

IBC offers web-based seminars

IBC is offering a series of web-based grower education seminars (webinars). Participation is simple and at no cost. You log onto the website at <https://connect.cals.uidaho.edu/barley> (requires Adobe Flash Player which is installed on most computers) and enter your email address as a participant. **We conducted our first webinar on Sept. 14 on Grain Market Outlook & 2011 Malt Contract Pricing Strategies** – a recorded version of the seminar can be downloaded at <https://connect.cals.uidaho.edu/p972411481>.

UPCOMING WEBINAR TOPICS AND DATES:

(Check our website for current dates and times)

Nov. 10 at 8:00 a.m. MST – Understanding technical trends in futures contracts / current grain market outlook – presented by Craig Corbett (Grace, ID grower) and Kelly Olson, IBC

Dec. 7 at 8:00 a.m. MST (tentative) – Managing Input Costs – Fine tuning on-farm energy use and owning vs. leasing machinery

Feb. 7 at 8:00 a.m. MST (tentative) – Understanding new barley crop insurance options – presented by Mark Andreasen, Mountain States Insurance

IBC campaigns to improve barley crop insurance

For the past several years, the IBC has led a national effort to improve barley crop insurance. Our recent focus has included:

Modifying the formula that RMA uses to calculate the feed barley insurance price guarantee – Under the new COMBO insurance rules that go into effect for 2011 policies, the previous APH and revenue-type policies have been consolidated into a single yield policy and a single revenue policy. RMA plans to use the average daily CBOT corn futures price traded in the month of Feb. multiplied by a barley conversion factor to determine the feed barley price guarantee. We have mounted a serious challenge of the proposed conversion factor, arguing that it does not represent a true comparison of actual market price values for barley and corn. **We have provided a comprehensive review of the new barley insurance policies inside this newsletter.**

We developed and worked with RMA on the creation of a new stand-alone Specialty Type Barley Insurance Policy that was available for the first time in 2010. This policy insures specialty types of barley – malting, food and certified seed of malting/food – based on actual contract prices. An important difference between this new malt barley policy and the traditional Malt Barley Endorsement is that it does not insure against quality losses.

IDAHO BARLEY R•E•P•O•R•T

IDAHO BARLEY COMMISSION • BOISE, ID • 208-334-2090

Fall 2010

www.idahobarley.org

Vol. 21, No. 1

BARLEY MARKET INNOVATIONS: *Making fish feed from barley*

Dating back 10 to 15 years when fish meal supplies started to dwindle and prices began to escalate, USDA/ARS and University of Idaho fish scientists in Hagerman, ID, and Bozeman, MT, began evaluating plant based alternatives to the traditional marine-based fish meal diets that are fed to farm-raised trout. But their quest for new affordable fish feed ingredients has not been simple. Unlike other animal species, such as cows, chickens and pigs, fish require a unique diet that is very high in protein and energy, with little or no fiber, making formulations using plant ingredients very challenging.

In the ensuing years the team of ARS and university scientists evaluated many plant ingredients, including barley, wheat, corn, soybeans, canola and peas, with the goal of maximizing protein levels and minimizing other components that are undesirable in fish diets. Barley was an early target of their investigations because of Idaho's large barley production base and relatively few anti-nutritional concerns with barley, but the barley hull presented many challenges. The barley hull can't be digested by fish and the fish feed manufacturers don't have readily available equipment to either de-hull or grind the barley into suitable particles for further processing into fish pellets.

But thanks to a unique partnership formed between ARS scientist Dr. Rick Barrows and a private Montana company with expertise in enzymes, a major breakthrough has been achieved in segregating and purifying a protein concentrate from barley that looks like an excellent fit in trout and salmon diets. Fish feed manufacturers have tested this barley protein concentrate and have found the barley protein to be highly digestible when compared to other available ingredients and very palatable to the fish, without reducing the fish growth or the quality of the finished fish product.

Dr. Rick Barrows, lead USDA/ARS fish feed researcher based in Hagerman, ID and Bozeman, MT, says this new extraction process is a win-win for barley – it can deliver the protein levels that the fish need without

the other anti-nutritional factors that come with whole grains and other plant ingredients. Montana Microbial Products, based in Missoula, MT, developed the new processing method for extracting and purifying barley protein concentrate to 60% protein level on a dry matter basis, and worked in partnership with Dr. Barrows to develop applications in aquaculture feeds. The two partners – USDA/ARS and MMP – have a patent pending on their break-through enzymatic process and use of the barley protein in aquaculture feeds.

To commercialize this innovative extraction process, MMP says they need to find a viable use for the remaining starch and ethanol production is the most economically viable candidate. For the past year, MMP has evaluated several plant scenarios in both Idaho and Montana, including a possible joint venture partnership with the Simplot Co. to convert Simplot's now defunct potato waste ethanol plant in Caldwell to a barley protein concentrate and ethanol facility. Ironing out the ownership and equity financing details has been a big hurdle according to Cliff Bradley, one of the two principals in Montana Microbial Products. If the joint venture idea doesn't work out, Bradley says he and his partner are aggressively pursuing equity financing to build a new facility from the ground up. Unfortunately their preferred site in Buhl, Idaho, is no longer being considered because they could not secure a new water permit from the state to build in that region. Despite the current financing roadblocks, Cliff Bradley remains excited about the possibility of this state-of-the-art venture. "It makes both economic and environmental sense," says Bradley. "If we get this first plant built, it should be a very profitable business in the future as the aquaculture market and demand for fish feed ingredients continues growing at a rapid pace."

Meanwhile the marketplace is eagerly awaiting the barley protein concentrate. Dr. Barrows reports that he has worked closely with major fish feed manufacturers based in Hagerman, Idaho as well as overseas to test

continued on next page

PRODUCER TOOLBOX: *Tracking herbicide use with new computer tools*

With the help of IBC funding, University of Idaho weed scientists have designed a dynamic computer tool to help Idaho grain producers simplify herbicide selection and prevent development of herbicide resistant weeds and damage to future crops.

This dynamic herbicide tracking tool – **“Herbicide Resistance and Persistence Management”** – is available for purchase online at www.cals.uidaho.edu/herbicidemanagement. Growers who download the program will have a six month free trial period before they have to pay a \$50 annual subscription fee to cover updates. The university’s weed scientists plan to update the database twice each year to keep the data as current as possible.

The initial effort by Moscow-based weed scientists Donn Thill, Joan Campbell and Traci Rauch was to focus on dryland crop rotations suitable for northern Idaho, eastern Washington and eastern Oregon. Thill says the goal was to help growers make decisions about which herbicide might best control weed problems and fit into their crop rotations. **A more recent effort led by Kimberly-based weed scientist Don Morishita has expanded the program to cover southern Idaho irrigated crop rotations.**

Tracking and adjusting herbicide use is essential to controlling resistance in weeds. Over 200 weeds worldwide now show resistance to commonly used herbicides. Thill and Campbell have been leaders in helping Northwest growers plan strategies to limit herbicide resistance in weeds. The main way to avoid resistance is to change herbicides based on their modes of action on weeds.

Growers can face substantial challenges in both trying to use herbicides from different groups to control common weeds and then keeping clear records through multiple seasons. This herbicide management program can help accomplish both tasks. In addition, the program targets another challenge for growers, deciding which herbicide best fits their crop rotations. Some herbicides can persist in the soil for more than a year in concentrations high enough to damage future crops that are especially susceptible to damage.

The backbone of the program is manufacturer’s labels required by federal law for all herbicides. The label information contains directions on which crop the herbicide is registered and directions on how to use it.

The database tracks label directions on herbicide persistence for up to five years, although

in most cases the effects are gone in a year. Some crops, however, can suffer herbicide injury several years later. In rare instances, Thill said, unique soil conditions could extend herbicide persistence but common sense made five years seem a logical limit.

The program’s development was funded by the Idaho Barley Commission, Idaho Wheat Commission, and University of Idaho College of Agricultural and Life Sciences.

BARLEY MARKET INNOVATIONS

continued from front page

the barley protein concentrate as a viable feed ingredient for trout, salmon and other fish species. The feeding trial results have been very promising. Cliff Bradley says their market research shows an immediate demand for at least 25,000 metric tons of barley protein concentrate (would require 110 thousand metric tons or about 5 million bushels of barley) just to satisfy the needs of the North American trout and salmon market. The potential demand from other aquaculture segments that have traditionally relied on fish meal ingredients, particularly in China and Southeast Asia, is likely to be even greater.

MARKET OUTLOOK: *MY 2010/11 Global Grain Market Fundamentals*

(USDA WASDE, Oct. 8, 2010)

World barley production down 17% to the lowest level in 40 years (U.S. crop down 20%), usage down 3% (U.S. up 2%) and carryover down 43% (U.S. down 24%). Malting barley crops are significantly smaller in the EU, Canada and the US compared to last year’s bumper crops, helping to draw down large malt inventories in the face of lackluster beer demand.

World wheat production down 6% (U.S. crop up slightly), usage up 2% (U.S. up 5%) and carryover down 11% (U.S. down 13%).

World corn production up 1% (U.S. crop down 3%), usage up 3% (U.S. up 3%) and carryover down 11% (U.S. down 47%).

Key Factors to Watch –

Will Australia and Argentine wheat production reach or exceed current estimates?

Excessively dry conditions in Western Australia will most likely cut yield potential in this key production area by as much as half, BUT the eastern and southern Australia wheat crops are expected to be bumper if the weather cooperates during harvest. Argentina started the crop year very dry but has received enough moisture recently to stabilize yields.

Will USDA make additional cuts to their U.S. corn yield and production estimates in either November or January? USDA pegged the national average corn yield this month at

a surprisingly bullish 155.8 bpa, which cut production by nearly 500 million bu. The ending stocks estimate has fallen below one billion bushels, with the second tightest stocks to use ratio ever.

How much corn will China need to import this year to meet its expanding livestock feed demand?

Right now, private forecasts peg the Chinese corn crop at a much lower level (153 MMT) than either USDA (166 MMT) or Chinese government (169 MMT) estimates.

U.S. Grain Supply & Demand • USDA, Oct. 8, 2010 (million bu)						
	BARLEY		CORN		WHEAT	
	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
Harvested Acres (min)	3.1	2.5	79.6	81.3	49.9	47.7
Carryin	89	115	1,673	1,708	657	976
Production	227	182	13,110	12,664	2,218	2,224
Imports	17	15	8	10	119	100
Total Supply	333	312	14,791	14,382	2,993	3,299
Food, Seed & Industrial	164	165	5,930	6,080	986	1,016
Ethanol			4,560	4,700		
Feed	48	50	5,167	5,400	150	180
Exports	6	10	1,987	2,000	881	1,250
Total Usage	217	225	13,084	13,480	2,018	2,446
End Stocks	115	87	1,708	902	976	853
Stocks to Use	53%	38.7%	13.1%	6.7%	48.4%	34.9%

World Grain Supply & Demand • USDA, Oct. 8, 2010 (million metric tons, MMT)						
	BARLEY		CORN		WHEAT	
	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11	2009-10	2010-11
Carryin	30.9	36.8	147.9	148.1	165.3	196.5
Production	149.7	124.6	810.3	819.6	682.2	641.4
Total Supply	180.6	161.4	958.2	967.7	847.5	837.9
Export Trade	16.9	16.2	91.7	93.6	134.4	125.7
Total Usage	143.9	140.3	810.2	835.4	650.9	663.3
Carryout	36.8	21.1	148.1	132.4	196.5	174.7
Stocks / Use	25.6%	15.0%	18.3%	15.8%	30.2%	26.3%

2011 BARLEY CROP INSURANCE COVERAGE OPTIONS: Fact Sheet for PNW Barley Producers

By Kellen Corbett

**Spring Barley: Sales closing date 3/15/2011
Acreage reporting date 6/30/2011**

Multi-Peril Crop Insurance (MPCI) – provides protection against weather-related production losses, with coverage options from 50 to 85% of the producers actual production history (APH) average yields.

Producers now have three choices under one insurance plan:

• Yield Protection

Insurance coverage only providing protection against a production loss. The production guarantee is based on the projected price (Approved APH yield X Coverage level X Projected price). Production to count is based on the projected price.

• Revenue Protection

Insurance coverage providing protection against loss of revenue due to a production loss, price decline or increase, or a combination of both. The revenue guarantee is based on the greater of the projected or harvest price (Approved APH yield X Coverage Level X Greater of the Projected Price or Harvest Price). Production to count is based on the harvest price

• Revenue Protection with Harvest Price Exclusion

Insurance coverage providing protection only against loss of revenue due to a production loss, price decline or a combination of both. The revenue guarantee is based on the projected price only (Approved APH yield X Coverage Level X The Projected Price). Production to count is based on the harvest price

Price Determination: Both the Revenue and Yield Protection plans will use the Chicago Board of Trade Corn Futures Contract to derive the projected price used to establish the insurance guarantee and premium for the crop and the harvest price used to value production to count under the Revenue Protection Plan. This pricing method is new to policies converting from the APH plan to the Yield Protection plan. These prices are adjusted for barley based on a factor determined by RMA that will be published ahead of the sales closing date. The factor will be based on the historical relationship of the corn futures contract price and the season average cash price for barley. The deadline for the factor is the first day of the discovery period – which is when it will appear on the price discovery page.

The Commodity Exchange Price Provisions (CEPP) contains information necessary to derive the projected price and the harvest price for the insured crop, as applicable. This information includes the price discovery period, release dates, board of trade's utilized, and additional pricing information. It is available

at your agent's office and at the RMA web site: <http://www.rma.usda.gov>.

Malting Barley: There are 3 ways to insure malting barley:

- Under a yield protection policy or revenue protection policy based on a price election published by RMA or calculated in accordance with Commodity Exchange Price Provisions (CEPP).
- Under yield a protection or revenue protection policy with added protection provided in accordance with the Malting Barley Price and Quality Endorsement. In this case, the prices are used to determine the coverage under the Small Grains Crop Provisions as stated above, plus an additional value price determined in accordance with the Endorsement.
- Under a yield protection policy based upon a price contained in a production contract (specialty malting type).

Malting Barley Price and Quality Endorsement (MBPQE)

MBPQE provides supplemental coverage for malting barley in addition to the coverage provided for barley by the Small Grains Crop Provisions.

Two malting barley coverage options are available under the MBPQE, Option A and Option B.

Option A provides supplemental coverage for insured's that grow approved malting barley varieties, with or without a malting barley contract(s), or a malting barley price agreement.

Option B provides supplemental coverage for insured's that grow approved malting barley varieties under malting barley contract(s) only.

Option A or B must be elected by indicating the option selected on the Application (new insured's) or Policy Change (carryover insured's).

MBPQE Changes for 2011:

For counties with both fall and spring Sales Closing Dates (SCD), producers may elect this endorsement until the spring SCD only if they don't have any fall planted acreage of approved malting varieties.

If production is retained past May 31 of the year following the insured crop year, the claim may be deferred until the disposition of the production if the insured agrees, or if the insured does not agree the claim will be settled with no adjustment for quality.

Any damaged production sold for any use at a price greater than the projected price will be production to count.

Option A – Added provisions to allow the additional value price to be determined based on

a contract price contained in a malting barley contract or price agreement, and to limit the additional value price to no more than \$1.25.

Option B – Insured's need to provide malting barley contracts and sales records to show at least 75% of the contracted amount of production was produced in 1 of the last 3 crop years in which malting barley was planted.

COVERAGE EXAMPLES:

Yield Protection and Revenue Protection:

Assume: 50 acres of barley have been planted with an approved yield of 60 bu/A and a production guarantee of 45 bu/A at the 75% coverage level. The projected price is \$3.02. The harvest price is \$3.14. Actual production is 2,000 bu.

Yield Protection:

Value of production guarantee:

50 acres X 45 bu/A X \$3.02 = \$6,795

Number of acres X Bushel protection guarantee X Projected price = Value of production guarantee

Value of the production to count:

2,000 bu X \$3.02 = \$6,040

Number of bushels produced X Projected price = Value of the production to count

Indemnity:

\$6,795 - \$6,040 = \$755

Value of production guarantee – Value of the production to count = Indemnity

Revenue Protection:

Value of revenue protection guarantee:

50 acres X 45 bu/A X \$3.02 = \$6,795

Number of acres planted X Bushel production guarantee X Projected price = Value of revenue protection guarantee

Value of production to count:

Recalculate guarantee because harvest price is greater than the projected price.

50 acres X 45 bu/A X \$3.14 = \$7,065; THEN

2,000 bu X \$3.14 = \$6,280

Number of bushels produced X Projected price = Value of the production to count.

Indemnity:

\$7,065 - \$6,280 = \$785

Value of revenue protection guarantee – Value of production to count = Indemnity

Revenue Protection With the Harvest Price Exclusion**:

Value of revenue protection guarantee:

50 acres X 45 bu/A X \$3.02 = \$6,795

Number of acres planted X Bushel production guarantee X Projected price = Value of revenue guarantee

Value of production to count:

2,000 bu X \$3.14 = \$6,280

Number of bushels produced X Harvest price = Value of production to count

Indemnity

\$6,795 - \$6,280 = \$515

Value of revenue protection guarantee – Value of production to count = Indemnity

**If the harvest price exclusion is elected, the revenue protection guarantee is only multiplied by your projected price, providing protection only against loss of revenue due to a production loss, price decline, or a combination of both.

Specialty Malting Type:

Assume: 50 acres of specialty malting type barley has been planted with a production guarantee of 45 bu/A. The projected price is \$3.02. The harvest price is \$3.14. The actual production is 2,000 bu. The producer has a malting barley contract for \$4.00 bu.

Yield Protection:

Value of production guarantee:

50 acres X 45 bu/A X \$4.00 = \$9,000

continued on back page

COVERAGE EXAMPLES *continued*

Number of acres planted X Bushel protection guarantee X Contract price = Value of production guarantee

Value of production to count:

2,000 bu X \$4.00 = \$8,000

Number of bushels produced X Contract price = Value of production to count.

Indemnity:

\$9,000 - \$8,000 = \$1,000

Value of production guarantee - Value of production to count = Indemnity

Coverage Examples With a Malting Barley Endorsement:

Option A: Assume: 400 acres of barley has been planted, 200 acres of an approved malting variety of barley and 200 acres of feed barley. The APH on the feed barley is 55 bu/A, and the APH for the malting variety barley is 52 bu/A. The malting barley price agreement is to sell 5,720 bu for \$2.72 per bu. The projected price is \$1.92 and the added value for the barley grown under the price agreement is \$0.80. The additional value in the actuarial documents is \$0.40 (RMA's price for production not under contract or price agreement.) Total production on 200 acres of malting barley is 7,250 bu, all of which fails to meet quality standards. Consequently, 4,750 bushels are sold at \$2.31. After conditioning, at a cost of \$0.05 per bushel, an additional 2,500 bushels are sold at \$2.20 per bushel.

Amount of bushels eligible for coverage:

The amount of bushels eligible for coverage is determined by the lesser amount of bushels created by these two equations.

$5,720 \times 75\% = 4,290$ bu eligible for coverage

Amount of bushels grown under price agreement X Selected insurance coverage level

OR: $200 \times 39^* = 7,800$ (52 bu/A X 75% = 39*)

Number of acres planted of approved malting barley X Bushel production guarantee

Amount of insurance protection for bushels grown under malt agreement:

$4,290 \text{ bu} \times \$0.80 = \$3,432.00$

Amount of bushels eligible for coverage X Additional value price = Amount of insurance protection for bushels grown under malt barley price agreement

Amount of insurance for bushels not grown under the malt barley price agreement:

$7,800 \text{ bu} - 4,290 \text{ bu} \times \$0.40 = \$1,404$

Total malt barley production - Bushels covered using the additional value price from the price agreement x Additional value price from the actuarial documents

Total Amount of insurance protection:

$\$3,432 + \$1,404 = \$4,836$

Total amount of insurance protection under malt barley agreement + Total amount of insurance for bushels not grown under malt barley price agreement

Determination of total production to count:

Damaged Production that is not reconditioned:

$\$2.31 - \$1.92 = \$0.39$

Sale price per bushel - Projected price

$\$0.39 \div \$0.62 = .63$ [$\$4,836 \div 7,800 = .62$]

Difference in price ÷ Weighted average of additional value price = Factor

$\$0.63 \times 4,750 \text{ bu} = 2,993$ bu to count

Factor X Number of damaged bushels sold @ \$2.31

Damaged production that is reconditioned:

$\$2.20 - \$1.92 = \$0.28$

Price per bushel of damaged production - Projected price

$\$0.28 - \$0.05 = \$0.23$

Difference in price - Reconditioning costs

$\$0.23 \div .62 = .37$

Factor ÷ Weighted average of additional value price

$.37 \times 2,500 \text{ bu} = 925$ bushels to count

Factor X Number of bushels of damaged production sold

Total production to count:

$2,993 \text{ bu} + 925 \text{ bu} = 3,918$ bu

Damaged production sold that was not reconditioned +

Damaged production that was sold and reconditioned =

Total production to count

Value of production to count:

$3,918 \text{ bu} \times \$0.80 = \$3,134$

Total bushels of production to count X Additional price value

= Value of production to count

Indemnity:

$\$4,836 - \$3,134 = \$1,702$

Total amount of insurance protection for the unit - Value of production to count = Indemnity

Coverage Examples With a Malting Barley Endorsement:

Option B: Assume: 400 acres of barley has been planted, 200 acres of an approved malting variety and 200 acres of feed barley. The APH on the feed barley is 55 bu/A, and the APH for the malt barley is 52 bu/A. There is a malting barley contract for the sale of 10,000 bu at \$2.60 per bu. The projected price for the feed barley is \$1.92 per bu. The additional value price per bushel for production grown under the contract is \$0.68. Total production from the 200 acres of malting barley is 7,250 bu, all of which fails to meet quality standards contained in the malting barley contract. Consequently, 4,750 bu are sold at \$2.31 per bu, and after conditioning, at a cost of \$0.05 per bushel, the remaining 2,500 bu are sold at \$2.20 per bu.

Amount of insurance protection:

The amount of insurance protection is determined based upon the lesser amount of bushels created by the following equations:

$55 \text{ bu/A} \times 75\% = 41.3$ bu

Approved yield protection for feed barley X Percentage of insurance coverage selected = Amount of insurance protection

OR

$10,000 \text{ bu} \div 200 \text{ acres} = 50 \text{ bu}$ [$50 \text{ bu} \times 75\% = 37.5 \text{ bu}$]

Number of bushels contracted ÷ Number of acres planted = Number of bushels then multiply: Number of bushels X

selected coverage level = Amount of insurance protection

$37.5 \text{ bu} \times 200 = 7,500 \text{ bu}$

The lesser total from equations X Number of acres of malt barley planted = Total malting barley production guarantee.

Total Amount of insurance protection:

$7,500 \text{ bu} \times \$0.68 = \$5,100$

Malting barley production guarantee X Additional value

price = Total amount of insurance for the unit

Amount of production to count:

Damaged production not reconditioned:

$\$2.31 - 1.92 = \0.39

Price per bushel that damaged barley is sold for -

Projected price for feed barley = Factor

$\$0.39 \div \$0.68 = .57$

Factor ÷ Additional price value = New factor

$.57 \times 4,750 \text{ bu} = 2,708$

New factor X Number of bushels sold @ \$2.31 = Amount of production to count

Damaged production that is reconditioned:

$\$2.20 - \$1.92 = \$0.28$

Price per bushel that damaged barley is sold for -

Projected price for feed barley

$\$0.28 - \$0.05 = \$0.23$

Subtract Reconditioning costs per bu.

$\$0.23 \div \$0.68 = \$0.34$

Factor ÷ Additional value price = New Factor

$\$0.34 \times 2,500 \text{ bu} = 850$

New Factor X Number of damaged production sold

@\$2.20 = Amount of production to count

Total production to count:

$2,708 + 850 = 3,558$

Total production to count of non-conditioned damaged production + Total production to count of conditioned damaged production = Total production to count.

Value of production to count:

$3,558 \times \$0.68 = \$2,419$

Total bushels to count X Additional value amount = Value of production to count

Indemnity:

$\$5,100 - \$2,419 = \$2,681$

Total amount of insurance protection - Value of production to count = Indemnity

Kellen Corbett, a third-year law student at Gonzaga University in Spokane, WA, was an intern with the USDA Risk Management Agency's regional office in Spokane this past summer. Kellen is the oldest son of Craig and Dawn Corbett, barley farmers in Grace, ID. Kellen is a 2004 graduate of Grace High School and a 2008 graduate of Westminster College in Salt Lake City, UT. His interests include insurance law, golf, Gonzaga basketball, along with all other sports. Kellen would like to thank Dave Paul, Jon Burcham, and Rick Williams of the Spokane regional office for all of their help on this project. This fact sheet was created to notify and help explain the new changes the Combo Insurance policy will have on barley producers beginning in 2011.



821 W. State Street
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 334-2090
Fax (208) 334-2335
kolson@idahobarley.org

PRSRT STD
US POSTAGE
PAID
BOISE, ID
PERMIT NO. 734

Address Service Requested