

**Senate Agriculture Committee
Field Hearing**

*Growing Jobs and Economic Opportunity:
Perspectives on the 2018 Farm Bill from Michigan*

Frankenmuth, Michigan
May 6, 2017

**Testimony by
Rick Gerstenberger,
Gerstenberger Farms, Inc.
and
Chairman of the Board,
Michigan Sugar Company**

*The Importance of the Sugar Industry to Michigan and
U.S. Sugar Policy to the Michigan and U.S. Sugar Industry*

Introduction

My name is Richard Gerstenberger and I am testifying today on behalf of the Michigan Sugar Company. I am a second-generation farmer on the farm that began with my parents. Along with my wife Linda and brother Robert, and our two sons Dan and Mike and their families, we raise sugarbeets, corn, soybeans, wheat, alfalfa, and occasionally dry beans on 2,900 acres of land. For the past 30 years I have also have been a sugarbeet, corn, and soybean seed dealer.

For the past nine years I have served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Michigan Sugar Company, which was in bankruptcy in 2002 until 600 growers banded together to save the Michigan industry and convert it to a farmer-owned cooperative. I know the sugar business from the genetics in the seed to when the sugar arrives at the loading docks and shelves of our customers. Every step in that process has an impact on the profitability of our grower-owners.

Brief History of the Industry in Michigan. Sugarbeets have been in continuous production on Michigan family farms for over 120 years. Between 1898 and 1904, 23 sugarbeet factories were constructed across Michigan. Of these, only the four Michigan Sugar Company (MSC) factories exist today.

Transformation to a Farmer-Owned Cooperative. In 2001, Imperial Sugar Company, the owner of Michigan Sugar Company at the time, announced that MSC was for sale. Imperial and its subsidiaries were in bankruptcy and made it very clear that if the company were not

purchased soon, the factories would be shuttered and would no longer operate. With sugarbeets being one of the key rotation crops in the cash-crop region for more than 100 years, the growers formed a cooperative and purchased the Michigan Sugar Company in 2002.

What is unique to the sugarbeet and sugar cane industries, and unlike most other cash crops, is the fact that local growers are tied to a dedicated processing facility. You can't stop and start this industry based on global market forces. Once you are out, you are out.

Just two years later, in 2004, Monitor Sugar Company, the competitor just seven miles to the north, also went up for sale and the same scenario was in play; if Monitor Sugar Company was not purchased soon, the factory would be shuttered and would no longer operate.

Facing that reality, in October 2004 the growers from both Monitor and Michigan combined efforts, purchased Monitor Sugar Company and merged the two companies into what is today the Michigan Sugar Company grower-owned cooperative. Purchasing two companies and all of the operating facilities was a huge risk. Many growers mortgaged their farms to make the cooperative a reality and keep the sugarbeet industry in Michigan alive.

This is testimony to the fact that across the U.S. sugarbeet industry all of the beet-processing companies are grower-owned cooperatives and are the last owners of the business. I would note that the majority of the cane milling and refining industry is also owned by cane farmers.

Magnitude of Investments in the Factories. Since buying the companies, the growers of our cooperative have focused on the future and providing opportunities for their sons and daughters, who are the next generation of operators of the family farm. As a result, growers have invested heavily to strengthen the foundation of the Michigan sugarbeet industry and provide an adequate return for their hard work and investment. In addition to purchasing two sugarbeet processing companies, growers have made significant investments on their farms for advanced sugarbeet production and harvesting. The grower-owners of the cooperative have also invested heavily in their factories and beet-pile storage systems, with capital investments of \$200 million since 2002. These investments have concentrated on energy savings, environmental stewardship, extraction efficiencies, retail packaging lines, and beet quality in storage piles.

U.S. Sugar Industry and Policy

Nationally, the U.S. sugar-producing industry generates 142,000 jobs in 22 states. I want to thank Senator Stabenow for constantly reminding her colleagues and the nation that agriculture is about jobs. The Farm Bill is about jobs.

Our cooperative employs 2,400 workers, full and part time combined, to operate our four factories, various beet piling sites, and sugar storage and distribution facilities in Ohio. These are good union jobs in small rural towns that have no other manufacturing jobs. Our cooperative also provides employment for 1,000 farm families and their employees who grow beets on 151,000 acres. This industry is the economic lifeblood for many of the small towns throughout our region.

The U.S. sugar industry generates \$20 billion in annual economic activity.¹ In Michigan, our industry's contribution to our state's economy is \$1.5 billion.

American sugar policy is working well for American consumers, food manufacturers, and taxpayers. It can provide an adequate economic safety net for American sugar producers if it is updated to reflect today's realities and as long as there is an effective response to Mexican subsidizing and dumping.

In 2014 and 2015, the U.S. International Trade Commission agreed unanimously that the Mexican government and sugar industry had injured the U.S. sugar industry. The U.S. Department of Commerce calculated subsidy and dumping margins totaling more than 80%. Rather than imposing those duties, the U.S. and Mexican governments negotiated Suspension Agreements (SAs) to resume duty-free trade, with the objective of eliminating harmful dumping.

These SAs have proven to be ineffective. The dumping continues, and U.S. refined sugar prices are hovering near loan-forfeiture levels. Hawaii has ceased cane sugar production, and a beet factory in Wyoming is about to close. Many other American sugar producers are financially vulnerable.

Today, only 73% of U.S. sugar consumption is supplied by domestic production, with the balance coming from imports. Twenty years ago, 85% was supplied by domestic production (*Figure 1*). Growing dependence on foreign suppliers is an alarming trend that must be reversed. Domestic production should not be restricted to accommodate more imports. The sugar policy's focus must be to put American beet and cane farmer interests first.

We are encouraging the U.S. and Mexican governments to correct the shortcomings of the SAs or, failing that, to impose the subsidy and dumping duties.

An adequate response to foreign subsidies and dumping is essential to our survival.

Background

Food security. Sugar is a strategic commodity and plays an important role in the security of our nation's food system. We are already heavily dependent on foreign suppliers for about 30% of our domestic needs. We cannot become more dependent on foreign imports because they have been proven to be unreliable in times of global shortages. The Michigan sugar industry is a key supplier to the Midwest markets, where food manufacturers and retail businesses depend on us to provide them with a high quality, safe, dependable and on-time supply of sugar. Our core market area is Indiana, Michigan and Ohio, where we supply sugar products to 500 manufacturers and businesses.

The U.S. sugar industry is a major player in the world sugar market. The United States is the world's fifth largest sugar-producing country and is among the most efficient.

¹ LMC International, "The Economic Importance of the Sugar Industry to the U.S. Economy – Jobs and Revenues," Oxford, England, August 2011.

The U.S. is the 20th lowest cost among the 95 largest sugar-producing nations. Most of these are developing countries with far lower government-imposed costs for worker, consumer, and environmental protections. U.S. beet sugar producers, mostly in northern-tier states, are the lowest-cost beet producers in the world.²

U.S. beet and cane producers are among the most efficient in the world because we have reduced costs by vertically integrating. We have formed cooperatives and growers now own all of the nation's 22 beet factories, and cane growers have purchased most of their refineries.

The United States is also the world's fourth largest sugar-consuming country and the third largest sugar importer. We provide guaranteed and essentially duty-free access to 41 countries. This makes the U.S. one of the world's most open markets to foreign sugar. The amount of duty-free access is determined under the World Trade Organization and other trade agreements to which the United States is a party.

We have reduced costs through research and innovation. The adoption of modern biotechnology has raised beet sugar yields by 30% and provides 26 environmental benefits that include dramatically reduced energy, crop protection products, and water use. The sugar from genetically engineered beets is the same as sugar from conventional beets or cane. Our sugarbeets are now one of the most sustainable sugar crops in the world.

American food manufacturers and consumers depend on a reliable, dynamic, geographically-dispersed domestic sugar-producing industry to provide safe, high-quality, responsibly-produced sugar at a reasonable price. Despite a well-designed sugar policy in the 2014 Farm Bill, the low prices caused by Mexican subsidies and dumping threaten the economic viability of American sugar producers.

Justification for U.S. Sugar Policy

Since U.S. sugar producers are among the lowest cost in the world, one might ask why the industry requires a sugar policy at all. The answer is found in the distorted, dump nature of the world sugar market.

Foreign governments subsidize their producers so egregiously that many of these countries produce far more sugar than their markets demand. Rather than store these surpluses, or close mills and lose jobs, as the United States has done, these countries dump their subsidized sugar onto the world market for whatever price it will bring. This subsidized dumping threatens further harm to American farmers.

As a result of these dumped surpluses, the so-called "world price" for sugar has been rendered essentially meaningless. The world price has rarely reflected the actual cost of producing sugar – a minimal criterion for a meaningful market price.

² LMC International, "Sugar & HFCS Production Costs: Global Benchmarking," Oxford, England, August 2011.

The world price is so depressed by subsidies and dumping that, over the past 28 years, the world average cost of producing sugar has averaged nearly 50% more than the world price (*Figure 2*).³

One European market expert noted: “The world market price is a ‘dump’ price...(it) should never be used as a yardstick to measure what benefits or costs may accrue from free trade in sugar.”⁴

Researchers at Texas A&M University’s Agricultural and Food Policy Center wrote: “Policymakers in the United States have long recognized that the world sugar market is heavily distorted by foreign subsidies and market manipulations and have provided U.S. sugar farmers with some form of safety net for more than 200 years. Major exporters of sugar do not respond to the signals of the world market but rather to the policies of their governments that enable them to export sugar below their costs of production and their own domestic prices.”⁵

How can a world sugar industry exist if the price received for the product is just a fraction of the cost of producing it? The answer is twofold:

1. Only about 20-25% of the sugar produced each year is actually traded at the so-called “world price.”
2. The other 75-80% of sugar is consumed in the countries where it is produced, at prices considerably higher than the world price and higher than production costs.

The International Sugar Organization (ISO) surveyed 78 countries to learn actual wholesale prices – the price producers in those countries receive for their sugar. The ISO documents that, globally, actual wholesale refined sugar prices have averaged 46% higher than the world price over the past decade. Prices in developed countries have been nearly double the world dump market price – averaging 94% higher (*Figure 3*).⁶

This, then, explains how we can have a vast world sugar industry: Governments shield their producers from the world dump market sugar and maintain prices high enough – above the dump market and above production costs – to sustain their subsidized domestic industry and generate and defend jobs.

Further, this explains why we require a U.S. sugar policy – even with American sugar producers among the lowest cost, and most responsible, in the world. Generous domestic pricing encourages over-production in many countries, and governments then seek to export their surplus. Absent U.S. sugar policy, those subsidized and dumped surpluses would wreck the U.S. market and displace efficient American sugar farmers.

³ LMC International, “*World Sugar Prices vs Costs of Production*,” Oxford, England, March 2017.

⁴ Patrick Chatenay, “*Government Support and the Brazilian Sugar Industry*,” Canterbury, England, April 2013.

⁵ Dr. Joe Outlaw and Dr. James Richardson, “*Analysis of the Coalition for Sugar Reform Amendments to U.S. Sugar Policy: Potential Effect on Policy and Industry*,” Agricultural and Food Policy Center, Texas A&M University, May 2016.

⁶ International Sugar Organization, “*Domestic Sugar Prices - a Survey*,” MECAS (15)06, May 2015.

Recent exposure of the U.S. sugar market to Mexican subsidies and dumping provides a disconcerting case in point. And Mexico is by no means unique. Its behavior is typical of foreign sugar exporters who subsidize their exports and shift the burden of their surpluses from their domestic markets onto the world market.

Damage from Mexican Subsidized Dumping

When the NAFTA went into effect in 1994, the Mexican sugar industry was struggling financially and was an occasional exporter of small volumes of sugar. In 2001, the Mexican government expropriated half of all its country's sugar mills, rather than allowing them to go out of business. With government help, Mexican sugarcane plantings exploded – up about 60% since NAFTA was signed – though Mexican sugar demand was flat or declining (*Figure 4*).

Mexico became one of the world's largest sugar exporters, with the group of Mexican government mills by far the country's leading sugar producer and exporter. Virtually all those exports have been aimed at the U.S. market, which opened fully to Mexican sugar in 2008 under NAFTA rules.

Though the Mexican government recently “officially” divested itself of its mills, the government remains closely involved in the Mexican sugar industry. In addition to government ownership, Mexican growers and processors have benefitted from federal and state cash infusions, debt restructuring and forgiveness, government grant programs to finance inventory, exports, and inputs, and a cane-grower payment system that effectively subsidizes exports.⁷

In 2013, Mexican sugar production soared to an all-time high – a stunning 38% higher than the previous year's production. Yet despite the huge domestic market surplus, Mexico was able to sustain sugar prices higher in their domestic market than in the United States. How did they manage to balance their market? By dumping their subsidized surplus on the U.S. market. Mexico doubled its exports to the United States, shipping about 1 million more tons than our market could bear (*Figure 5*). Mexican exports to the U.S. in 2013 and 2014, at 2 million tons each year, were about 250 times greater than their pre-NAFTA levels.

The subsidized and dumped Mexican surpluses collapsed the U.S. sugar market and caused the first government cost for U.S. sugar policy in a dozen years, as American farmers struggled to repay loans they normally repay fully – principal plus interest.

The U.S. sugar industry filed antidumping and countervailing duty cases against Mexico in 2014, and won. The ITC ruled unanimously that Mexico had injured the U.S. sugar industry, and the Department of Commerce calculated subsidy margins of 6-44% and dumping margins of 41-42% (*Figure 6*).⁸

U.S. producer prices plummeted by more than half from 2010 to early 2014, recovered somewhat in late 2014, and have fallen by a fourth since then. Subsidized Mexican imports continue to harm the U.S. sugar industry, despite Suspension Agreements the U.S. and Mexican

⁷ <https://sugaralliance.org/mexican-export-subsidies-injuring-u-s-sugar-producers/4990>

⁸ U.S. Department of Commerce https://www.usitc.gov/publications/701_731/pub4577.pdf

governments implemented in late 2014 with the intention of preventing further damage. Much of American sugar production cannot survive under current market conditions.

Unfortunately, the SAs are not working as intended. Mexico, basically, has sent too little raw sugar and too much refined sugar to the U.S., relative to market needs. U.S. cane refiners have been starved for raw sugar to process, and refined beet sugar prices are so low that loan forfeitures are a serious threat.

The U.S. and Mexican governments are working on modifications to the SAs, and the U.S. government will need to impose duties on Mexican sugar if the two sides cannot reach a resolution. American sugar producers are committed to working with our government to find a negotiated solution, but it will take a willing Mexican government and industry to correct the flaws in the SAs.

How U.S. Sugar Policy is Working

U.S. sugar policy has had the same structure since the 2002 Farm Bill and certain provisions need to be updated to reflect today's costs and realities. With these updates and elimination of Mexican dumping, it can continue to be a successful policy.

- American consumers and food manufacturers continue to have access to high-quality, safe, affordable, and responsibly-produced sugar supplies.
- American taxpayers benefit from a policy that has run at zero cost in all but one of the past 15 years and is projected to remain zero cost for years to come if the Mexican dumping problem is resolved.
- American sugar farmers have retained an economic safety net that has helped many, though not all, to survive an extended period of low prices and the catastrophic effects of Mexican dumping. An enhanced safety net is needed.

American Consumer Benefits. With U.S. wholesale prices at or below world average levels, one would expect American consumer prices, too, to be low. They are. World average retail sugar prices are 20% higher than U.S. prices; developed-country prices are 29% higher (*Figure 7*). With a stable U.S. sugar policy and industry, American consumers get a great deal on high-quality, safe, and responsibly-produced sugar.

American Taxpayer Benefits. Farm Bills have long instructed the USDA to operate sugar policy at no cost to taxpayers by avoiding sugar loan forfeitures. Sugar policy requires USDA to administer U.S. sugar policy to ensure sugar processors can repay their operating loans at principle plus interest.

USDA has consistently met this no-cost requirement, except in 2013, when Mexico dumped subsidized sugar into the U.S. market. USDA took action, as directed by law, to minimize loan forfeitures, taxpayer costs, and long-term harm to American sugar producers.

With Suspension Agreements in effect, the Congressional Budget Office projects zero cost as long as the agreements are in place, with modest costs in the unlikely event the SAs, and/or duties, are terminated in five years and Mexican dumping resumes. USDA and FAPRI project zero cost over the next 10 years (*Figure 8*).

Sugar policy opponents, led by major sugar-containing product manufacturers, have urged opening the U.S. market to greater quantities of subsidized foreign sugar. Additional, unneeded sugar, however, would threaten USDA's ability to administer a zero-cost policy. The Texas A&M researchers wrote:

Our analysis leads us to conclude that food manufacturers' reforms would undermine the no cost requirement of the law, resulting in taxpayer costs, jeopardizing the viability of U.S. sugar farmers and processors, and leading to higher sugar costs for consumers as domestic suppliers are lost and the volatile world sugar market is increasingly relied upon to meet domestic demand. Meanwhile, food manufacturers may benefit in the short term from depressed domestic sugar prices but, in the long-run, they would suffer from the loss of what they say they need: a viable, healthy, and geographically diverse supply of domestic sugar.⁹

Sugar Producer Safety Net; Low Sugar Market Prices. With the exception of the year of excessive Mexican dumping, when prices fell below loan forfeiture levels, U.S. sugar policy has provided an economic safety net for American sugar producers. But not for all producers, and there have been numerous casualties.

Since the loan support price was established in 1985 at 18 cents per pound of raw cane sugar, the loan rate has risen only 4%, to 18.75 cents. General price inflation since 1985 has been 123%. Real producer prices, corrected for inflation, have fallen 43% since the 1980s.

Producers who could not reduce production costs enough to keep pace with falling real prices for their product have gone out of business. We have lost 57 beet and cane operations – more than half of all those operating in 1985. Hawaii has ceased growing sugarcane after nearly two centuries of high-yielding production that was at the core of Hawaii's economic and social development. Another beet factory, in Wyoming, is expected to close permanently this year (*Figures 9-12*).

More closures would certainly have occurred over time if not for vertical integration by beet and cane growers and investment in biotechnology and other breeding and processing advancements.

With current low sugar market prices, payments to growers have dropped significantly, essentially putting some of our young growers out of business and jeopardizing the ability of established farms to acquire operating loans for the coming crop year.

Current low market prices are also reducing our cooperative's financial resources for maintenance and efficiency updates in our factories. Significant sugar yield improvement –

⁹ Outlaw and Richardson, op. cit.

through advanced technology combined with high beet yields, high sugar content, improved storage techniques and minimal factory interruptions – is the only way we are surviving. When we are already right on the economic “edge,” problems in any of these areas would make it hard for the industry to survive.

The price safety net in the current statute is inadequate to cover growers’ costs. We can survive under the current policy if market supply and demand are in balance, but we cannot survive if prices drop to the safety net levels. Our current safety net is not really a safety net.

Biotechnology Advances

Currently one of the key elements in our ability to survive low market prices is biotechnology. Advances in seed varieties have allowed growers to benefit from significant yield increases. The technology has eliminated the need for hand labor, reduced the amount of chemicals used to address crop protection issues, and raised environmental stewardship to unprecedented levels. The introduction of biotechnology traits has made our beet sugar producers the most efficient and, more importantly, the most sustainable beet sugar industry in the world.

Tied to the benefits of biotechnology traits is the responsibility to educate legislators and consumers about the safety and commonality of natural sugars. Beet and cane sugar are identical. Any attempt to differentiate between beet and cane only creates misunderstanding, inefficiencies and higher costs for consumers.

Crop Insurance

Crop insurance is an essential risk management tool for beet growers and is usually a requirement by their bankers. With a higher investment in growing sugarbeets than most other commodities, agricultural lenders are evaluating their lending risk and basing their loan approvals on the availability of an adequate safety net, which most crop insurance coverage provides.

Historically, crop insurance has served beet growers with minimal but adequate coverage. This past year, however, many beet growers were plagued by low sugar contents in their beets that insurance needed to cover, but did not. Beet growers are assessing the problem and will work with the Risk Management Agency (RMA) to find a solution. RMA has always worked well with our growers, and we appreciate their attention to our concerns. Beet growers will brief the Committee in the weeks and months ahead to achieve an effective solution.

Research

The Michigan sugar industry and the entire U.S. sugarbeet industry is dependent on ARS research funding for staffing of USDA research scientists at the Lansing ARS Facility and others across the country. The advances in yields and disease control that we have seen in recent years are the direct result of ARS research shared with industry seed development specialists. Even with these advances, we continue to be challenged with disease, insect and parasite issues which,

if left unaddressed, would seriously threaten the future of our industry. Continued adequate funding of ARS research is, therefore, critically important.

Regulations

Our farmers need relief from over-regulation and burdensome costs that provide few benefits to society. Waters of the U.S. and other wetland regulations top the list. Under the CREP program, we are required to block off or dig up our subterranean tile lines on acreage signed up in the “long term” program even though it may only last 10 years.

U.S. Sugar Policy in the Next Farm Bill

As long as there is an adequate response to Mexican subsidies and dumping, and the U.S. sugar policy is updated to reflect current grower and factory production costs and realities, it can continue to be effective for American consumers, food manufacturers, taxpayers, and sugar producers.

The response to Mexican dumping is most likely to take either of two forms:

1. Anti-dumping and countervailing duties, as calculated by the Department of Commerce, that would severely limit sugar imports from Mexico; or,
2. Effective Suspension Agreements that would permit continued duty-free sugar imports from Mexico, but limit those imports to the amount, and type, of sugar the U.S. market needs, and at minimum reference prices designed to prevent further dumping.

The U.S. and Mexican governments are attempting to negotiate modifications to the Suspension Agreements that have been in place since late 2014 but that have proven ineffective. We support these government efforts.

Zero-for-Zero

U.S. sugar producers recognize that subsidies and other market-distorting policies must be addressed in order for the world dump market to recover and better reflect free market principles. Therefore, American producers have publicly pledged to give up U.S. sugar policy when foreign producers agree to eliminate their subsidies.

The American Sugar Alliance has endorsed a congressional resolution (H.Con.Res. 40)¹⁰ that was introduced by a member of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Ted Yoho of Florida. This “zero-for-zero” resolution explicitly calls for the U.S. to surrender its sugar policy when other major producers have done the same.

To weaken or surrender sugar policy without any foreign concessions, as some critics of U.S. sugar policy have called for, would amount to foolish unilateral disarmament. We would sacrifice good American jobs in a dynamic, efficient industry in favor of foreign jobs in the countries that continue to subsidize.

¹⁰ <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/hconres40/BILLS-115hconres40ih.pdf>

Conclusion

U.S. sugar policy has worked well for American consumers, food manufacturers, and taxpayers. U.S. sugar policy can continue to operate at zero cost to taxpayers, and provide a genuine economic safety net for American sugar farmers if it is updated to reflect today's realities and as long as Mexican dumping on the U.S. market does not continue.

Sugar producers in Michigan and across the country will work hard for an effective 2018 Farm Bill for all American farmers. We strongly support U.S. government efforts to put an end to Mexican dumping of subsidized sugar on the U.S. market.

The beet sugar industry has been in Michigan for over 120 years, and we plan to be here indefinitely. But our future depends on the Congress passing strong sugar provisions in the 2018 Farm Bill that allows our growers to make an adequate return and on the Administration's implementation of that policy, including trade policy that complements our domestic sugar provisions. We look forward to working with you in the months ahead to determine what modifications are needed.

Thank you.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6

U.S. Anti-Dumping (AD) and Countervailing-Duty (CVD) Cases vs. Mexican Sugar	
2012/13	Mexican sugar production rises by 38%; Mexican sugar exports to the U.S. double (to 2 million tons); U.S. sugar price collapses.
2014	
March	U.S. files AD/CVD cases vs. Mexican sugar.
May	U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) preliminary finding, by 5-0 vote, that Mexico has injured the U.S. sugar industry.
August	U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) finds that Mexico has been subsidizing and imposes preliminary CVDs at 3-17%.
October	DOC finds that Mexico has been dumping (selling below domestic cost of production or prices) and imposes preliminary ADs at 40-47%.
	U.S. & Mexican governments announce draft Suspension Agreements (SAs) to suspend duties and resume duty-free sugar trade, with Mexican exports to the U.S. no longer to exceed U.S. needs.
December	U.S. & Mexican governments sign the SAs. Mexico may fulfill 100% of U.S. import needs above trade commitments; reference prices and limit on refined share of imports set.
2015	
March	ITC finds, by 6-0 vote, that the SAs eliminate the injurious effect of Mexican dumping on the U.S. industry.
September	DOC finds final dumping margins of 41-42%.
October	DOC finds final subsidy margins of 6-44%. Combined final subsidy and dumping margins total 48-84%.
	ITC final finding, by 6-0 vote, that Mexico injured U.S. sugar industry.
2016	
October	U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) denies the Imperial Sugar appeal of the ITC determination that SAs eliminate the injurious effect of Mexican dumping and subsidies.
December	DOC preliminarily determines in an administrative review of the SAs, covering 2015, that some companies may not be in compliance with the SAs and that not all statutory requirements for the SAs are still being met.
	Imperial Sugar appeals the CIT decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 10




Figure 11




Figure 12

