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Introduction and Summary of Pilot Programs

The Farm Bill is the cornerstone of American food policy. Passed every four to six years, this law guides policy objectives and expenditures on food and agricultural issues. Despite its name, the Farm Bill impacts every aspect of our food system and plays a role in a variety of issues from climate change to the diet quality and health of the American people. As the country navigates these challenges, it is crucial to ensure that our food policy effectively addresses them.

An important, but often overlooked component of the Farm Bill is the use of pilot programs and projects: small-scale testing programs operated over a short period of time to determine the viability of long-term, nationwide programs. Pilot programs have been part of the Farm Bill since their inclusion in the 1981 Agriculture and Food Act (the 1981 Farm Bill). Over the years, these programs expanded in scope and purpose, from four pilots in 1981 to nine in the most recent Farm Bill. Today, pilot programs reach all corners of food-related issues from rural development to school snacks.

The genesis for this report came from Senator Tom Harkin’s (ret.) involvement in past Farm Bill pilots. Senator Harkin crafted the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (FFVP) which passed as part of the 2002 Farm Bill. The purpose of the pilot was to promote the health and well-being of America’s low-income children and expose them to healthy food that they might not otherwise get outside of the school setting by providing more fresh fruits and vegetables during the school day. The program primarily targeted high-need schools.

The FFVP, as summarized in this report, proved to be a highly successful program. A review of the pilot found a reported decrease in hunger from kids, better eating habits, and positive views amongst parents. In 2013, Congress expanded the program to all 50 states and many U.S. territories based on these results. The FFVP’s success demonstrates the effectiveness of the pilot process.

A number of other programs have been created based on pilot success. For example, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), which provides food packages to low-income senior citizens, was made permanent shortly after the 1981 pilot. Similarly, many of the concepts from the 2014 Rural Gigabit Network Pilot Program, providing grants to rural areas not served...
by high-speed internet, were rolled into the ReConnect initiative to expand rural broadband access.²

Another landmark pilot was the Wetlands Reserve Program. The 1990 pilot attempted to control farmland erosion and improve water quality through the creation of wetlands. Today, the Wetlands Reserve Program, folded into the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) in the 2014 Farm Bill, encompasses over 2.3 million acres with over 11,000 farmers participating.³

Pilot programs are a financially effective way for policymakers to attempt new programs on a small scale before committing significant taxpayer dollars. A well-designed pilot program usually includes a review process to evaluate the program’s effectiveness in achieving its objectives. Some programs fail to make the cut, such as the Dairy Options Pilot Program (DOPP). Implemented in the 1996 Farm Bill, the DOPP entailed the use of options and futures as a means of risk management. The programs received mixed reviews from farmers, with the main concerns relating to the complexity and risk involved with this form of trading.⁴

The adoption of a pilot program does not automatically guarantee its enactment. Most pilots, based on our research, were never implemented. Other programs were reduced in scope and budget. Part of the success with the FFVP came from continued oversight by Senator Harkin.

Pilot programs such as the Healthy Food and Education Program Replicability, later named the People’s Garden School Pilot Program (PGSPP), showed promise for a national rollout. The program aimed to increase student health through the creation of community gardens at schools as well as educational programs involving the gardens. The PGSPP led to increased fruit and vegetable consumption at schools and greater availability of fresh fruits and vegetables at home.⁵ But despite its success, the pilot was not made permanent.

Another successful program that was not made permanent was the transition of the Northern Mariana Islands and other United States territories to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) from their less comprehensive territorial counterparts. Due to their poverty, the islands cannot support the SNAP program without additional federal assistance. Yet, attempts to institute SNAP for these territories have failed in Congress even in recent legislation.⁶

This report seeks to inform policymakers and experts on the outcomes of pilot programs and to encourage lawmakers to be proactive in championing them once they have been enacted. As Senator Harkin demonstrated with his tireless advocacy of the FFVP, public officials can impact agricultural policy through these program provisions. Millions of American children now receive healthier snacks at school because of his work.

This report characterizes programs as pilots if there is explicit wording within the text of the Farm Bill designating the program as a pilot or if the program was created through a mechanism that allows for a pilot component. Farm bill provisions that may be characterized as pilots but did not meet either of the two criteria outlined above, such as the 2014 Farm Bill’s “Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research” program, were not included on the list.

We believe that issues in the food system can be ameliorated through the proactive passage and oversight of pilot programs within the Farm Bill, as demonstrated by previous efforts regarding pilots. Pilots offer a manageable starting point to deal with a long-standing issue. For example, as COVID-19 affects every aspect of the country, crop and nutrition programs will be vital for millions of Americans as the prolonged effects of the virus will persist, especially in agriculture. If those programs were done on a pilot basis, they could provide excellent guidance into future projects that could create a strong and stable for system for the American people. We hope that this report assists policymakers in crafting the next round of pilot programs in the Farm Bill scheduled for 2023.

The Harkin Institute for Public Policy and Citizen Engagement prides itself on continuing Senator Harkin’s legacy to advocate for beneficial and effective policy to advance the national conversation.
Section I: 2018 Farm Bill

2018.1

Title: CLEAR 30

Farm Bill: 2018

Summary: The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to enroll land in the conservation reserve program through a 30-year conservation reserve contract. The program covers land close to waterways.7

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: Nothing to report yet. According to an April 2020 press release, “the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Farm Service Agency (FSA) will open signup this summer for CLEAR30, a new pilot program that offers farmers and landowners an opportunity to enroll in a 30-year Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) contract. This pilot is available to farmers and landowners with expiring water-quality practice CRP contracts in the Great Lakes and Chesapeake Bay regions. The program is currently enrolling participants as of the report’s publication.”8

Classified in Bill Under: Conservation

Total Appropriations: The Congressional Research Service (CRS) could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin

2018.2

Title: Soil Health and Income Protection

Farm Bill: 2018

Summary: This pilot program creates a soil health and income protection program. The program is a voluntary program which seeks to improve and conserve soil, water, and wildlife resources through contracts with landowners and operators. It covers up to 50,000 acres in Upper Midwestern states.

Reporting Requirement(s): A report must be submitted to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report describing the eligible land enrolled in the pilot program under this subsection, including land conservation value and estimated savings from payments, indemnities, and subsidies.7

Results: Nothing to report yet. According to a February 2020 press release, “the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA) today announced a new pilot program that enables farmers in the Prairie Pothole region to receive payments for planting perennial cover for conservation use for three to five years.”10 The signup is currently enrolling participants as of the report’s publication.

Classified in Bill Under: Conservation

Total Appropriations: The Congressional Research Service (CRS) could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota
**2018.3**

**Title:** Feral Swine Eradication and Control Pilot Program  

**Farm Bill:** 2018  

**Summary:** The program establishes a feral swine eradication and control pilot program to respond to the threat feral swine pose to agriculture, native ecosystems, and human and animal health.  

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None  

**Results:** Several states have started the pilot program in the Southeastern United States. The programs enacted primarily focus on the elimination of feral swine in rural areas and the restoration of lands damaged by swine.  

**Classified in Bill Under:** Conservation  

**Total Appropriations:** The Congressional Research Service reports, “Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary shall use to carry out this section $75,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”  

**States Affected:** Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas

---

**2018.4**

**Title:** Pilot Projects to Encourage the Use of Public-Private Partnerships Committed to Address Food Insecurity  

**Farm Bill:** 2018  

**Summary:** The program establishes up to ten pilot projects that support public-private partnerships addressing food insecurity and poverty.  

**Reporting Requirement(s):** There must be an independent evaluation of pilot programs with a summary, assessment, and an overview of best practices for partnerships.  

**Results:** Not known  

**Classified in Bill Under:** Nutrition  

**Total Appropriations:** The Congressional Research Service states, “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 to remain available until expended. Only funds appropriated [from the first sentence] in advance specifically to carry out this section shall be available to carry out this section.”  

**States Affected:** Not Known
2018.5

**Title:** Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Authority Pilot

**Farm Bill:** 2018

**Summary:** This pilot establishes a Department of Agriculture authority, known as the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Authority (AGARDA), to carry out advanced research and development. The goals of the AGARDA are to—

1. Come up with solutions to protect against threats to domestic agriculture and food systems.
2. Overcome barriers in the development of beneficial agricultural tools and products.
3. Keep the United States on the forefront of agricultural development and promotion.
4. Undertake agricultural research through the U.S.D.A. that is not being done by private interests.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** The Director of AGARDA will report to the Chief Scientist of the USDA. The Secretary must submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an annual report on AGARDA.7

**Results:** As of July 2020, the program has not received any money, and multiple agricultural research groups requested Congress to appropriate funds. Groups calling on the funds to be distributed include the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Farmers Union.12

**Classified in Bill Under:** Research, Extension, and Related Matters

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There is established in the Treasury the Agriculture Advanced Research and Development Fund, which shall be administered by the Secretary, acting through the Director... the Secretary, acting through the Director, may accept and deposit into the Fund monies received pursuant to cost recovery, contribution, or royalty payments under a contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or other transaction under this section... in addition to funds otherwise deposited in the Fund... there is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to remain available until expended.”9

**States Affected:** Not known

2018.6

**Title:** Utility Infrastructure Rights-of-Way Vegetation Management Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2018

**Summary:** The pilot program creates partnerships between utilities and the Forest Service to clear away vegetation along power lines to create a wider right-of-way. The intent is to protect against potential wildfires that could be caused by power lines in the forest.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** Not later than December 31, 2020, and 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report describing the status of the pilot program and vegetation management projects conducted under the pilot program to the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.7

**Results:** US Forest Service proposed changes to existing regulations in September 2019 which would create more options for collaboration between the Forest Service and utility companies.13

**Classified in Bill Under:** Forestry

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “a participant in the pilot program shall be responsible for all costs, as determined by the Secretary, incurred in participating in the pilot program... [except for] funds for a vegetation management project conducted under the pilot program if the Secretary determines that the contribution is in the public interest.”9

**States Affected:** Not Known
2018.7

**Title:** Regional Appointment Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2018

**Summary:** This creates a pilot program to allow a regional forester to appoint members of resource advisory committees. 14

**Reporting Requirement(s):** With 180 days of October 1, 2023, a report shall be submitted to Congress a report that includes appointments made in the program comparing and contrasting ones not made in the program, efficiencies in the program, and whether the program should change, stay, or end.7

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Forestry

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Montana, Arizona

---

2018.8

**Title:** Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production: Urban and Suburban County Committees (Pilot Program)

**Farm Bill:** 2018

**Summary:** This act introduces a pilot program that creates 10 county committees in urban/suburban areas with large numbers of urban/suburban farms. The committees seek to address food access issues and promote urban agricultural practices. FY 2020 is the first year the USDA is attempting the pilot.15

**Reporting Requirement(s):** For fiscal year 2019 and each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2023, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing a summary of status of the program, meetings related to the program, and the amount of assistance provided.7

**Results:** According to a report in August 2020, the Farm Service Agency established five county committees focused on urban agriculture through this pilot. The locations are in Albuquerque, NM, Cleveland, OH, Philadelphia, PA, Portland, OR, and Richmond, VA. Five additional county committees are to be announced by the end of 2020. As of this publication, they have not been announced.

**Classified in Bill Under:** Miscellaneous

**Total Appropriations:** There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”

**States Affected:** New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia

---

Chris Warner Allegheny National Forest United States Forest Service, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons
2018.9

**Title:** Office of Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production: Increasing Community Compost and Reducing Food Waste (Pilot Program)

**Farm Bill:** 2018

**Summary:** This pilot project allows for cooperative efforts with municipal governments to create and test compost plans and food waste reduction plans.⁷

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None to report.

**Results:** Nothing to report yet. The USDA announced the availability of $900,000 for the Community Compost and Reducing Food Waste Pilot Program in May 2020.¹⁷

**Classified in Bill Under:** Miscellaneous

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”⁹


SuSanA Secretariat SuSanA Secretariat, CC BY 2.0 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>, via Wikimedia Commons
Section II: 2014 Farm Bill

2014.1

Title: Pilot Projects to Improve Federal-State Cooperation in Identifying and Reducing Fraud in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Farm Bill: 2014

Summary: The program establishes testing by Federal-State partnerships to identify, investigate, and reduce fraud in businesses taking part in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and allow states to create fraud-prevention programs.

Reporting Requirement(s): Not later than September 30, 2017, the Secretary must have submitted to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate an evaluation of the impact and costs of the pilot project on fraud. Evaluation on the pilot was not found as of this report.18

Results: The pilot ended and transitioned into a larger program started in 2019 called the “SNAP Fraud Framework” which included a grant program for fraud prevention to continue between state and federal agencies.19 20

Classified in Bill Under: Nutrition

Total Appropriations: The CRS reports, “Any costs incurred by a State to operate pilot projects under this subsection that are in excess of the amount expended under this Act to identify, investigate, and reduce fraud described... in the respective State in the previous fiscal year shall not be eligible for Federal reimbursement under this Act.”9

States Affected: Not Known

2014.2

Title: Pilot Projects to Reduce Dependency and Increase Work Requirements and Work Effort Under Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Farm Bill: 2014

Summary: This pilot project created partnerships between the USDA and State agencies to increase vocational and educational requirements for recipients and looked to generally reduce welfare spending.

Reporting Requirement(s): Not later than December 31, 2015, and each December 31 thereafter until the completion of the last evaluation, the Secretary must submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes a description of the status, evaluation, pertinent info, initiatives, and impact of the pilot program.19

Results: According to the most recent annual report from 2019, state programs created through the pilot varied in their target population and goal. Most states offered forms of vocational training or other education programs for applicants. Applicants involved in the program ranged from able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs) to work registrants with some form of barrier, such as mental health disorders or criminal background, which made it more difficult to obtain a secure job. While the interim and final evaluation is still being conducted (expected to be published in 2020 and 2022, respectively), some states in the annual report stated that parts of the program were beneficial and were looking to add some programs as part of their state’s respective SNAP.21

Classified in Bill Under: Nutrition

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Vermont
2014.3

Title: Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Pilot Program

Farm Bill: 2014

Summary: This pilot program allows for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in the same way the program is operated in the States.

Reporting Requirement(s): Not later than June 30, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the pilot program carried out under this section, including an analysis of the feasibility of operating the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands like in the states.

Results: The Northern Mariana Islands has run a similar food assistance program, the Nutritional Assistance Program (NAP) since the 1980s, but benefits from the program are less than SNAP recipients receive. The pilot program was geared toward testing the feasibility of SNAP.

In 2016, a report from Mathematica Analytics showed that the increased benefits under a SNAP program would help underemployed and unemployed people in the Commonwealth, but the cost of the part of the Northern Mariana Islands may be prohibitive given the bleak economic picture of the territory.

In 2018, Rep. Gregorio Kilili C. Sablan (Ind-MP) had been working with Rep. Jim McGovern (D-MA) to allow the Northern Mariana Islands into the SNAP program after delays in benefits for the pilot program put the funding in jeopardy for the 2018 Farm Bill.

A bill, the Equitable Nutrition Assistance for the Territories Act of 2019, was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT) to place the Northern Mariana Islands, as well as other territories, in SNAP. It was referred to the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee where it died, and NAP remained in the U.S. Territories. The bill was primarily in response to the aftermath of Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico and the inefficiencies of their territory's NAP.

Classified in Bill Under: Nutrition

Total Appropriations: The CRS reports, “The Secretary may use to establish and carry out the pilot program... not more than—(i) $13,500,000 for fiscal year 2016; and (ii) $8,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018

States Affected: Territory of the Northern Mariana Islands

2014.4

Title: Pilot Project for Procurement of Unprocessed Fruits and Vegetables

Farm Bill: 2014

Summary: The pilot project allows for up to 8 states to obtain unprocessed fruits and vegetables to distribute in schools, primarily.

Reporting Requirement(s): Each participating State must submit to the Secretary a report on the success of the pilot project in the State, including information on the quantity and cost of received fruits and vegetables and any benefits from the program. State reports compiled into one document prepared for the FNS.

Results: Key findings from a 2018 report prepared for the USDA FNS include: increased interest in pilot participation, more fruits than vegetables were obtained (70.9% of spending was on fruit), common types of produce obtained were romaine lettuce, oranges, pears, salad mixes, and carrots, respectively, and 65% was local produce.

Classified in Bill Under: Nutrition

Total Appropriations: The 2018 report puts the total cost at $7,647,247. The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

States Affected: California, Connecticut, Michigan, New York, Oregon, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin
2014.5

Title: Pilot Project for Canned, Frozen, or Dried Fruits and Vegetables

Farm Bill: 2014

Summary: The pilot allows for at least five states to expand the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (FFVP) in the Russell National School Lunch Act to allow canned, frozen, or dried fruits and vegetables to be offered more often in schools.

Reporting Requirement(s): Not later than January 1, 2015, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the impacts, implementation, acceptance, and other outcomes. On completion of the pilot project, another report to that committee must be given to state the outcomes.19

Results: According to a Food and Nutrition Service commissioned report from Mathematica, schools participating in the pilot program had a lower percentage of offerings that were fresh compared to the FFVP standard the school semester prior. The increases in offerings came mainly from canned and dried fruit at the cost of fresh fruits and vegetables as canned, frozen, and dried products are primarily fruit-based. Common fresh fruits and vegetables offered did not change in the pilot program. Caloric and carbohydrate increases in the snacks occurred as fruits, especially canned fruits, typically have higher levels of calories due to increased sugar, both naturally and added. The study suggested that, while not certain, decreases in consumption of fruits and vegetables between the fall and spring semester may have occurred due to the introduction of pilot offerings. There was also a slight increase in empty calories consumed.27

Classified in Bill Under: Nutrition

Total Appropriations: The CRS reports, “The Secretary shall use $5,000,000 of amounts otherwise made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.”19

States Affected: Alaska, Delaware, Kansas, Maine

2014.6

Title: Cooperative Lending Pilot Projects (Microloans)

Farm Bill: 2014

Summary: During each of the 2014 through 2018 fiscal years, the Secretary was allowed to carry out a pilot project to make loans to community development financial institutions for microloans or services for microloan borrowers.19

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: As of a September 2019 article, the program has not been implemented.28

Classified in Bill Under: Credit

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
2014.7

**Title:** Farmer Loan Pilot Projects

**Farm Bill:** 2014

**Summary:** This provision allowed for pilot projects of limited scope and duration that evaluated processes and techniques that may improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Farm Loan Programs (FLP).19

**Reporting Requirement(s):** Sixty days or more before the start of the program, the Secretary must submit notice of the proposed pilot project to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and consider any recommendations or feedback provided to the Secretary in response to the notice provided.19

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Credit

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

2014.8

**Title:** Rural Gigabit Network Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2014

**Summary:** The pilot program, known as the ‘Rural Gigabit Network Pilot Program’, provides grants, loans, or loan guarantees to eligible entities. The program can only apply to a project in a proposed service territory if it is in a rural area where high-speed internet is not currently being provided.19

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** The program was replaced with the Innovative Broadband Advancement Program to be a demonstration program in the 2018 Farm Bill.30 31 Nothing specific has come from the demonstration program itself, but the ReConnect (Broadband) Program, passed in 2018 before the Farm Bill, covers much of the same goals of the pilot and demonstration programs on a greater scale.32

**Classified in Bill Under:** Rural Development

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.”9

**States Affected:** Nationwide
2014.9

**Title:** Forest Service Large Airtanker and Aerial Asset Firefighting Recapitalization Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2014

**Summary:** This pilot allowed the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, to establish a large airtanker and aerial asset lease program if funds were made available.19

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Forestry

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

2014.10

**Title:** Index-Based Weather Insurance Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2014

**Summary:** The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is able to conduct at least two pilot programs that provide index-based weather insurance to underserved specialty crops and livestock commodities. It will be calculated as a percentage of a premium, percentage of a calculation of expected loss, or a fixed dollar amount per acre. The subsidy provides a comparable subsidy per acre from what the FCIC pays for insurance policies, but the subsidy cannot exceed 60% of the premium.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not Known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Crop Insurance

**Total Appropriations:** “Notwithstanding any other provision in this subsection, of the funds of the Corporation, the Corporation shall use to carry out this section not more than $12,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018, to remain available until expended.”9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
Section III: 2008 Farm Bill

2008.1

**Title:** Transferability Pilot Project

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** This pilot project that permitted the planting of cucumbers, green peas, lima beans, pumpkins, snap beans, sweet corn, and tomatoes grown for processing on base acres during each of the 2009 through 2012 crop years.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** The Secretary must submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the evaluation.

**Results:** An article from 2011 in Vegetable Growers News stated that only 1/8 of the allotted acres had been active in the program. It appears that there has been fighting between fresh fruit and vegetable producers and manufacturers on the extent of the program, also in the VGN 2011 Report.

**Classified in Bill Under:** Commodity Programs

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

**States Affected:** Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin

2008.2

**Title:** Revised Pilot Program for Enrollment of Wetland and Buffer Acreage in Conservation Reserve

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** This was a pilot program, during the 2008 through 2012 fiscal years, in each State under which the Secretary shall enroll wetlands and related lands in conservation programs.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not Known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Conservation

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

**States Affected:** Not known
2008.3

**Title:** Wetlands Reserve Enhancement Program and Reserved Rights Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** This pilot program allows for landowners to maintain grazing rights if those rights are compatible with surrounding easements and is consistent with wetland conservation goals and plans.34

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** The program was offered and allowed for various easement options to farmers and ranchers who decided to partake in the program. The easements ranged from 30 years to permanent. It also allowed for landowners to reserve the right for livestock to graze on wetlands if that function was appropriate to the sustainability of the wetland.35 The program continues to enroll landowners as of 2020.36

**Classified in Bill Under:** Conservation

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Montana37

---

2008.4

**Title:** Pilot Projects to Evaluate Health and Nutrition Promotion in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** The pilot project develops and tests methods to increase the nutritional intake for low-income Americans, mainly SNAP participants, and to reduce the number of overweight and obese people in the United States.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** Starting with fiscal year 2009, within 90 days after every fiscal year the program is in operation, the Secretary had to submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that includes a status of pilot programs, annual results, health impact, and relevant information.34

**Results:** Became known as the Healthy Incentives Pilot (HIP). According to evaluations of HIP, 2,500 SNAP recipients participating in the pilot were selected to test the nutritional benefits and costs of the pilot with 2,500 non-SNAP participants selected as a control group to determine HIP's impact. The results included a 26% increase in fruit and vegetable consumption. In addition, HIP households spent about 8.5% more for fruits and vegetables compared to non-HIP households.39 The pilot program, demonstrated by the previous statistics, was highly successful. In 2014, it became permanent and known as the Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive (FINI), now the Gus Schumacher Nutrition Incentive Program (GusNIP). The program now distributes grants out to organizations tied to the food system that work with local and state SNAP agencies to increase fruit and vegetable consumption for recipients.40

**Classified in Bill Under:** Nutrition

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012. Out of the funds made available... the Secretary shall make available $20,000,000 to carry out a project...”9

**States Affected:** Massachusetts
2008.5

**Title:** Wetlands Reserve Enhancement Program and Reserved Rights Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** The pilot program creates community gardens at schools through nonprofit organizations or public entities in up to five states. Students at these schools would then take care of the gardens and learn about agricultural processes.34

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** The program was renamed the “People’s Garden School Pilot Program.” The Food and Nutrition Service made $1,000,000 available in FY 2010 for the pilot program.41

Four Land Grant Universities (Iowa State University, Cornell University, Washington State University, and the University of Arkansas) were awarded the funds made available by FNS42, and those funds were then distributed to high-poverty schools in those particular states. 47 schools ended up participated in the study. The Washington State University report also found that children who were at schools with gardens consumed more fruits and vegetables during lunch at school and increasing nutrition and garden activity at school predicted increases in availability of fruits and vegetables at home.43

**Classified in Bill Under:** Nutrition

**Total Appropriations:** $1,000,000 in Fiscal Year 2010 The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Iowa, Arkansas, Washington, and New York

2008.6

**Title:** Beginning Farmer and Rancher Individual Development Accounts Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** This pilot program allowed for individual farmers to open matched savings accounts through nonprofit organizations or state/local/tribal governments. The accounts were geared toward purchases related to farm assets. The program was permitted in a minimum of 15 states over a period of at least five years.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** Within 60 days of the end of the calendar year in which a government or nonprofit participates in the program, they must prepare a report that shows the progress and outcome of the account pilot. After the program concludes, the Secretary must prepare a report to Congress on the results of the program within a year of its conclusion.34

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Credit

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.”9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
2008.7

Title: Enhanced Use Lease Authority Pilot Program

Farm Bill: 2008

Summary: This program allows for property at the Beltsville (Maryland) Research Center of the Agricultural Research Service and the National Agricultural Library to be leased to any organization that does not negatively impact operations.

Reporting Requirement(s): Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes detailed management objectives and performance measurements by which the Secretary intends to evaluate the success of the program under this section. Not later than 1, 3, and 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary must submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report describing the implementation of the program under this section, including a copy of each lease entered into and an assessment by the Secretary of the success of the program.

Results: An article from 2013 quoted the Government Accountability Office stating that the enhanced lease program did occur at the Beltsville Research Center and has been relatively successful due to the public-private research cooperation between the lessee and the facility.

Classified in Bill Under: Research and Related Matters

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

States Affected: Maryland

2008.8

Title: Enterprise and Whole Farm Units

Farm Bill: 2008

Summary: This pilot program allows for farmers insuring with whole-farm and enterprise unit structures the same subsidy payments as farmers who insure crops under basic and optional unit structures. The premium paid cannot exceed 80% of the total premium for the enterprise or whole farm unit policy.

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: The pilot became a permanent part of the federal crop insurance program in the 2014 Farm Bill.

Classified in Bill Under: Crop Insurance and Disaster Assistance Programs

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

States Affected: Not known

Carol M. Highsmith creator QS:P170,Q5044454, Idaho farm and field, marked as public domain, via Wikimedia Commons
2008.9

**Title:** Camelina Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall establish a pilot program under which producers or processors of camelina may propose for approval by the Board policies or plans of insurance for camelina. In this pilot program, only spring-planted camelina grown under contract with a processor will be eligible for coverage. The insured causes of loss will include adverse weather, fire, wildlife, earthquake, volcanic eruption and insect/plant disease. Damage due to insufficient or improper use of pest or disease control measures was not covered.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Program began in 2012 as a way to explore camelina’s potential as a biofuel. The pilot product for camelina was submitted by Great Plains Oil and Exploration, LLC– The Camelina Company and Crop Insurance Systems, Inc. No further camelina programs appear to have been implemented.

**Classified in Bill Under:** Crop Insurance and Disaster Assistance Programs

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

**States Affected:** Montana, North Dakota

---

2008.10

**Title:** Sesame Insurance Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2008

**Summary:** The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall establish and carry out a pilot program under which a producer of seed-dispersing sesame crop under contract may obtain multiperil crop insurance.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Counties in Oklahoma and Texas were selected in the program to produce sesame as an alternative crop. The Risk Management Agency announced in 2018 that the program would be expanded to 36 additional counties in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas in 2019. According to the High Plains Journal, the demand for sesame grew seven percent between 2013 and 2018, sparking interest in expanding the program.

**Classified in Bill Under:** Crop Insurance and Disaster Assistance Programs

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

**States Affected:** Oklahoma, Texas
2008.11

Title: Grass Seed Insurance Pilot Program

Farm Bill: 2008

Summary: In addition to any other authority of the Corporation, the Corporation shall establish and carry out a grass seed pilot program under which a producer of Kentucky bluegrass or perennial rye grass under contract may elect to obtain multiperil crop insurance, as determined by the Corporation.

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: In 2011, an underwriting guidebook was published to go over procedures in the pilot. The pilot appeared to have continued into the 2018 crop year in Minnesota, and it covered adverse weather, irrigation failures, fire, and disease.

Classified in Bill Under: Crop Insurance and Disaster Assistance Programs

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.

States Affected: Minnesota, North Dakota
Section IV: 2002 Farm Bill

2002.1

Title: Pilot Program for Enrollment of Wetland and Buffer Acreage in Conservation Reserve

Farm Bill: 2002

Summary: This program allows for owners and operators of wetlands or land wetland-adjacent to participate in a conservation project.\textsuperscript{52}

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: Not known

Classified in Bill Under: Conservation Reserve

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.\textsuperscript{9}

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

2002.2

Title: Alternative Procedures for Residents of Certain Group Facilities Pilot Program

Farm Bill: 2002

Summary: This program allows for the testing the feasibility of standard rather than individual allotments of food stamps for residents of group homes.\textsuperscript{53}

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: Not Known

Classified in Bill Under: Nutrition Programs

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.\textsuperscript{9}

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
2002.3

**Title:** Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2002

**Summary:** The program, commencing in the school year beginning July 2002, makes available free fresh and dried fruits and fresh vegetables throughout the school day for students in 25 schools in four states and one Indian reservation.54

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Became known as the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (FFVP). Program response from states was highly positive amongst many stakeholders according to an evaluation of the program conducted in 200355; the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 added 4 states and a handful of tribal organizations to the program due to program’s popularity. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006 added six additional states to the program. As of 2013, the program was extended to schools across all 50 states, D.C., Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.56

**Classified in Bill Under:** Nutrition Programs

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “The Secretary shall use not more than $6,000,000 of funds made available under section 32 of the [1935 Appropriation to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural products] (7 U.S.C. 612c), to carry out this subsection...”9

**States Affected:** Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio (2002 charter states)

2002.4

**Title:** Nutrition Information and Awareness Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 2002

**Summary:** The pilot program encourages domestic consumption of more fruits and vegetables through public-private partnerships and cost-sharing.56

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Nutrition Programs

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2007.”9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
2002.5

Title: Beginning Farmer and Rancher Contract Land Sales [Pilot] Program

Farm Bill: 2002

Summary: The program allows for loans made by a private seller of a farm or ranch to be distributed to qualified beginning farmers on a contract land sale basis, if the loan can be underwritten.\(^5\)

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: The program began in 2002 in nine states. It became permanent and nationwide in the 2008 Farm Bill. The 2008 Farm Bill also included socially disadvantaged farmers as qualifying for this program. Socially disadvantaged farmers include women and people of color. The program is now known as the Land Contract Guarantee Program, and it is administered through the Farm Service Agency (FSA). The program provides some protection through federal loan guarantees to retiring farmers who sell their land to beginning and socially disadvantaged farmers. The loan guarantee is in effect for ten years regardless of the contract plan made. As of the date of the published article, two loan guarantees have been made through the program totaling nearly $350,000. Congress, recently, has funded the program to $2.75 billion.\(^5\)

Classified in Bill Under: Credit

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.\(^9\)

States Affected: Not known

2002.6

Title: Adjusted Gross Revenue Insurance Pilot Program

Farm Bill: 2002

Summary: The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall carry out, through at least the 2004 reinsurance year, the adjusted gross revenue insurance pilot program in effect for the 2002 reinsurance year. It is an extension of a pilot program in place, but it was included as a provision in the Farm Bill.\(^5\)

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: The USDA performed an audit of the program in 2007. During insurance years 2002 and 2003, 9 providers in 18 States paid AGR indemnities totaling over $24 million. The audit found that insurance providers did not procure proper documents, and there was a lack of a quality control mechanism within the program to fix documentation errors.\(^5\)

Classified in Bill Under: Miscellaneous

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.\(^9\)

States Affected: California, Pennsylvania
Section V: 1996 Farm Bill

1996.1

Title: Options Pilot Program

Summary: The program permitted farmers with supported commodities to rely on futures and options contracts as risk management for changes in price, yield, and income rather than utilizing existing U.S.D.A. programs. It was a voluntary program that could operate in up to 100 counties with additional limitations.\(^5\)

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: The program was specified for dairy farmers after milk was determined to be a good market candidate. It became known as the Dairy Options Pilot Program (DOPP) and went through four rounds between 1999 and 2002. The program provided 80% of the put option premium and up to $30 of broker commissions per round-trip transaction. Nearly 6,400 producers completed options training (less than ten percent of all eligible) and 21 percent of those producers bought options. Aside from round three of the program, in which milk prices were high but falling, there was little activity when prices were near support level. Overall, returns remained stable, and participating farmers did gain some valuable experience according to a 2010 presentation for the Dairy Industry Advisory Committee. The complexity of markets and risk concerns deterred some farmers from committing. The program had little impact on price and production.\(^6\)

Classified in Bill Under: Agricultural Market Transition Act

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.\(^9\)

States Affected: California, Illinois, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin

1996.2

Title: Crop Insurance Pilot Project

Summary: The program develops and administers crop insurance coverage that protects against crop losses due to an insect infestation or disease. There are no specifics on crops covered. There must be no net cost from the program. Within two years of the enactment of the program, the Secretary must conduct a similar, but limited, pilot program on the feasibility of insuring nursery crops.\(^6\)

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: Not Known

Classified in Bill Under: Agricultural Market Transition Act

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.\(^9\)

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
1996.3

**Title:** Revenue Insurance Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 1996

**Summary:** The pilot program allows, in a limited number of counties, producers of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, or any other accepted commodity to receive insurance against loss of revenue through private insurance companies.62

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** This particular pilot was not implemented, but similar programs were developed in the late 1990s. In 2000, Congress approved legislation that allowed for private companies to expand their roles in the crop insurance sector. Previously, crop insurance was only provided through the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC).62

**Classified in Bill Under:** Agricultural Market Transition Act

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

---

1996.4

**Title:** Micronutrient Fortification Pilot Program

**Farm Bill:** 1996

**Summary:** The program seeks to assist developing countries in correcting dietary deficiencies and encourage development of technologies to fortify micronutrients that can be transferred to developing countries. The Secretary may pick up to five developing countries.62

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** While the program was not enacted in 1996, $10 million in funding was allocated in 2010 for the Micronutrient-Fortified Food Aid Products Pilot (MFFAPP) with similar goals according to a 2014 USDA presentation.63 The presentation goes on to state that two primary stages of the pilot were implemented with smaller projects undertaken under each phase. For the first phase, a dairy supplement was provided to about 4,800 school-age children in Guinea-Bissau in 2012. The pilot, implemented through the McGovern-Dole global child development framework, showed promising results including: improvement in Vitamin A and iron levels, improvements in school attendance, and greater insight into nutrition deficiencies in Guinea-Bissau. In addition, projects within phase one included supplementary nutrition and medications for children in Guatemala and Haiti. Phase two of the pilot also included Guinea-Bissau and providing dairy supplements to over 2,000 women, infants, and children who also demonstrated vitamin improvements and weight and height gain. The final part of the pilot included fortification of rice in Cambodia and soy and sorghum blends in Tanzania which produced similar nutritional results to that of Guinea-Bissau.

**Classified in Bill Under:** Trade

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Not known
1996.5

**Title:** Wind Erosion Estimation Pilot Project

**Farm Bill:** 1996

**Summary:** The project reviews and modifies wind erosion factors in areas where cropland is highly erodible.⁶²

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Conservation

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.⁹

**States Affected:** Not known

*Note:* After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

1996.6

**Title:** Mitigation Banking Program

**Farm Bill:** 1996

**Summary:** The program applies to mitigation banking of wetlands to increase efficiency of agricultural operations while protecting wetland functions.⁶²

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Wetland Conservation

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.⁹

**States Affected:** Not known

*Note:* After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
1996.7

**Title:** Conservation Farm Option

**Farm Bill:** 1996

**Summary:** This pilot program allowed for the establishment of conservation farm options for producers of wheat, feed grains, cotton, and rice.⁶²

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Conservation

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation shall make available to carry out this section—

“(1) $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1997;
“(2) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;
“(3) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;
“(4) $37,500,000 for fiscal year 2000;
“(5) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and
“(6) $62,500,000 for fiscal year 2002.”⁹

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

1996.8

**Title:** Pilot Research Program to Combine Medical and Agricultural Research

**Farm Bill:** 1996

**Summary:** The program seeks to combine research into disease research efforts with agricultural research that studies compounds in fruits and vegetables linked to disease prevention. The research from the pilot shall assist in the development of new varieties of fruits and vegetables for disease prevention.⁶²

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Research, Extension, and Education

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There are authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1997 to carry out the pilot program.”⁹

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
Section VI: 1990 Farm Bill

1990.1

Title: Pilot Voluntary Production Limitation Program (for Wheat)

Farm Bill: 1990

Summary: This pilot allows for wheat producers to participate, if they met the requirements, for an acreage limitation or land diversion program.

Reporting Requirement(s): The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a report that evaluates the pilot program carried out under this subsection. The Comptroller General shall submit a copy of the report required to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Secretary.64

Results: In 1994, an interim rule was added to this pilot. In it, the rule put forward amendments to set forth provisions to go forward with the pilot as amended in the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1993. No further information on the pilot’s outcome is available.65

Classified in Bill Under: Wheat

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Not known

1990.2

Title: Pilot Voluntary Production Limitation Program (for Feed Grains)

Farm Bill: 1990

Summary: This pilot allows for feed grain producers to participate, if they met the requirements, for an acreage limitation or land diversion program.

Reporting Requirement(s): The Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare a report that evaluates the pilot program carried out under this subsection. The Comptroller General shall submit a copy of the report required to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Secretary.67

Results: In 1994, an interim rule was added to this pilot. In it, the rule put forward amendments to set forth provisions to go forward with the pilot as amended in the Agricultural Reconciliation Act of 1993.66 No further information on the pilot’s outcome is available.

Classified in Bill Under: Feed Grains

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Not known
1990.3

Title: Options Pilot Program

Farm Bill: 1990

Summary: The pilot program sought to use regulated agricultural commodity options trading for use by producers to obtain protection from fluctuations in the market prices of the commodities they produce and the impact of such trading on the prices of the commodities for each of the 1991 through 1995 crops of corn and for each of the 1993 through 1995 crops of wheat and soybeans.67

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: A report was requested on behalf of Senator Richard Lugar’s (R-Indiana) office in 1995. Final reports for the program were not found.

In 1993, the USDA offered the program to 956 producers in nine counties in the states of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, totaling 17 million bushels of corn covered in the program. The cost was $12.7 million. All options through this specific program were offered through the Chicago Board of Trade (CBoT).

In 1994, four counties in two states, Kansas and North Dakota joined the program, with 20 million bushels of corn and 5 million bushels of wheat enrolled in the program. Subsidies in 1994 totaled $14.6 million between corn and wheat producers. During this time, the Kansas City Board of Trade (KCBoT) and the Minneapolis Grain Exchange (MGE) were also trading partners in the pilot. The 1995 program offered the program to 21 counties in seven states.

In 1994, the CBoT, KCBoT, and the MGE published a report stating that farmers were highly interested in the program, and it demonstrated itself to be a suitable alternative to price support and deficiency payment programs. The USDA Economic Research Service and Consolidated Farm Service Agency also conducted a study, but their conclusion differed in a couple of key respects. One, the cost advantages of the options pilot program were varied when compared to the deficiency payments, opening the possibility up for the options program to ultimately cost more. Second, there were concerns that the program did not adequately teach farmers how to use the options market, characterized by observations made in the 1993 pilot cycle.67

Classified in Bill Under: General Commodity Provisions

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio

1990.4

Title: Country of Origin Labeling Programs

Farm Bill: 1990

Summary: The Secretary shall implement a 2-year pilot program during which time perishable Agricultural products (fresh fruits and vegetables) are labeled or marked as to their country of origin.

Reporting Requirement(s): After the 2-year period, the Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the results of the program. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress the results of the study within 18 months from the date of completion of the program.67

Results: Not known


Total Appropriations: The CRS reports, “There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”9

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
1990.5

Title: Wetlands Reserve [Pilot] Program (WRP)

Farm Bill: 1990

Summary: This program allowed for the creation of a pilot in which easements on converted cropland and farmed wetlands were purchased and converted back into wetlands.67

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: Congress appropriated $46,000,000 to create a pilot program in nine states in FY 1992. No additional funds for the pilot were made after that point.68 Nearly twenty percent of farmers who had been approved for the program dropped out. Despite concerns of farmers regarding easement purchases and federal control, the subsequent Great Midwest Flood of 1993 emboldened the Soil Conservation Service (among other agencies overseeing the WRP) to encourage more farmers to enroll in an emergency program based on the pilot, citing the elimination of wetlands in the Upper Midwest as a reason for the severity of flooding.69 According to a 1998 report from the USDA, the program had over 530,000 acres of wetlands enrolled in 3,200 contracts by mid-1997.70

Classified in Bill Under: Conservation

Total Appropriations: A 1993 appropriations reports stated that $46,000,000 was provided for the pilot in Fiscal Year 1992.68

States Affected: California, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Wisconsin

1990.6

Title: Agricultural Water Quality Incentives Demonstration and Pilot Programs

Farm Bill: 1990

Summary: This allowed for pilot programs, focusing on implementation in areas determined to be priority agricultural areas that may compromise water quality, to provide incentives and education to farming operations to reduce waste and increase water quality.67

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: A report on the pilot concluded that certain changes to farming practices could lead to improved water quality and increased farm profits.71

Classified in Bill Under: Conservation

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

$82,650 was awarded by the federal government in 1993. $64,500 in matching non-federal funds also was spent on the pilots.71

States Affected: South Dakota
1990.7

**Title:** Pilot Project to Coordinate Food and Nutrition Education Programs

**Farm Bill:** 1990

**Summary:** The pilot made available grants for the design and program delivery of food and nutrition education programs for potential participants within the states and through related state programs.67

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Research

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each of the fiscal years 1991 through 1995 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the pilot project...”9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

---

1990.8

**Title:** Reprocessing Agreements with Private Companies (Pilot Project)

**Farm Bill:** 1990

**Summary:** In each of fiscal years 1992 and 1993, the Secretary shall conduct a pilot project in not more than three States under which any commodity made available to agencies that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for reprocessing is made available to the agencies as reprocessed end products.67

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Food Stamp and Related Provisions

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
1990.9

**Title:** Urban Forestry Demonstration Projects

**Farm Bill:** 1990

**Summary:** The Secretary is authorized to undertake, through the Forest Service’s Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry program, a study and pilot implementation project to demonstrate the benefits of retaining and integrating forests in urban development. The focus of such a study and implementation project should be to protect the environment and associated natural resource values, for current and future generations.⁶⁷

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Global Climate Change

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.⁹

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
Section VII: 1985 Farm Bill

1985.1

**Title:** Pilot Barter Program for Exchange of Agricultural Commodities for Strategic Materials

**Farm Bill:** 1985

**Summary:** The program acts to trade domestic commodities internationally for strategic materials that the United States does not produce in sufficient amounts.

**Reporting Requirement(s):** The program established by the Secretary shall be carried out during the fiscal years ending September 30, 1986, and September 30, 1987, and the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress, not later than 60 days after the end of each such fiscal year with respect to the operation of the program.72

**Results:** A 1989 Congressional report stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) attempted to undertake two pilot barter programs of crude oil in exchange for grain. The CCC proposed contracts with seven different countries (Algeria, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, and Venezuela), but none were interested in the barter program.73

**Classified in Bill Under:** Trade

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

**States Affected:** None

1985.2

**Title:** Supplemental and Alternative Crops (Pilot Program)

**Farm Bill:** 1985

**Summary:** The program creates and research and pilot project program for the development of supplemental and alternative crops, using such funds as are appropriated to the Secretary each fiscal year under this title.75

**Reporting Requirement(s):** None

**Results:** Not known

**Classified in Bill Under:** Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching

**Total Appropriations:** The CRS reports, “...using such funds as are appropriated to the Secretary each fiscal year under this title.”9

**States Affected:** Not known

**Note:** After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
1985.3

Title: School Lunch Pilot Project

Farm Bill: 1985

Summary: The program permits an eligible school district to receive assistance to carry out the school lunch program operated in the district in the form of, in lieu of commodities, all cash assistance or all commodity letters of credit assistance through the 1986-1987 school year.⁷⁵

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: Not known

Classified in Bill Under: Food Stamp and Related Provisions

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.⁹

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

1985.4

Title: Special Study and Pilot Projects on Futures Trading

Farm Bill: 1985

Summary: The pilot program created an extensive education program in counties with sizable commodity production that taught producers how to maximize return on their commodities in a futures or options market. This was in response to reductions in government price supports for commodities.⁷⁵

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: There was further discussion about implementing the program later in the 1980s, but nothing has been found on the final results.⁷⁴

Classified in Bill Under: Related and Miscellaneous Matters

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.⁹

States Affected: Not known

Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
Section VIII: 1981 Farm Bill

1981.1
Title: Extending and Amending Cash-Out Pilot Projects
Farm Bill: 1981
Summary: The pilot was designed to test program changes that may increase the efficiency of the food stamp program and improve the delivery of food stamp benefits to eligible households. This included changing the payment levels or allotments to recipients of benefits as well as the method by which food stamps are given out. This primarily came from cash-out programs.

Reporting Requirement(s): None
Results: Not known
Classified in Bill Under: Food Stamp and Commodity Distribution Amendments of 1981
Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.
States Affected: Not known
Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.

1981.2
Title: Nutritional Monitoring (Pilot Program)
Farm Bill: 1981
Summary: The pilot tests various means of measuring the nutritional status of low-income people, particularly those on food stamps. This is intended to create a national standard in how nutrition is monitored amongst food stamps recipients.

Reporting Requirement(s): The Secretary shall report on the progress of these pilot programs on an annual basis commencing on July 1, 1982, to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, together with such recommendations as the Secretary deems appropriate.
Results: Not known
Classified in Bill Under: Food Stamp and Commodity Distribution Amendments of 1981
Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.
States Affected: Not known
Note: After contact with the USDA/CRS and our independent research, we believe that this program never occurred.
1981.3

Title: Pilot Projects to Simplify the Processing of Applications for Certain AFDC, SSI, and Medicaid Recipients

Farm Bill: 1981

Summary: The pilot allowed for two states to participate in a simplification of application processes for various welfare programs. Instead of completing a separate application for food stamp eligibility, information from individuals’ Aid for Families with Dependent Children, Social Security, or Medicaid applications would be used to determine eligibility.75

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: According to a 1987 Congressional report, results from the pilot program showed that, “standardization of the benefit determination process could lead to significant reduction in administrative costs and error rates.”76

Classified in Bill Under: Food Stamp and Commodity Distribution Amendments of 1981

Total Appropriations: The CRS could not identify funding language in bill text.9

States Affected: Illinois, California75

1981.4

Title: Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)—Pilot Projects for the Elderly and Administrative Costs

Farm Bill: 1981

Summary: This pilot program distributed food packages to low-income elderly people using matching funds from the Treasury and operations by state and local agencies to run the program. For an individual to qualify for the program, they had to be 60 or older and have income below 130 percent of the poverty line.75

Reporting Requirement(s): None

Results: The pilot program was originally instituted in Des Moines, Iowa and Detroit, Michigan. The program expanded to New Orleans, Louisiana. In Fiscal Year 1986, the program was made permanent for seniors as part of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.77

Classified in Bill Under: Food Stamp and Commodity Distribution Amendments

Total Appropriations: The CRS reports, “…the Secretary...shall provide to the State agencies administering the commodity supplemental food program, for each of the fiscal years 1982 through 1985, funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury in amounts equal to the administrative costs of State and local agencies in operating the program, except that the funds provided to State agencies each fiscal year may not exceed 15 per centum of the amount appropriated for the provision of commodities to State agencies.”79

States Affected: Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan80
Sources
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The Harkin Institute and Drake University

The Harkin Institute for Public Policy & Citizen Engagement serves as a venue and catalyst for dynamic non-partisan research, learning, and outreach to promote understanding of the policy issues to which Senator Tom Harkin devoted his career.

The Harkin Institute is located at Drake University. Established in 1881, Drake is recognized as one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the Midwest. A mid-sized, private university in Des Moines, Iowa, Drake offers the benefits and resources of a larger institution along with the advantages of intimate class sizes and close personal relationships.

Drake’s mission is to provide an exceptional learning environment that prepares students for meaningful personal lives, professional accomplishments, and responsible global citizenship. The Drake experience is distinguished by collaborative learning among students, faculty, and staff and by the integration of the liberal arts and sciences with professional preparation. Our inspiration is that together we transform lives and strengthen communities.