

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

U.S. Agriculture Profile <b>PRODUCTION</b>	Tools to Succeed Policies & Options	Comments Recommendations
<p><b>Management Skills:</b></p> <p><i>Successful farming requires a solid management foundation. Training resources and programs should be made readily available for producers.</i></p>	<p>NASDA has no specific policy on specific programs for leadership and management development.</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile <b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	
<p><b>Safeguarding Plants and Animals</b></p> <p><i>Labor management problems, transportation inadequacies, and the increasing concentration among suppliers can have adverse effects on the agriculture industry. Producers and shippers of agricultural and agri-food products rely heavily on the transportation system to move their foods to market destinations in an efficient and cost-effective manner. Increasingly, agricultural products more are being transported by truck, particularly as value-added processing becomes popular. Highway corridors and international border crossings should be seamless so as to ensure the lowest transportation costs for continental trade in agricultural products and to enhance the competitiveness of North American exports to world markets. Differences in trucking standards between the three NAFTA</i></p>	<p><b>Agriculture Infrastructure</b>--NASDA believes in maintaining fairness and equity within the agriculture community through the development of a strong agriculture infrastructure.</p> <p>NASDA supports the implementation of the trucking provisions contained in NAFTA and the elimination of transportation system barriers. Consideration should be given to harmonizing trucking standards among the three countries, streamlining the obtainment of interstate and international trucking permits, and establishing one-stop, joint vehicle inspection facilities.</p> <p>6.2 Expansion of Trade Opportunities 10.1 Agriculture Infrastructure, Introduction 10.3 Agricultural Transportation 10.4 Concentration in Agriculture</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action by Department of Justice on Anti-trust</li> <li>• Closer Review of Rail Mergers</li> <li>• Harmonization of Standards</li> <li>• Tax breaks (diesel fuel)</li> <li>• Weight loads for trucks on highways</li> </ul>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

U.S. Agriculture Profile <b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	
<p><i>countries have created inefficiencies and increased transportation costs borne by producers and shippers.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop dam breaches on rivers where agricultural commodities are transported</li> <li>• Study costs of shifting from trucking to rail</li> <li>• High speed rail</li> </ul> <p>Resource(s):</p> <p>Cargill-Continental Grain Merger, Agricultural Outlook, September 1999</p> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of USDA-APHIS.</p>	

U.S. Agriculture Profile <b>STEWARDSHIP</b>	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments Recommendations
<p><b><i>Safeguarding Plants and Animals</i></b></p> <p><i>The need for basic and applied animal health protection and disease control research continues to demand attention. There is a critical need to strengthen integrated animal health management programs to facilitate the transfer of information and technology from laboratory to the producer/consumer. Research is needed to prevent introductions of pathogens into the food chain by developing methods to reduce or eliminate them from animals during production. As international trade has</i></p>	<p>NASDA believes that a coordinated approach is essential so as to encourage continued importation of new natural enemies into the United States.</p> <p>NASDA supports classic biological control in dealing with exotic pests and rangeland weeds.</p> <p>NASDA believes that the USDA should encourage the use of irradiation for pest control. This is an important technology that can be applied to agricultural products to ensure a safe and healthy food supply.</p> <p>NASDA policy 2.4 outlines strategies for controlling pests through biological pest control, integrated crop management and integrated pest management.</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
<p><i>increased, the threat of an outbreak of a foreign animal disease in the United States has also increased. Classical biological control is a pest control strategy that involves the importation of new natural enemies to control introduced pests. The use of this strategy of pest management is experiencing renewed attention because it is extremely cost effective and environmentally sound.</i></p> <p><i>Currently, there is no coordinated effort between the federal government and the state departments of agriculture to support and promote classical biological control at regional and national levels. Today's farmers and ranchers are being criticized for abusing our natural resources while still being asked to provide more and cheaper food. Two practices currently expanding in use are Integrated Crop Management (ICM) and Integrated Pest Management (IPM). IPM should be implemented nationally to reduce the reliance on chemical pesticides and increase the use of non-chemical tools over the long term..</i></p>	<p>2.4 Strategies for Controlling Pests</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dialogue and agreement among NAFTA members</li> <li>• Private Research &amp; Research from our land grant institutions is necessary to improve agricultural production.</li> <li>• If the federal government bans or quarantines a product, there needs to be guidelines for implementation of said ban. (Reimbursement to producer, methods, and timeline of action.)</li> <li>• Contractors must share risk with producers.</li> </ul> <p>** USDA PPQ has asked Congress to totally revise their statues to meet modern times and problems</p> <p>** Support funding for modern technology</p> <p>2.4 Biological Pest Control 2.4 Integrated Crop Management</p> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of USDA-APHIS.</p> <p>“Pulling Together”, National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management</p>	
<p><b>Foreign and Domestic Animal Health Issues</b></p>	<p><b>Animal Health</b>--NASDA Policy 1.2 discusses the issue of foreign and domestic animal health issues, but offers no specific guidelines.</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
<p><b><i>Completion of Animal Disease Control Programs</i></b></p> <p><i>The completion of several disease control programs of significance to the economic viability of livestock production agriculture in the United States is nearing. Bovine tuberculosis, bovine brucellosis, swine brucellosis and pseudorabies are examples of diseases that will likely be eradicated from domestic livestock by the year 2000. Funding cuts and other resource constraints threaten the ability of USDA, specifically the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), to complete these important programs.</i></p>	<p>1.2 Foreign and Domestic Animal Health Issues</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dialogue and agreement among NAFTA members</li> <li>• Private Research &amp; Research from our land grant institutions is necessary to improve agricultural production.</li> <li>• If the federal government bans or quarantines a product, there needs to be guidelines for implementation of said ban. (Reimbursement to producer, methods, and timeline of action.)</li> <li>• Contractors must share risk with producers.</li> </ul> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of USDA-APHIS.</p> <p>“Pulling Together”, National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management</p>	
<p><b><i>Animal Damage Control</i></b></p> <p><i>The Animal Damage Control Program was renamed in 1997 as the Wildlife Services (WS) program, it is an Animal &amp; Plant Health Inspection Service effort to protect agriculture, natural resources, property or endangered species from unwanted and potentially harmful effects of wildlife species, including predators. ADC also works to prevent wildlife/ airplane collision hazards at civilian and military airports.</i></p>	<p><b><i>Wildlife Management</i></b>--NASDA policy 1.4 supports the efforts of the USDA to manage wildlife and to protect American agriculture and other aspects of human life.</p> <p>NASDA policy supports the appropriation of federal funds to support rabies control and vaccination programs.</p> <p>1.4 Animal Damage Control</p> <p>** Legislation to provide USDA APHIS total control of infectious diseases in both domestic and wildlife, which threaten food supply or public health.</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
<p><i>Managing wildlife is important to reduce damage to agriculture and natural resources, to minimize potential threats to public health and safety, and to protect other species. Strategies are implemented that are environmentally, socially and biologically sound. In addition, the emergence and demonstrated spread of rabies in the United States has overwhelmed state rabies control and prevention programs.</i></p>	<p>** APHIS should be encouraged to proceed with vet services in modernization, also.</p>	
<p><b><i>Animal Welfare/Animal Rights</i></b></p> <p><i>Farming is a business and farm animals are not pets. Because the margin between costs of production and marketing products is so small, today's producers recognize that poor or inhumane management is never profitable. Our nation's farmers and ranchers must use the highest quality, most nutritious feeds, provide safe, clean stress free environments coupled with a love for their animals to obtain even small margins of profit. However, there is a clear distinction between animal welfare and animal rights. The Animal Welfare Act, P.L. 89544 (August 24, 1966) was enacted to curb the theft and mistreatment of dogs and cats for experimental research.</i></p>	<p>NASDA policy 1.6 outlines the distinction between animal rights and animal welfare.</p> <p>1.6 Animal Welfare–Quality animal care is at the heart of farm animal production in an age when science and technology have moved farming from horsepower to computer power. Farmers and ranchers devote their lives to providing a safe, ample supply of food and fiber for the nation and many beyond our borders. Farming is a business and farm animals are not pets. Because the margin between costs of production and marketing products is so small, today’s producers recognize that poor or inhumane management is never profitable.</p> <p>Resource(s):</p> <p>USDA Animal Welfare Report, 1998 (APHIS 41-35-059)</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
<p><i>purposes. The principal federal animal protection law, it has been amended several times to address specific concerns such as the shipping of pets on public transportation, dog fighting, and using other warm-blooded animals in biomedical experiments. Although administered by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the law has always excluded farm animals from its coverage.</i></p>		
<p><b><i>Foreign and Domestic Plant Pest and Disease Issues</i></b></p> <p><i>The agriculture industry is faced with wide-ranging plant pests and diseases that threaten to damage crops and cause farmers to suffer severe economic losses. Programs have been established at the federal and state level to combat plant health concerns.</i></p>	<p>NASDA policy 2.2 recognizes the importance of controlling devastating pests and diseases and believes that the federal government should be provided the adequate funding to carry out existing programs and to perform research to find ways to control and eradicate these pests and diseases through Plant Quarantine and Inspection Guidelines, Consolidated Plant Pest Act and maintaining a Taxonomic Expertise Resource List.</p> <p>NASDA policy supports the efforts of the federal government to improve the efficiency for dealing with plant pests and diseases and to consolidate the functions and responsibilities of the various agencies. We encourage the federal government to complete its work and submit it to Congress for approval. We believe effective coordination and consolidation should include provisions that delegate uniform emergency action authority to the Secretary of Agriculture and that provides for the detection, control, eradication, suppression, prevention, or retardation of the spread of plant pests necessary for the protection of agriculture, the environment, and the economy of the United States.</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments Recommendations
	<p>NASDA policy notes that the National Plant Board should work with USDA-APHIS-PPQ, USDA-ARS and other appropriate groups to address this issue. USDA-APHIS-PPQ should coordinate this effort. NASDA also believes it would be beneficial for a catalog of existing taxonomic expertise in the United States to be developed and recognizes that the catalog will need regular updating and suggests APHIS maintain the catalog.</p> <p>2.2 Domestic Plant Pest and Disease Issues 2.3 Foreign Plant Pest and Disease Issues</p> <p>“Draft Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety”, Convention on Biological Diversity , January 28, 2000</p> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of USDA-APHIS.</p>	
<p><b><i>Noxious Weeds/ Plant Health</i></b></p> <p><i>Noxious weeds are undesirable plants that infest either land or water resources and cause physical and economic damage. Under the Federal Noxious Weed Act (FNWA) (P.L. 93-629, January 3, 1975 the Animal &amp; Plant Health Inspection Service works to prevent noxious weeds from entering the country, and conducts cooperative control/ eradication programs with the states. Local governments</i></p>	<p>NASDA believes the Federal Noxious Weed Act should be amended to consider the value of both the agricultural industry and our natural ecosystems. Federal agencies should work in partnership with stated and local governments. NASDA generally supports recommendations made by the National Plant Board.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <p>“Safeguarding American Plant Resources”, A Stakeholder Review of the APHIS-PPQ Safeguarding System, July 1, 1999, National Plant Board at the request of USDA-APHIS.</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
<p><i>frequently impose taxes on landowners to carry out noxious weed control programs. FNWA as currently enacted, creates serious problems for the development of sound regulatory and enforcement programs both at the federal and state levels. It should be amended to consider the value of both the agricultural industry and our natural ecosystems.</i></p> <p><i>Protecting the health of our nation's crops is becoming an increasingly important and difficult task. The passage of trade agreements has increased the flow of fruits and vegetables across our borders making the U.S. more susceptible to plant pests and diseases.</i></p>	<p>“Pulling Together”, National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Plant Quarantine and Inspection</b></li> <li>• <b>Offshore Pest Exclusion</b></li> <li>• <b>Interstate Regulation of Nursery Stock</b></li> <li>• <b>Regulation of Seed Stock</b></li> <li>• <b>Consolidated Plant Pest Act</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Control Strategies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Integrated Crop Management (ICM) (2.4)</b></li> <li>• <b>Integrated Pest Management (IPM) (2.4)</b></li> <li>• <b>Biotechnology</b></li> <li>• <b>Irradiation</b></li> <li>• <b>Methyl Bromide</b></li> <li>• <b>Biological Pest Control (2.4)</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b><i>Emergency Preparation</i></b></p> <p><i>The U.S. has the ability to control and eradicate foreign animal and poultry diseases. However, decreases in government infrastructure at the state and federal level hinders emergency preparation. The economic trade implications due to our inability to control an outbreak are enormous.</i></p>	<p>NASDA policy 1.2 and 1.3 states that disease control programs are essential if eradication of animal and poultry diseases and the prevention of the introduction or outbreak of foreign or domestic diseases is to be successful. Priority should be given to programs whose efforts are aimed at preventing the outbreak of animal health diseases and protecting our nation's domestic livestock from foreign diseases. Valid tests should also be developed to properly detect diseases that pose a risk to animal health. Sufficient resources should be made available for such programs so that the appropriate agencies can provide indemnity to owners of diseased livestock, which will encourage the elimination of remaining infected herds, and maintain an adequate number of animal health professionals able to respond to animal health issues.</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP	Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)	Comments Recommendations
	<p>NASDA policy 1.3 commends APHIS for its efforts to seek efficiency within the federal government and to improve satisfaction of its constituencies. We strongly support the consolidation of APHIS programs into eastern and western regional offices as a cost savings measure, while maintaining accessibility by customers and partners. NASDA recommends that, to prevent negative impacts on services, costs for consolidation should not be taken from operational programs, but from agency overhead savings. Further, NASDA recognizes that plant and animal health issues may not be similar within the proposed consolidated regions and that current funding levels of programs in a particular region may be diminished due to priority setting as a result of the regional consolidation. NASDA urges APHIS to consider the plant and animal health needs of the states within the current regional composition when allocating program funding.</p> <p>1.3 APHIS Reorganization and Consolidation</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate where possible state with federal employees.</li> <li>• If there is a shortage of federal employees, then state employees should be able to fill role.</li> <li>• counter-terrorism is an issue that needs further investigation</li> <li>• **Representative of Departments of Agriculture on all major policy committees of USDA-FDA-Health</li> <li>• **USDA be active partner with other federal departments in decision making on national policies regarding security,</li> </ul>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile STEWARDSHIP</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
	<p align="center">including bioterrorism.</p> <p>Resource(s):</p> <p>“The Economic Impact of a Bioterrorist Attack: Are Prevention &amp; Postattack Intervention Programs Justifiable?”, Kaufmann, Meltzer, and Schmid. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia. (Perspective)</p>	

<b>U.S. Agriculture Profile TECHNOLOGY</b>	<b>Tools to Succeed (Policies/ Options)</b>	<b>Comments Recommendations</b>
<p><b>Research and Development</b> <i>(need to define)</i></p> <p><i>The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform (FAIR) Act (the 1996 Farm Bill) began the process of fundamental change in agriculture. The seven-year phase out of commodity programs which the legislation initiated, emphasizes the need for greater global competitiveness in agriculture. This increases the demand for sound, progressive agricultural research.</i></p> <p><i>In the past, public investments in agriculture research have paid large</i></p>	<p>NASDA believes aquaculture should be considered a form of agriculture in the broadest sense and aquaculture products should be viewed and treated as agricultural commodities. NASDA believes regulatory constraints imposed upon the aquaculture industry should be clarified, streamlined, and consolidated.</p> <p>NASDA believes the development of improved processing technologies and new products development represent important opportunities for the aquaculture industry. NASDA endorses the HACCP principles for aquaculture processing and encourages USDA and FDA to provide on-going training for the industry that is both cost effective and focused. NASDA believes the process of development of minimum health standards by USDA should be with the direct involvement of the major aquaculture organizations, insuring coverage of all species groups and uses for the interstate and international</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<p><i>dividends to society, and the global, high-tech, environmentally-sensitive era we have now entered requires support of public research. The nation's land grant universities must remain a strategic resource for agriculture and the general public. They must be used wisely and fully to support the needs of an ever expanding domestic and worldwide population.</i></p>	<p>movement of aquatic animals and plants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of improved processing technologies and new products development.</li> <li>• Value-added products can contribute to domestic and foreign markets.</li> <li>• Adoption of uniform quality standards.</li> <li>• Need federally approved chemicals, vaccines, and therapeutic compounds to increase productivity.</li> <li>• Increase research funding.</li> <li>• Change basic misconceptions in Congress and make research and development a higher priority</li> <li>• Crop Insurance for Aquaculture</li> <li>• Permits for water discharge (cost is too high)</li> <li>• Availability of the Internet</li> <li>• Ag Research, Extension, and Education (14.1)</li> <li>• Aquaculture (1.9)</li> <li>• **Develop National Committee of Ag-Health-FOA-CDC-Military Vet Services to identify and coordinate lab needs and direct which departments conduct tests and research</li> <li>• **Coordinate research work in college and private labs.</li> <li>• **Support funding for modern technology.</li> <li>• **APHIS should be encouraged to proceed with vet services in modernization, also.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>GMO's /Biotech</b>  <i>Genetically Modified Organism is a term</i></p>	<p>NASDA policy 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 supports the principle that information relevant to the safety and healthfulness of foods should be widely disseminated. NASDA supports the policy of the Food and Drug</p>	

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<p><i>currently used most often in international trade discussions, that designates crops that carry new traits that have been inserted through advanced genetic engineering methods (e.g. Flavr Saver tomato, Roundup Ready soybeans, Bt Cotton, Bt corn). GMO crops are meeting resistance from some trading partners, particularly the European Union, that are responding in turn to consumer concerns over public health and environmental safety aspects of GMOs. The U.S. scientific community maintains that research shows GMOs to be safe and that the regulatory process for their commercial approval, which includes USDA, Food and Drug Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency, is an adequate safeguard against any potential problems.</i></p> <p><i>Even though federal agencies are defining the appropriate regulatory process and labeling of bioengineered products, public interest and concern continue to be heightened as increased visibility of these products and issues develop. This broadening scope of perception, based on misrepresentations of the value, safety and usefulness of biotechnology, is affecting the availability of bioengineered tools for producers and new products reaching</i></p>	<p>Administration that foods produced through modern biotechnology should be labeled as such only if the foods differ from similar foods in ways that are significant and relevant to the issues of safety, efficacy, and purity. It is particularly important that labels convey useful and accurate information in a way that is not misleading to the consumer. Suggestions that biotech foods be labeled as such without regard to data demonstrating their substantial equivalence to other, unlabeled foods are unsupportable.</p> <p>3.1 Introduction to Biotechnology 3.2 Biotech’s Impact on Agriculture 3.3 Commercial Marketing of Products</p> <p>Other policy options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased state and federal efforts to educate consumers</li> <li>• Work with FDA, EPA and USDA to update biotech policies.</li> <li>• Internat’l negotiations to eliminate non-science based barriers to trade in biotech products</li> <li>• Oppose state level labeling requirements.</li> <li>• Needs to be a different term for GMO</li> <li>• More independent public research</li> <li>• The administration must inform state departments of agriculture, or work in partnership.</li> <li>• Federal and State cooperation</li> <li>• Development of improved processing technologies and new products development.</li> <li>• Value-added products can contribute to domestic and foreign markets.</li> <li>• Adoption of uniform quality standards.</li> <li>• Need federally approved chemicals, vaccines, and</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

**Animal & Plant Industries Committee**

<p><i>consumers. The world's poor must not be forgotten as consumers. As the minutiae of biotechnology is critically analyzed by developed countries, millions of the third world's poorest are denied a food resource.</i></p> <p><i>It is critical that federal and state officials be informed, knowledgeable, and included as working partners in all phases of the ongoing biotechnology regulatory policy process. It is essential that state agencies be active partners, sharing oversight responsibilities with federal agencies, while carrying out their responsibilities to the state's agricultural community and the consuming public at large.</i></p>	<p>therapeutic compounds to increase productivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase research funding.</li> <li>• Change basic misconceptions in Congress and make research and development a higher priority</li> <li>• Crop Insurance for Aquaculture</li> <li>• Permits for water discharge (cost is too high)</li> <li>• Availability of the Internet</li> </ul> <p>Resource(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Genetic Engineering the Technological Revolution”, Suzanne Wuerthele, US EPA 999 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Denver, CO. 80202, 303-312-6039. (Speaker at Accord 1999)</li> <li>• “Application of Biotechnology to Crops: Benefits and Risks” ,Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST) Number 12, December 1999</li> <li>• “Crop Busters” ,pg. 44 , by Michael Fumento. Reason Magazine, January 2000</li> <li>• “Crops Busters Take on Monsanto”, by James Gillis and Anne Swardson, Tuesday, October 26, 1999 page E01</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp~srv/WPlate/1999-10/26/1461-102699-idx.html">www.washingtonpost.com/wp~srv/WPlate/1999-10/26/1461-102699-idx.html</a></li> <li>• “The Real Losers from Seattle”, The Economist, December 11-17, 1999.</li> <li>• “Biotechnology: Trade Crisis or Path to Future”, Global Food Quarterly, Summer 1999, Number 28.</li> </ul>	
---	--	--