



State & National
Partnership
The Federation of State Beef Councils

2016 Investor Report

2016 Federation Division Board of Directors



Hanson, Steve	Chairman, NE	Jacobs, Spencer	Kansas Beef Council, KS
Effertz, Jerry S.	Vice Chair, ND	Johnson, Joe	Mississippi Beef Council, MS
Abbott, Christopher J.	Nebraska Beef Council, NE	Jones, Larry	Kansas Beef Council, KS
Akin, James	Alabama Cattlemen's Association - Beef Council, AL	Jones, Scott	South Dakota Beef Industry Council, SD
Anderson, Don	Utah Beef Council, UT	Keith, Joel	Kansas Beef Council, KS
Anderson, Rod	Oregon Beef Council, OR	Kirkbride, Dianne	Wyoming Beef Council, WY
Bassett, Charles	Missouri Beef Industry Council, MO	Knobbe, Pat	Nebraska Beef Council, NE
Bayer, Matthew	Wisconsin Beef Council, WI	Larson, Kristin M.	Montana Beef Council, MT
Berry, Betts	Georgia Beef Board, GA	Lastovica, Steven R.	Texas Beef Council, TX
Beverly, Joel	Florida Beef Council, FL	Lipscomb, Bill	Alabama Cattlemen's Association - Beef Council, AL
Beyer, Jason	Texas Beef Council, TX	Lyman, Alan	Illinois Beef Association - Beef Council, IL
Black, Dean	Iowa Beef Industry Council, IA	Malecek, Mark	Minnesota Beef Council, MN
Bohn, Jerry	Kansas Beef Council, KS	Martin, Nathan K.	Missouri Beef Industry Council, MO
Brake, Linda	Region VI, AZ	Martinell, Kiley	Montana Beef Council, MT
Brenny, Katie	Region III, MN	McGregor, Scott	Iowa Beef Industry Council, IA
Brown III, Austin	Texas Beef Council, TX	McKee, Kristina	Tennessee Beef Industry Council, TN
Brownback, Kyra	Kansas Beef Council, KS	Meyer, Angie	Oklahoma Beef Council, OK
Burkholder, Anne	Nebraska Beef Council, NE	Miller, Sallie	Colorado Beef Council, CO
Burtrum, Clay	Oklahoma Beef Council, OK	Moorhouse, Ryan	Texas Beef Council, TX
Caldwell, Dawn	Nebraska Beef Council, NE	Moyer, Jaret	Kansas Beef Council, KS
Campbell, Rob C.	Arkansas Beef Council, AR	Murgoitio, Lou	Idaho Beef Council, ID
Carlson, Jodi	North Dakota Beef Commission, ND	Niess, Scott	Beef Industry Council, IA
Carter, Darren	South Carolina Beef Council, SC	Nissley, Darwin	Pennsylvania Beef Council, PA
Church, Larry	Tennessee Beef Industry Council, TN	Oeschger, Dale	Michigan Beef Industry Commission, MI
Coddington, Cliff	Florida Beef Council, FL	Para, Liz	Washington State Beef Commission, WA
Cook, Dan	Iowa Beef Industry Council, IA	Payne, Glenn	Oklahoma Beef Council, OK
Creighton-Smith, Kathy	Montana Beef Council, MT	Pazour, Karla	South Dakota Beef Industry Council, SD
Curtis, Donna Jo	Region II, AL	Pendleton, Mark	North Carolina Beef Council, NC
Dahl, Jeff	North Dakota Beef Commission, ND	Price, Clark	North Dakota Beef Commission, ND
Danner, Myron	Nebraska Beef Council, NE	Rechel, Lucy	Nevada Beef Council, NV
Deering, Gary	South Dakota Beef Industry Council, SD	Rehder, Steve	Iowa Beef Industry Council, IA
Downey, Barb	Region VII, KS	Roe, Beverly	Ohio Beef Council, OH
Dunning, Steve	Kentucky Beef Council, KY	Schrunk, Richard	Nebraska Beef Council, NE
Ellis, Spencer	Wyoming Beef Council, WY	Scott, Brad	California Beef Council, CA
Evans, Morgan	Idaho Beef Council, ID	Sexten, Bill	Region I, OH
Farr, R D	Oklahoma Beef Council, OK	Shelton, Dan	Texas Beef Council, TX
Ferguson, Jon C.	Kansas Beef Council, KS	Swanz, Linda	Montana Beef Council, MT
Forester, Bryan	Texas Beef Council, TX	Swenson, Steve	Texas Beef Council Revenue Seat, TX
Galimba, Michelle	Hawaii Beef Industry Council, HI	Taylor, Glenn	New York Beef Industry Council, NY
Graham, Jamie	Ohio Beef Council, OH	Treat, Bernarr	New Mexico Beef Council, NM
Gray, Rodney	Nebraska Beef Council, NE	Walth, Becky	South Dakota Beef Industry Council, SD
Gwin, Mark	Virginia Beef Industry Council, VA	Waters, Glen	Missouri Beef Industry Council, MO
Harms, Mark D.	Kansas Beef Council Revenue Seat, KS	Wehrbein, Buck	Nebraska Beef Council Revenue Seat, NE
Hauck, Dana R.	Kansas Beef Council, KS	Weltmer, Philip	Kansas Beef Council, KS
Hinman, Dan	Region V, ID	Wiley, Garry	Michigan Beef Industry Commission, MI
Hinman, Judy	Idaho Beef Council, ID	Wright, Thomas R.	Wyoming Beef Council, WY
Hinz, Norman J.	Arizona Beef Council, AZ	Wynn, Weldon	Region IV, AR
Horstman, Joe	Indiana Beef Council, IN	Yeoman, Byron	Oklahoma Beef Council, OK
Inglee, Todd	Colorado Beef Council, CO		

Dear Fellow Beef Producers,

Focus! It's a word with many uses, but for the beef industry in 2016 it has one clear directive: Concentrate.

Focus has become much more important to the beef industry as it attempts to do more with less, especially through the Beef Checkoff Program. Limited resources have made state beef councils and the Beef Promotion Operating Committee concentrate even more closely on what will have the biggest impact on building beef demand and thereby protect the interests of beef producers. They have forced many difficult – even painful – decisions about where to direct resources, both time and money. And they have caused the industry to be really resolute in narrowing the number of objectives it will pursue and strategies it will utilize.

The Beef Industry Long Range Plan 2016-2020 demonstrates that focus, and provides beef producers an important sense of direction and purpose. The authors of the Plan focused on one Strategic Objective – to Increase the Beef Demand Index measure by 2 percent annually over the next five years. That objective delivers a goal that allows industry leaders and the staffs of contracting organizations and state councils to measure their progress for the work they are doing. It also gives producers a key tool to help them determine how well their checkoff dollars are working to build demand for beef.

The plan is focused on four areas: Drive growth in beef exports; protect and enhance the business and political climate for beef; grow consumer trust in beef and beef production; and promote and strengthen beef's value proposition. They give us focus to deal effectively with the myriad of issues with which we struggle as an industry. They are a thoughtful, serious effort to make sure our work as an industry has tangible results.

State beef council and national leaders are already working toward the goals it presents. You'll see evidence of that in this issue of Directions.

As we struggle with limited budgets and increasing needs, this kind of focus is crucial. There's no question that within our states we have varying priorities and different sets of needs. With an eye toward better management of checkoff dollars, though, our Beef Industry Long Range Plan is a way to get everyone headed toward the final destination. Please accept my assurance that the NCBA Federation of State Beef Councils is on board, and committed to maintaining the focus so that we don't get off course along the way.

Yours Truly,

Steve Hanson, Chairman
Federation of State Beef Councils



Federation Executive Committee:

Chair	Steve Hanson, Nebraska
Vice-Chair	Jerry Effertz, North Dakota
Region I	Bill Sexten, Ohio
Region II	Donna Jo Curtis, Alabama
Region III	Katie Brenny, Minnesota
Region IV	Weldon Wynn, Arkansas
Region V	Dan Hinman, Idaho
Region VI	Linda Brake, Arizona
Region VII	Barb Downey, Kansas
Rev. Seat	Mark Harms, Kansas
Rev. Seat	Buck Wehrbein, Nebraska
Rev. Seat	Steve Swensons, Texas

Federation Advisory Council:

Patti Brumbach, Washington, Chair
George Quackenbush, Michigan, Vice-Chair
Valerie Bass, Tennessee, Past Chair
Nancy Jo Bateman, North Dakota
Bridget Bingham, Pennsylvania
Ann Marie Bosshammer, Nebraska
Chaley Harney, Montana
Bill Dale, California
Richard Wortham, Texas
Karin Schaefer, Minnesota



Federation members on the 2016 Beef Promotion Operating Committee are: (back row, left to right) Steve Hanson (Federation chairman and BPOC vice chairman, Nebraska); Scott McGregor, (Iowa); Gary Deering (South Dakota); Austin Brown III (Texas); Brent Buckley (Hawaii); Jerry Effertz (Federation vice chairman, North Dakota); (front row, left to right) Barb Downey, (Kansas); Kristin Larson (Montana); Dawn Caldwell (Nebraska); and Clay Burtrum (Oklahoma).

STATE OF THE FEDERATION

Getting to Know the U.S. Beef Consumer

Five people may provide five different routes to the same destination, and each of those routes may eventually end at the final point. But which route makes the most sense when all of the factors are considered? When deciding how to spend beef checkoff dollars to maximize impact on consumer beef demand, it's an important question.

Identifying who the beef consumer is and what they want is where it all starts, and the checkoff-funded national Consumer Beef Index (CBI) is an important tool in getting that done. Still, it obviously can't explain everything about every consumer in every part of the country. In fact, when staff and boards at state beef councils take a look at the national numbers they may naturally wonder whether the picture represents their own beef consumers and the best route to reach them.

Nationally, the checkoff-funded CBI, which is managed by staff at NCBA, a beef checkoff contractor, was started in 2006 as a meaningful, actionable, data-driven national performance measure to meet a beef industry Long Range Plan goal for a mechanism to track goals. It has continued on a bi-annual basis through 2015, with 18 "waves" creating a combined national database of more than 19,500 consumers

aged 13-65.

The CBI measures changes in consumer perceptions of, and demand for, beef relative to other meat



proteins; consumer impressions of beef that could be attributed to the industry's communications and advertising efforts; areas of relative strength and potential vulnerability for beef sales; and market dimensions having an impact on national communication strategies.

It paints effective pictures of U.S. beef consumers at the national level, and has been important in the development of national checkoff-funded programs that address consumer demand for beef. But by itself the research doesn't distinguish between consumers geographically. That's why since 2007 states have been allowed to customize that index to determine how their consumers differ from national scores for behavior and beliefs regarding beef and its primary competitors.

Nuances within states might include how often consumers eat beef (consumers in beef production states tend to eat beef more often); the importance or reduced importance of production issues; competitive proteins (chicken is produced more commonly in some areas of the country); and distribution channels (big discounters are more prevalent in certain regions).

Larger differences do exist, however. Even within what are commonly thought of as "beef production states" there are some significant urban elements. While consumers in these urban areas are more knowledgeable on agricultural issues than consumers in, say, Los Angeles or New York City, they are still further removed from agriculture.

And those are the kinds of things a state council board really wants to know. These boards are trying to make smart decisions in-state, and this information can help them set targets, and possibly close some gaps.

A Welcome Tool

State beef councils have responded very well to the checkoff-funded information, which they can purchase at-cost through the national database. They recognize it's difficult to get state-specific information, and can determine from the research if consumers in their state are different than those in other parts of the country.

The research provides benchmarks from which states can build some programs. The CBI also infuses programs with direction and elements on which to focus. Finally, it maximizes value to producers in the state, as it improves checkoff-funded decisions by helping determine where the best returns are. Many state marketing plans have information from the CBI built in.

If state councils find acquiring individual CBI data cost-prohibitive, they may join forces with other nearby councils to gather information. Last year, the councils in Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas and Iowa acquired data that would help them in their marketing plans. By joining together the "MINK" states gathered information useful in their efforts.

Since individual state needs differ, state beef councils utilize the information they obtain in ways that are meaningful to their own volunteer producer boards. Some states use it to make their boards more knowledgeable, or to set key tracking goals.

Bottom Line

Regardless how it's used, CBI information is the kind of third-party research crucial to an industry that sometimes has a

Supports these Long Range Plan Strategies:
grow consumer trust in beef and beef production; promote and strengthen beef's value proposition

skewed perspective. Let's face it: when you're part of the industry you're not totally objective. We're too close to our product and our work.

Being involved in the CBI allows national and state beef checkoff leaders and staffs to see the consumer from a fresh and unbiased angle, and plan

and develop programs accordingly. Everything done on behalf of the beef checkoff starts and ends with the consumer. 🐮

Digital Does It

A new national Families in Motion campaign from the Beef Checkoff Program began in late June, and is delivering a message about beef's nutrition, versatility and ease-of-preparation to a more specific – but very critical – audience. The campaign is being managed by NCBA, a beef checkoff contractor.

The campaign is designed to reach millennial parents ages 25-34, and is targeted to cooking and/or health enthusiasts who are open to inspiration about their meals and seeking assistance on what to prepare, and how. Digital media purchases for the campaign continues through October.

Included in the campaign are cooking techniques, nutrition information and recipes to meet the demands of these important consumers. The messages are promoted through a wide variety of digital platforms, including Facebook, Twitter

and Pinterest, as well as Google search and banner advertising.

It also includes partnerships with online food sites Food52 and TasteMade, which provide helpful food and meal suggestions to many millennial consumers. Food52 will provide nearly 28 million impressions for beef, while TasteMade will feature full-length YouTube videos and shorter teasers.

The goal of the campaign is to get parents of young children to include beef in more meals by helping them see how beef's versatility and unique combination of nutrients gives each member of the family what they need to get through the day. Videos associated with the campaign inspire beef usage and inform consumers about beef's health benefits.

A goal for the video campaign is 24 million viewers, linking each viewer to

the campaign's landing page, which is the Beef It's What's For Dinner website. Sixteen percent of visitors continue on to other pages on the site.

States Step Up

State beef councils also stepped up to be part of the campaign, both extending the national campaigns in their states or regions or incorporating parts of the Families in Motion campaign in their own in-state programs.

Some councils individually funded extensions of the campaign in their states; others pooled funds at the regional level to create some of the same kinds of benefits, recognizing that demographics of their consumers were similar. State beef councils in Kansas, Illinois, Iowa and Nebraska, for instance, regionally enhanced the reach of the campaign.

SOCIAL MEDIA

[READ MORE](#) [CONTACT US](#)

Supports this Long Range Plan Strategy:
promote and strengthen beef's
value proposition

Joining Forces to Increase Reach in Key Consumer States

Seven state and regional beef promoting organizations joined forces with the national Beef Checkoff Program in a summer campaign targeting millennial consumers in five high population states. State beef councils in Illinois, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming and Oklahoma, along with the Northeast Beef Promotion Initiative, funded extended promotion of the online checkoff-funded flagship website *BeefItsWhatsForDinner.com*, along with the brand's online videos, into California, Florida, New York, Illinois and Pennsylvania.

The Top 5 State Media Campaign ran from mid-May through Aug. 31. Collectively, the five states targeted account for more than 100 million consumers, or about one-third of the total U.S. population.

The campaign utilized internet search advertising on Google and YouTube video advertising to hit the consumer at the point of inspiration, encouraging beef interest and purchases. While the national campaign focuses on millennials throughout the United States, this campaign enhanced checkoff-funded efforts in top U.S. consumer markets.

The 30 second and one minute videos were promoted in consumer YouTube searches through thousands of purchased keyword combinations, such as "easy meals" or "steak." When those keywords and combinations were used, the beef ads moved to the top of the list.

In addition, keywords typed into the YouTube site triggered a visual and linked to the Beef. It's What's For Dinner website, inviting consumers to watch how easy beef is to prepare. "Pre-roll" advertising, where consumers can elect to view a 30 second beef video prior to viewing their selected YouTube video, was also used.

These video pre-roll ads are charged to an advertiser only when a viewer watches either 30 seconds of a video, the full video (if under 30 seconds) or clicks on a link within the video at any point. On Google, advertisers only pay when a searcher clicks on their site.

The Top 5 State Media Campaign repeated a successful 2015 summer campaign that on Google delivered more than 4.1 million impressions and 188,000 clicks to the beef website, which resulted in almost 369,000 page views on the site. On YouTube, ads delivered 1.2 million impressions and received about 363,000 video views – at a cost-per-view of 8 cents.

State-by-state detailed analytics from the campaign were provided to both participating state beef councils and councils in targeted states midway through the campaign to show progress, and at the end of the campaign to measure success. 🐾

beef checkoff has developed significant creative ideas and content, and will leverage what's been learned and created into the spring. It's a checkoff investment

that is helping generate both visibility for beef and quantifiable contact with millions of consumers who buy and prepare beef products. 🐾



The extra effort in these four states will generate at least a half million video views of checkoff messages across the states.

States participating in the campaign, whether individually or regionally, are seeing value in the campaign. Because research shows this audience is important to beef and one that gets its information digitally, council leaders can justify the additional investment in the campaign. The campaign message that beef fits into a healthy, balanced diet resonates with consumers. Furthermore, it's a targeted approach that reaches the appropriate audience efficiently, and provides metrics that allow state council managers and leaders to analyze results.

In addition to the videos and partnerships, there are numerous forms of assistance available to state beef councils allowing them to extend the campaign while coordinating promotion programs in their own states. Banner ads, social media posts and imagery, and video commercials in a variety of lengths fit the theme and can be used in a state's campaign. New radio advertising has been made available through the national

Beef Checkoff Program, while planning assistance is offered to help coordinate and maximize the state/national promotion effort. Additional materials are in production.

State councils weighed in on both the development and the implementation of the campaign. The national team, for instance, received significant feedback from the Federation Advisory Council. Webinars for council staffs and direct contact between staffs at the national and state levels helped broaden the collaboration.

Just Beginning

The Family in Motion video campaign runs into October, but that won't be the end of the effort at either the state or national level. Through research the

Increasing Demand by Building Trust

Supported by the Beef Checkoff Program, Beef Quality Assurance is a nationally coordinated, state implemented program that provides systematic information to U.S. beef producers and beef consumers. It demonstrates how common sense husbandry techniques can be coupled with accepted scientific knowledge to raise cattle under optimum management and environmental conditions. BQA guidelines are designed to assure all beef consumers they can take pride in what they purchase – and can trust and have confidence in the entire beef industry.

BQA programs, which are coordinated nationally by NCBA as a contractor to the Beef Checkoff Program, have evolved to include best practices that involve good record keeping and

protecting herd health, which can result in more profits for producers. When better quality cows leave the farm and reach the market place, the producer, packer, and consumer all benefit. When better quality beef reaches the supermarket, consumers are more confident in the beef they are buying, and this increases beef consumption.

The efforts of BQA across the nation have been instrumental in recent successes that continue to re-build and sustain beef demand. Through BQA programs, producers recognize the economic value of committing to quality beef production at every level - not just at the ranch, feedlot or packing plant, but within every segment of the cattle industry. 🐮



The guiding principles of BQA are based on these core beliefs:

WE BELIEVE production practices affect consumer acceptance of beef.

WE BELIEVE the BQA Program has and must continue to empower beef producers to improve the safety and wholesomeness of beef.

WE BELIEVE these fundamental principles are the fabric of the BQA Program.

Supports this Long Range Plan Strategy:
grow consumer trust in beef and
beef production

Federation Initiative Fund

State	Program	Audience	Grant
Arizona Beef Council	Gate to Plate Tour Series	Health and Retail/Foodservice	\$8,600
Georgia Beef Board	Team Beef Program	Fitness Enthu-siasts	\$10,000
Hawaii Beef Industry Council	Reaching International Consumers at Home	International Consumers	\$10,000
Indiana Beef Council	Indiana Team BEEF	Fitness Enthusiasts	\$2,200
Indiana Beef Council	Beef Facilities Tour	Meat Retailers	\$2,500
Indiana Beef Council	Social Media Expansion	General Public	\$1,500
Michigan Beef Industry Commission	Family Meal Time Immersion	Dietitians, Bloggers	\$4,700
New York Beef Council	Social Media Synergy	Meal-time Decision Makers, Bloggers	\$18,000
New York Beef Council	Dietetic Intern Leadership Summit	Dietetic Interns	\$10,500
Ohio Beef Council	Beef Immersion	Chefs, Culinary Instructors	\$5,000
Ohio Beef Council	Ohio State 4-Miler	Fitness Enthusiasts	\$10,000
Pennsylvania Beef Council	Ibotta Have Beef	Millennials	\$20,000
Pennsylvania Beef Council	Raising the Steaks for Dietitians	Dietetic Health Influencers	\$5,500
Pennsylvania Beef Council	Opening the Farm Gate	School Foodservice Professionals	\$5,000
Wisconsin Beef Council	Blogger Immersion	Blogger Influencers	\$1,550

Beef to Consumers? Bring the Consumers to Beef

Our communications world today is dominated by computers, smart phones, tablets and other forms of impersonal contact. Checkoff-funded farm-to-fork tours conducted by state beef councils, however, have shown that more face-to-face forms of interaction are a valuable tool in shifting perceptions about the beef industry.

State beef council managers who have been active in farm-to-fork tours over the past decade are unanimously enthusiastic about the ability of the tours to improve knowledge of and move attitudes about the industry. They see it as chance to give influencers first-hand experience in beef production, and allow them to network with producers themselves. Many of the influencers do not have any idea there is so much involved with the care of animals, or in the production of beef. By conducting these tours, the industry is helping to effectively put a face on the industry itself.

As a result, research shows the tours are helping shift opinions and producing incredible results, with attitudes being significantly changed.

Not for Everyone

Because they're so effective, any consumer would benefit from these checkoff-funded farm-to-fork tours. But because of the time and fund requirements, they aren't for everyone. In fact, it's impossible to take every consumer on a beef industry tour. That's why these tours are focused on

participants, but the number on a tour is not nearly as important as the content. Fostering relationships is an important element of the trips.

Surveys conducted both pre- and post-tours support the use of tours with checkoff funds. For instance, a survey of participants in a beef checkoff-funded tour coordinated at the national level showed that 92 percent of participants before the tour were somewhat or very concerned about humane treatment of cattle, and 8 percent were somewhat or very concerned afterward. Eighty two percent were somewhat or very concerned about environmental impact pre-tour, and 25 percent afterward.

Reach is extended through social media. Participants share their own experiences, pictures and quotes, and these spread all over the country quickly. Furthermore, the goal isn't just to change opinion. It's to give influencers an experience that would shape how they share their stories with those they reach.

Producers involved in the tours find that it's a great way to share their stories, and often want to do it again. They're proud of their operations. They aren't afraid of the tough conversations during the tours, which represent the reality the industry faces today.

Building Trust

Farm-to-fork tours help build consumer trust in beef and beef production, which is one of four Core Strategies of the Beef Industry 2016-2020 Long Range Plan. Coordination

between state beef councils and the national beef checkoff teams provide cooperative momentum toward that goal.

For instance, checkoff-funded meat cutting and culinary experts at the national level often assist state tour efforts. State beef councils also get assistance from the national checkoff team, which can help identify appropriate tour participants or provide spokesperson training for producers, or develop materials for appropriate audiences. The Federation has also supported several state beef council-conducted tours financially.

There will always be a place for these kinds of in-person production experiences, and the industry is building on them to produce other types of communications programs, such as virtual experiences via video. It can reach people who aren't able to go on a tour, or who are in a geographical area of the country where one or another segment of the beef industry isn't represented.

Furthermore, the checkoff is always trying to improve on ways of getting the right production images to the right people at the right time. Video shot in Nebraska and Texas in 2014 and 2015 is helping provide images that share a view of cattle production with consumers. Some of these images and additional information can be found on FactsAboutBeef.com.

Production immersion experiences are an industry exercise in transparency. Those who work for state beef councils and the Beef Checkoff Program help gather the information, coordinate the events and

manage the follow-up, but the first-hand visits and non-scripted conversations allow producers themselves to be the story-tellers about how beef is raised. 🍖

Supports this Long Range Plan Strategy:
grow consumer trust in beef and
beef production



Often these tours will include from 20-40

A National Staff to Support the States

Regardless of where they're located in this country, state beef councils have plenty on their plates. While some states have the checkoff-resources to support all of their efforts, others must look outside of their offices to secure the services and expertise they need.

The Federation can serve an enormous role in filling those needs.

For example, the NCBA design services team can provide graphic and design services to participating state beef councils at no charge – and do so with knowledge of the cattle industry and Beef Checkoff Program that traditional ad agencies and graphic services companies won't have. Incorporating images and concepts that are consistent with existing national programs, the design team can collaborate with state council staffs to make sure the state/national partnership is working at an optimum level.

Among the many materials the NCBA design services team has assisted with over the past year have been brochures, posters, logos, banners and other materials that require imagination and special graphic talents. Because they do work for so many groups, the design services team can also usually help states save on printing costs – and NCBA has printing capabilities on-site for larger printed items such as banners, posters and signs, so even greater savings are available there.

IT Services

In addition to design services, NCBA provides IT support to state beef councils on a regular basis. In fact, numerous state beef councils turn to the NCBA IT team to help create, update and revitalize websites that will allow them to more effectively reach consumers in their states.

Some of the same benefits to states apply to IT. NCBA fully understands the cattle industry, so requires less of the learning curve that an outside IT firm would need. And because it does work for so many states across the country, it also understands what kinds of approaches work and which don't when it comes to reaching out to various audiences through the computer. It also has the capabilities to efficiently make use of many of the industry's online properties to make sure states don't have to re-create the wheel on their own sites.

Every year about 10 state beef councils will work with the NCBA IT team on their state websites. Many of those websites are hosted on the NCBA server. And, of course, the team is available to states for consultation and advice when it comes to the best approaches for filling web needs at the state level.

Meeting Other State Needs

A state/national partnership isn't complete without collaboration on the day-to-day programs being conducted by states that

involve national programs, and by the national program that require the input of state beef councils. In addition to the Cattle Industry Convention and the Cattle Industry Summer Meeting, there are two meetings held at the NCBA offices that go toward filling those needs.

The Partnerships in Action conference allows state council managers to meet and not only learn what is being done by NCBA at the national level on behalf of the Beef Checkoff Program, but discuss ways they can work with other states and national staffers on how to make the efforts better. Specifically, it provides state managers the opportunity to weigh in on how they might roll out or extend national programs in their states.

On the volunteer level, new state beef council directors are invited to an orientation in Denver each spring to enhance their knowledge of the checkoff process and learn more about how states work together with the national teams to get the work of the Beef Checkoff Program done. 🐮



Photos from the 2016 Partnerships in Action meeting at NCBA Office in Centennial, Col.

Supports all Long Range
Plan Strategies

2016 Federation Expenses

For the year ending 09/30/2016



	BPOC/CBB	Federation	Total	Percent Federation
Revenue				
BPOC/Federation	\$34,662,822	\$10,302,615	\$44,965,437	23%
Customer Service		270,956	270,956	100%
Other	86,958	77,861	164,819	47%
Total Revenue	34,749,780	10,651,432	45,401,212	23%
BPOC Program Expenses				
Promotion	7,369,827	1,543,001	8,912,828	17%
Research	9,280,329	1,854,281	11,134,610	17%
Consumer Information	6,497,969	1,169,180	7,667,149	15%
Industry Information	3,212,691	566,062	3,778,753	15%
Foreign Marketing	8,302,006	1,665,252	9,967,258	17%
Total BPOC programs expenses	34,662,822	6,797,776	41,460,598	16%
Non-BPOC Program Expenses				
Federation Relations (a)		2,284,172	2,284,172	100%
Governance (b)		686,605	686,605	100%
Other	86,958		86,958	0%
Total Non-BPOC program expenses	86,958	2,970,777	3,057,735	97%
Total expenses	34,749,780	9,768,553	44,518,333	22%
Net Increase in Reserves (c)	–	882,879	882,879	100%

(a) Federation Relations includes expenses associated with services and materials provided to State Beef Councils.

(b) Governance includes expenses associated with meetings and travel for NCBA's Officers, Board, Executive Committee and other committee members charged with governing the association. Governance costs are allocated to Federation and Policy divisions accordingly.

(b) Increase in Reserves relates to remaining Federation expenses required to complete FY16 multi-year programs as well as cost savings on program expenses.

If you are interested in a detailed explanation of the Federation, visit [this](#) presentation.



Summary of State Beef Council Investments

For the year ending 09/30/2016



State	Beef	USMEF Prioritized	USMEF Earmarked	NCBA Earmarked	Total SBC Revenue	Federation Initiative	Grand Total
Alabama	23,000	0	0	0	23,000	0	23,000
Arizona	17,000	0	0	0	17,000	0	17,000
Arkansas	26,000	0	8,600	0	34,600	0	34,600
California	23,000	0	8,600	0	31,600	0	31,600
Colorado	58,000	0	8,600	0	66,600	0	66,600
Florida	40,000	0	0	0	40,000	0	40,000
Georgia	14,000	0	0	0	14,000	0	14,000
Hawaii	950	0	0	0	950	0	950
Idaho	164,000	103,000	0	0	267,000	0	267,000
Illinois	14,000	0	0	15,000	29,000	0	29,000
Indiana	14,000	0	0	0	14,000	0	14,000
Iowa	500,000	100,000	8,600	15,000	623,600	0	623,000
Kansas	2,245,757	31,400	8,600	15,000	2,300,757	0	2,300,757
Kentucky	23,000	0	8,600	5,100	36,700	0	36,700
Michigan	28,000	0	0	49,826	77,826	0	77,826
Minnesota	26,000	0	8,600	6,300	40,900	0	40,900
Mississippi	19,000	0	0	0	19,000	0	19,000
Missouri	203,052	0	17,200	0	220,252	0	220,252
Montana	255,000	100,000	8,600	0	363,600	0	363,000
Nebraska	1,530,000	420,787	8,600	40,000	1,999,387	0	1,999,387
Nevada	13,500	0	0	0	13,500	0	13,500
New Mexico	29,000	0	8,600	0	37,600	0	37,600
New York	14,000	0	0	0	14,000	0	14,000
North Carolina	14,000	0	0	0	14,000	0	14,000
North Dakota	198,140	0	0	19,305	217,445	0	217,445
Ohio	14,000	14,000	0	0	28,000	0	28,000
Oklahoma	119,150	15,950	8,600	65,000	208,700	0	208,700
Oregon	19,000	4,000	0	0	23,000	0	23,000
Pennsylvania	17,000	0	0	23,500	40,500	0	40,500
South Carolina	4,245	0	0	0	4,245	0	4,245
South Dakota	209,453	100,000	17,200	0	326,653	0	326,653
Tennessee	46,000	0	0	5,750	51,750	0	51,750
Texas	2,000,000	491,400	8,600	9,300	2,509,300	0	2,509,300
Utah	26,000	0	0	0	26,000	0	26,000
Virginia	20,000	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000
Washington	20,000	0	0	37,980	57,980	0	57,980
Wisconsin	26,000	0	8,600	0	34,600	0	34,600
Wyoming	87,000	0	25,800	6,000	118,800	0	118,800
	8,100,247	1,380,537	172,000	313,061	9,965,845	0	9,965,845
Net deferred investments adjustment	133,135	46,251	0	56,076	235,462	101,308	336,770
	8,233,382	1,426,788	172,000	369,137	10,201,307	101,308	10,302,615

