

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 6

1. Name of the Planned Program

Economics, Marketing, Policy and Community Development

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
134	Outdoor Recreation			8%	
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies			4%	
601	Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management			7%	
603	Market Economics			7%	
604	Marketing and Distribution Practices			3%	
605	Natural Resource and Environmental Economics			26%	
606	International Trade and Development			5%	
607	Consumer Economics			2%	
608	Community Resource Planning and Development			26%	
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior			2%	
723	Hazards to Human Health and Safety			10%	
	Total			100%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2010	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
Actual	0.0	0.0	5.8	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
0	0	439658	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
0	0	535774	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

Research new ways to increase profitability of the agricultural sector. Develop tools for modeling consequences of land-use change. Analyze rural labor markets. Create systems for managing Maine's commercial fisheries. Publish peer-reviewed journal articles and other publications concerning research. Present findings at professional meetings, at field days for growers or producers, and at other venues.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Scientists, economists, state and local policymakers, extension specialists, Maine farmers and food producers, seafood processors, and commercial fishermen

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

2010	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Plan	0	0	0	0
Actual	0	0	0	0

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year: 2010
 Plan: 0
 Actual: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

2010	Extension	Research	Total
Plan	0	9	
Actual	0	8	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

- # of other types of publications

Year	Target	Actual
2010	8	17

Output #2

Output Measure

- # of papers presented at professional meetings

Year	Target	Actual
2010	24	23

Output #3

Output Measure

- # of research projects completed

Year	Target	Actual
2010	0	0

Output #4

Output Measure

- # of surveys of agri-food value chains--A telephone survey of 75 agri-food value chains in the northeast, upper midwest and Pacific northwest identified those that met the Agriculture of the Middle (AOTM) criteria of values-based and those that might evolve to meet those criteria

Year	Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	1

Output #5

Output Measure

- # of food value chain workshops for value chain participants and educators to find common

themes across various types of food value chains and to facilitate interaction and extend knowledge generated from project to practitioners, especially farmers who might benefit from organizing and participating in values-based food supply chains--The value chain workshops were as productive to farmers and marketers already operating value chains as those considering forming or joining chains, especially since it gave current operators an opportunity to share information with their colleagues operating value chains involving other products and in other areas of the country

Year	Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	2

Output #6

Output Measure

- # of sets of potato production standards that can be incorporated into a production contract in a bio-plastics value chain.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	1

Output #7

Output Measure

- Budgets and supporting documents for grass-fed and natural beef producers in Maine

Year	Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	0

Output #8

Output Measure

- # of electronic structured surveys for participants in cooperative research and the New England groundfish fishery management process. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with fishermen, fishery managers, scientists, and NGO representatives.

Year	Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	2

Output #9

Output Measure

- Amount of extramural funding awarded to faculty working in this program area during university fiscal year 2010

Year	Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	1921196

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O. No.	OUTCOME NAME
1	% of natural resource managers surveyed who will use spatial data on land management, land use, and land ownership in Maine
2	# of people developing a better understanding of land management, land use, and land ownership in Maine
3	State agencies will use findings to design more effective health information programs
4	Federal food safety agencies may alter the way they calculate the benefits of food safety programs and may change their food safety program priorities
5	Increased effectiveness of labeling and marketing regulations
6	Number of state agencies and regional tourism groups that will use research results in planning the types and locations of new nature-based tourism initiatives in the northern forest region
7	Number of economic research projects of direct use to Maine citizens, legislators, and community development professionals.
8	Research support for Maine's dairy industry

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

% of natural resource managers surveyed who will use spatial data on land management, land use, and land ownership in Maine

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	0	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Changing landscapes present opportunities and challenges for individuals, firms, communities, and policy-makers. In Maine, natural resources play significant roles in defining the quality of these places and shaping their regional economic options. The abundant and diverse natural resources of these states contribute to market and non-market services valued by both residents and visitors. Unanticipated changes to landscapes and their associated service flows pose unique challenges.

What has been done

MAFES economists are creating new data resources and testing alternative modeling approaches to support improved assessment and modeling of landscape change. Initial results show distinct preferences for public land management programs in rural and urban areas, confirm expectations of different development patterns in urban and rural areas, and suggest opportunities for improving natural resource management strategies at the municipal scale.

Results

If successful, this research will lessen the extent of surprises associated with landscape change, help reduce unexpected negative outcomes, and point towards desirable outcomes. These data and analyses offer improved information to public agencies, non-government organizations, private businesses, and individuals. It is hoped that such information will help them better understand the drivers of ongoing changes and anticipate future changes. The researchers are sharing the results of these analyses with relevant stakeholders, including the US Forest Service, US Environmental Protection Agency, Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Maine State Planning Office, Maine Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program, and Maine Congress of Lake Associations.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code **Knowledge Area**
605 Natural Resource and Environmental Economics

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

of people developing a better understanding of land management, land use, and land ownership in Maine

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #3

1. Outcome Measures

State agencies will use findings to design more effective health information programs

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #4

1. Outcome Measures

Federal food safety agencies may alter the way they calculate the benefits of food safety programs and may change their food safety program priorities

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	0	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

The function of product information approaches (e.g., labeling and social marketing) is to improve the flow of information to consumers who, in turn, alter their information search and or product purchase behaviors. These changes in consumer behaviors then may lead to changes in producer behaviors.

What has been done

MAFES economists use stated-preference data to estimate consumer willingness to pay (WTP) for food safety vaccines and then simulate the welfare impacts of subsidizing consumer purchases of the vaccine.

Results

The researchers' simulations show large social benefits if vaccines are relatively inexpensive. Their simulation of the impact of an E. coli vaccine with food-safety policy shows that all policies can increase aggregate welfare, though the largest effects are due to vaccine introductions. Firms profit most from vaccine introductions, as this stimulates demand among vaccinated consumers without shifting firm costs. Consumers who would choose not to become vaccinated due to the high vaccine price or lack of awareness benefit most from tighter standards alone. The magnitude and distribution of the impacts we simulate suggest that the introduction of such vaccines could stimulate vigorous discussion about the relative roles of consumers, industry, and government in ensuring safe food.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies
603	Market Economics
607	Consumer Economics
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior

Outcome #5

1. Outcome Measures

Increased effectiveness of labeling and marketing regulations

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #6

1. Outcome Measures

Number of state agencies and regional tourism groups that will use research results in planning the types and locations of new nature-based tourism initiatives in the northern forest region

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #7

1. Outcome Measures

Number of economic research projects of direct use to Maine citizens, legislators, and community development professionals.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	3

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

Research on the impacts of the proposed Oxford casino informed Maine voters about a statewide referendum question appearing on the November ballot. Groups on both sides of the casino issue used results from the study in public debates leading up to the election. The micro-business research informed members of Maine's economic development community about the importance of micro-enterprises to the state's economy and has influenced economic development policy and strategy in Maine. The study on cellular telephone warning labels informed members of a legislative committee, which voted on whether or not a bill should be considered by the full Maine Legislature.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
608	Community Resource Planning and Development

Outcome #8

1. Outcome Measures

Research support for Maine's dairy industry

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Maine fluid milk flows to Maine consumers through value chains. A state dairy stabilization program intervenes in that chain with a counter-cyclical income support program that recognizes the desirability of maintaining differently sized dairy farms. The Maine legislature, facing budget shortfalls, has been looking at modifications to this program. Proposed modifications could have affected various industry sectors quite differently.

What has been done

MAFES economists conducted a study of the cost of milk production and then worked directly with Maine legislators to help them understand the results of this cost analysis. Their results show that it costs the majority of Maine farmers \$20.70 per hundredweight to produce milk, whereas the federal set price was \$16.91 per hundredweight.

Results

Using these results, the Maine legislature then formulated Maine dairy income stabilization policy. This Maine statute (Title 7, sec. 3153-B: Dairy stabilization) explicitly incorporates the quantitative results of the MAFES study into the income stabilization program, which helps with the short- and long-run survivability of Maine's dairy industry. Because it costs more to make milk in Maine than anywhere else in the country, the program has helped stabilize the industry and slowed the loss of farms. Still, Maine lost 24 farms in just the past year. This program also indirectly helps maintain Maine's agricultural infrastructure, Maine rural businesses and rural communities.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
601	Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

Brief Explanation

{No Data Entered}

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)
- Case Study
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals, group, organizations) and non-participants
- Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

Evaluation Results

{No Data Entered}

Key Items of Evaluation

{No Data Entered}