No. 200100249

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME:

Sunderman Breeding Inc.

Whereas, THERE HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO THE

Secretary of Agriculture

AN APPLICATION REQUESTING A CERTIFICATE OF PROTECTION FOR AN ALLEGED DISTINCT VARIETY OF SEXUALLY REPRODUCED, OR TUBER PROPAGATED PLANT; THE NAME AND DESCRIPTION OF WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THE APPLICATION AND EXHIBITS, A COPY OF WHICH IS HEREUNTO ANNEXED AND MADE A PART HEREOF, AND THE VARIOUS REQUIREMENTS OF LAW IN SUCH CASES MADE AND PROVIDED HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH, AND THE TITLE THERETO IS, FROM THE RECORDS OF THE PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION OFFICE, IN THE APPLICANT(S) INDICATED IN THE SAID COPY, AND WHEREAS, UPON DUE EXAMINATION MADE, THE SAID APPLICANT(S) IS (ARE) ADJUDGED TO BE ENTITLED TO A CERTIFICATE OF PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW.

NOW, THEREFORE, THIS CERTIFICATE OF PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION IS TO GRANT UNTO THE SAID APPLICANT(S) AND THE SUCCESSORS, HEIRS OR ASSIGNS OF THE SAID APPLICANT(S) FOR THE TERM OF TWENTY YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THIS GRANT, SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF THE REQUIRED FEES AND PERIODIC REPLENISHMENT OF VIABLE BASIC SEED OF THE VARIETY IN A PUBLIC REPOSITORY AS PROVIDED BY LAW, THE [illegible]GHT TO EXCLUDE OTHERS FROM SELLING THE VARIETY, OR OFFERING IT FOR SALE, OR REPRODUCING IT, OR [illegible]RTING IT, OR EXPORTING IT, OR CONDITIONING IT FOR PROPAGATION, OR STOCKING IT FOR ANY OF THE [illegible] PURPOSE , OR CONDITIONING IT FOR PROPAGATION, OR STOCKING IT FOR ANY OF THE ABOVE [illegible], OR USING IT IN PRODUCING A HYBRID OR DIFFERENT VARIETY THEREFROM, TO THE EXTENT [illegible] BY THE PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION ACT. IN THE UNITED STATES SEED OF THIS VARIETY (1) [illegible] SOLD BY VARIETY NAME ONLY AS A CLASS OF CERTIFIED SEED AND (2) SHALL CONFORM TO THE NUME[illegible]ENERATIONS SPECIFIED BY THE OWNER OF THE RIGHTS. (84 STAT. 1542, AS AMENDED, 7 U.S.C. 2321 ET SEQ.)

WHEAT, COMMON

'Declo'

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Plant Variety Protection Office to be affixed at the City of Washington, D.C. this seventh day of December, in the year two thousand and five.

Attest:

Commissioner
Plant Variety Protection Office
Agricultural Marketing Service

Secretary of Agriculture

(Instructions and information collection burden statement on reverse)

1. NAME OF OWNER Sunderman Breeding, Inc.	2. TEMPORARY DESIGNATION OR EXPERIMENTAL NAME 215-B	3. VARIETY NAME Declo
4. ADDRESS *(Street and No., or R.F.D. No., City, State, and ZIP Code, and Country)* 3754N. 2700E. Twin Falls, Idaho 83301	5. TELEPHONE *(include area code)* (208) 733-0902 6. FAX *(include area code)* (208) 735-8800	FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY PVPO NUMBER 200100249 FILING DATE August 7, 2001
7. IF THE OWNER NAMED IS NOT A "PERSON", GIVE FORM OF ORGANIZATION *(corporation, partnership, association, etc.)* Chapter S Corporation	8. IF INCORPORATED, GIVE STATE OF INCORPORATION Idaho	9. DATE OF INCORPORATION June 25, 1991
10. NAME AND ADDRESS OF OWNER REPRESENTATIVE(S) TO SERVE IN THIS APPLICATION. *(First person listed will receive all papers)* Patsy J. Sunderman 3754N. 2700E. Twin Falls, Idaho 83301		FILING AND EXAMINATION FEES: $ 2705.00 DATE 8/6/2001 CERTIFICATION FEE: $ 682.00 DATE 9/19/2005

11. TELEPHONE *(include area code)*	12. FAX *(include area code)*	13. E-MAIL	14. CROP KIND *(Common Name)*
208-733-0902	(208)735 8800	sunstar@pmt.org	Wheat

15. CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX FOR EACH ATTACHMENT SUBMITTED (Follow instructions on reverse)

a. [X] Exhibit A. Origin and Breeding History of the Variety
b. [ ] Exhibit B. Statement of Distinctness
c. [X] Exhibit C. Objective Description of Variety
d. [ ] Exhibit D. Additional Description of the Variety *(Optional)*
e. [ ] Exhibit E. Statement of the Basis of the Owner's Ownership
f. [X] Voucher Sample *(2,500 viable untreated seeds or, for tuber propagated varieties, verification that tissue culture will be deposited and maintained in an approved public repository)*
g. [X] Filing and Examination Fee ($2,705), made payable to "Treasurer of the United States" *(Mail to the Plant Variety Protection Office)*

19. DOES THE OWNER SPECIFY THAT SEED OF THIS VARIETY BE SOLD AS A CLASS OF CERTIFIED SEED? *See Section 83(a) of the Plant Variety Protection Act)*
[X] YES *(If "yes", answer items 20 and 21 below)* [ ] NO *(If "no," go to item 22)*

20. DOES THE OWNER SPECIFY THAT SEED OF THIS VARIETY BE LIMITED AS TO NUMBER OF CLASSES? [ ] YES [ ] NO
IF YES, WHICH CLASSES? [X] FOUNDATION [X] REGISTERED [X] CERTIFIED

21. DOES THE OWNER SPECIFY THAT THE CLASSES BE LIMITED AS TO NUMBER OF GENERATIONS? [X] YES [ ] NO
IF YES, SPECIFY THE NUMBER 1, 2, 3, etc. [X] FOUNDATION [X] REGISTERED [X] CERTIFIED

(If additional explanation is necessary, please use the space indicated on the reverse.)

22. HAS THE VARIETY (INCLUDING ANY HARVESTED MATERIAL) OR A HYBRID PRODUCED FROM THIS VARIETY BEEN SOLD, DISPOSED OF, TRANSFERRED, OR USED IN THE U. S. OR OTHER COUNTRIES?
[X] YES August 2000 USA [ ] NO
IF YES, YOU MUST PROVIDE THE DATE OF FIRST SALE, DISPOSITION, TRANSFER, OR USE FOR EACH COUNTRY AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES. *(Please use space indicated on reverse.)*

23. IS THE VARIETY OR ANY COMPONENT OF THE VARIETY PROTECTED BY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHT *(PLANT BREEDER'S RIGHT OR PATENT)*?
[ ] YES [X] NO
IF YES, GIVE COUNTRY, DATE OF FILING OR ISSUANCE AND ASSIGNED REFERENCE NUMBER. *(Please use space indicated on reverse.)*

24. The owners declare that a viable sample of basic seed of the variety will be furnished with application and will be replenished upon request in accordance with such regulations as may be applicable, or for a tuber propagated variety a tissue culture will be deposited in a public repository and maintained for the duration of the certificate.

The undersigned owner(s) is(are) the owner of this sexually reproduced or tuber propagated plant variety, and believe(s) that the variety is new, distinct, uniform, and stable as required in Section 42, and is entitled to protection under the provisions of Section 42 of the Plant Variety Protection Act.

Owner(s) is(are) informed that false representation herein can jeopardize protection and result in penalties.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER Patsy J. Sunderman		SIGNATURE OF OWNER	
NAME *(Please print or type)* Sunderman Breeding, Inc. Patsy J. Sunderman		NAME *(Please print or type)*	
CAPACITY OR TITLE President	DATE Aug. 1, 2001	CAPACITY OR TITLE	DATE

200100249

18A Origin and breeding history of variety

Declo is a hard red winter wheat developed by Sunderman Breeding, Inc. from the cross Neeley/*2 Stephens//*2 Borah//ID180 made in 1988. A selection designated as SDM215 originated from a F5 head row. SDM215 was found to be still segregating for plant height and maturity in 193-94 trials. Re-selection from SDM215 head rows was made in 1995-96 for yield and for uniformity of plant height and maturity. A selection SDM215-2 was chosen based on yield and uniformity of plant height and maturity. Selection SDM215-2 was subsequently given the variety name Declo.

Declo has good resistance to lodging. Declo has protein content, and milling and baking quality which have been proven satisfactory.

Area of Adaptation: Southern Idaho irrigated land

Variability: A occasional brown chaffed plant may be found in the variety

Seedstock Maintenance: Breeder seed will be maintained by Sunderman Breeding, Inc. Foundation through Certified will be limited by regulations of the Idaho Crop Improvement Association.

Evidence of uniformity and stability.
Declo has been observed to be uniform and stable for 6 generations.

Variant.
The only variant which has been observed is the presence of an occasional brown chaffed plant. No off- types have been observed in Declo.

Variant A, a dark chaffed plant occurs less than one thousands of 1.0 percent

Exhibit B:

'Declo' is most similar to 'Promontory'. 'Declo' is similar to 'Promontory' in yield, test weight, and heading date.

'Declo' is shorter than 'Promontory' in plant height. Also, the kernel protein content of 'Declo' is higher than 'Promontory'.

The attached Agri-Source winter wheat trial results for the years 1998, 1999, and 2000 (Tables 1, 2, & 3) support the above claims of plant height and kernel protein content differences between 'Declo' and 'Promontory'.

Table 1. RESULTS OF WINTER WHEAT TRIALS, AGRI-SOURCE AGRONOMIC PLOTS, BURLEY, IDAHO1998

Entry	To Head	Height	Lodge	Weight	Moisture	Kernel Protein (%)	Net Yield
Boundary	258 d	39.0 a	0.0	61.5 bc	9.4 ab	12.7 cb	123.4 b
Garland	255 d	32.7 d	0.0	57.5 f	8.1 e	13.6 a	134.8 ab
Promontory	252 c	40.0 a	0.7	63.3 a	9.5 a	12.3 c	138.4 a
SDM-215-2 (Decio)	255 d	36.0 bc	0.0	60.1 e	8.4 d	13.7 a	130.1 ab
SDM-215-6	244 a	34.3 dc	0.0	61.1 dc	8.8 c	13.7 a	131.3 ab
SDM-215-9	246 b	38.3 b	0.0	61.9 b	8.9 c	13.6 a	132.3 ab
Sierra	246 b	36.3 a	0.0	62.1 b	9.2 b	13.5 a	127.4 ab
Uta	255 d	32.7 d	0.0	57.1 f	8.1 e	13.3 ab	123.2 b
WD-1 (Du)	246 b	35.7 bc	0.0	60.4 de	8.3 ed	12.3 c	137.4 ab
Means (n = 27)	251	36.1	0.1	60.5	8.7	13.2	130.9
LSD (0.05 by t)	1	1.7	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.8	14.4
CV% (s/mean)	0.34	2.7	259	0.7	1.7	3.6	8.3
F-Value (df=8,16)	99.85 **	21.74 **	4.00 ns	72.14 **	40.03 **	5.01 **	1.33 ns
P-Value (for F @ 8,16 df)	0.000	0.000	0.068	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.2992
Mean Square Error (df=16)	0.716	0.958	0.037	0.181	0.0216	0.220	69.012
Sums of Squares (treat)	572.1	166.7	1.165	104.5	8.623	8.819	732.39

Values with the same letter are not significantly different based on LSD(0.05)

** - significant at 1.0% level (0.01); * - significant at 5.0% level (0.05); ns - not significant at 5.0% level (0.05).

*statistical analysis run on raw plot data from Agri-Source using Montana State University Statistical program

Per conversation
MAH
9-08-2005

20100249

Table 2. RESULTS OF WINTER WHEAT TRIALS, AGRI-SOURCE AGRONOMIC PLOTS, BURLEY, IDAHO, 1999

Entry	To Head	Height	Lodge	Weight	Moisture	Kernel Protein (%)	Net Yield
Boundary	249 a	26.7 ab	0.0	60.3 cd	9.7 a	12.8 c	98.1 ab
Garland	249 ab	21.7 d	0.0	59.8 cd	9.4 ab	14.3 ab	80.2 cb
Promontory	249 ab	28.3 a	0.0	63.0 a	9.4 ab	13.6 b	104.8 ab
SDM-215-2 (Decio)	249 a	26.0 abc	0.0	62.8 ab	9.8 a	14.6 a	115.5 a
Sierra	248 a	23.7 dbc	0.0	62.0 ab	9.5 ab	14.1 ab	80.1 cb
Ute	248 a	23.0 d c	0.0	61.3 cb	9.5 ab	14.5 a	100.9 ab
Connie	250 b	25.0 bc	0.0	59.2 d	9.2 b	14.1 ab	53.2 c
Means (n = 21)	249	24.9	0.0	61.2	9.5	14.0	90.4
LSD (0.05 by t)	1	3.1	0.0	1.7	0.4	0.7	28.8
CV% (s/mean)	0.29	6.90	0.00	1.53	2.24	2.92	17.93
F-Value (df=6,12)	1.85 ns	5.37 ss	0.00	7.63 ss	2.5 ns	6.62 ss	4.96 ss
P-Value (for F @ 6,12 df)	0.172	0.007	0.00	0.002	0.087	0.003	0.009
Mean Square Error (df=12)	0.532	2.952	0.00	0.873	0.0454	0.167	262.56
Sums of Squares (treat)	5.905	95.14	0.00	39.95	0.6733	6.832	7810.2

Values with the same letter are not significantly different based on LSD(0.05)

ss - significant at 1.0% level (0.01); s - significant at 5.0% level (0.05); ns - not significant at 5.0% level (0.05).

*satatistical analysis run on raw plot data from Agri-Source using Montana State University Statistical prog.

MAH 9-08-2005 per phone conversation

5

200100249

6

MAH Feb-2
Perphora
Consider

20010249

Table 3: RESULTS OF WINTER WHEAT TRIALS, AGRI-SOURCE AGRONOMIC PLOTS, BURLEY, IDAHO, 2000

Entry	Days To Head	Height	Lodge	Test Weight	Moisture	Kernel Protein (%)	Net Yield
Boundary	231 e	37.5 ab	0.0	62.3 c	8.0 ab	11.7 cb	153.5 ab
Garland	228 cd	27.3 d	0.0	61.0 d	7.4 c	12.1 cb	155.7 ab
Promontory	225 ab	38.8 a	0.0	64.3 a	7.8 cb	11.5 c	155.1 ab
Decio	228 cb	31.7 c	0.0	63.7 ab	7.8 cb	12.4 ab	162.9 a
Sierra	224 a	36.2 b	0.0	63.0 cb	7.7 cb	12.3 cb	131.8 c
Ute	229 ed	29.3 d	0.0	60.8 d	7.7 cb	11.5 c	155.9 a
W.B. 703	228 ab	38.0 ab	0.0	62.2 c	8.1 a	13.3 a	148.2 b
Means (n = 21)	227	34.1	0.0	62.5	7.7	12.1	151.6
LSD (0.05 by t)	2	2.0	0.0	0.8	0.5	0.9	9.5
CV% (s/mean)	0.52	3.31	0.00	0.75	3.51	4.23	3.54
F-Value (df=6,12)	12.6 **	50.12 **	0.00	22.8 **	2.5 ns	4.67 *	10.44 **
P-Value (for F @ 6,12 df)	0.000	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.084	0.011	0.000
Mean Square Error (df=12)	1.373	1.276	0.00	0.222	0.0734	0.263	28.74
Sums of Squares (treat)	103.8	363.6	0.00	30.41	1.098	7.371	1801.0

Values with the same letter are not significantly different based on $LSD_{(0.05)}$

** - significant at 1.0% level (0.01); * - significant at 5.0% level (0.05); ns - not significant at 5.0% level (0.05).

*statistical analysis run on raw plot data from Agri-Source using the Montana State University Statistical p.

number for this collection of information is (0581-0055). The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact the USDA's TARGET Cent at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION OFFICE
BELTSVILLE, MD 20705

EXHIBIT C
(*Wheat*)

OBJECTIVE DESCRIPTION OF VARIETY
WHEAT (*Triticum* spp.)

NAME OF APPLICANT(S) Sunderman Breeding, Inc.	FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
ADDRESS (Street and No. or RD No., City, State, and Zip Code) 3754N. 2700E. Twin Falls, Idaho 83301	PVPO NUMBER 200100249 VARIETY NAME Declo TEMPORARY OR EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNATION

PLEASE READ ALL INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY: Place the appropriate number that describes the varietal character of this variety in the boxes below. Place a zero in the first box (e.g. [0][9][9] or [0][9]) when number is either 99 or less or 9 or less respectively. Data for quantitative plant characters should be based on a minimum of 100 plants. Comparative data should be determined from varieties entered in the same trial. Royal Horticultural Society or any recognized color standard may be used to determine plant colors; designate system used:
Please answer all questions for your variety; lack of response may delay progress of your application.

1. KIND:

[1] 1=Common 2=Durum 3=Club 4=Other (SPECIFY) : _____

2. VERNALIZATION:

[2] 1=Spring 2=Winter 3=Other (SPECIFY) : _____

3. COLEOPTILE ANTHOCYANIN:

[1] 1=Absent 2=Present

4. JUVENILE PLANT GROWTH:

[2] 1=Prostrate 2=Semi-erect 3=Erect

5. PLANT COLOR (boot stage):

[2] 1 = Yellow-Green 2 = Green 3 = Blue-Green

6. FLAG LEAF (boot stage):

[1] 1 = Erect 2 = Recurved [2] 1 = Not Twisted 2 = Twisted
MAH per correspondence of 2/15/02

7. EAR EMERGENCE:

[0][1] Number of Days Earlier Than Garland *

[0][2] Number of Days Later Than Promontory *

200100249

8. ANTHER COLOR:

[1] 1 = Yellow 2 = Purple

9. PLANT HEIGHT (from soil to top of head, excluding awns):

[2 0] cm Taller Than Garland *

[0 8] cm Shorter Than Promontory *

* Relative to a PVPO-Approved Commercial Variety Grown in the Same Trial

10. STEM:

A. ANTHOCYANIN

[1] 1= Absent 2=Present

B. WAXY BLOOM

[2] 1=Absent 2=Present

C. HAIRINESS (last internode of rachis)

[2] 1=Absent 2=Present

D. INTERNODE (SPECIFY NUMBER)

[1] 1= Hollow 2=Semi-solid 3=Solid

E. PEDUNCLE

[2] 1=Absent 2=Present

[35] cm Length

11. HEAD (at Maturity):

A. DENSITY

[1] 1=Lax 2=Middense 3= Dense

B. SHAPE

[4] 1 = Tapering 2= Strap 3 = Clavate 4 = Other (SPECIFY): oblong

C. CURVATURE

[1] 1 = Erect 2 = Inclined 3 = Recurved

D. AWNEDNESS

[4] 1 = Awnless 2 = Apically Awnletted 3 = Awnletted 4 = Awned

12. GLUMES (at Maturity):

A. COLOR

[3] 1 = White 2 = Tan 3 = Other (SPECIFY) : Tannish White

B. SHOULDER

[3] 1 = Wanting 2 = Oblique 3 = Rounded 4 = Square 5 = Elevated 6 = Apiculate

C. BEAK

[3] 1 = Obtuse 2 = Acute 3 =Acuminate

D. LENGTH

[3] 1 = Short (ca. 7mm) 2 = Medium (ca. 8mm) 3 = Long (ca. 9mm)

8

200100249

12. GLUMES (at Maturity) *Continued*:

E. WIDTH

[3] 1 = Narrow (ca. 3mm) 2 = Medium (ca. 3.5mm) 3 = Wide (ca. 4mm)

13. SEED:

A. SHAPE

[3] 1 = Ovate 2 = Oval 3 = Elliptical

B. CHEEK

[1] 1=Rounded 2=Angular

C. BRUSH

[1] 1=Short 2=Medium 3=Long

[1] 1 = Not Collared 2 = Collared

D. CREASE

[1] 1 = Width 60% or less of Kernel
2 = Width 80% or less of Kernel
3 = Width Nearly as Wide as Kernel

[1] 1 = Depth 20% or less of Kernel
2 = Depth 35% or less of Kernel
3 = Depth 50% or less of Kernel

E. Color

[3] 1=White 2= Amber 3= Red 4= OTHER (Specify)

F. TEXTURE

[1] 1=Hard 2=Soft

G. PHENOL REACTION *(see instructions)*:

[ ] 1 = Ivory 2 = Fawn 3 = Light Brown 4 = Dark Brown 5 = Black

14. DISEASE: (0=Not Tested; 1=Susceptible; 2=Resistant; 3=Intermediate; 4=Tolerant)

PLEASE INDICATE THE SPECIFIC RACE OR STRAIN TESTED

[0] Stem Rust *(Puccinia graminis* f. sp. *tritici)*

[0] Stripe Rust *(Puccinia striiformis)*

[0] Tan Spot *(Pyrenophora tritici-repentis)*

[0] Halo Spot *(Selenophoma donacis)*

[0] *Septoria nodorum* (Glume Blotch)

[0] *Septoria avenae* (Speckled Leaf Disease)

[0] *Septoria tritici* (Speckled Leaf Blotch)

[0] Scab (*Fusarium* spp.)

[2] Leaf Rust *(Puccinia recondita* f. sp. *tritici)*

[0] Loose Smut *(Ustilago tritici)*

[0] Flag Smut *(Urocystis agropyri)*

[0] Common Bunt *(Tilletia tritici* or *T. laevis)*

[1] Dwarf Bunt *(Tilletia controversa)*

[0] Karnal Bunt *(Tilletia indica)*

[0] Powdery Mildew *(Erysiphe graminis* f. sp. *tritici)*

[0] "Snow Molds"

14. Disease *(Continued)* (0=Not Tested; 1=Susceptible; 2=Resistant; 3=Intermediate; 4=Tolerant)

PLEASE INDICATE THE SPECIFIC RACE OR STRAIN TESTED

0	"Black Point" (Kernel Smudge)	0	Common Root Rot *(Fusarium, Cochliobolus* and *Bipolaris* spp.*)*
0	Barley Yellow Dwarf Virus (BYDV)	0	Rhizoctonia Root Rot *(Rhizoctonia solani)*
0	Soilborne Mosaic Virus (SBMV)	0	Black Chaff *(Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *translucens)*
0	Wheat Yellow (Spindle Streak) Mosaic Virus	0	Bacterial Leaf Blight *(Pseudomonas syringae* pv. *syringae)*
0	Wheat Streak Mosaic Virus (WSMV)		Other (SPECIFY)
	Other (SPECIFY)		Other (SPECIFY)
	Other (SPECIFY)		Other (SPECIFY)
	Other (SPECIFY)		Other (SPECIFY)

15. INSECT: (0=Not Tested; 1=Susceptible; 2=Resistant; 3=Intermediate; 4=Tolerant)

PLEASE SPECIFY BIOTYPE (where needed)

0	Hessian Fly *(Mayetiola destructor)*		Other (SPECIFY)
0	Stem Sawfly *(Cephus* spp.)		Other (SPECIFY)
0	Cereal Leaf Beetle *(Oulema melanopa)*		Other (SPECIFY)
0	Russian Aphid *(Diuraphis noxia*		Other (SPECIFY)
0	Greenbug *(Schizaphis graminum)*		Other (SPECIFY)
0	Aphids		Other (SPECIFY)

16. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON ANY ITEM ABOVE, OR GENERAL COMMENTS

200100249

EXHIBIT D: MILLING AND BAKING QUALITY

Tables 5, 6, and 7 compare the milling and baking quality of Declo to similar hard red winter wheat varieties grown in South Central and South East Idaho.

11

200100249

TABLE 5: PERCENT FLOUR YIELDS OF IRRIGATED DECLO HARD RED WINTER WHEAT IN COMPARISON TO PROMONTORY, BOUNDARY AND GARLAND GROWN IN IDAHO

Location	Kimberly		Aberdeen	
Year	1998	1999	1998	1999
Variety				
Declo	67.8	65.8	69.3	64.4
Promontory	72.1	68.3	72.1	68.2
Boundary	72.5	69.4	72.4	67.2
Garland	67.5	63.8	68.8	62.2

TABLE 6: MIXING TOLERANCE AND MIXING TIME (min) OF IRRIGATED DECLO HARD RED WINTER WHEAT IN COMPARISON TO PROMONTORY, BOUNDARY AND GARLAND GROWN IN IDAHO

	Mixing Tolerance (deg)		Mixing Time	
Location	Kimberly	Aberdeen	Kimberly	Aberdeen
Year	1998	1998	1998	1998
Variety				
Declo	71	75	3.6	4.2
Promontory	69	74	2.6	3.4
Boundary	74	76	2.8	3.5
Garland	56	67	2.4	2.5

TABLE 7: BAKE VOLUME (cc) OF IRRIGATED DECLO HARD RED WINTER WHEAT IN COMPARISON TO PROMONTORY, BOUNDARY AND GARLAND GROWN IN IDAHO

Location	Kimberly		Aberdeen	
Year	1998	1999	1998	1999
Variety				
Declo	950	850	900	825
Promontory	940	950	925	850
Boundary	900	725	900	775
Garland	950	775	925	750

200100249

EXHIBIT E

Breeding history and origin of Declo as described in 18A was exclusively developed by Dr. Donald W. Sunderman, former president of Sunderman Breeding, Inc.