

Appendix table 1—Selected characteristics of Federal marketing orders—Continued

Product	Year instituted	Status	Quantity	Farm value	Producers	States covered	Other policies	Grade*	Size*	Pack and container	Flow to market	Market allocation	Reserve pool	Producer allotments	Research and development	Advertising	
			1,000 pounds	1,000 dollars	-----Number-----												
Georgia Vidalia onions	1989	A	149,400	44,372	240	1	S-R&P								x	x	
Idaho-Oregon onions	1957	A	1,063,800	139,834	550	2		x	x	Pack	4				x	x	
South Texas onions	1961	A	276,800	72,522	80	1		x	x	x	4				x		
Texas Valley tomatoes ^{1, 12}	1959	In				1		x	x	x					x	x	
Florida tomatoes	1955	A	1,281,600	371,536	250	1	S-R&P	x	x	x					x	x	
Florida celery ¹⁵	1965	S	1,344,000	58,670	7	1	S-R&P	x	x	x	x			x		x	
South Texas lettuce ⁹	1960	In				1		x	x	x	x				x		
South Texas melons	1961	S	224,000	40,682	36	1		x	x	x					x		
California almonds	1950	A	490,000	911,430	7,000	1		x	5			x			x	x	
Oregon-Washington filberts	1949	A	76,400	24,191	950	2	OR-R&P	x	x	Pack		x			x	x	
California walnuts	1948	A	520,000	364,000	5,000	1		x	x	Pack		x	x		x		
Far West spearmint oil	1980	A	2,258	26,373	280	7							x	x			
California dates	1955	A	50,000	24,500	135	1		x	x	Cont.	x				x	x	
California raisins ⁷	1949	A	3,334,000	361,739	4,800	1		x	x		x		x		x	x	
California prunes ⁷	1949	A	242,000	140,360	1,300	1		x	x	Pack		x	x		x		
Peanuts (not M.A. 146) ^{8, 13}	1990	A				All U.S.	Price support	x	x								
Peanuts (M.A. 146) ^{2, 8}	1965	A				16		x	x								
Milk (38 orders)	@ M	@	104,000,000	N 13.5 billion	92,840 673 handlers	45	Yes SP								x	x	
Hops	1966	T-1987	N/A	N/A	N/A	3											

Note: Data are from 1993 unless specified otherwise.

*Restrictions on imports as well as domestic production for tomatoes, black olives, prunes, avocados, limes, grapefruit, Irish potatoes, oranges, onions, walnuts, dates, filberts, table grapes, raisins, kiwifruit, nectarines, and plums.

M.A. = Marketing agreement.

@ = See appendix table 2.

A = Active.

S = Suspended.

S-Res = State research program.

S-MO = State marketing order.

N = 1993 gross value at weighted average of milk marketing order blend prices adj. to 3.5-percent butterfat.

¹Order only.

²Export only.

³Reserve only.

⁷Contains authority for a voluntary producer diversion program.

⁹Order suspended 7/17/92-7/17/95.

¹¹Order suspended 3/1/93. Referendum conducted 11/13-12/10/93.

¹³Administered by the Agricultural Marketing Service.

¹⁵Orders suspended 1/12/95-12/31/97.

= Termination announced.

N/A = No farmers, no production, and no value of production are subject to the terminated order.

In = Inactive.

T = Terminated.

S-R&P = State research and promotion.

M = The number of Federal milk orders peaked at 83 in 1962. However, the proportion of all milk regulated under Federal milk orders is higher in 1993 than in 1962.

SP = Dairy price support program. State milk orders.

²Agreement only.

⁴Shipping holiday.

⁶Applies only to withheld (reserve) cranberries.

⁸Contains indemnity provisions for aflatoxin damaged peanuts.

¹⁰Order suspended 3/1/93-2/28/95.

¹²Inactive. No committee appointed.

¹⁴Order suspended for pears effective 4/4/94.

¹⁶AMS has announced its intention to terminate this order.

Appendix table 2—Federal milk orders in effect on December 31, 1993, with number assigned each order in the code of Federal regulations and date on which each order became effective

Federal milk order	CFR- Chapter 7 part number	Date effective
Alabama-West Florida	1093	5-1-82
Black Hills	1075	8-1-54
Carolina	1005	9-1-90
Central Arizona	1131	12-1-55
Central Arkansas	1108	12-1-55
Central Illinois	1050	1-1-67
Chicago Regional	1030	7-1-68
Merger of: Milwaukee, WI, 12-1-50		
Rock River Valley, 6-1-52, (Rockford-Freeport, 9-1-49)		
Northwestern Wisconsin, 12-1-58		
Madison, WI, 6-1-62		
Northwestern Indiana, 4-1-65 (South Bend-La Porte-Elkhart, 8-1-58),		
(South Bend-La Porte, 12-1-47, merger of LaPorte County, IN, 11-13-37		
and St. Joseph County, IN, 7-1-43).		
Eastern Colorado	1137	12-1-65
Merger of: Eastern Colorado, 11-1-61		
Colorado Springs-Pueblo, 2-1-59		
Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania	1036	5-1-69
Merger of: Clarksburg, WV, 11-1-55		
Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania, 7-1-68		
Merger of: Northeastern Ohio, 8-1-59		
Merger of: Cleveland, OH, 8-1-46		
Akron-Stark County, 2-1-57		
Merger of: Akron, OH, 2-1-55		
Stark County, 12-1-52		
Wheeling, WV, 11-1-55		
Youngstown-Warren, 8-1-61		
Eastern South Dakota	1076	5-1-65
Merger of: Eastern South Dakota, 5-1-55		
Sioux Falls-Mitchell, SD, 9-1-52		
Georgia	1007	3-1-69
Great Basin	1139	4-1-88
Merger of: Great Basin, 11-1-59		
Lake Mead, 8-1-73		
Greater Kansas City	1064	9-1-66
Merger of: St. Joseph, MO, 10-1-61		
Greater Kansas City, 10-1-57		
Merger of: Greater Kansas City, 12-1-36		
Topeka, KS, 8-16-36		
Greater Louisiana	1096	4-1-76
(Northern Louisiana, 8-1-58), (Shreveport, LA, 4-1-55)		
Indiana	1049	1-1-69
Merger of: Indianapolis, IN, 3-1-61		
Fort Wayne, IN, 2-1-37		
Iowa	1079	5-1-77
Merger of: Cedar Rapids-Iowa City, 9-1-51		
Des Moines, IA, 10-1-58		
North Central Iowa, 11-1-57		
Quad Cities-Dubuque, 1-1-61		
Merger of: Dubuque, IA, 10-1-36		
Quad Cities, 12-1-51		
Merger of: Quad Cities, 2-1-40		
Clinton, IA, 10-1-44		
	1046	3-1-62

Continued--

Appendix table 2—Federal milk orders in effect on December 31, 1993, with number assigned each order in the code of Federal regulations and date on which each order became effective—Continued

Federal milk order	CFR- Chapter 7 part number	Date effective
Louisville-Lexington-Evansville Merger of: Louisville-Lexington, 3-2-60, (Louisville, KY, 4-1-40) Ohio Valley, 3-1-60	1046	3-1-62
Michigan Upper Peninsula	1044	12-1-58
Middle Atlantic Merger of: Delaware Valley, 12-1-63 Merger of: Philadelphia, PA, 4-1-42 Wilmington, DE, 6-16-56 Upper Chesapeake Bay, 2-1-60 Washington, DC, 7-1-59	1004	8-1-70
Nebraska-Western Iowa Merger of: Nebraska-Western Iowa, 11-1-61 Merger of: Omaha-Lincoln-Council Bluffs, 9-1-52, (Omaha-Council-Bluffs, 4-5-39) Platte Valley, 5-1-57 Sioux City, IA, 4-16-40	1065	5-1-68
New England Merger of: Boston Regional, 7-1-71, (Massachusetts-Rhode Island-New Hampshire, 12-1-67) (Massachusetts-Rhode Island, 10-1-64) Merger of: Springfield, MA, 1-1-50 Worcester, MA, 1-1-50 Southeastern New England, 1-1-59 Boston, MA, 7-1-59 Merger of: Boston, MA, 8-1-37 Merrimack Valley, 4-1-54, (Lowell-Lawrence, 2-12-39) Connecticut, 4-1-59	1001	4-1-76
New Mexico-West Texas Merger of: Texas Panhandle, 2-1-56 Lubbock-Plainview, TX, 7-1-62 Rio Grande Valley, 7-1-62	1138	12-1-91
New Orleans-Mississippi (New Orleans, LA, 10-1-39)	1094	4-1-76
New York-New Jersey (New York, NY, 9-1-38)	1002	8-1-57
Ohio Valley Merger of: Greater Cincinnati, 11-23-42 Columbus, OH, 2-1-46 Miami Valley, 9-1-67, (Dayton-Springfield, OH, 7-1-45) Northwestern Ohio, 1-1-65 Merger of: North Central Ohio, 7-1-57, (Lima, OH, 8-1-49) Toledo, OH, 9-16-38 Tri-State, 8-1-45	1033	8-1-70
Pacific Northwest Merger of: Puget Sound-Inland, 1-1-84 Merger of: Puget Sound, 6-1-51 Inland Empire, 4-1-56 Oregon-Washington, 1-1-70	1124	2-1-89
Paducah, KY	1099	1-1-48
Southeastern Florida	1013	9-1-57

Continued—

Appendix table 2—Federal milk orders in effect on December 31, 1993, with number assigned each order in the code of Federal regulations and date on which each order became effective—Continued

Federal milk order	CFR- Chapter 7 part number	Date effective
Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri (Southern Illinois, 1-1-67), (Suburban St. Louis, 6-1-60)	1032	5-1-88
Southern Michigan Merger of: Southern Michigan, 8-1-65 Merger of: Southern Michigan, 2-1-60, (Detroit, MI, 9-1-51) Muskegon, MI, 10-1-53 Upstate Michigan, 11-1-55	1040	4-1-73
Southwest Plains Merger of: Southwest Plains, 1-1-83 Merger of: Neosho Valley, 12-1-51 Oklahoma Metropolitan, 5-1-57 Merger of: Oklahoma City, OK, 5-1-50 Tulsa-Muskogee, OK, 8-1-53 Merger of: Tulsa, OK, 5-1-50 Muskogee, OK, 7-1-51 Red River Valley, 11-1-58 Wichita, KS, 9-1-66 Merger of: Wichita, KS, 6-1-44 Southwest Kansas, 7-1-54 Fort Smith, AR, 9-1-52	1106	5-1-87
Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon	1135	7-1-81
Tampa Bay	1012	1-1-66
Tennessee Valley Merger of: Appalachian, 3-1-61 Merger of: Appalachian, 11-1-54 Bluefield, WV, 11-1-56 Chattanooga, TN, 9-1-56 Knoxville, TN, 8-1-49	1001	4-1-76
Texas Merger of: Austin-Waco, TX, 2-1-55 Central West Texas, 12-1-52 Corpus Christi, TX, 7-1-55 North Texas, 10-1-51 San Antonio, TX, 7-1-52 South Texas, 10-1-68	1126	7-1-75
Upper Florida	1006	1-1-67
Upper Midwest Merger of: Duluth-Superior, 5-5-41 Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN, 11-3-45 Minnesota-North Dakota, 11-1-67 Southwestern Minnesota-Northern Iowa, 5-1-69	1068	6-1-76
Western Colorado	1134	12-1-58

Appendix table 3—Research and promotion programs authorized by individual statutes

Commodity	Status	Administrative body			Assessments							Referendum and approval requirement	USDA costs reimbursed	Credit for State program	Enforcement
		Name	Authorized composition	How appointed	Authorized rate	Coverage	Refund allowed	Imports assessed	Collected on domestic production ¹	Collected on imports ¹	Collected (refunded) total ¹				
Beef	Implemented in 1986	Cattlemen's Beef Promotion and Research Board	Producers and importers based on cattle numbers per State or unit (Currently 101 producers and 6 importers)	By Secretary from nominations by eligible organizations	\$1 per head	All cattle producers and importers	No	Yes	\$73.7 million	\$7.3 million	\$81.0 million	Delayed until 22 months after program start Referendum May 1988; approved by 79% Majority vote ²	Referenda and administrative	Up to 50 cents per head	Civil penalty up to \$5,000 assessed by Secretary; enforced by Attorney General
									To Board \$44.2 million To States \$36.8 million						
Cotton	Implemented in 1966-67	Cotton Board	At least one rep from each cotton-producing State and importers; and up to 15% to be consumer advisor (Currently 20 producers, 4 importers, and 1 consumer advisor)	By Secretary from nominations by eligible organizations	\$1 per bale plus up to 1% of bale value	Producers and importers	No	Yes	\$36.9 million	\$14.0 million	\$50.9 million	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Two-thirds vote or majority representing two-thirds volume ²	Up to \$300,000 for referenda; up to 5 staff years for administrative	No	Monetary penalty of \$1,000 enforced by Attorney General
Dairy	Implemented in 1984	National Dairy Promotion and Research Board	36 milk producers	By Secretary from nominations by eligible organizations and other interested parties	15 cents per cwt	Dairy farmers	No	No	\$226.32 million	—	\$226.32 million	Delayed until 18 months after program start Referendum Aug. 1985; approved by nearly 90% Majority vote ²	Referenda and administrative	Up to 10 cents cwt	Civil penalty up to \$1,000 assessed by Secretary; enforced by Attorney General.
									To Board \$76.31 million To States \$150.01 million						
Eggs	Implemented in 1976	American Egg Board	Up to 20 members consisting of egg producers and consumers (Currently 18 producers)	By Secretary from nominations by eligible organizations	Up to 20 cents per 30-doz case (Current rate is 5 cents)	Producers with 75,000 or more laying hens	No	No	\$7.95 million	—	\$7.95 million	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Two-thirds vote or majority representing two-thirds volume ²	Referenda and administrative	No	Civil penalty of \$500-\$5,000 assessed by Secretary; cease and desist authority
Flowers and plants	Inactive program rejected in 1983-84 referendum	Floraboard	Up to 75 producers and importers	By Secretary from nominations by eligible organizations	0.5% of value of flowers and plants sold first 2 years; annual increases of 0.25% to maximum of 1.5% thereafter	Producers and importers with sales over \$100,000	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Two-thirds vote and two-thirds volume ²	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs

Continued—

Appendix table 3—Research and promotion programs authorized by individual statutes—Continued

26

Commodity	Status	Administrative body			Assessments							Referendum and approval requirement	USDA costs reimbursed	Credit for State program	Enforcement
		Name	Authorized compositions	How appointed	Authorized rate	Coverage	Refund allowed	Imports assessed	Collected on domestic production ¹	Collected on imports ¹	Collected (refunded) total ¹				
Fluid milk	Implemented in 1993	National Fluid Milk Processor Promotion Board	One rep from each of 12-15 geographic regions Five additional at large, of which at least 1 must be a public rep (Currently 20 members)	By Secretary from nominations by fluid milk processors, eligible organizations, only interested parties	20 cents per 100 lbs of all fluid milk products marketed	Every processor who processes and markets commercially more than 500,000 lbs of fluid milk in consumer type packages per month in the U.S.	No	No	\$53.0 million	—	\$53.0 million ¹⁴	Initiated by referendum held within 60 days prior to program start Referendum Sept. 1993; approved by 71.7%, representing 76.7% of volume Majority vote and 60% of volume ³	Referenda and administrative	Yes ¹⁵	Same as eggs
Fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens	Not yet implemented Enacted December 1993	PromoFlor Council	14 handlers; 3 producer-handlers; 3 importer-handlers; 3 retailers; 2 producers (1 each east and west of Mississippi River)	By Secretary from nominations by handlers and retail organizations	0.5% of gross sales during first 3 years; annual increases or decreases Of 0.25% with maximum of 1%	Handlers with sales of \$750,000	Only prior to initial referendum	Yes	—	—	—	Initial referendum to be held within 3 years after program begins Majority vote ⁴	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs
Honey	Implemented in 1987	Honey Board (Nominations Committee to consist of not more than 1 member per State Currently 40 producer members)	7 producers; 2 handlers; 2 importers or 1 importer and 1 exporter; 1 public; 1 marketing cooperative official	By Secretary from nominations by handlers and retail organizations	\$0.01 per lb	Producers and importers	No	Yes	\$1.7 million	\$1.1 million	\$2.8 million	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Continuance referendum Aug. 1991; approved by 90% ⁵	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs
Limes ⁶	Implemented in 1992	Lime Board	3 producers; 3 importers; 1 public	By Secretary from nominations by producers and importers, except public rep nominated by Board	Up to \$0.01 per lb	Producers producer handlers; importers of more than 200,000 lbs yearly	Only prior to initial referendum	Yes	—	—	—	Initial referendum delayed until 30 months after assessments begin Majority vote representing 50% of volume ⁷	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs

Continued—

Federal Marketing Orders and Research/Promotion Programs:

Appendix table 3—Research and promotion programs authorized by individual statutes—Continued

Commodity	Status	Administrative body			Assessments							Referendum and approval requirement	USDA costs reimbursed	Credit for State program	Enforcement
		Name	Authorized compositions	How appointed	Authorized rate	Coverage	Refund allowed	Imports assessed	Collected on domestic production ¹	Collected on imports ¹	Collected (refunded) total ¹				
Mohair	Implemented in 1966	Mohair Council of America	Not specified in statute	Not specified in statute	Pro rata deduction from incentive payments	CCC deducts assessments from incentive payments to mohair producers	No	No	\$0.7 million	—	\$0.7 million	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Majority vote representing 50% of volume ⁷	No	No	Not specified in statute
Mushrooms	Implemented in 1993	Mushroom Council	4-9 producers and importers based on production and imports (Currently 9 producers)	By Secretary from nominations by producers and importers	1st year, up to 1/4 cent per lb; 2nd year, up to 1/3 cent; 3rd year, up to 1/2 cent; subsequent years, up to 1 cent	Producers and importers of more than 500,000 lbs per year	No	Yes	\$1.1 million	\$9.5 thousand	\$1.1 million	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Referendum Aug. 24-Sept. 28, 1992; approved by 68% Majority vote representing 50% of volume ⁹	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs
Pecans*	Implemented in 1992 Terminated March 15, 1994	Pecan Marketing Board	8 growers; 4 shellers; 1 handler; 1 importer; 1 public; 1 non-voting	By Secretary from nominations by growers and shellers, except importer and public rep nominated by board	Prior to referendum, 1/2 cent per lb for inshell; afterward, up to 2 cents per lb Twice the rate for shelled	Growers, grower-shellers, importers	Only prior to initial referendum	Yes	\$0.66 million	\$0.27 million	\$0.93 million	Initial referendum delayed until no later than 2 years after program begins Referendum Oct. 1993 Referendum terminated program Majority vote ⁷	Referenda and administrative	No ¹⁰	Civil penalty of \$1,000-\$10,000 assessed by Secretary; cease and desist order authority
Pork	Implemented in 1986	National Pork Board (Delegate Body to consist of at least 2 producers from each State and importers Currently 162 producers and 7 importers)	Producers representing at least 12 States and importers (Currently 14 producers and 1 importer)	By Secretary from nominations made by the National Pork Producers Delegate Body	0.35 of 1% of market value; may increase 0.1% annually, not to exceed 0.50% New rate of 0.35 effective 12/1/91 was 0.25 of 1%)	All producers of porcine animals and importers	No	Yes	\$37.1 million	\$2.0 million	\$39.1 million	Delayed until 24-30 months after program start Referendum Sept. 1988; approved by 77.5% Majority vote ¹¹	Referenda and administrative	As deter-mined by Delegate Body	Civil penalty up to \$1,000 assessed by Secretary; cease and desist order authority

Continued—

Appendix table 3—Research and promotion programs authorized by individual statutes—Continued

Commodity	Status	Administrative body			Assessments							Referendum and approval requirement	USDA costs reimbursed	Credit for State program	Enforcement
		Name	Authorized compositions	How appointed	Authorized rate	Coverage	Refund allowed	Imports assessed	Collected on domestic production ¹	Collected on imports ¹	Collected (refunded) total ¹				
Potatoes FY-94	Implemented in 1972	National Potato Promotion Board	1 producer per State, plus up to 5 importers and 1 public rep (Currently 100 producers, 1 public, 2 importers)	By Secretary from nominations by producers and importers Public rep nominated by Board	\$0.02 per cwt or up to 1/2 of 1% of immediate past 10 CY year U.S.	Producers growing 5 or more acres and importers	No	Yes	\$7.4 million	\$0.467 million	\$7.9 million	Initiated by referendum held prior to program start Majority vote ⁷	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs
Soybeans	Implemented in 1991	United Soybean Board	Producers based on geographic basis (Currently 60 producers representing 29 States and 2 combined units plus 3 temporary members)	By Secretary from nominations by each State unit	1/2 of 1% of net market value of soybeans sold	Producers	Yes ¹²	No	\$58.0 million	—	\$58.0 million (\$11.0 million)	Delayed referendum passed by 54% majority Majority vote ¹³	Referenda and administrative	Up to 1/4 of 1% of net market price	Civil penalty up to \$1,000 assessed by Secretary; cease and desist order authority
Watermelons	Implemented in April 1990	National Watermelon Promotion Board	Equal number of handlers and producers; one public rep; and at least one importer (Currently 14 producers, 14 handlers, 1 importer, 1 public member)	By Secretary from nominations by producers, handlers, and importers Public rep nominated by Board	Fixed by Secretary, 2 cents per cwt for producer and handlers, 4 cents per cwt for importers	Producers growing 10 or more acres; all handlers; and importers of 150,000 lbs or more per year	No	Yes	\$0.85 million	—	\$0.85 million (\$0.20 million)	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Majority vote ⁷	Referenda and administrative	No	Same as eggs
Wheat	Inactive Terminated in 1986	Wheat Industry Council	20 members consisting of producers, processors, and consumers	By Secretary from nominations by eligible organizations	Not to exceed 5 cents per cwt	End-product manufacturers	Yes	No	—	—	—	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Two-thirds vote or majority representing two-thirds volume ²	Referenda and administrative	No	Monetary penalty of \$1,000 enforced by Attorney General

Continued—

Appendix table 3—Research and promotion programs authorized by individual statutes—Continued

Commodity	Status	Administrative body			Assessments							Referendum and approval requirement	USDA costs reimbursed	Credit for State program	Enforcement
		Name	Authorized compositions	How appointed	Authorized rate	Coverage	Refund allowed	Imports assessed	Collected on domestic production ¹	Collected on imports ¹	Collected (refunded) total ¹				
Wool ⁸	Implemented in 1955	American Sheep Industry Association	Not specified in statute	Not specified in statute	Pro rata deductions from incentive payments	CCC deducts assessments from incentive payments to wool producers	No	No	\$7.3 million	—	\$7.3 million	Initiated by referendum prior to program start Majority vote or majority of volume	No	No	Not specified in statute

— = No collections.

⁴Pecan program terminated 3-15-94.

¹Figures represent annual collections and refunds, where applicable, for the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

²Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum if requested by 10 percent of those covered under the program.

³Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum if requested by the Board or by those processors who marketed 10 percent or more of the volume of fluid milk products marketed by all processors.

⁴Beginning 3 years after initial referendum, Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum if requested by the Council or by 30 percent or more of the handlers or at the Secretary's discretion.

⁵Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum every 5 years or if requested by the Board or by 10 percent of those covered under the program.

⁶Act amended December 1993 to change the scientific name of limes, increase exemption level, change size and composition of Board, and delay referendum until 30 months after assessments begin. Before the 1993 amendment, the program was inactive.

⁷Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum if requested by the Board or by 10 percent of those covered under the program.

⁸Program authorized by the National Wool Act of 1954. Secretary enters into a promotion and research agreement with producer group.

⁹Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum 5 years after order becomes effective, and if requested by the Board or by 30 percent of producers and importers.

¹⁰Board will collect one-fourth cent per pound special assessment, in addition to the Federal assessment, if requested by a State and approved by the Secretary—currently approved for Kansas and Oklahoma.

¹¹Secretary to hold suspension/termination referendum if requested by 15 percent of producers and importers. No more than one referendum will be held every 2 years.

¹²After initial referendum, refunds will be paid once a year from an escrow account on a pro rated basis. Secretary required to conduct a producers poll to determine if they want a referendum conducted on whether to continue refunds.

¹³Poll is required of producers every 5 years to determine if they want a reconfirmation referendum to be conducted; or if requested by 10 percent covered under the program.

¹⁴Collection period was Feb.-July 1994.

¹⁵For California only.

Appendix table 4—Selected characteristics of Federal research and promotion programs

Commodity	Branded advertising	Exclusionary provisions ¹	Bloc voting	Funds collected before initial referendum
	A = Allowed R = Required N = Not allowed	A = Allowed R = Required N = Not allowed	A = Allowed R = Required D = Done N = Not allowed	A = Allowed R = Required D = Done N = Not allowed
Beef	N ²	N	N	R
Cotton	N	N	N	N
Dairy	A ³	N	A	R
Eggs	N	N	N	N
Fluid milk	N	N	N	N
Fresh cut flowers and fresh cut greens	N	N	N	R
Honey	N	N	N	N
Limes	N	N	N	A
Mohair	N	N	A	N
Mushrooms	N	N	N	N
Pecans ⁴	N	N	N	D
Pork	N ²	N	N	R
Potatoes	N	N	N	A/D
Soybeans	N	N	N	R
Watermelons	N	N	N	N
Wheat	N	N	N	N
Wool	N	N	A	N

¹The exclusionary provision allows a proprietary firm or cooperative to be at least partly excluded from assessments because of their promotion efforts.

²Minor amount of check off funds used in brand promotion.

³Limited by Board resolution to the creation and support of a new dairy product.

⁴Pecan Program terminated 3-15-94.

Appendix table 5—Commodity research and promotion program expenditures by category

Budget item	Beef FY 94	Cotton	Dairy CY 94	Eggs FY 93	Fluid milk ¹	Honey	Limes ²	Mohair
	<i>Dollars</i>							
Domestic generic advertising	24,300,000 ³	19,825,000	59,887,000	2,679,990	40,025,000	1,984,460		FY 94
Foreign generic advertising	4,800,000	261,000	900,000			326,953		403,610
Domestic branded advertising		—	319,000	—	0	—		153,000
Foreign branded advertising		—	0	—	0	—		
Nutrition education		—	2,412,000	1,071,784	0	—		
Nutrition research	3,400,000 ⁴	—	4,246,000	500,000	0	—		
New product development		8,615,000	5,143,000	23,422	0	152,500 ⁵		
Public relations	8,200,000 ⁶	782,000	1,247,000	—	5,000,000	191,923		2,800
Program evaluation	200,000	—	2,580,000	—	100,000	79,000		
Contributions to State R&P programs	36,400,000	—	151,052,000	—	5,130,000	—		
Contributions to trade associations		—	0	—	0	—		
Oversight	250,000	170,000	376,000	70,167	600,000	106,250		0
Administration	2,300,000	3,704,400	2,508,000	223,530	1,520,000	132,150		163,329 ⁷
Other	450,000 ⁸ 100,000 ¹³	16,082,000	0	1,995,292 ⁹	100,000 ¹⁰ 325,000 ¹⁴	1,165,835 ¹¹		67,000 ¹² 10,500 ¹⁴
Total	44,000,000	49,439,000	230,670,000	6,564,185	52,800,000	4,139,071		732,789

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued—

Appendix table 5—Commodity research and promotion program expenditures by category—Continued

Budget item	Mushrooms ¹⁵	Pecans ¹⁶	Pork CY 93	Potatoes FY 94	Soybeans	Watermelons
	-----Dollars-----			Million dollars		Dollars
Domestic generic advertising			20.0	3,235,000		275,000
Foreign generic advertising	NA		1.0	50,000	8.6	—
Domestic branded advertising	NA			Not allowed 0		
Foreign branded advertising	NA			Not allowed 0		
Nutrition education				30,000		—
Nutrition research			4.6 ¹⁷	0	3.9 ⁴	—
New product development				0		—
Public relations			4.0 ¹⁸	735,000	9.6 ⁶	221,896
Program evaluation				150,000	.046 ¹⁹	—
Contributions to State R&P programs			8.3 ²⁰	Not allowed 0	24.0 ²¹	
Contributions to trade associations			—	5,000 ²²	—	—
Oversight	138,800		.250	130,000	.320 ²³	105,113 ²⁴
Administration	405,650		.287	1,730,000	1.2	150,201
Other	60,050 ²⁵		.376 ²⁶ .241 ²⁸ .1 ²³	235,000	.300 ²⁷	156,532
Total	604,500		39.0	6,300,000	24.0	908,742

¹Budgeted amounts for period of Dec. 93-Dec. 96.

²Program is not expected to be fully implemented until January 1995. The Lime Board will recommend a budget at such time.

³FY 94 domestic promotion and advertising budget. Includes TV, radio, and newsprint advertisement and promotion.

⁴Total research budget for FY 94.

⁵Product research includes new products and improvement of current products.

⁶Includes consumer information, industry information, and producer communications.

⁷AMS not reimbursed for oversight costs.

⁸Program development.

⁹Includes foodservice promotion, consumer education, State and regional support, industry relations, materials distribution, and USDA Office of the General Counsel (OGC) charges.

¹⁰Financial services.

¹¹Includes \$1,061,472 as a reserve.

¹²Foreign travel.

¹³U.S. Customs Service — collection of import assessments.

¹⁴Meeting expenses.

¹⁵Budget applicable to a 17-month period from August 1, 1993, to December 31, 1994. Of the \$1,415,000 in anticipated revenue, the Mushroom Council expects to spend \$604,500 for administrative expenses (including USDA and U.S. Customs Service implementation repayments, and AMS, OGC, and U.S. Customs Service user fees) and \$810,500 on promotion, research, and consumer information and industry projects. Such projects are approved on a project-by-project basis.

¹⁶Pecan program terminated 3-15-94.

¹⁷CY 93 research budget.

¹⁸Includes communications and consumer information.

¹⁹2 percent deducted from each program area.

²⁰Distribution of check off funds to State pork producer associations.

²¹State's share of collections under Federal law retained at State level and not part of National Board's budget.

²²Supports only marketing activities. No funds may be used for lobbying.

²³AMS oversight costs — includes FAS oversight costs.

²⁴Includes \$11,200 for start up cost.

²⁵Includes USDA and U.S. Customs Service implementation repayments and OGC and U.S. Customs Service user fees.

²⁶Resource management.

²⁷Reserve.

²⁸Policy development.

Appendix table 6—Federal checkoff and marketing order commodities promoted under FAS market development programs, 1989-93¹

Item	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
<i>Thousand dollars</i>					
Organizations promoting Federal checkoff commodities:²					
Mohair Council of America (mohair)	18	18	20	20	131
National Dairy Board (dairy products)	0	0	171	368	656
U.S. Meat Export Federation (beef and pork)	8,390	8,255	22,415	11,680	13,070
USA Poultry and Egg Export Council (eggs)	7,922	4,663	8,744	7,952	8,925
American Horticultural Council (floral products)	120	151	425	800	245
American Soybean Association (soybeans)	15,968	19,975	17,820	15,262	11,467
Cotton Council International (cotton)	12,654	15,575	18,662	16,974	16,672
National Honey Board (honey)	113	472	717	254	257
National Potato Promotion Board (potatoes)	3,386	4,378	5,641	4,304	3,186
American Sheep Industry Association (wool)	167	161	383	424	357
Organizations promoting Federal marketing order commodities:					
California Almond Board (almonds) ³	5,402	5,566	6,739	4,506	4,922
California Prune Board (prunes)	5,691	6,417	7,604	6,466	5,831
California Raisin Advisory Board (raisins)	11,118	10,738	10,257	6,884	6,938
California Table Grape Commission	1,447	2,018	3,277	2,569	2,990
California Tree Fruit Agreement	225	506	902	1,024	953
CA/AZ citrus Export Incentive Program ⁴	10,513	12,404	8,149	7,899	7,794
Florida Department of Citrus (Florida citrus)	9,114	5,099	12,523	8,016	7,408
Northwest Cherry Growers (sweet cherries)	765	942	983	1,090	686
Oregon/Washington/California pears	541	803	1,725	2,630	2,100
Cranberry Export Incentive Program	102	102	288	502	600
Texas Produce Association (grapefruits)	0	30	0	0	0
California Walnut Commission (walnuts)	7,393	8,544	8,189	6,425	5,080

¹Includes expenditures for the Foreign Market Development, Targeted Export Assistance, and Market Promotion Programs.

²Many export promotion organizations promote a variety of commodities. Federal expenditures are not available for specific commodities.

³Many Federal marketing order commodities are promoted through agricultural cooperatives and other companies. Almonds are promoted primarily through cooperatives and other firms.

⁴Export Incentive Programs are agreements between USDA, FAS, and specific firms to promote almonds, California and Arizona citrus and other specific commodities.

Source: Derived from data provided by USDA, FAS, Planning and Evaluation Staff.

Appendix table 7—Econometric studies of the effectiveness of nonprice export market promotions

Agricultural products	Authors	Markets studied	Time period	Type of model	Results	Comments
Citrus and products: Orange juice	Lee	Western Europe	1972/73-75/76	Single equation	Export revenue increases of \$1.33 per \$1 of promotion from all sources	Dummy variable technique across countries and time expenditures
Orange juice	Lee, Myers, and Forsee	Western Europe	1972/73-76/77	Single equation	Export revenue increases of \$4.85 per \$1 of promotion expenditures from all sources	Update of 1977 analysis with addition of Brazilian FCOJ price and exports on a per capita basis
Orange juice	Lee and Brown	Western Europe	1973/74-81/82	Error components analysis	Export returns per \$1 invested	Range of \$2.40-\$7.81 Average of \$5.51
Fresh grapefruit	Lee, Behr, Brown, and Fairchild	Western Europe and Pacific Rim countries	1976-87	Single equation	Export revenue increases of \$3 per \$1 of promotion expenditures	
Apples, poultry, tobacco	Rosson, Hammug, and Jones	World	1974-81	Single equation	Returns per \$1 of investment: \$60 for apples \$31 for tobacco Insignificant result for poultry	Dummy variables used for regions
Avocados, grapes, cherries, wine, grapefruit, grapefruit juice, peanut butter, salmon, walnuts	Dwyer and Flowers	Japan	1970-88	Single equation	TEA's share of 1987 and 1988 export increases: Avocados—70% Cherries—70% Fresh grapes—58% Grapefruit juice—70% Fresh grapefruit—54% Walnuts—45% Wine—69%	Dummy variables used for TEA expenditures: Insignificant coefficients for TEA variables for avocados, salmon, peanut butter
Fresh grapefruit	Fuller, Bello, and Capps	Japan, France, Netherlands	1969-88	Single equation	Returns per \$1 of investment: \$5.02 for Japan \$4.13 for France \$6.65 for the Netherlands	
Cotton	Solomon and Kinnucan	Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Philippines, Thailand	1965-85	Armington market share	Increase in market share attributable to promotion: Japan—8.2% South Korea—1.6% Hong Kong—5.0% Philippines—2.6% Marginal returns to promotion: Japan—\$32 South Korea—\$13 Hong Kong—\$171 Philippines—\$11	Promotion variables for Taiwan and Thailand were insignificant
Red meat (beef, pork, beef offal)	DeBrito and Hennebery	Japan	1973-88	Armington market share	Returns of \$8.64 per \$1 of FAS expenditure	Promotion variable was positive but insignificant for total red meats, but positive and significant for beef offal
Soybeans and soybean products	Williams	World	1970-80	96-equation world trade model	\$62 of export revenue per \$1 of total expenditures (FAS, ASA, and 3rd party cooperator investments)	
Wool (Australian)	Dewbre, Richardson, and Beare	United States	1974-85	Household consumption: Aggregate demand model	1% increase in promotion expenditures yield a 0.07% increase in household consumption: Aggregate effects of 1% increase in promotion expenditures: 1983-84—7.6% 1985-85—8.9% 1985-86—9.1%	

Sources: Ackerman and Hennebery.

SUMMARY OF REPORT #AER-715

The 1995 Farm Bill

Planting Flexibility Seen as Key Issue in Oilseeds Debate

May 1995

Contact: Mark Ash, (202) 219-0838

The 1990's will be remembered as a period of market opening for U.S. oilseeds. That is one important element in the current policy climate as policymakers take a look at all commodity programs. The oilseed situation is detailed in ***Oilseeds: Background for 1995 Farm Legislation***, a new report from USDA's Economic Research Service.

Since the 1980's, the U.S. oilseed industry has been much influenced by government programs and foreign trade policies directed toward other commodities. Acreage-idling policies restrict the ability to plant nonprogram crops such as oilseeds. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) has removed millions of acres from production.

In the 1970's, the European Union (EU) began heavily subsidizing oilseed production and vegetable oil exports, restricting major markets for the United States. Competition from South American soybean growers and Asian palm oil producers also increased. A strong dollar further complicated U.S. trade competitiveness in the 1980's. Soybean acreage plunged throughout the southern United States.

The 1990 Farm Act gave U.S. oilseed producers the incentive to plant the crop with the best market return on a portion of their base acres. However, gains in production and export share have been modest. In 1992, U.S. and EU negotiators finally agreed to settle the U.S. trade complaint against the EU's oilseed policy, which had unfairly discouraged soybean imports.

This accord cleared a hurdle for a wider agreement in 1994 for the Uruguay Round reforms of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The new GATT agreement will lower import barriers and encourage demand worldwide. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was implemented in 1994, reinforcing Mexico's status as a major U.S. trading partner in oilseeds and products.

One of the most important U.S. farm policy questions affecting oilseeds in 1995 relates to planting flexibility on farmers' program crop acreage bases.

Other questions facing policymakers include:

Can government program payments be scaled back without slashing farm incomes? How can farmers be protected from catastrophic price and yield risks without adding to the Federal budget deficit? Can policy be reoriented from support for farm commodities to conservation of resources and environmental protection?

This year's policy issues that will affect domestic oilseeds include: setting oilseed marketing loans and loan rates, determining target prices and payment acres for program crops, extension of acreage-idling policies, continued funding for the CRP and other land-use programs, resumption of the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) for vegetable oils, export credits, promotion of industrial uses of vegetable oils, agricultural research priorities, soybean quality, and revenue assurance.

To Order This Report...

The information presented here is excerpted from ***Oilseeds: Background for 1995 Farm Legislation***, AER-715, by Mark Ash, George Douvelis, Jaime Castaneda, and Nancy Morgan. The cost is \$9.00.

To order, dial **1-800-999-6779** (toll free in the United States and Canada) and ask for the report by title.

Please add 25 percent to foreign addresses (including Canada). Charge to VISA or MasterCard. Or send a check (made payable to ERS-NASS) to:

ERS-NASS
341 Victory Drive
Herndon, VA 22070

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, and marital or familial 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 Office of Communications at (202) 720-5881 (voice) or (202) 720-7808 (TDD).

To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250, or call (202) 720-7327 (voice) or (202) 720-1127 (TDD). USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Economic Research Service
1301 New York Avenue, NW.
Washington, DC 20005-4788