than 320 acres ........................................................... $100
  - □ Member: 320 acres or more .............................................................. $150
  - □ Member: More than 2000 acres ....................................................... $200
  - □ Affiliate: Retired grower or landlord .............................................. $75

- **Business Associate Member**

  Agribusiness companies serving producers
  - □ Associate: 1-10 employees ............................................................... $100
  - □ Associate: 11-25 employees ............................................................ $150
  - □ Associate: 26 or more employees ................................................. $200

**WheatPAC Donation: Your support helps!**

Please enclose a separate check made payable to Oregon WheatPAC. Your credit card will be charged separately. Thank you.

---

**Payment Information**

- □ Check

  Please make payable to Oregon Wheat Growers League

- □ MasterCard □ Visa

---

- **Credit Card Number**

- **Expiry Date**

- **Name on Card**

- **Signature**

---

Would you prefer to receive the OWGL bi-weekly newsletter:

- □ Via e-mail (also on our website)
- □ Via fax
- □ Via U.S. Postal Service
- □ Not at all
Drop 50% more body fat with whole grains

Warm weather is upon us! Whole grains can help you trim down for summer.

If you could make a simple diet change to drop more pounds and body fat, would you? Switching from refined-wheat foods, such as white bread or pasta, to whole-grain versions can boost your weight loss by 35% and help you melt nearly 50% more body fat.

In a new study, 79 overweight or obese postmenopausal women were randomly assigned to eat a diet containing refined or whole-grain wheat products. After 12 weeks, both groups lost weight (7.9 pounds for the whole-wheat group and 5.9 pounds for the refined-wheat group). The whole-wheat group also shed 3% body fat, whereas the refined-wheat eaters shed 2.1%.

Even more dramatic was the result for heart health: The refined-wheat eaters saw a whopping 5% increase in their total and LDL (bad) cholesterol levels. No changes were found in the whole-grain group.

That’s great news, except only 5% of Americans actually consume the minimum recommended serving of whole grains — three (1-ounce) equivalents per day, such as an ounce of dry pasta or a slice of bread. Still, a whopping 92% of consumers say they believe whole-grain breads are much healthier than white bread, according to The Academy of Nutrition and Dieters’ Nutrition and You: Trends 2011 survey. They’re right. Processing grains strips away up to two-thirds of many of the nutrients naturally found in whole grains.

Now that you’ve been persuaded (right?) to eat three or more servings of whole grains a day, how do you know you’re choosing the right foods? “Be sure the word ‘whole’ is on the ingredient statement, such as ‘whole wheat,’” says food scientist Joy Dubost, RD, CSSD.

Also look on the packaging for the seal from the Whole Grains Council. “If a product bears the 100% Whole Grain Stamp, then all of its ingredients are whole grains,” Dubost says. “There’s a minimum requirement of 16 grams — a full serving.” If a product bears the basic Whole Grain Stamp, it contains at least 8 grams (half a serving) and may also include some refined grain.

Don’t think you’re stuck chowing down on slices of whole-wheat bread every day. “Half of your intake of grains should be from a variety of whole-grain sources,” Dubost says. Throw some sauce on that whole-wheat pasta and before long you’ll be losing, not gaining, body fat.◆

IOM releases “Measuring Progress in Obesity Prevention - Workshop Report”

Nearly 69 percent of U.S. adults and 32 percent of children are either overweight or obese, creating an annual medical cost burden that may reach $147 billion. Researchers and policy makers are eager to identify improved measures of environmental and policy factors that contribute to obesity prevention. The IOM formed the Committee on Accelerating Progress in Obesity Prevention to review the IOM’s past obesity-related recommendations, identify a set of recommendations for future action, and recommend indicators of progress in implementing these actions. The committee held a workshop in March 2011 about how to improve measurement of progress in obesity prevention.

Visit www.wheatfoods.org for this full article and more on wheat foods and your health. WFC Network is the official nutrition site of the U.S. wheat and grain industry. Visit their website for useful information and videos on nutrition, recipes, and so much more.

Source: Institute of Medicine; Food and Nutrition Board

Source: RealAge.com
Dear wheat producer/landlord,

Members of the Oregon Wheat Growers League belong to an organization that has a long standing history of supporting and protecting our industry. Since establishing the first commodity commission in the nation in 1947, the League has gone on to actively support programs and policies that have helped our industry grow and thrive.

We have led the battle to protect our industry by participating in the debates around climate change, pesticide use, environmental regulations, water and taxes. This year we were fortunate to pass legislation that reduced our costs by consolidating the grain and wheat commission as well as removing agricultural cooperatives from the increased tax liability of Measure 67.

However, there is always unfinished business in the world of public policy and many issues remain on the table that will have adverse effects on farming operation. If we are to maintain our ability to run productive operations, we need to have the resources in place to counter their strategies.

That means, simply, that we need to grow Oregon wheat so we can support candidates who will work with us to protect and encourage our industry. Many good candidates fail simply because they can’t afford to get their message out to Oregon’s voters. We need to help get candidates elected that will support our industry and make a difference to us in the future!

While much of the nation has struggled this year with our faltering economy, Oregon’s wheat producers were fortunate to benefit from a good harvest and a strong market. That means that now is the time for us to begin building for the future of our industry through Oregon WheatPAC contributions. Joining together to support candidates that will support our industry will allow the voice of Oregon’s wheat producers to be heard in Salem.

And the State of Oregon will support you as you support your industry! You will receive a $50 tax credit for single filers or a $100 tax credit for joint filers off your Oregon state taxes* when you file next year. It’s that easy! Write your check now and send it along with this contribution form or call the OWGL office to contribute with your credit card.

Together we can make a difference – but we need your help to make this happen!

Thank you,

Tyson Raymond   Blake Rowe
OWGL President   CEO, Oregon Wheat

---

Oregon WheatPAC Contribution Form

☐ $500  ☐ $250  ☐ $100  ☐ $50  ☐ Other ____________  AMOUNT

FARM/BUSINESS NAME

REPRESENTATIVE

ADDRESS

CITY/STATE/ZIP

EMAIL

PHONE

☐ Check  ☐ MasterCard  ☐ Visa ____________  CHECK NUMBER

CREDIT CARD NUMBER  EXPIRATION DATE

NAME ON CARD

SIGNATURE

Please make checks payable to Oregon WheatPAC. Mail your contribution with this form to the OWGL office, 115 SE 8th, Pendleton OR 97801, or fax to (541) 276-1723. Please keep a copy for your records.

* Consult your tax preparer for details. OWPAC TIN: 20-5086793

---

Raspberry Lover’s Pudding

Ingredient List:
- 2 12-ounce bags frozen, unsweetened raspberries, thawed
- ½ cup sugar
- ¼ cup raspberry flavored liqueur, optional
- 1 1-pound loaf very thin sandwich bread, crusts removed
- ½ cup heavy cream
- Fresh raspberries and mint, to garnish, optional

Directions:
In a medium saucepan, bring the raspberries, sugar and liqueur to a boil. Boil for 3 minutes and remove from heat. Line a 9×5-inch loaf pan with plastic wrap. Cover the bottom with 3 slices of bread. Use 8 slices, standing up, to line all the sides of the loaf. Cover with about ¼ of the raspberries. Over the raspberries lay 3 more slices of bread. Repeat this layering until all the raspberries have been used, ending with a layer of bread slices. If you have bread leftover, set it aside for another use. Cover the pudding with plastic wrap, set a second loaf pan on top of it, and weight it down with a can of food. Refrigerate overnight or up to 24 hours.

To serve, uncover the pudding and invert it onto a serving plate. Peel off the plastic wrap. Whip the cream to a soft peak. Slice the pudding and garnish with cream, fresh raspberries and mint.

Servings: 10 servings.

Calories/Serving: 367

Nutrition analysis:
One serving provides approximately: 367 calories, 7 g protein, 54 g carbohydrates, 2 g fiber, 14 g fat (7 g saturated), 56 mg cholesterol, 28 mcg folate, 1 mg iron, 614 mg sodium.
30° Axial Twist
The Condor G Series sprayer’s flexible C-channel frame is designed to provide 30° of axial twist front to back, ensuring the driving wheels are always planted firmly on the ground.

There’s spraying...and then there’s Spray-Air™
Think long and hard before buying your next sprayer. You choose the best seed, the best crop protection products. You want to grow the very best crop you can. So, choose the best method of application. Spray-Air™ ensures the spray penetrates dense canopies, all leaf surfaces are covered, that the target pest gets wiped out.