

Calendar No. 890

110TH CONGRESS }
2d Session } SENATE { REPORT
110-426

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG
ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIA-
TIONS BILL, 2009**

JULY 21 (legislative day, JULY 17), 2008.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. KOHL, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3289]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 3289) mak-
ing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and
Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal
year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, reports fa-
vorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Total obligational authority, fiscal year 2009

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	\$97,203,926,000
Amount of 2008 appropriations	90,651,967,000
Amount of 2009 budget estimate	95,543,969,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2008 appropriations	+ 6,551,959,000
2009 budget estimate	+ 1,659,957,000

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of the Bill:	
Overview and Summary of the Bill	5
Fiscal Constraints on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee	5
Reports to Congress	6
USDA Departmental Office of Ethics Activities	7
Title I:	
Agricultural Programs:	
Production, Processing, and Marketing:	
Office of the Secretary	8
Executive Operations	10
Office of the Chief Information Officer	11
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	12
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights	12
Office of Civil Rights	13
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	13
Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments	13
Hazardous Materials Management	14
Departmental Administration	14
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	15
Office of Communications	15
Office of Inspector General	16
Office of the General Counsel	16
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Eco- nomics	17
Economic Research Service	18
National Agricultural Statistics Service	19
Agricultural Research Service	19
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	24
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Pro- grams	34
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	34
Agricultural Marketing Service	46
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	49
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	50
Food Safety and Inspection Service	50
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	52
Farm Service Agency	52
Risk Management Agency	56
Corporations:	
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund	57
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund	57
Title II:	
Conservation Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environ- ment	60
Natural Resources Conservation Service	61
Title III:	
Rural Development Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	70
Rural Housing Service	71
Rural Business—Cooperative Service	79
Renewable Energy Program	83

	Page
Title III—Continued	
Rural Development Programs—Continued	
Rural Utilities Service	84
Title IV:	
Domestic Food Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services	90
Food and Nutrition Service	90
Title V: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs: Foreign Agricultural Service	100
Title VI:	
Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration:	
Food and Drug Administration	106
Independent Agency: Farm Credit Administration	113
Title VII: General Provisions	114
Program, Project, and Activity	117
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	117
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	118
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	118
Budgetary Impact of Bill	121
Disclosure of Congressionally Directed Spending Items	121

BREAKDOWN BY TITLE

The amounts of obligational authority for each of the seven titles are shown in the following table. A detailed tabulation, showing comparisons, appears at the end of this report. Recommendations for individual appropriation items, projects and activities are carried in this report under the appropriate item headings.

[In thousands of dollars]

	2008	2009 Committee recommendation
Title I: Agricultural programs	24,450,902	24,412,241
Title II: Conservation programs	937,547	970,163
Title III: Rural economic and community development programs	2,333,957	2,887,855
Title IV: Domestic food programs	60,056,845	65,011,562
Title V: Foreign assistance and related programs	1,476,470	1,503,056
Title VI: Related agency and FDA	1,716,770	2,051,397
Title VII: General provisions	- 56,068	- 100,048
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	90,916,423	96,736,226

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill provides funding for a wide array of Federal programs, mostly in the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA]. These programs include agricultural research, education, and extension activities; natural resources conservation programs; farm income and support programs; marketing and inspection activities; domestic food assistance programs; rural housing, economic and community development, and telecommunication and electrification assistance; and various export and international activities of the USDA.

The bill also provides funding for the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] and allows the use of collected fees for administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration [FCA].

Given the budgetary constraints that the Committee faces, the bill as reported provides the proper amount of emphasis on agricultural and rural development programs and on other programs and activities funded by the bill. It is within the subcommittee's allocation for fiscal year 2009.

All accounts in the bill have been closely examined to ensure that an appropriate level of funding is provided to carry out the programs of USDA, FDA, and FCA. Details on each of the accounts, the funding level, and the Committee's justifications for the funding levels are included in the report.

The Committee has encouraged the consideration of grant and loan applications from various entities. The Committee expects the Department only to approve those applications judged meritorious when subjected to the established review process.

FISCAL CONSTRAINTS ON THE AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Programmatic demands on the Appropriations subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies (Agriculture subcommittee) have escalated at a rapid pace over the past several years. The President's budget for agencies under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee for fiscal year 2009 demonstrates a major failure to recognize the expectations of the American people who rely on programs that provide basic safeguards for public safety and a reasonable level of Federal support for basic services. This is especially true for programs impacted by rapidly rising food costs, some of which the President proposed to eliminate. Similarly, while the President did propose a \$500,000,000 increase in rental subsidies for rural families otherwise faced with eviction this coming year, the budget also proposed to eliminate more than \$1,000,000,000 in single family housing loans that would otherwise help rural households cope with the on-

going housing crisis. The costs to maintain these vital services are a responsibility taken seriously by the Agriculture subcommittee which refuses to turn a blind eye on those Americans who rely on these programs for protection and to sustain a modest standard of living for their families.

The Congress has recently enacted a \$300,000,000,000 farm bill, yet that legislation failed to provide the United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] the resources necessary to carry out these expanding farm bill programs and that burden has fallen squarely on the Agriculture subcommittee. Systems failures experienced by USDA in recent years due to antiquated technologies will only worsen given the new demands placed on agency personnel and equipment without prudent investment to maintain and upgrade human and technological capital. A new Farm Bill will provide little benefit to the American people if USDA is allowed to suffer further erosion in staffing resources, tools for program administration, and workplace safety requirements. The Agriculture subcommittee believes the agencies under its jurisdiction should be provided resources necessary to ensure that USDA lives up to its expectations as one of the major departments of the Federal Government, and should not be allowed to fall into decline.

The Food and Drug Administration [FDA] holds a responsibility for public health and safety unequaled by any other agency in the Federal Government. Every American relies each and every day on items for which FDA is charged with ensuring product safety and efficacy. Yet historic growth in drug and device technologies and a rapid expansion in the global marketplace for food and other products have placed extraordinary pressure on FDA's comparatively modest resources. As a result, American consumer confidence is at risk and Americans are questioning the safety of the food they consume and the pharmaceuticals and medical treatments their doctors prescribe and pharmacists dispense. Clearly, providing necessary resources to FDA is a paramount responsibility of the Agriculture subcommittee.

For the reasons stated above, the fiscal constraints on the Agriculture subcommittee for fiscal year 2009 are severe. Accordingly, the Committee recommends programmatic increases that are directly tied to the most basic of Federal responsibilities. Namely, these include public (including food and drug) safety, food security, family shelter, protection from invasive species and related emergency threats, and departmental/agency integrity (including workplace safety and security). These limitations are sobering. However, given the limited resources, the growing demands, and the expectations of the American people, the Committee believes the priorities set forth in this appropriations bill are the right and necessary investments at this time.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

The Committee has, throughout this report, requested agencies to provide studies and reports on various issues. The Committee utilizes these reports to evaluate program performance and make decisions on future appropriations. The Committee requests that all studies and reports be provided as one document per Department in an agreed upon format within 120 days after the date of

enactment, unless an alternative submission schedule is specifically stated in the report request.

USDA DEPARTMENTAL OFFICE OF ETHICS ACTIVITIES

In order to streamline and make more efficient the USDA Office of Ethics activities, the President's budget assumes the transfer of \$3,424,000 from multiple agencies within the Department to a centralized Office of Ethics within the Departmental Administration account. The Committee concurs with this action and the account for each affected agency, as reflected in the fiscal year 2008 level, includes a reduction by the amount transferred to Departmental Administration for this purpose.

TITLE I
 AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS
 PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Appropriations, 2008	\$5,061,000
Budget estimate, 2009	19,749,000
Committee recommendation	5,174,000

The Secretary of Agriculture, assisted by the Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, Chief Information Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and members of their immediate staffs, directs and coordinates the work of the Department. This includes developing policy, maintaining relationships with agricultural organizations and others in the development of farm programs, and maintaining liaison with the Executive Office of the President and Members of Congress on all matters pertaining to agricultural policy.

The general authority of the Secretary to supervise and control the work of the Department is contained in the Organic Act (7 U.S.C. 2201–2202). The delegation of regulatory functions to Department employees and authorization of appropriations to carry out these functions is contained in 7 U.S.C. 450c–450g.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,174,000 for the Office of the Secretary.

Animal Fighting.—The Committee is very concerned about reports of illegal animal fighting activities and directs the Secretary to work with relevant agencies on the most effective and proper means for investigating and enforcing laws and regulations regarding these activities.

Civil Rights.—Recent testimony presented by the Government Accountability Office paints a very disturbing picture of the management of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights. According to GAO, the office among other deficiencies, is incapable of accurately tracking the number of complaints, a most basic function. Because this has been an ongoing issue for the Department, the Committee can only believe this is due to a lack of commitment to the mission of the office. The Committee directs the Secretary to personally review the situation, and then develop and implement a plan that will effectively eliminate the current backlog in a timely manner, while also putting USDA on a footing to prevent a backlog from developing in the future. The Secretary may not delegate this directive. The Secretary shall submit the required plan to the Committee no later than October 15, 2008.

Greenbook and Working Capital Fund Charges.—The Committee is concerned that charges assessed to agencies by the USDA have grown excessively over the last few years. The disclosure of these charges to Congress is limited and may impact program delivery. Beginning with the fiscal year 2010 budget submission and for each year thereafter, the Committee directs the USDA to explicitly present greenbook and working capital fund charges for each agency in budget justifications, including prior year, current year, and budget year charges, a description of how the charges are assessed, and the proposed use of the funding that has been charged to the agency.

Inherent Function of Government.—The Committee expects that none of the funds recommended for Rural Development or the Farm Service Agency should be used to enter into or renew a contract for any activity that is best suited as an inherent function of Government, without prior approval from the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. Such activities may include, but are not limited to, any function that affects eligibility determination, disbursement, collection or accounting for Government subsidies provided under any of the direct or guaranteed loan programs of the Rural Development mission area or the Farm Service Agency.

International Humanitarian Food Assistance.—The Committee continues its strong support for programs that provide emergency food assistance throughout the world and work to achieve sustainable food security. Contributions by individuals with special expertise in humanitarian food assistance and international agricultural challenges are extremely critical as we witness a rising crisis of world hunger due in part to climate change, shifting world commodity markets, civil unrest and other factors. Funds are provided in this bill to support the Borlaug Fellowship Program, authorized in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, and the Committee believes this program will play an important role in expanding the agricultural knowledge base throughout the world in order to increase food production on a sustainable basis. In addition, the Committee is aware of the “Borlaug Dialogue” (and its associated functions) which provides a forum for world leadership related to international food assistance. The Committee encourages the Secretary to support this activity and for the Department to maintain a strong role in the fight against world hunger.

The differing nutritional needs of populations, particularly in areas with high incidents of HIV/AIDS and other diseases, makes the composition and quality of foods available through programs such as Public Law 480 and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program extremely important elements in the delivery of humanitarian food assistance. The Committee is aware that the Department has taken actions within USDA during fiscal year 2008 to ensure that food aid recipients have access to products that better reflect dietary needs among varying populations. However, these steps have not yet translated to actual procurement and distribution changes in the field. The Secretary is directed to continue working with the U.S. Agency for International Development and affected stakeholders toward modifications which are necessary to improve nutritional benefits while maintaining efficiency in pro-

curement and payment practices. The Committee further requests the Department to keep the Committee apprised of ongoing studies on this subject.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

Executive operations were established as a result of the reorganization of the Department to provide a support team for USDA policy officials and selected departmentwide services. Activities under the executive operations include the Office of the Chief Economist, the National Appeals Division, the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, and the Office of Homeland Security.

CHIEF ECONOMIST

Appropriations, 2008	\$10,414,000
Budget estimate, 2009	12,584,000
Committee recommendation	10,651,000

The Office of the Chief Economist advises the Secretary of Agriculture on the economic implications of Department policies and programs. The Office serves as the single focal point for the Nation's economic intelligence and analysis, risk assessment, energy and new uses, and cost-benefit analysis related to domestic and international food and agriculture issues, and is responsible for coordination and review of all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food-related data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,651,000 for the Office of the Chief Economist. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for preferred procurement and labeling for biobased products.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

Appropriations, 2008	\$14,365,000
Budget estimate, 2009	15,402,000
Committee recommendation	14,711,000

The National Appeals Division conducts administrative hearings and reviews of adverse program decisions made by the Rural Development mission area, the Farm Service Agency, the Risk Management Agency, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,711,000 for the National Appeals Division.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Appropriations, 2008	\$8,212,000
Budget estimate, 2009	9,054,000
Committee recommendation	8,449,000

The Office of Budget and Program Analysis provides direction and administration of the Department's budgetary functions including development, presentation, and execution of the budget; reviews program and legislative proposals for program, budget, and

related implications; analyzes program and resource issues and alternatives, and prepares summaries of pertinent data to aid the Secretary and departmental policy officials and agency program managers in the decision-making process; and provides departmentwide coordination for and participation in the presentation of budget-related matters to the committees of the Congress, the media, and interested public. The Office also provides departmentwide coordination of the preparation and processing of regulations and legislative programs and reports.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,449,000 for the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Appropriations, 2008	\$924,000
Budget estimate, 2009	2,617,000
Committee recommendation	974,000

The Office of Homeland Security formulates emergency preparedness policies and objectives for the Department of Agriculture [USDA]. The Office directs and coordinates all of the Department's program activities that support USDA emergency programs and liaison functions with the Congress, the Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal departments and agencies involving homeland security, natural disasters, other emergencies, and agriculture-related international civil emergency planning and related activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$974,000 for the Office of Homeland Security.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Appropriations, 2008	\$16,246,000
Budget estimate, 2009	18,305,000
Committee recommendation	16,527,000

The Office of the Chief Information Officer was established in August 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), pursuant to the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, which required the establishment of a Chief Information Officer for major Federal agencies. This office provides policy guidance, leadership, coordination, and direction to the Department's information management and information technology investment activities in support of USDA program delivery, and is the lead office in USDA e-gov efforts. The Office provides long-range planning guidance, implements measures to ensure that technology investments are economical and effective, coordinates interagency information resources management projects, and implements standards to promote information exchange and technical interoperability. In addition, the Office of the Chief Information Officer is responsible for certain activities financed under the Department's Working Capital Fund (7 U.S.C. 2235). The Office also provides telecommunication and automated data processing [ADP] services to USDA agencies through the National Information Tech-

nology Center with locations in Fort Collins, Colorado, and Kansas City, Missouri. Direct ADP operational services are also provided to the Office of the General Counsel, Office of Communications, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, and Executive Operations.

On November 28, 2004, the information technology staffs of the Service Center Agencies [SCA] were converged into one IT organization within the office of the Chief Information Officer; this converged organization is named Information Technology Services and replaces a network of cross-agency teams used to coordinate IT infrastructure investment within the SCA and allows for unified management of the IT infrastructure.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,527,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

Appropriations, 2008	\$5,809,000
Budget estimate, 2009	6,221,000
Committee recommendation	5,954,000

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer is responsible for the dual roles of chief financial management policy officer and chief financial management advisor to the Secretary and mission area heads. The Office provides leadership for all financial management, accounting, travel, Federal assistance, and performance measurement activities within the Department. The Office is also responsible for the management and operation of the National Finance Center and the Departmental Working Capital Fund. In addition, the Office provides budget, accounting, and fiscal services to the Office of the Secretary, Departmental staff offices, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Office of Communications, and Executive Operations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,954,000 for the Chief Financial Officer.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$847,000
Budget estimate, 2009	897,000
Committee recommendation	871,000

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights provides oversight of civil rights and related functions. This includes coordination of the administration of civil rights laws and regulations for employees of the Department of Agriculture and participants in programs of the Department, and ensuring compliance with civil rights laws.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$871,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$20,353,000
Budget estimate, 2009	21,551,000
Committee recommendation	20,798,000

The Office of Civil Rights provides overall leadership responsibility for all departmentwide civil rights activities. These activities include employment opportunity as well as program non-discrimination policy development, analysis, coordination, and compliance. The Office is responsible for providing leadership in facilitating the fair and equitable treatment of Department of Agriculture [USDA] employees, and for monitoring program activities to ensure that all USDA programs are delivered in a non-discriminatory manner. The Office's outreach functions provide leadership, coordination, facilitation, and expertise to internal and external partners to ensure equal and timely access to USDA programs for all constituents, with emphasis on the underserved, through information sharing, technical assistance, and training.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,798,000 for the Office of Civil Rights.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	\$668,000
Budget estimate, 2009	739,000
Committee recommendation	687,000

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration directs and coordinates the work of the departmental staff in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress relating to real and personal property management, personnel management, ethics, and other general administrative functions. In addition, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration is responsible for certain activities financed under the Department's Working Capital Fund (7 U.S.C. 2235).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$687,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$194,878,000
Budget estimate, 2009	231,105,000
Committee recommendation	226,432,000

Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments.—Department headquarters presently operates in a four-building Government-owned complex in downtown Washington, DC, and in leased buildings in the Metropolitan Washington, DC, area. Annual appropriations finance payments to the General Services Administration [GSA] for leased space and related services. Under this arrangement USDA operates, maintains, and repairs D.C. complex buildings, while GSA remains responsible for major nonrecurring repairs. GSA charges commercial rent rates pursuant to the Public

Buildings Amendments of 1972, and agencies may review rate procedures and exercise rights to appeal. For the last several years the Department has implemented a strategic space plan to locate staff more efficiently, renovate its buildings, and eliminate safety hazards, particularly in the Agriculture South Building.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$226,432,000 for Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments.

The following table reflects the Committee’s specific recommendations for this account as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

(In thousands of dollars)

	2008 enacted	2009 budget request	Committee recommendation
Rental Payments	156,590	168,901	168,901
Building Operations	38,288	48,704	44,031
DHS Building Security		13,500	13,500
Total	194,878	231,105	226,432

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2008	\$4,852,000
Budget estimate, 2009	12,281,000
Committee recommendation	4,933,000

Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Department has the responsibility to meet the same standards regarding the storage and disposition of hazardous materials as private businesses. The Department is required to contain, clean up, monitor, and inspect for hazardous materials in areas under the Department’s jurisdiction.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,933,000 for Hazardous Materials Management.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	\$22,982,000
Budget estimate, 2009	28,637,000
Committee recommendation	27,011,000

Departmental Administration is comprised of activities that provide staff support to top policy officials and overall direction and coordination of administrative functions of the Department. These activities include departmentwide programs for human resource management, ethics, occupational safety and health management, real and personal property management, procurement, contracting, motor vehicle and aircraft management, supply management, emergency preparedness, small and disadvantaged business utilization, and the regulatory hearing and administrative proceedings conducted by the Administrative Law Judges and Judicial Officer.

Departmental Administration is also responsible for representing USDA in the development of Governmentwide policies and initiatives; and analyzing the impact of Governmentwide trends and developing appropriate USDA principles, policies, and standards. In addition, Departmental Administration engages in strategic planning and evaluates programs to ensure USDA-wide compliance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to administrative matters for the Secretary and general officers of the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$27,011,000 for Departmental Administration.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Appropriations, 2008	\$3,768,000
Budget estimate, 2009	4,099,000
Committee recommendation	3,877,000

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations maintains a liaison with the Congress and White House on legislative matters. It also provides for overall direction and coordination in the development and implementation of policies and procedures applicable to the Department's intra- and inter-governmental relations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,877,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

The Committee allows these funds to be transferred to support congressional relations' activities at the agency level. Within 30 days from the enactment of this act, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the allocation of these funds by USDA agency, along with an explanation for the agency-by-agency distribution of the funds as well as the staff years funded by these transfers.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

Appropriations, 2008	\$9,273,000
Budget estimate, 2009	9,961,000
Committee recommendation	9,514,000

The Office of Communications provides direction, leadership, and coordination in the development and delivery of useful information through all media to the public on USDA programs. The Office serves as the liaison between the Department and the many associations and organizations with an interest in USDA's mission areas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,514,000 for the Office of Communications.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2008	\$79,492,000
Budget estimate, 2009	85,766,000
Committee recommendation	81,517,000

The Office of the Inspector General was established October 12, 1978, by the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-452). This act expanded and provided specific authorities for the activities of the Office of the Inspector General which had previously been carried out under the general authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Office is administered by an inspector general who reports directly to the Secretary of Agriculture. Functions and responsibilities of this Office include direction and control of audit and investigative activities within the Department, formulation of audit and investigative policies and procedures regarding Department programs and operations, and analysis and coordination of program-related audit and investigation activities performed by other Department agencies.

The activities of this Office are designed to assure compliance with existing laws, policies, regulations, and programs of the Department's agencies, and to provide appropriate officials with the means for prompt corrective action where deviations have occurred. The scope of audit and investigative activities is large and includes administrative, program, and criminal matters. These activities are coordinated, when appropriate, with various audit and investigative agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the government.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$81,517,000 for the Office of the Inspector General. The Committee recommendation includes the fiscal year 2008 level for OIG to continue to address violations of section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) and to coordinate with State and local law enforcement personnel in this effort.

Audit.—The Delta Regional Authority [DRA] Act of 2000 mandates that the OIG conduct recurring audits of the DRA. The August 2006 audit of DRA's grant process found no anomalies, which resulted in no monetary recoveries to DRA or USDA and produced no substantial recommendations. Since DRA receives funding from USDA annually, OIG currently has authority to audit DRA at any time. The Committee believes that continuing this audit mandate will further dilute resources within the OIG and potentially distract from more urgent oversight work. A general provision is included that terminates the audit mandate.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Appropriations, 2008	\$38,952,000
Budget estimate, 2009	42,852,000
Committee recommendation	40,083,000

The Office of the General Counsel provides all legal advice, counsel, and services to the Secretary and to all agencies, offices, and corporations of the Department. The Office represents the Depart-

ment in administrative proceedings; non-litigation debt collection proceedings; State water rights adjudications; proceedings before the Environmental Protection Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Maritime Administration, and International Trade Commission; and, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, in judicial proceedings and litigation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$40,083,000 for the Office of the General Counsel.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS

Appropriations, 2008	\$592,000
Budget estimate, 2009	654,000
Committee recommendation	609,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress for food and agricultural research, education, extension, and economic and statistical information. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Agricultural Research Service; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; Economic Research Service; and National Agricultural Statistics Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$609,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.

Biofuels Internship Program.—The Department is encouraged to study the value of creating an internship pilot program that would focus on producing agricultural biofuels from biomass. In determining the value of creating this internship program, the Department should consider allowing economically disadvantaged and minority students pursuing an undergraduate program in agriculture with direct relevance to biofuels and renewable energy to gain practical work experience through placements within Congress, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Energy, private companies, and non-profit organizations. The Department should evaluate whether this internship program would enhance ongoing efforts to develop a skilled workforce in the area of alternative energy, and contribute to related national efforts to enhance agriculture production and economic development in the U.S. agriculture sector.

Invasive Species.—The Committee recognizes the increasing threat of the invasive species Phragmites to wetlands and wildlife in many national watersheds including the Great Lake, Chesapeake Bay, Upper Mississippi, and the Platte River, and therefore there is a need to research and find cost efficient means for the long term control and reduction of Phragmites. The Committee encourages the Secretary to address this emerging problem.

Methyl Bromide.—The Committee is aware that the Department is working with the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] on a

meta-analysis of methyl bromide. The Committee supports this analysis and encourages the Department to continue to work with the EPA until the results are complete.

Northwest Michigan Horticultural Research Station.—The Committee is aware of the significant contributions the Northwest Michigan Horticultural Research Station has made to cherry growers throughout the United States, particularly in Utah. The Committee encourages the Department to strongly support the work of the research station and to provide additional funds, as available, for enhanced research.

REE Reorganization.—The Committee notes the intent of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to improve the coordination of the Department’s research portfolio. The USDA’s research and education system has been and remains a key to maintaining a safe, economic, and abundant supply of food and fiber for the American people. The Department’s research and education programs must continue to be effective and efficient to meet the difficult and complex issues confronting farmers, ranchers, industry and consumers alike. The Committee expects that the reorganization, once in place, will avoid duplication and layering of administrative functions. Indeed, the Congress expects management efficiencies, if not cost savings, as a result of the newly authorized legislation. Appropriations, as noted elsewhere in this report, are limited and spending is constrained.

In this regard, the Committee directs the Secretary to provide the Committee fiscal year 2008 baseline amounts for management funding levels for each of the four mission-area agencies as well as REE operations at headquarters; any administrative and management contracts issued at headquarters; and greenbook and working capital funds costs. These reports and associated costs will provide the Committee with a baseline to compare reorganization costs and to ensure the American people that USDA is committed to reduced bureaucracy and enhanced program results.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Appropriations, 2008	\$77,324,000
Budget estimate, 2009	82,106,000
Committee recommendation	78,209,000

The Economic Research Service [ERS] provides economic and other social science information and analysis for public and private decisions on agriculture, natural resources, food, and rural America. The information ERS produces is for use by the general public and to help the executive and legislative branches develop, administer, and evaluate agricultural and rural policies and programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$78,209,000 for the Economic Research Service. The Committee directs that no less than the fiscal year 2008 level be used to carry out the Organic Production and Market Data Initiative.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Appropriations, 2008	\$162,137,000
Budget estimate, 2009	153,475,000
Committee recommendation	149,115,000

The National Agricultural Statistics Service [NASS] administers the Department’s program of collecting and publishing current national, State, and county agricultural statistics. These statistics provide accurate and timely projections of current agricultural production and measures of the economic and environmental welfare of the agricultural sector which are essential for making effective policy, production, and marketing decisions. NASS also furnishes statistical services to other USDA and Federal agencies in support of their missions, and provides consulting, technical assistance, and training to developing countries.

The Service is also responsible for administration of the Census of Agriculture, which is taken every 5 years and provides comprehensive data on the agricultural economy including: data on the number of farms, land use, production expenses, farm product values, value of land and buildings, farm size and characteristics of farm operators, market value of agricultural production sold, acreage of major crops, inventory of livestock and poultry, and farm irrigation practices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$149,115,000 for the National Agricultural Statistics Service. Included in this amount is \$37,265,000 for the Census of Agriculture.

Chemical Use Data.—The Committee directs NASS to carry out the Chemical Use Data study. Further, the Committee expects the agency not to disrupt ongoing market analysis reporting and to notify the Committee in advance of any termination of other ongoing NASS activities.

Organic Data Collection.—The Committee encourages NASS to take all necessary steps, including a follow-up Census of Agriculture survey, to collect in-depth coverage on acreage, yield, production, inventory, production practices, sales and expenses, marketing channels, and demographics of the organics industry.

Potato Objective Yield Survey.—The Committee expects NASS to continue the potato objective yield survey.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	\$1,120,635,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,037,016,000
Committee recommendation	1,134,084,000

The Agricultural Research Service [ARS] is responsible for conducting basic, applied, and developmental research on: soil, water, and air sciences; plant and animal productivity; commodity conversion and delivery; human nutrition; and the integration of agricultural systems. The research applies to a wide range of goals; commodities; natural resources; fields of science; and geographic, climatic, and environmental conditions.

ARS is also responsible for the Abraham Lincoln National Agricultural Library which provides agricultural information and library services through traditional library functions and modern electronic dissemination to agencies of the USDA, public and private organizations, and individuals.

As the U.S. Department of Agriculture's in-house agricultural research unit, ARS has major responsibilities for conducting and leading the national agricultural research effort. It provides initiative and leadership in five areas: research on broad regional and national problems, research to support Federal action and regulatory agencies, expertise to meet national emergencies, research support for international programs, and scientific resources to the executive branch and Congress.

The mission of ARS research is to develop new knowledge and technology which will ensure an abundance of high-quality agricultural commodities and products at reasonable prices to meet the increasing needs of an expanding economy and to provide for the continued improvement in the standard of living of all Americans. This mission focuses on the development of technical information and technical products which bear directly on the need to: (1) manage and use the Nation's soil, water, air, and climate resources, and improve the Nation's environment; (2) provide an adequate supply of agricultural products by observing practices that will maintain a sustainable and effective agriculture sector; (3) improve the nutrition and well-being of the American people; (4) improve living in rural America; and (5) strengthen the Nation's balance of payments.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,134,084,000 for salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Research Service.

The Committee recognizes the successful history of ARS, the premier in-house USDA research agency, and strongly supports ongoing research activities vital to protecting this Nation's food supply, environment, rural communities, and working toward energy independence.

The fiscal year 2009 appropriation includes \$15,125,000 for pay costs and \$3,000,000 for research enhancements for food security in specific areas of pests and disease affecting domestic production and to support the USDA mission in fighting world hunger. Of the total appropriation for fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends \$1,115,959,000 to continue ongoing research programs and activities at the locations and at levels no less than provided in fiscal year 2008. The Committee concurs with the President's fiscal year 2009 proposal as it relates to the following: Invasive Weed Management Research; Lyme Disease 4 Poster Project; Mosquito Trapping Research/West Nile Virus; National Corn to Ethanol Research Pilot Plant; NutriCore/Nutrition Interventions; Source Water Protection Initiatives; and Vector-Borne Diseases. In addition, the Committee provides the following directives:

Arthropod-Borne Animal Diseases Research Laboratory.—The fiscal year 2009 budget request proposes to relocate the Arthropod-Borne Animal Diseases Research Laboratory [ABADRL] from its current location in Laramie, Wyoming. Before deciding whether it

is appropriate to relocate the lab, the Committee requests ARS to provide a report describing the current status of the laboratory's facilities and research. Additionally, the Committee requests ARS to provide an assessment of no fewer than two locations that could serve as the new location of ABADRL. When selecting the locations to assess, ARS should consider the facilities, capacity, expertise, and synergies relevant to fulfilling and expediting the ABADRL mission that are offered by each potential location. Any remarkable fiscal issues should also be noted.

Biomass Feedstock.—The Committee directs that fiscal year 2008 funding for precision agriculture at the Northern Great Plains Research Laboratory in Mandan, ND, shall be made available to expand biomass feedstock research at that location.

Center for Agroforestry.—The Committee expects that the funds made available for the Center for Agroforestry be used to continue research into all five temperate-zone agroforestry practices applicable in Midwestern states.

Combating World Hunger.—Agricultural research, exemplified by the work of the ARS, is a leading reason for the U.S. prominence in food production throughout the world. However, we continue to witness devastating images of people in undeveloped and developing countries struggle with chronic hunger. The toll of that struggle on the human spirit is appalling and the costs in lives and the redirection of resources from other parts of the world to meet growing international assistance needs argues strongly for the development of sustainable food systems in those countries now dependent on foreign assistance. To help meet that need, the Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for research in the area of agriculture production designed to assist farming regions in which populations are now the beneficiaries of international food assistance.

Human Nutrition.—The Committee recognizes the need to investigate diet-related health problems, which include obesity and its associated illnesses and that these needs are particularly great in rural and Native American communities. Accordingly, the Committee continues support for the ARS Grand Forks Human Nutrition Research Center, which provides unique contributions related to these nutrition-related challenges and maintains funding for the Center. Further, the Committee directs the agency to continue development of the Center's programs to address obesity and diet-related health issues in rural and Native American communities, the study of minerals and other nutrients contained in widely consumed foods contributing to healthy diets, and the role of nutrition in preventing chronic diseases among all Americans.

The Human Nutrition Centers, including the Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, focus on the effects of dietary factors and nutritional status (including body composition) on disease prevention and maintenance of good health. The Committee recommends that particular attention be given to critical periods of development and vulnerable stages of life (including the nutritional status of women at the time of conception; nutritional issues during pregnancy and lactation; and diets, nutrition, and the development of eating behaviors during childhood, adolescence, and later stages of life). The Committee further recommends attention to disease prevention of

cancer, cardiovascular disease, and bone and muscle disease. Other extremely important areas requiring continued attention include brain development and cognitive function in children; maintenance of cognitive function and vision in the elderly; the developmental origins of adult health and disease; the effects of non-nutrient bioactive food components; the development, function, and enhancement of the immune system; the understanding of dietary influences on inflammation; and gene/nutrient interactions.

The Committee is aware of need for upgrades of the Metabolic Diet Facility at the Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging at Tufts University and encourages ARS to initiate such improvements from within available funds.

National Agricultural Library [NAL] Digitop.—The NAL initiated a digitop information service in 2004 to electronically deliver published information about agriculture, forestry, and related fields to individuals, universities, and other institutions and customers. This program provides continuous access to key data bases, journals, and other electronic resources. The Committee expects the NAL to complete its plan to encompass its total portfolio of services under the digitop umbrella and provide a report on the status of this activity.

Phytoestrogen Research.—The Committee recognizes the importance of phytoestrogen research at the Southern Research Center in collaboration with the Center for Bioenvironmental Research at Tulane and Xavier Universities and the Laboratory for Soy Products and Health at the University of Toledo. Funding in this bill is provided to support research to characterize phytoestrogenic compound and determine structure activity relationships in animal system bioassays.

Pollinator Recovery.—The Committee continues its strong concern for reports of Colony Collapse Disorder [CCD] and indications that this threat to the U.S. food supply is spreading. Honey bees and other pollinators perform a vital function relating to the production of much of our fruit and vegetable production, and the threat of CCD places this production at high risk. The Committee provides a total of \$10,439,000 for ARS research related to pollinator species, including an increase of \$1,000,000 above the fiscal year 2008 level specifically tied to research on the cause and control of CCD. The Committee requests a report on the progress of the agency relating to CCD, the specific areas of pollinator research conducted at the various ARS locations, and the manner in which those activities relate to the subject of CCD.

Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia [VHS].—The Committee is aware that at present there is no Great Lakes research program directed to the problem of Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia [VHS] or other emerging diseases in fish. There is a critical need for the monitoring, diagnosis, epidemiology, treatment and prevention of VHS and other such diseases, and the Committee encourages ARS to work with research institutions around the Great Lakes to ascertain the extent to which VHS is present in U.S. waters, develop an effective vaccine to VHS, and establish the genetic basis for resistance to VHS in fish.

Wheat Stem Rust.—The rapid spread of the wheat stem rust known as Ug99, from East Africa to the Arabian Peninsula and

most recently to the Middle East is of great concern to the Committee. Ug99 is a very virulent strain of stem rust and could threaten 80 percent of the world's wheat supply (including wheat production in the United States) if resistant varieties of wheat are not developed. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 to speed efforts to develop Ug99 resistant wheat varieties.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2008	\$46,752,000
Budget estimate, 2009	13,220,000
Committee recommendation	30,995,000

The ARS "Buildings and Facilities" account was established for the acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or used by, the Agricultural Research Service. Routine construction or replacement items continue to be funded under the limitations contained in the regular account.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$30,995,000 for buildings and facilities of the Agricultural Research Service.

Modern research facilities are an important part of the ability of ARS to meet the objectives of its mission purpose, and the Committee recommends funding to ensure that modernization and upgrades of facilities are achieved.

Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee is unable to recommend full funding to complete the construction of all ongoing projects. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for Agricultural Research Service Buildings and Facilities:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee Recommendation
Agriculture Research Center; Pullman, WA	1,870
Alcorn State University Biotechnology Laboratory; Alcorn State, MS	1,780
Animal Bioscience Facility; Bozeman, MT	1,600
Animal Waste Management Research Laboratory; Bowling Green, KY	1,390
Appalachian Fruit Laboratory; Kearneysville, WV	1,000
ARS Agricultural Research Center; Logan, UT	5,561
Dairy Forage Agricultural Research Center; Prairie du Sac, WI	2,558
Forage-Animal Production Research Facility; Lexington, KY	2,085
Hagerman Fish Culture Experiment Station; Hagerman, ID	695
Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center; Stoneville, MS	2,000
National Plant and Genetics Security Center; Columbia, MO	2,086
Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center; Hilo, HI	2,000
Poultry Science Research Facility; Starkville, MS	1,780
Sugarcane Research Laboratory; Houma, LA	3,200
Systems Biology Research Facility; Lincoln, NE	1,390
Total	30,995

National Plant and Genetics Security Center.—The Committee directs ARS, when planning and designing the National Plant and Genetics Security Center, to include plans for expanded vivarium capacity.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on October 1, 1994, under the authority of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6912). The mission is to work with university partners and customers to advance research, extension, and higher education in the food and agricultural sciences and related environmental and human sciences to benefit people, communities, and the Nation.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2008	\$668,286,000
Budget estimate, 2009	535,277,000
Committee recommendation	629,871,000

The research and education programs administered by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service [CSREES] are the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s principal entree to the university system of the United States to support higher education in food and agricultural sciences and to conduct agricultural research as authorized by the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i); the Cooperative Forestry Research Act of 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a–7); Public Law 89–106, section (2) (7 U.S.C. 450i); the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.); the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301); the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.); and the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246). Through these authorities, the U.S. Department of Agriculture participates with State and other cooperators to encourage and assist the State institutions to conduct agricultural research and education through the State agricultural experiment stations of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories; by approved schools of forestry; by the 1890 land-grant institutions, Tuskegee University, and West Virginia State University; by colleges of veterinary medicine; and by other eligible institutions.

The research and education programs participate in a nationwide system of agricultural research program planning and coordination among the State institutions, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the agricultural industry of America.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$629,871,000 for research and education activities of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. In addition to the appropriation for research and education activities, this bill makes available an additional \$68,000,000 in mandatory funding for research related to organics, specialty crops, beginning farmer and rancher, and renewable energy research. Therefore, CSREES will have a total of \$697,871,000 in funding for research and related activities in fiscal year 2009, which is an increase of \$29,585,000 above the previous year.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for research and education activities:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Payments under Hatch Act	205,602
Cooperative forestry research (McIntire-Stennis)	26,031
Payments to 1890 Institutions	43,104
Special research grants:	
Advanced genetic technologies, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	481
Advancing Biofuel Production, Baylor University, TX	149
Aegilops cylindrica/Biomass (jointed goatgrass), Washington State University	200
Agricultural diversity, University of Minnesota, Crookston	200
Agricultural Entrepreneurial Alternatives, Pennsylvania State University	248
Air quality, Kansas State University; Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	300
Alliance for food protection, University of Nebraska	130
Animal disease research, University of Wyoming	258
Animal Health, Forages for Advancing Livestock Production Project, KY	291
Animal Science Food Safety Consortium, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture, Iowa State University, Kansas State University	1,000
Apple fire blight, Cornell University/New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Michigan	200
Aquaculture product & marketing development, West Virginia University	521
Aquaculture, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	200
Aquaculture, Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station	385
Aquaculture, North Carolina State University	242
Armillaria root rot, Michigan State University	111
Asparagus technology and production, Washington State University	184
Avian bioscience, University of Delaware	100
Barley for Rural Development, Montana State University, University of Idaho	547
Biodesign and Processing, Virginia Tech University	223
Biomass-based energy research, Oklahoma State University, Mississippi State University	894
Cataloging Genes Associated with Drought and Disease Resistance, New Mexico State University	187
Center for One Medicine	250
Center for Public Land and Rural Economies, Utah State University	223
Center for rural studies, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	261
Childhood obesity and nutrition, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	180
Citrus canker/Greening, University of Florida	200
Competitiveness of agricultural products, Washington State University and the University of Washington	350
Cool season legume research, North Dakota State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	250
Cotton insect management and Fiber Quality, University of Georgia	368
Cranberry/Blueberry disease & breeding, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	480
Cranberry/Blueberry, University of Massachusetts	118
Crop integration and production, South Dakota State University	275
Dairy and meat goat research, Prairie View A&M University	100
Dairy farm profitability, Pennsylvania State University	372
Delta revitalization project, Mississippi State University	187
Designing foods for health, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	500
Detection and Food Safety, Auburn University, AL	1,862
Drought management, Utah State University	670
Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Extension Service and Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	575
Environmentally safe products, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	200
Floriculture, University of Hawaii	259
Food & Fuel Initiative, Iowa State University	298
Food safety, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	74
Fresh Produce Food Safety, University of California	750
Functional Genomics, Utah State University	1,192
Future foods, University of Illinois	450
Genomics for Southern Crop Stress and Disease, Mississippi State University	849

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—RESEARCH
AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Global change UV/B radiation, Colorado State University	1,500
Grain sorghum, Kansas State University, Texas Tech University	548
Grass seed cropping systems for sustainable agriculture, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	150
Great Basin Environmental Program, University of Nevada—Reno	225
High Performance Computing, Utah State University	559
Human nutrition, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA	526
Increasing Shelf Life of Agricultural commodities, University of Idaho	642
Infectious disease research, Colorado State University	609
Institute of Agriculture—Phytosensors for Crop Security, University of Tennessee	745
Integrated Economic, Environmental and Technical Analysis of Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems, Purdue University	200
Joint U.S.-China Biotechnology Research and Extension, Utah State University	447
Leopold Center hypoxia project, Iowa State University	112
Livestock & dairy policy, Cornell University, NY, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	200
Livestock waste, Iowa State University	196
Lowbush Wild Blueberry research, University of Maine	184
Managed Drainage System for Crop Production, University of Missouri—Columbia	250
Maple research, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	165
Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance, University of Nebraska	365
Midwest Center for Bioenergy Grasses, Purdue University	200
Midwest poultry consortium, Iowa State University	250
Milk safety, Pennsylvania State University	821
Montana Sheep Institute, Montana State University	270
National beef cattle genetic evaluation consortium, Colorado State University, Cornell University, University of Georgia	655
National Center for Soybean Technology, University of Missouri—Columbia	735
Nematode resistance genetic engineering, New Mexico State University	223
Nevada arid rangelands initiative, University of Nevada—Reno	400
New Century Farm, Iowa State University	300
New crop opportunities, Lexington, KY	559
New Satellite and Computer-Based Technology for Agriculture, Mississippi State University	697
Oil resources from desert plants, New Mexico State University	187
Organic cropping, Oregon State University	149
Organic cropping, Washington State University	264
Organic waste utilization, New Mexico State University	74
Peach tree short life research, Clemson University, SC	208
Pierce's disease, University of California	1,500
Policy Analyses for a National Secure & Sustainable Food, Fiber, Forestry and Energy Program, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	149
Potato Cyst Nematode, University of Idaho	372
Potato research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University, University of Maine	750
Precision agriculture, Auburn University, AL	446
Precision agriculture, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	502
Preharvest food safety, Kansas State University	151
Protein utilization, Iowa State University	600
Renewable Energy and Products, North Dakota State University	1,000
Ruminant nutrition consortium, University of Nebraska—Lincoln, South Dakota State University	600
Russian wheat aphid, Colorado State University	228
Seed technology, South Dakota State University	300
Small fruit research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	300
Soil and Environmental Quality, University of Delaware	75
Soil-Borne Disease Prevention in Irrigated Agriculture, New Mexico State University	187
Southern Great Plains Dairy Consortium, New Mexico State University	250
Soybean research, National Soybean Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois	500
Specialty Crops, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture	175
Sustainable agriculture & natural resources, Pennsylvania State University	142
Sustainable beef supply, Montana State University	200
Sustainable Engineered Materials from Renewable Resources, Virginia Tech	250
Sweet Sorghum for Energy Production, University of Nebraska—Lincoln	149

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—RESEARCH
AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Swine and other animal waste management, North Carolina State University	372
Tillage, silviculture, waste management, Louisiana State University	200
Tri-state joint peanut research, Auburn University, AL	440
Tropical and subtropical research/T-STAR, University of Hawaii	800
Uniform farm management program, University of Minnesota	250
Virtual plant database enhancement project, Missouri Botanical Garden	626
Viticulture consortium, Cornell University, University of California	1,200
Water conservation, Kansas State University	74
Water use efficiency and water quality enhancements, University of Georgia	368
Wetland plants, Louisiana State University	200
Wheat genetic research, Kansas State University	256
Wine Grape Foundation Block, Washington State University	237
Wood utilization (AK, ID, LA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC, OR, TN, WV)	4,841
Total, special research grants	50,749
Improved pest control:	
Expert IPM decision support system	154
Integrated pest management	2,379
IR-4 minor crop pest management	11,368
Pest management alternatives	1,412
Total, Improved pest control	15,313
1994 institutions research program	1,610
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative	200,000
Agriculture and Rural Policy Research	2,602
Alaska Native-serving and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions education grants	3,196
Alternative crops	819
Aquaculture centers (sec. 1475)	3,928
Capacity building grants (1890 institutions)	13,592
Critical Agricultural Materials Act	1,083
Graduate fellowships grants	3,859
Hispanic education partnership grants	6,046
Institution challenge grants	5,654
Joe Skeen Institute for Rangeland Management	983
Multicultural scholars program	981
Payments to the 1994 institutions	3,319
Secondary agriculture education	983
Sustainable agriculture research and education	14,399
Resident instruction grants for insular areas	745
Veterinary Medical Services Act	5,000
Federal administration:	
Agriculture development in the American Pacific, University of Hawaii	372
Agriculture waste utilization, West Virginia State University	485
Agriculture-based industrial lubricants, University of Northern Iowa	405
Applied Agriculture and Environment Research, California State University	250
Aquaculture Research, Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council	298
Aquaculture, Cheyney University, PA	164
Biotechnology Research, Alcorn State University, MS	511
Botanical research, Utah State University	670
Center for North American studies, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	200
Centers for Dairy and Beef Excellence, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture	340
Cotton research, Texas Tech University	300
Council for Agriculture and Technology, Ames, IA	112
Electronic Grants Administration System	2,136
Ethnobotanicals, Frostburg State University, MD	500
Farmland Preservation, The Ohio State University	112
Feed efficiency, West Virginia University	112
Florida Biomass to Biofuels Conversion Program, University of Central Florida	250
Medicinal and Bioactive Crops, Stephen F. Austin State University, TX	298

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—RESEARCH
AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Midwest Agribusiness Trade and Information Center MATRIC, Iowa State University	187
Mississippi Valley State University	1,067
NE Center for Invasive Plants, University of Connecticut, the University of Vermont, and the University of Maine	150
Office of Extramural Programs	440
Pay Cost	4,973
Peer Panels	397
PM-10 air quality study, Washington State University	150
Polymer Research, Pittsburg State University, KS	1,367
Research, Education, and Economics Information System	2,704
Rural systems, Jackson State University, MS	229
Shellfish, University of Rhode Island	261
Shrimp aquaculture, University of Southern Mississippi	300
Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia, University of Toledo, OH	223
Water pollutants, Marshall University, WV	410
Total, Federal administration	20,373
Total, CSREES Research and Education Activities	629,871

Agriculture and Food Research Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$200,000,000 for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative [AFRI].

Section 7406 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 specifies priority areas within the newly created Agriculture Food and Research Initiative [AFRI], including a emphasis on conventional (classical) plant and animal breeding. The Committee strongly concurs with the intent of this section, and requests a report from the agency as to its plans for implementing the intent of this important conventional/classical plant and animal breeding requirement.

Agricultural Research Enhancement Awards.—The Committee remains determined to see that quality research and enhanced human resources development in the agricultural and related sciences be a nationwide commitment. Therefore, the Committee continues its direction that not less than 10 percent of the competitive research grant funds be used for USDA's agricultural research enhancement awards program (including USDA-EPSCoR), in accordance with 7 U.S.C. 450i.

Agriculture and Rural Policy Research.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants and take other actions under 7 U.S.C. 3155 for research and related activities concerning public policy and trade agreements and their effect on the farm and agricultural sector; the environment; rural families, households, and economies; and consumers, food, and nutrition. The Committee recommends \$2,602,000 for activities under this authority.

Of the amount available for Agriculture and Rural Policy Research [ARPR], \$1,213,000 is provided for the Food and Agriculture Policy Institute [FAPRI]. Of the amount available for FAPRI, \$200,000 shall be provided to continue a cooperative agreement with the University of Wisconsin relating to dairy policy and

\$149,000 shall be used to conduct analysis of rangeland, cattle, and hay with the University of Nevada—Reno.

In addition, of the amount available for ARPR, \$889,000 shall be available for the Rural Policies Research Institute and \$500,000 shall be available for the National Drought Mitigation Center.

Alaska Native-Serving and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions Education Grants.—The Committee recommends \$3,196,000 for grants to individual eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions in Alaska and in Hawaii, with grant funds to be awarded equally between Alaska and Hawaii to carry out the programs authorized in 7 U.S.C. 3242. The Committee directs the agency to fully comply with the use of grant funds as authorized.

Alternative Crops.—The Committee recommends \$819,000 for alternative crop research to continue and strengthen research efforts on canola. The Committee understands that the United States does not produce enough canola to meet its consumption needs and encourages the Department to seek stakeholder input and to provide funds in a manner that reaches those areas most likely to see expansions in canola production.

Community Food Projects.—The Committee expects the Department of Agriculture to consider as fully eligible for Community Food Project [CFP] grants any program that encourages the effective use of community resources to combat hunger and the root causes of hunger through the recovery of donated food, distribution of meals to nonprofit organizations, and the training of unemployed and underemployed adults for careers in food service. The Committee considers such programs to meet the requisite eligibility standards for CFP grants in that they meet the food needs of low-income people, increase the self-reliance of communities in providing their own food needs, and plan for long-term solutions to address such needs.

Floriculture and Tropical and Subtropical Research.—The Committee provides funding to carry out floriculture research in Hawaii and expects priorities of this activity (as defined by industry stakeholders) to include the maintenance and improvement of germplasm of orchid, anthurium, and protea to derive and release new commercial varieties and continue research on disease resistance and insect control. The Committee also provides funding for tropical and subtropical research and supports the current mechanism of solicitation, recommendation and distribution of funds through the Pacific Basin and Caribbean Basin Administration Groups.

Forestry and Related Natural Resource Research.—The Committee recognizes that forestry and related natural resource research were an integral part of the National Research Initiative, the predecessor program to the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative [AFRI]. As this program has grown, however, the allocation of AFRI funds by CSREES for research on forestry and related natural resource topics has fallen behind. In the future, the Committee directs the AFRI program administrator to put a greater emphasis on AFRI funding for forestry and natural resources topics with a goal of eventually providing at least 10 percent of the total funds provided for AFRI for forestry and natural resources related research on topics including: woody plant systems, including large

scale efforts to sequence the genome for several economically important tree species, technologies for enhanced pest and disease resistance, and increased tree growth rates; management of complex forest ecosystems, including issues of forest health, productivity, economic sustainability, and restoration; assessing alternative management strategies, with emphasis on risk analysis, geospatial analysis including landscape implications, consideration of ecological services, providing decision support systems; and development of nanotechnology and biorefining technologies for the forest products sector as critical to enhancing global competitiveness and energy security.

National Veterinary Medical Services Act.—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 to carry out the National Veterinary Medical Services Act [NVMSA]. In speaking of previous funding levels for this purpose, the Secretary has noted that “the modest appropriations to date make implementation of this section [NVMSA] impractical”. The level recommended by the Committee is a substantial increase from fiscal year 2008 and this amount coupled with previously appropriated funds will provide the level necessary to implement this program. Therefore, the Committee fully expects the Secretary to implement NVSMA in fiscal year 2009 which will be an important step to place critically necessary animal health practitioners in Rural America and as an important element in support of homeland security. The Committee further requests a report on implementation of this program.

Special Research Grants.—The Committee recognizes the vital relationships between Federal research activities and land grant institutions and firmly supports the importance of congressionally recognized research priorities. The Special Research Grants program was authorized by the Congress to promote research among these partners in specific areas of need to meet emerging and long-term national and regional challenges.

The Secretary is authorized to make grants to eligible institutions under 7 U.S.C. 450i(c), commonly referred to as Special Research Grants. These grants are authorized for the purpose of conducting research and related activities to facilitate or expand promising breakthroughs in areas of the food and agricultural sciences of the United States. The authorizing statute directs that these grants be provided through State-Federal partnerships to promote excellence of such activities on a regional or national level, to promote the development of regional research centers, and to generally support these activities among the States, the regions, and the Nation. In addition, the law requires that these grants can only be awarded if the proposed activity has undergone scientific peer review and that the grantee submit an annual report to the Secretary describing the results of the research or related activity and the merits of the results.

Over the past few years, the Committee has made clear its intentions to employ a heightened level of scrutiny to grants awarded under 7 U.S.C. 450i(c). These indications have included requirements of detailed reports by grantees, in-depth explanations of prospective research objectives, and an understanding that grantees should not expect indefinite fiscal assistance from the Committee under this authority. In addition, the Committee has previously ex-

pressed concern that ongoing, long-term Federal commitments to specific research projects may reduce the opportunity to focus on emerging important research priorities and result in a less efficient Federal investment in agricultural and related research.

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee continues its responsibility of expressing congressional interest and intervention in setting research priorities through the investment of Federal funds. As the Committee has expressed in previous years, specific problems require specific objectives and specific attention. Therefore, the individual research activities described in this report are intended to accomplish the objectives set forth in this report and are not intended to extend into ongoing, long-term, indefinite research endeavors. The Secretary is encouraged to work with grantees to ensure that research conducted with these funds is set to achieve specific objectives and to refrain from undertaking research of an indefinite nature. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a report by March 1, 2009 regarding the status of grant awards for fiscal year 2009 and the specific objectives to be sought in each case.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2008	\$11,880,000
Budget estimate, 2009	11,880,000
Committee recommendation	11,880,000

The Native American Institutions Endowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103-382 provides an endowment for the 1994 land-grant institutions (33 tribally controlled colleges). This program will enhance educational opportunity for Native Americans by building educational capacity at these institutions in the areas of student recruitment and retention, curricula development, faculty preparation, instruction delivery systems, and scientific instrumentation for teaching. Income funds are also available for facility renovation, repair, construction, and maintenance. On the termination of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall withdraw the income from the endowment fund for the fiscal year, and after making adjustments for the cost of administering the endowment fund, distribute the adjusted income as follows: 60 percent of the adjusted income from these funds shall be distributed among the 1994 land-grant institutions on a pro rata basis, the proportionate share being based on the Indian student count; and 40 percent of the adjusted income shall be distributed in equal shares to the 1994 land-grant institutions.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$11,880,000 for the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2008	\$453,157,000
Budget estimate, 2009	431,753,000
Committee recommendation	464,272,000

Cooperative extension work was established by the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914. The Department of Agriculture is authorized

to provide, through the land-grant colleges, cooperative extension work that consists of the development of practical applications of research knowledge and the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations of existing or improved practices or technologies in agriculture, uses of solar energy with respect to agriculture, home economics, related subjects, and to encourage the application of such information by demonstrations, publications, through 4-H clubs, and other means to persons not in attendance or resident at the colleges.

To fulfill the requirements of the Smith-Lever Act, State and county extension offices in each State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas, and Micronesia conduct educational programs to improve American agriculture and strengthen the Nation's families and communities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$464,272,000 for extension activities of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for extension activities:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Smith-Lever sections 3(b) and 3(c)	288,393
Smith-Lever section 3(d):	
Farm safety	4,726
Food and nutrition education [EFNEP]	65,557
Indian reservation agents	2,979
New technologies for extension	1,549
Pest management	9,791
Sustainable agriculture	4,568
Youth at risk	7,968
Youth farm safety education and certification	463
1890 colleges, Tuskegee University, and West Virginia State University Colleges	37,643
1890 facilities grants	17,267
Extension services at the 1994 institutions	3,298
Renewable Resources Extension Act [RREA]	4,008
Rural health and safety education	1,738
Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database	806
Federal administration:	
Ag in the Classroom	553
Childhood Farm Safety, Farm Safety 4 Just Kids, Urbandale, IA	74
Conservation technology transfer, University of Wisconsin Extension	400
Dairy education, Iowa State University	169
E-commerce, Mississippi State University	246
Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX	475
Extension specialist, Mississippi State University	98
General administration	7,433
Health education leadership, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	628
Iowa vitality center, Iowa State University	223
National Center for Farm Safety, Northeast Iowa Community College	168
Nutrition enhancement, University of Wisconsin Extension and Wisconsin Department of Public Institutions	800
Ohio-Israel Agriculture Initiative, The Negev Foundation, OH	496
Pesticide Reduction on Vegetables, University of Wisconsin Extension	350

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—EXTENSION
ACTIVITIES—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Pilot technology transfer, Mississippi State University, Oklahoma State University	223
Potato Integrated Pest Management—Late Blight, University of Maine	298
Range improvement, New Mexico State University	223
Rural technologies, Maui Economic Development Board, HI	150
Urban horticulture and marketing, Chicago Botanic Garden, Glencoe, IL	111
Urban horticulture, University of Wisconsin Extension and Growing Power	400
Total, Federal administration	13,518
Total, CSREES Extension Activities	464,272

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2008	\$55,850,000
Budget estimate, 2009	20,120,000
Committee recommendation	55,850,000

Section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 authorizes an integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$55,850,000 for integrated activities of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for integrated activities:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE [CSREES]—INTEGRATED
ACTIVITIES
[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Water Quality	12,649
Food Safety	14,596
Regional Pest Management Centers	4,096
Crops at Risk from FQPA Implementation	1,365
FQPA Risk Mitigation Program for Major Food Crop Systems	4,388
Methyl Bromide Transition Program	3,054
Organic Transition Program	1,842
Total, section 406	41,990
International Science and Education Grants Program	1,986
Critical Issues Program	732
Regional Rural Development Centers Program	1,312
Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative (Homeland Security)	9,830
Total, CSREES Integrated Activities	55,850

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

Appropriations, 2008	\$6,395,000
Budget estimate, 2009	6,930,000
Committee recommendation

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not include a recommendation for this program. The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 provides \$15,000,000 for this activity and repeals the authorization for appropriations.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2008	\$716,000
Budget estimate, 2009	792,000
Committee recommendation	737,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs provides direction and coordination in carrying out laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's marketing, grading, and standardization activities related to grain; competitive marketing practices of livestock, marketing orders, and various programs; veterinary services; and plant protection and quarantine. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Agricultural Marketing Service; and Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$737,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	\$867,322,000
Budget estimate, 2009	919,137,000
Committee recommendation	860,989,000

The Secretary of Agriculture established the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service [APHIS] on April 2, 1972, under the authority of reorganization plan No. 2 of 1953, and other authorities. The major objectives of APHIS are to protect the animal and plant resources of the Nation from diseases and pests. These objectives are carried out under the major areas of activity, as follows:

Pest and Disease Exclusion.—The agency conducts inspection and quarantine activities at U.S. ports of entry to prevent the introduction of exotic animal and plant diseases and pests. The Agency also participates in inspection, survey, and control activities in foreign countries to reinforce its domestic activities.

Agricultural Quarantine Inspection [AQI].—The agency collects user fees to cover the cost of inspection and quarantine activities at U.S. ports of entry to prevent the introduction of exotic animal and plant diseases and pests.

Plant and Animal Health Monitoring.—The agency conducts programs to assess animal and plant health and to detect endemic and exotic diseases and pests.

Pest and Disease Management Programs.—The agency carries out programs to control and eradicate pest infestations and animal

diseases that threaten the United States; reduce agricultural losses caused by predatory animals, birds, and rodents; provide technical assistance to other cooperators such as States, counties, farmer or rancher groups, and foundations; and ensure compliance with interstate movement and other disease control regulations within the jurisdiction of the agency.

Animal Care.—The agency conducts regulatory activities that ensure the humane care and treatment of animals and horses as the Animal Welfare and Horse Protection Acts require. These activities include inspection of certain establishments that handle animals intended for research, exhibition, and as pets, and monitoring certain horse shows.

Scientific and Technical Services.—The agency performs other regulatory activities, including the development of standards for the licensing and testing of veterinary biologicals to ensure their safety and effectiveness; diagnostic activities to support the control and eradication programs in other functional components; applied research to reduce economic damage from vertebrate animals; development of new pest and animal damage control methods and tools; and regulatory oversight of genetically engineered products.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$860,989,000 for salaries and expenses of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

The following table reflects the Committee's specific recommendations for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 budget request	Committee recommendation
PEST AND DISEASE EXCLUSION:			
Agricultural Quarantine Inspection [AQI]	26,874	27,059	26,979
Cattle Fever Ticks	7,600	9,907	7,833
Foreign Animal Disease/Foot and Mouth Disease	8,634	4,000	7,000
Fruit Fly Exclusion & Detection	60,298	67,406	61,088
Import/Export	11,158	13,576	12,963
Overseas Technical & Trade Operations	27,559	19,369	15,725
Screwworm	12,417	28,797	27,635
Trade Issues Resolution & Management	421	435	425
Tropical Bont Tick			
Subtotal, Pest and Disease Exclusion	154,961	170,549	159,648
PLANT AND ANIMAL HEALTH MONITORING:			
Animal Health Monitoring & Surveillance	122,507	143,585	124,146
Animal & Plant Health Reg. Enforcement	12,352	13,694	12,583
Avian Influenza		59,849	59,849
Biosurveillance	1,977		
Emergency Management Systems	15,265	18,380	15,619
Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza	51,047		
National Veterinary Stockpile		8,166	3,739
Pest Detection	27,530	31,363	27,776
Select Agents	4,221	5,997	4,259
Wildlife Disease Monitoring & Surveillance		1,300	
Subtotal, Plant and Animal Health Monitoring	234,899	282,334	247,971

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 budget request	Committee recommendation
PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT:			
Aquaculture	6,807	3,787	6,920
Biological Control	9,514	10,158	9,737
Brucellosis	9,465	9,211	9,584
Chronic Wasting Disease	17,682	10,391	17,808
Contingency Funds	993	4,195	3,025
Cotton Pests	37,008	14,162	29,590
Emerging Plant Pests	126,964	145,498	127,549
Golden Nematode	801	845	816
Grasshopper	6,597	4,577	6,456
Gypsy Moth	4,769	4,994	4,843
Imported Fire Ant	1,885	2,158	1,893
John's Disease	10,539	3,319	6,821
Low Pathogen Avian Influenza	15,610
Noxious Weeds	1,776	1,150	1,773
Plum Pox	2,184	3,225	2,195
Private Land Initiative for Invasive Species	500
Pseudorabies	2,385	2,532	2,446
Scrapie	17,978	17,487	18,145
Tuberculosis	15,289	16,948	15,393
Wildlife Services Operations	74,919	73,258	74,163
Witchweed	1,504	1,532	1,510
Subtotal, Pest and Disease Management	364,669	329,927	340,667
ANIMAL CARE:			
Animal Welfare	20,498	21,522	20,894
Horse Protection	494	499	497
Subtotal, Animal Care	20,992	22,021	21,391
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SERVICES:			
Biosecurity	1,938
Biotechnology Regulatory Services	11,729	16,306	11,877
Environmental Compliance	2,627	2,874	2,669
Plant Methods Development Labs	9,483	10,818	9,712
Veterinary Biologics	16,541	19,580	16,922
Veterinary Diagnostics	23,093	33,241	23,511
Wildlife Services Methods Development	17,755	19,579	17,986
Subtotal, Scientific and Technical Services	83,166	102,398	82,677
MANAGEMENT:			
APHIS Information Technology Infrastructure	4,474	5,029	4,474
Physical/Operational Security	4,161	6,879	4,161
Subtotal, Management	8,635	11,908	8,635
TOTAL, APHIS	867,322	919,137	860,989

The Committee is unable to recommend the full increases requested in the President's budget for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. However, the Committee does recommend increases for a number of specific animal and plant health programs. The Committee encourages the Secretary to continue use of contingency funding from Commodity Credit Corporation monies, as in past fiscal years, to cover needs as identified in the President's budget and any additional emergencies as the Secretary determines necessary.

PEST AND DISEASE EXCLUSION

Agricultural Quarantine Inspection [AQI]

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$26,979,000 for the AQI appropriated account to conduct preclearance quarantine inspections of persons, baggage, cargo, and other articles destined for movement from the State of Hawaii to the continental United States, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the United States Virgin Islands.

Interline Activities.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,750,000 for interline activities in Hawaii. The State of Hawaii is currently under a Federal quarantine for fruit flies. This quarantine requires the predeparture inspection of all airline passengers and luggage departing Hawaii for the U.S. mainland. Although APHIS currently provides funding to pay for inspections at the Honolulu airport, this funding will pay for federally required inspections for flights originating at neighbor island airports and connecting in Honolulu.

Phytosanitary Standards.—The Committee urges the Department to establish protocols that allow shipment of untreated fruits and vegetables grown in Hawaii to cold-weather States during winter months while maintaining reasonable assurances that potential transshipment of such produce will not jeopardize the phytosanitary standards of warm weather States. The Committee also urges the Department to follow the same scientific principles used to justify rules for foreign imports in promulgating rules for exports from Hawaii to the U.S. mainland.

Fruit Fly Exclusion and Detection

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$61,088,000 for the fruit fly exclusion and detection program, of which no less than the fiscal year 2008 level shall be used to enhance activities to prevent Medflies from moving into the United States as well as activities at U.S. borders.

PLANT AND ANIMAL HEALTH MONITORING

Animal Health Monitoring and Surveillance

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$124,146,000 for the animal health monitoring and surveillance program.

Animal Identification.—The Committee recommendation includes \$9,787,000 to continue implementation of the National Animal Identification System.

Bio-safety.—The Committee recommendation includes \$240,000 to address bio-safety issues relating to antibiotic resistant strains of bacterial pathogens in the State of Vermont.

Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy [BSE].—The Committee recommendation includes \$17,799,000 to continue the ongoing BSE surveillance program.

Disease Surveillance.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,400,000 to work with North Dakota State University and Dickinson State University to develop, test, and implement the use of RFID tags for animal identification, strengthening pathogen diag-

nostic and identification capabilities and pinpointing problem areas in the traceback systems and methods to resolve them.

National Farm Animal Identification and Records.—The Committee recommendation includes \$343,000 to allow additional producers to participate in the National Farm Animal Identification and Records Project, which electronically identifies individual animals and tracks their movements from birth to slaughter within 48 hours in order to combat animal disease outbreaks.

New Mexico Rapid Syndrome Validation Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$404,000 for the New Mexico Rapid Syndrome Validation Program to develop an early detection and reporting system for infectious animal diseases.

Wisconsin Livestock Identification Consortium.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,550,000 for a cooperative agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to continue work carried out by the Wisconsin Livestock Identification Consortium. The Wisconsin Livestock Identification Consortium serves as a national model and laboratory for premise registration, a critical first step for nationwide animal identification efforts. This work is key to national efforts to improve the traceability of livestock and manage potential animal diseases thereby protecting public health and safety.

Animal and Plant Health Regulatory Enforcement

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$12,583,000 for the animal and plant health regulatory enforcement program to support Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) compliance inspections.

Avian Influenza

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$59,849,000 for avian influenza activities.

Delmarva Peninsula.—The Committee is aware of the large poultry industry on the Delmarva Peninsula and the presence of live poultry markets in the Mid-Atlantic region. In preparation for a possible introduction of highly pathogenic avian influenza into the United States, the location and concentration of this industry, and its proximity to high human population centers and the Atlantic flyway for migratory birds, require serious response capabilities. Accordingly, the Committee encourages the Secretary to work with appropriate Delaware State officials and with the University of Delaware, to develop proper surveillance, diagnostic, and response systems.

Emergency Management Systems

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,619,000 for emergency management systems.

National Veterinary Stockpile

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,739,000 for the National Veterinary Stockpile.

Pest Detection

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$27,776,000 for pest detection.

California County Pest Detection Augmentation Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$619,000 to continue the California County Pest Detection Augmentation Program, which is a statewide network of insect traps and other detection tools to serve as an early warning system against serious agricultural pests in the State of California.

Import Inspection.—California's agricultural industry is highly susceptible to exotic pests due to its international border and as home to some of the Nation's busiest seaports. The California County Pest Detection Augmentation Program is operated at points of entry in California to prevent the establishment of serious agricultural and environmental invasive pests and diseases. This funding will address the growing of interstate shipments from international ports of entry in other States, where inspectors are not monitoring for the pests that could devastate California agriculture. The Committee recommendation includes \$738,000 for this program.

PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT

Aquaculture

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$6,920,000 for the aquaculture program.

Cormorant and Pelican Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$569,000 to continue telemetry and population dynamics studies and operations to develop environmentally and economically sustainable methods to help catfish farmers manage cormorant and pelican populations.

Lamprey Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$100,000 for the State of Vermont's Lake Champlain's Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative for the control of sea lampreys, which cause invasive species damage and threaten State listed endangered species, and are one of the biggest threats to the fishing industry in Lake Champlain.

Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia [VHS].—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,561,000 for the control of VHS in the Great Lakes States, which is \$3,033,000 above the budget request. The Committee encourages APHIS to continue its work in the areas of monitoring, diagnosis, epidemiology and prevention of VHS, especially in farmed-raised fish (including those for enhancement purposes). The Committee also encourages APHIS to begin implementation of the National Aquatic Animal Health Plan in approaching aquatic animal health issues holistically.

Brucellosis Eradication

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$9,584,000 for brucellosis eradication.

Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee.—The Committee recommendation includes \$692,000 for the Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee to continue brucellosis prevention, surveillance, control, and eradication. The Committee

encourages the coordination of Federal, State, and private actions to eliminate brucellosis from wildlife in the Greater Yellowstone area. This amount shall be equally divided between the States of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

Chronic Wasting Disease [CWD]

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$17,808,000 for the chronic wasting disease certification and control program to include additional surveillance and disease control activities with free-ranging cervids, and to increase State testing capacity for the timely identification of the presence of this disease. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,350,000 for the State of Wisconsin, \$182,000 for the State of Utah, and \$38,000 for the State of Colorado.

Contingency Funds

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,025,000 for APHIS contingency funds, allowing APHIS to control outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases, and pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions. The contingency fund allows APHIS to act rapidly to control emergencies before they can spread and cause significant economic damage.

Cotton Pests

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$29,590,000 for the cotton pests program, of which \$19,780,000 is for boll weevil and \$9,810,000 is for pink bollworm.

Emerging Plant Pests

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$127,549,000 for the emerging plant pests program. The Committee expects the Secretary to make funds available from the CCC for activities related to plant pests in fiscal year 2009, as necessary.

Asian Long Horned Beetle.—The Committee recommendation includes \$19,969,000 for Asian long horned beetle.

Citrus Health Response Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$35,496,000 for the citrus health response program.

Emerald Ash Borer.—The Committee recommendation includes \$32,493,000 for emerald ash borer. This invasive species has been found in Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. The Committee recognizes that the emerald ash borer, which poses a significant threat to the Nation's population of ash trees, has the potential to cause significant economic and ecological damage, and that further efforts are required to manage the spread of emerald ash borer and develop techniques and technologies to eradicate this species.

The Committee further recognizes that the recent discovery of the Emerald Ash Borer in the City of Chicago poses a significant threat to the City's tree population and directs APHIS to work collaboratively with the City to manage the infestation and to provide appropriate resources.

Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter.—The Committee recommendation includes \$23,136,000 for glassy-winged sharpshooter.

Karnal Bunt.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,503,000 for karnal bunt.

Light Brown Apple Moth.—The Committee recommendation includes \$993,000 for Light Brown Apple Moth. The Committee notes that in fiscal year 2007 and 2008, approximately \$90,000,000 in CCC funding has been made available for Light Brown Apple Moth. As of June 2008, however, only \$27,000,000 has been obligated, leaving \$63,000,000 in CCC funds available to continue APHIS' efforts.

Potato Cyst Nematode.—The Committee recommendation includes \$7,715,000 for potato cyst nematode.

Sudden Oak Death (Phytophthora ramora).—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,306,000 for sudden oak death. The Committee encourages APHIS to use the funding provided to promote the research, development, and testing of new systems of nursery pest and disease management and for programs of inspection and regulation.

Varroa Mite Suppression.—The Committee recommendation includes \$500,000 to suppress and limit the varroa mite population on the Island of Oahu, and to prevent spread of the mite to the neighboring islands. Colony Collapse Disorder [CCD] has devastated bee keepers on mainland USA, and is severely limiting the supply of bees to those commercial crops requiring bee pollination. The Island of Hawaii (Big Island) is free of varroa mite and is a major supplier of queen bees to mainland bee keepers with the largest supplier of queen bees in the United States located in Kona on Big Island.

Grasshopper

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$6,456,000 for the grasshopper program.

Mormon Crickets.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,117,000 for grasshopper and Mormon cricket activities in the State of Utah to continue control measures. APHIS may use funds provided for Mormon cricket activities in Utah for eradication and control of the Black Grass Bug in Utah.

Johne's Disease

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$6,821,000 for Johne's disease. The Committee expects APHIS to work with the Agricultural Research Service to coordinate activities to research and develop an effective diagnostic test for Johne's disease with appropriate field validation and methods development. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for Johne's activities in the State of Wisconsin.

Noxious Weeds

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,773,000 for the noxious weeds program.

Cogongrass Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$221,000 for an invasive species program to prevent the spread of cogongrass in Mississippi, and requests that the agency take nec-

essary steps to address this invasive weed as a regional infestation problem.

Nevada Weed Management.—The Committee recommendation includes \$250,000 for a weed management program with the State of Nevada to control invasive weeds on rangelands that threaten the viability of Nevada's agricultural economy.

Nez Perce Bio-Control Center.—The Committee recommendation includes \$187,000 for the Nez Perce Bio-Control Center to increase the availability and distribution of biological control organisms used in an integrated weed management system.

Tuberculosis

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,393,000 for the tuberculosis program.

Bovine Tuberculosis in New Mexico.—The Committee is aware of a new occurrence of bovine tuberculosis in New Mexico. The Committee encourages the Secretary to use authorities and resources of the Department to provide testing, monitoring, surveillance, and other services as needed toward the control and eradication of this disease, and for the prompt restoration of split-state status for New Mexico.

Tuberculosis Transmission.—The Committee is concerned about the potential threats that wildlife poses for transmitting tuberculosis to domestic livestock and directs the agency to continue technical and operational assistance to Michigan producers to prevent or reduce the transmission of tuberculosis between wildlife and cattle. The Committee also encourages the agency to continue its research for developing methods to minimize the interaction between wildlife and livestock.

Wildlife Services Operations

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$74,163,000 for wildlife services operations. The Committee does not concur with the budget request to reduce funding in the wildlife services operations account to allow cooperators to assume a larger share of the costs associated with preventing and reducing wildlife damage. The Committee provides funding to continue cooperating with States to conduct wildlife management programs such as livestock protection, migratory bird damage to crops, invasive species damage, property damage, human health and safety, and threatened and endangered species protection.

Beaver Management and Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$472,000 for beaver management and control in the State of Mississippi. The Committee expects the agency to make the fiscal year 2009 level of funding available to all counties in the State. The Committee commends the agency's assistance in cooperative relationships with local and Federal partners to reduce beaver damage to cropland and forests. The Committee recommendation also includes \$221,000 for beaver management and control in the State of North Carolina.

Blackbird Management.—The Committee recommendation includes \$282,000 to conduct methods development and continue control measures for minimizing blackbird damage in North and South Dakota. The Committee recommendation also includes \$100,000 for

blackbird management activities in Louisiana and \$127,000 for Kansas.

Cooperative Livestock Protection Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$223,000 for the Cooperative Livestock Protection Program in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to provide technical and operational assistance in identifying, controlling, and abating damage, animal health problems, and economic losses caused by black vultures, Canadian geese, European starlings, coyotes, and other wildlife.

Cormorant Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$495,000 for cormorant management and control, which includes \$148,000 for the State of Michigan, \$110,000 for the Lake Champlain basin, and \$237,000 for Delta States' operations.

Integrated Predation Management Activities.—The Committee recommendation includes \$298,000 for integrated predation management activities in the State of West Virginia.

Oral Rabies Vaccination.—The Committee recommendation includes \$23,650,000 for rabies control activities. The Committee expects a portion of the program increase to be available for rabies activities in the Appalachian region and to further progress already made along the Appalachian Ridge to control this disease.

Tri-State Predator Control.—Due to the increase in federally listed endangered species and the reintroduction of wolf populations in Idaho, Montana and Wyoming, State operation accounts for wildlife services have suffered financially, therefore the Committee recommendation includes \$986,000 for the tri-State predator control program in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming to respond to wolf depredation and monitor wolf populations.

Western States.—The Committee recommendation includes \$10,700,000 to continue wildlife control activities in Western States.

Wildlife Services, Hawaii.—The Committee recommendation includes \$400,000 for the operation of the State Wildlife Services office in Hawaii to provide on-site coordination of prevention and control activities in Hawaii and the American Pacific. The Committee also recommends \$700,000 for activities in Hawaii and Guam to prevent movement of brown tree snakes from Guam to Hawaii, which would be a major ecological disaster for Hawaii, and for expanding efforts to control coqui frog infestations.

Wildlife Services South Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes \$553,000 for wildlife service operations with the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks to meet the growing demands of controlling predatory, nuisance, and diseased animals.

ANIMAL CARE

Animal Welfare

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$20,894,000 for the animal care unit for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

Biotechnology Regulatory Services

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$11,877,000 for biotechnology regulatory services.

Genetically Modified Products.—The Committee recommendation includes \$276,000 for a national institute at Iowa State University devoted to risk assessment, mitigation, and communication for genetically modified agricultural products.

Plant Methods Development Laboratories

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$9,712,000 for the Plant Methods Development Laboratories Program.

Sericea Lespedeza.—The Committee recognizes both the importance of sericea lespedeza as a field crop in the Southeastern United States and the environmental challenges sericea lespedeza poses to ecosystems in tallgrass prairielands in the Great Plains region. The Committee recommends that APHIS provide Federal field crop designations for sericea lespedeza on a regional basis so that conservation programs in tallgrass prairie regions where sericea lespedeza is an invasive species can partner with USDA to find economically and ecologically appropriate controls.

Veterinary Diagnostics

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$23,511,000 for veterinary diagnostics.

Disease Prevention.—The Committee recommendation includes \$74,000 to develop diagnostics, treatment and prevention for diseases, including West Nile Virus, infecting farm-raised reptiles. Research has confirmed that reptiles are a major vector for West Nile Virus, and the spread of this disease appears to be escalating, posing a significant human health risk and a great economic cost to the farming industry.

National Agriculture Biosecurity Center.—The Committee recommendation includes \$276,000 for the National Agriculture Biosecurity Center in the State of Kansas to help protect agricultural infrastructure and economy from endemic and emerging biological threats.

Wildlife Services Methods Development

Committee Recommendation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$17,986,000 for wildlife services methods development.

Berryman Institute.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,117,000 to continue the existing program at the Jack Berryman Institute for addressing wildlife damage management issues, including wildlife disease threats and wildlife economics.

National Wildlife Research Center, Mississippi.—The Committee recommendation includes \$255,000 to continue existing research efforts in aquaculture at the National Wildlife Research Center field station in the State of Mississippi.

National Wildlife Research Station, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes \$309,000 for the National Wildlife Research Station located in the State of Texas for activities related to emerg-

ing infectious diseases associated with wildlife populations and human health.

Predator Control.—The Committee understands that APHIS is currently evaluating a theobromine and caffeine mixture as a possible tool for predation management. The Committee also understands that this mixture induces mortality with minimal pre-mortality symptoms, and because theobromine and caffeine are readily available, antidotes exist should it be accidentally ingested by livestock or a pet. The Committee encourages APHIS to continue evaluating this method, conduct field studies, and take the appropriate steps to register these compounds with the Environmental Protection Agency.

Predator Research Station, Utah.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,033,000 for ongoing activities at the Utah Predator Research Station, including research on the ecology of wildlife depredation, reproductive intervention strategies for managing wildlife depredation, and sensory and behavioral methods for managing wildlife depredation on livestock.

Rodent Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$172,000 to continue the cooperative agreement with the Hawaii Agriculture Research Center for rodent control in active agricultural areas to contain and prevent the damage caused to Hawaii’s agriculture.

COMMITTEE DIRECTIVES

In complying with the Committee’s directives, the Committee expects APHIS not to redirect support for programs and activities without prior notification to and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the reprogramming procedures specified in the act. Unless otherwise directed, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service shall implement appropriations by programs, projects, and activities as specified by the Appropriations Committees. Unspecified reductions necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are to be implemented in accordance with the definitions contained in the program, project, and activity section of this report.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2008	
Budget estimate, 2009	\$7,431,000
Committee recommendation	2,000,000

The APHIS appropriation for “Buildings and Facilities” funds major nonrecurring construction projects in support of specific program activities and recurring construction, alterations, preventive maintenance, and repairs of existing APHIS facilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$2,000,000 for buildings and facilities of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. This funding is necessary to allow APHIS to maintain existing facilities, and perform critically needed repairs to and replacements of building components, such as heating, ventilation and air-conditioning on a prioritized basis at

APHIS facilities. The Committee notes that due to the environmentally sensitive nature of many APHIS facilities, closure of a facility could result if APHIS is unable to complete the required repairs.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

Appropriations, 2008	\$76,324,000
Budget estimate, 2009	76,015,000
Committee recommendation	71,655,000

The Agricultural Marketing Service [AMS] was established by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 2, 1972. AMS carries out programs authorized by more than 50 different statutory authorities, the primary ones being the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627); the U.S. Cotton Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 51–65); the Cotton Statistics and Estimates Act (7 U.S.C. 471–476); the Tobacco Inspection Act (7 U.S.C. 511–511q); the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (7 U.S.C. 499a–499s); the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031–1056); and section 32 (15 U.S.C. 713c).

Programs administered by this agency include the market news services, payments to States for marketing activities, the Plant Variety Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 2321 et seq.), the Federal administration of marketing agreements and orders, standardization, grading, classing, and shell egg surveillance services, transportation services, wholesale farmers and alternative market development, commodity purchases, Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (7 U.S.C. 499a–499b), and market protection and promotion activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$71,655,000 for marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Horticulture Marketing.—The Committee is aware of an innovative urban horticulture planning, development, and marketing project in the State of Illinois. The Committee encourages the Department to provide appropriate technical and financial assistance to the Windy City Harvest initiative.

Local Purchase.—The Committee is aware that the Iowa Buy Fresh/Buy Local works with communities to implement plans to create more local commerce around locally grown foods, including working with institutional food buyers to develop strong linkages to local farmers and processors. The Committee encourages AMS to provide technical and financial assistance, as appropriate, to this program.

Organics.—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,177,000 for the National Organic Program [NOP]. The Committee is aware that USDA is implementing draft revisions to the National Organic Program resulting from the American National Standards Institute [ANSI] 2004 and USDA Office of the Inspector General [OIG] 2005 audits. The Committee directs the agency to report on the status of these revisions by December 2008. Further, the Committee believes the agency should work to publish regulations for new, updated pasture standards for organic ruminants, and if necessary,

resolve conflicting standards governing the origin of livestock used in organic dairy, and hopes to see action on these items in 2009. Finally, the Committee expects the NOP to work closely with the National Organic Standards Board with respect to Peer Review Panel requirements of the Organic Food Production Act and USDA's organic regulations.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2008	\$61,233,000
Budget limitation, 2009	62,888,000
Committee recommendation	62,888,000

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35) initiated a system of user fees for the cost of grading and classing cotton, tobacco, naval stores, and for warehouse examination. These activities, authorized under the U.S. Cotton Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 51 et seq.), the Tobacco Inspection Act (7 U.S.C. 511 et seq.), the Naval Stores Act (7 U.S.C. 91 et seq.), the U.S. Warehouse Act (7 U.S.C. 241 et seq.), and other provisions of law are designed to facilitate commerce and to protect participants in the industry.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$62,888,000 on administrative expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY

(SECTION 32)

MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

Appropriations, 2008	\$16,798,000
Budget estimate, 2009	17,270,000
Committee recommendation	17,270,000

Under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, (7 U.S.C. 612c), an amount equal to 30 percent of customs receipts collected during each preceding calendar year and unused balances are available for encouraging the domestic consumption and exportation of agricultural commodities. An amount equal to 30 percent of receipts collected on fishery products is transferred to the Department of Commerce. Additional transfers to the child nutrition programs of the Food and Nutrition Service have been provided in recent appropriations Acts.

The following table reflects the status of this fund for fiscal years 2007-2009:

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2007-2009

	Fiscal year 2007 actual	Fiscal year 2008 estimate	Fiscal year 2009 estimate
Appropriation (30 percent of Customs Receipts)	\$7,029,269,059	\$7,563,683,777	\$7,979,334,788
Rescission	- 37,601,000	- 684,000,000	
Less Transfers:			
Food and Nutrition Service	- 5,731,073,000	- 6,253,548,000	- 6,721,834,000
Commerce Department	- 82,817,059	- 84,594,777	- 84,500,788

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2007–2009—Continued

	Fiscal year 2007 actual	Fiscal year 2008 estimate	Fiscal year 2009 estimate
GSA Board of Contract Appeals	– 47,345
Total, Transfers	– 5,813,937,404	– 6,338,142,777	– 6,806,334,788
Budget Authority	1,177,730,655	541,541,000	1,173,000,000
Unobligated Balance Available, Start of Year	146,760,123	500,000,000
Offsetting Collections	139,276,862
Recoveries of Prior Year Obligations	119,915
Available for Obligation	1,463,887,555	1,041,541,000	1,173,000,000
Less Obligations:			
Child Nutrition Programs (Entitlement Commodities)	465,000,000	465,000,000	465,000,000
12 Percent Commodity Floor Requirement	199,860,396	150,000,000	150,000,000
State Option Contract	5,000,000	5,000,000
Removal of Defective Commodities	1,871,239	52,500,000	2,500,000
Emergency Surplus Removal	56,891,473	89,460,000
Direct Payments	101,650,000
Disaster Relief	11,316,600	5,000,000	5,000,000
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program	108,000,000
Whole Grain Products Study (FSA)	4,000,000
Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases	190,000,000	193,000,000
Estimated Future Needs	45,997,000	191,149,000
Total, Commodity Procurement	836,589,708	1,002,957,000	1,123,649,000
Administrative Funds:			
Commodity Purchase Support	31,146,383	21,786,000	32,081,000
Marketing Agreements and Orders	15,492,951	16,798,000	17,270,000
Total, Administrative Funds	46,639,334	38,584,000	49,351,000
Total Obligations	883,229,042	1,041,541,000	1,173,000,000
Returned To Treasury	– 80,658,513
Unobligated Balance Available, End of Year	500,000,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a transfer from section 32 funds of \$17,270,000 for the formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders.

Section 32 Authorities.—Under the authority described in clause 3 of 7 U.S.C. 612c, the Secretary is able to direct funds from the section 32 account to increase the purchasing power of producers. This practice has been used on various occasions to provide direct assistance to producers when market forces or natural conditions adversely affect the financial condition of farmers and ranchers. The Committee notes the importance in the ability of the Secretary to utilize this authority, but believes that communication between the Department and the Congress should be improved when this practice is used. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary to provide notification to the Appropriations Committee in advance of any public announcement or release of section 32 funds under the specific authorities cited above.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

Appropriations, 2008	\$11,627,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,334,000
Committee recommendation	1,685,000

The Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program [FSMIP] is authorized by section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 and is also funded from appropriations. Payments are made to State marketing agencies to: identify and test market alternative farm commodities; determine methods of providing more reliable market information, and develop better commodity grading standards. This program has made possible many types of projects, such as electronic marketing and agricultural product diversification. Current projects are focused on the improvement of marketing efficiency and effectiveness, and seeking new outlets for existing farm produced commodities. The legislation grants the U.S. Department of Agriculture authority to establish cooperative agreements with State departments of agriculture or similar State agencies to improve the efficiency of the agricultural marketing chain. The States perform the work or contract it to others, and must contribute at least one-half of the cost of the projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,685,000 for payments to States and possessions for Federal-State marketing projects and activities. The Committee directs that \$360,000 be provided to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to provide food safety training; technical assistance for market and business planning; and assistance for producers with packaging, label development, and market distribution for specialty meat products.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2008	\$38,514,000
Budget estimate, 2009	44,005,000
Committee recommendation	39,182,000

The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration [GIPSA] was established pursuant to the Secretary's 1994 reorganization. Grain inspection and weighing programs are carried out under the U.S. Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 71 et seq.) and other programs under the authority of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, including the inspection and grading of rice and grain-related products; conducting official weighing and grain inspection activities; and grading dry beans and peas, and processed grain products. Under the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), assurance of the financial integrity of the livestock, meat, and poultry markets is provided. The administration monitors competition in order to protect producers, consumers, and industry from deceptive and fraudulent practices which affect meat and poultry prices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$39,182,000 for salaries and expenses of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Limitation, 2008	\$42,463,000
Budget limitation, 2009	42,463,000
Committee recommendation	42,463,000

The Agency provides an official grain inspection and weighing system under the U.S. Grain Standards Act [USGSA], and official inspection of rice and grain-related products under the Agricultural Marketing Act [AMA] of 1946. The USGSA was amended in 1981 to require the collection of user fees to fund the costs associated with the operation, supervision, and administration of Federal grain inspection and weighing activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$42,463,000 on inspection and weighing services expenses.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

Appropriations, 2008	\$596,000
Budget estimate, 2009	659,000
Committee recommendation	613,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's inspection of meat, poultry, and egg products. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$613,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

Appropriations, 2008	\$929,742,000
Budget estimate, 2009	951,946,000
Committee recommendation	973,566,000

The major objectives of the Food Safety and Inspection Service are to assure that meat and poultry products are wholesome, unadulterated, and properly labeled and packaged, as required by the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.); and to provide continuous in-plant inspection to egg processing plants under the Egg Products Inspection Act.

The Food Safety and Inspection Service was established on June 17, 1981, by Secretary's Memorandum No. 1000-1, issued pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

The inspection program of the Food Safety and Inspection Service provides continuous in-plant inspection of all domestic plants preparing meat, poultry or egg products for sale or distribution; re-

views foreign inspection systems and establishments that prepare meat or poultry products for export to the United States; and provides technical and financial assistance to States which maintain meat and poultry inspection programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$973,566,000 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service. This amount is \$21,620,000 above the President’s request and is necessary for FSIS to carry out new responsibilities mandated by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

Codex Alimentarius.—Codex Alimentarius is critical for the protection of consumer health globally and facilitating international trade. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$3,827,000 exclusively for the activities of the U.S. Codex office including international outreach and education.

Humane Slaughter.—The Committee is pleased that the budget request included \$3,000,000 for maintenance of the Humane Animal Tracking System [HATS]. The Committee recommendation includes full funding, and notes that maintenance of this system will include costs such as monthly access fees, hardware servicing, remote maintenance charges, and any additional personnel costs. The additional personnel costs could include staff support required to configure and service equipment, as well as personnel to provide technical support via the help desk.

The Committee recommends the amount requested in the budget, which will maintain no less than 120 full-time equivalent positions which have been provided solely for humane slaughter enforcement. The Committee continues to believe that a portion of this funding should be used to allow additional FSIS personnel to continue to work cooperatively with the existing District Veterinary Medical Specialists [DVMS], whose duties are specifically tied to HMSA enforcement, and to allow each DVMS opportunities to visit facilities in other FSIS districts to enhance communication and problem solving among all districts.

State Meat Inspection.—The Committee is pleased that Public Law 110–246 included language requiring that FSIS fund State meat inspection costs at no less than 60 percent of eligible State costs, as well as provisions allowing for the shipments of meat and poultry from eligible State inspected plants in interstate commerce. The Committee notes that the Secretary is directed to promulgate regulations regarding this provision within 18 months of enactment of Public Law 110–246, but encourages the Secretary to begin work to implement these provisions immediately.

The following table represents the Committee’s specific recommendations for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES
[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 budget request	Committee recommendation
Food Safety Inspection:			
Federal	831,152	850,530	872,150

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 budget request	Committee recommendation
State	63,421	65,703	65,703
International	18,464	18,916	18,916
PHDCIS	12,970	12,970	12,970
Codex Alimentarius	3,735	3,827	3,827
Total	929,742	951,946	973,566

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN
AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

Appropriations, 2008	\$628,000
Budget estimate, 2009	695,000
Committee recommendation	646,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's international affairs (except for foreign economic development) and commodity programs. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Farm Service Agency (including the Commodity Credit Corporation), Risk Management Agency, and the Foreign Agricultural Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$646,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

The Farm Service Agency [FSA] was established October 3, 1994, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, Public Law 103-354. The FSA administers a variety of activities, such as the commodity price support and production adjustment programs financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation; the Conservation Reserve Program [CRP]; the Emergency Conservation Program; the Commodity Operation Programs including the warehouse examination function; farm ownership, farm operating, emergency disaster, and other loan programs; and the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program [NAP], which provides crop loss protection for growers of many crops for which crop insurance is not available. In addition, FSA currently provides certain administrative support services to the Foreign Agricultural Service [FAS] and to the Risk Management Agency [RMA].

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriations	Transfers from program accounts	Total, FSA, sala- ries, and expenses
Appropriations, 2008	\$1,125,705,000	304,188,000	1,429,893,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,188,580,000	332,946,000	1,521,526,000
Committee recommendation	1,164,123,000	331,547,000	1,495,670,000

The account Salaries and Expenses, Farm Service Agency, funds the administrative expenses of program administration and other functions assigned to FSA. The funds consist of appropriations and transfers from the CCC export credit guarantees, Public Law 480 loans, and agricultural credit insurance fund program accounts, and miscellaneous advances from other sources. All administrative funds used by FSA are consolidated into one account. The consolidation provides clarity and better management and control of funds, and facilitates accounting, fiscal, and budgetary work by eliminating the necessity for making individual allocations and allotments and maintaining and recording obligations and expenditures under numerous separate accounts.

The Committee, again, fully funds the information technology [IT] needs requested in the President’s budget proposal. The Committee remains aware of the unstable status of the Farm Service Agency computer system which is responsible for the calculation and tracking of the agency’s payments to agricultural producers, and which has resulted in disruption of services to U.S. farmers and ranchers. The Department continues to submit inadequate and inconsistent budget requests for this deteriorating system and has shown an extreme lack of cooperation with this Committee in an effort to resolve this devolving situation. The Committee continues to stand willing to work with the Department to stabilize and modernize the system whenever this growing problem reaches a level of importance within the Department that matches the one it has long since reached in this Committee.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,164,123,000 for salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency.

Conservation Reserve Program.—As the value of land has risen over several consecutive years, some Conservation Reserve Program [CRP] participants have recognized the financial advantage of breaking their contract and returning environmentally sensitive land to production. As this trend shows no sign of reversing in the near future, it is appropriate to determine the effects of recalculating CRP payment rates for existing contracts where the surveyed value of land is above the established payment rate for 3 consecutive years. The Committee directs the Farm Service Agency to issue a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act to assess the effects such a policy change would have on program costs, early withdrawal rates, and future participation.

National Agriculture Imagery Program.—The Committee recommends that funds be allocated to purchase high resolution satellite imagery data or products to meet programmatic requirements. The acquisition of high resolution satellite imagery will also encourage the development of second generation imagery satellites, which is key to preparing our Nation’s agricultural economy to keep pace with 21st century technological innovation.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$4,369,000
Budget estimate, 2009	4,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,369,000

This program is authorized under title V of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.). Originally designed to address agricultural credit disputes, the program was expanded by the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-354) to include other agricultural issues such as wetland determinations, conservation compliance, rural water loan programs, grazing on National Forest System lands, and pesticides. The authorization for this program was extended through fiscal year 2010 by Public Law 109-17. Grants are made to States whose mediation programs have been certified by the FSA. Grants will be solely for operation and administration of the State's agricultural mediation program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,369,000 for State Mediation Grants.

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$3,687,000
Budget estimate, 2009	
Committee recommendation	3,687,000

This program is intended to assist in the protection of ground-water through State rural water associations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,687,000 for Grassroots Source Water Protection.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$100,000
Budget estimate, 2009	100,000
Committee recommendation	400,000

Under the program, the Department makes indemnification payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products who, through no fault of their own, suffer losses because they are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets due to contamination of their products by registered pesticides. The program also authorizes indemnity payments to dairy farmers for losses resulting from the removal of cows or dairy products from the market due to nuclear radiation or fallout.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$400,000 for the Dairy Indemnity Program.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account is used to provide direct and guaranteed farm ownership, farm operating, and emergency loans to individuals, as well as the following types of loans to associations: irrigation and drainage, grazing, Indian tribe land acquisition, and boll weevil eradication.

FSA is also authorized to provide financial assistance to borrowers by guaranteeing loans made by private lenders having a

contract of guarantee from FSA as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The following programs are financed through this fund:

Boll Weevil Eradication Loans.—Made to assist foundations in financing the operations of the boll weevil eradication programs provided to farmers.

Credit Sales of Acquired Property.—Property is sold out of inventory and is made available to an eligible buyer by providing FSA loans.

Emergency Loans.—Made to producers to aid recovery from production and physical losses due to drought, flooding, other natural disasters, or quarantine. The loans may be used to: restore or replace essential property; pay all or part of production costs associated with the disaster year; pay essential family living expenses; reorganize the farming operation; and refinance certain debts.

Farm Operating Loans.—Provide short-to-intermediate term production or chattel credit to farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere, to improve their farm and home operations, and to develop or maintain a reasonable standard of living. The term of the loan varies from 1 to 7 years.

Farm Ownership Loans.—Made to borrowers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere to restructure their debts, improve or purchase farms, refinance nonfarm enterprises which supplement but do not supplant farm income, or make additions to farms. Loans are made for 40 years or less.

Indian Tribe Land Acquisition Loans.—Made to any Indian tribe recognized by the Secretary of the Interior or tribal corporation established pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act (Public Law 93-638) which does not have adequate uncommitted funds to acquire lands or interest in lands within the tribe's reservation or Alaskan Indian community, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, for use of the tribe or the corporation or the members thereof.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a total loan level of \$3,427,584,000 for programs within the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account.

The following table reflects the program levels for farm credit programs administered by the Farm Service Agency recommended by the Committee, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and the budget request levels:

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 budget	Committee recommendation
Farm ownership:			
Direct	222,298	252,902	222,298
Guaranteed	1,238,768	1,223,636	1,238,768
Farm Operating:			
Direct	575,095	628,372	575,095
Guaranteed unsubsidized	1,017,497	1,012,369	1,017,497
Guaranteed subsidized	269,986	260,943	269,986
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition	3,940	3,975	3,940

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 budget	Committee recommendation
Boll Weevil Eradication	100,000	59,400	100,000
Total, Farm Loans	3,427,584	3,441,597	3,427,584

LOAN SUBSIDIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Subsidies			Administrative expenses		Total ACIF
	Direct loan	Guaranteed loan	Total	Appropriations	Transfer to FSA	
Appropriations, 2008	82,996	65,594	148,590	309,051	301,186	457,641
Budget estimate, 2009	88,801	65,230	154,031	333,013	325,093	487,044
Committee recommendation	80,767	66,655	147,422	331,559	323,694	478,981

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the program account. Appropriations to this account are used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed, as well as for administrative expenses.

The following table reflects the cost of loan programs under credit reform:

[In thousands of dollars]

	2008 enacted	2009 budget	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:			
Farm ownership:			
Direct	9,982	14,466	12,715
Guaranteed	4,955	4,038	4,088
Farm operating:			
Direct	72,980	74,085	67,804
Guaranteed unsubsidized	24,623	25,208	25,336
Guaranteed subsidized	36,016	35,984	37,231
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition	124	250	248
Boll Weevil Eradication			
Total, loan subsidies	148,590	154,031	147,422
ACIF expenses	309,051	333,013	331,559

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Appropriations, 2008	\$76,048,000
Budget estimate, 2009	77,177,000
Committee recommendation	77,177,000

The Risk Management Agency performs administrative functions relative to the Federal crop insurance program that is authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508), as amended by the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 [ARPA], Public Law 106-224, and the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246).

ARPA authorized significant changes in the crop insurance program. This act provides higher government subsidies for producer premiums to make coverage more affordable; expands research and development for new insurance products and under-served areas

through contracts with the private sector; and tightens compliance. Functional areas of risk management are: research and development; insurance services; and compliance, whose functions include policy formulation and procedures and regulations development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$77,177,000 for the Risk Management Agency.

Data Mining.—The Committee includes bill language to allow up to \$11,166,000 of the unobligated funds of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund to be used for program compliance and integrity purposes, including the data mining projects, and for the Common Information Management System.

Pest Information Platform for Education and Extension [PIPE].—The Pest Information Platform for Education and Extension [PIPE] is a monitoring and early-warning system developed to alert farmers to the presence and spread of soybean rust and other pests. The Committee encourages RMA to continue the PIPE program in fiscal year 2009.

CORPORATIONS

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2008 ¹	\$4,818,099,000
Budget estimate, 2009 ¹	6,582,945,000
Committee recommendation ¹	6,582,945,000

¹ Current estimate. Such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, are provided.

The Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended by the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act of 1994, authorizes the payment of expenses which may include indemnity payments, loss adjustment, delivery expenses, program-related research and development, startup costs for implementing this legislation such as studies, pilot projects, data processing improvements, public outreach, and related tasks and functions.

All program costs, except for Federal salaries and expenses, are mandatory expenditures subject to appropriation.

Producers of insurable crops are eligible to receive a basic level of protection against catastrophic losses, which cover 50 percent of the normal yield at 55 percent of the expected price. The only cost to the producer is an administrative fee of \$100 per crop per policy.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated to be \$6,582,945,000 for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

The Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] is a wholly owned Government corporation created in 1933 to stabilize, support, and protect farm income and prices; to help maintain balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, including products, foods, feeds, and fibers; and to help in the orderly distribution of

these commodities. CCC was originally incorporated under a Delaware charter and was reincorporated June 30, 1948, as a Federal corporation within the Department of Agriculture by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, approved June 29, 1948 (15 U.S.C. 714).

The Commodity Credit Corporation engages in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to agricultural commodities, their products, food, feed, and fibers. Its purposes include stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices; maintaining the balance and adequate supplies of selected commodities; and facilitating the orderly distribution of such commodities. In addition, the Corporation makes available materials and facilities required in connection with the storage and distribution of such commodities. The Corporation also disburses funds for sharing of costs with producers for the establishment of approved conservation practices on environmentally sensitive land and subsequent rental payments for such land for the duration of Conservation Reserve Program contracts.

Corporation activities are primarily governed by the following statutes: the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (Public Law 80-806), as amended; the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law 81-439), as amended (1949 Act); the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (Public Law 75-430), as amended (the 1938 Act); the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198), as amended (1985 Act); and the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246).

Management of the Corporation is vested in a board of directors, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is an ex officio director and chairman of the board. The board consists of seven members, in addition to the Secretary, who are appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate. Officers of the Corporation are designated according to their positions in the Department of Agriculture.

The activities of the Corporation are carried out mainly by the personnel and through the facilities of the Farm Service Agency [FSA] and the Farm Service Agency State and county committees. The Foreign Agricultural Service, the General Sales Manager, other agencies and offices of the Department, and commercial agents are also used to carry out certain aspects of the Corporation's activities.

Under Public Law 87-155 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12), annual appropriations are authorized for each fiscal year, commencing with fiscal year 1961. These appropriations are to reimburse the Corporation for net realized losses.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

Appropriations, 2008 ¹	\$12,983,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009 ¹	11,106,324,000
Committee recommendation ¹	11,106,324,000

¹ Current estimate. Such sums as may be necessary are provided.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated in fiscal year 2009 to be \$11,106,324,000, for the payment to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

Limitation, 2008	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

The Commodity Credit Corporation's [CCC] hazardous waste management program is intended to ensure compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.). The CCC funds operations and maintenance costs as well as site investigation and cleanup expenses. Investigative and cleanup costs associated with the management of CCC hazardous waste are also paid from USDA's hazardous waste management appropriation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$5,000,000 for Commodity Credit Corporation hazardous waste management.

FARM STORAGE FACILITY LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2008	
Budget estimate, 2009	\$4,724,000
Committee recommendation	4,724,000

The Farm Storage Facility Loan Program [FSFL], originally established in 1949, was discontinued in the early 1980's pending adequate capacity, and re-established in fiscal year 2000 to address current storage space shortages. Federal Government subsidy costs supporting this program are estimated pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act [FCRA] of 1990 (Public Law 101-508, sec. 13201, et seq.) (2 U.S.C. 661, et seq.). The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 directed the CCC to establish a Sugar Storage Facility Loan Program to provide financing for domestic processors to construct and improve sugar storage and handling facilities. Administrative expenses for this program have been included in the Salaries and Expenses account of the Farm Service Agency [FSA], which administers the program. Following OMB guidance (Circular A-11), FSA recently moved these expenses to the FSFL account to comply with FCRA section 504(g) direction that all funding for an agency's administration of a direct loan or loan guarantee program shall be displayed as distinct and separately identified subaccounts within the same budget account as the program's cost (2 U.S.C. 661c).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,724,000 for administration of the Farm Storage Facility Loan Program.

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Appropriations, 2008	\$737,000
Budget estimate, 2009	822,000
Committee recommendation	758,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to natural resources and the environment. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$758,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.

Atlantic Salmon Recovery.—The Committee supports the goals of the Penobscot River Restoration Project in the State of Maine. This project will restore nearly 1,000 miles of habitat in the Penobscot watershed for endangered Atlantic salmon and six other species of sea-run fish and 100 percent of the historic habitat in Maine’s largest river system for four additional species. The Committee encourages NRCS to improve migratory fish habitat in this watershed, including the purchase of dams and the removal of impediments to passage, by utilizing all appropriate funding sources.

Houlka Master Watershed Project.—The Committee directs the Department to provide monthly updates on its execution of section 731 of this act.

Wetlands Reserve Program.—The Committee strongly encourages the NRCS to establish a demonstration pilot program utilizing rapid growth reforestation technology.

Wetlands Reserve Program Assessments.—In February 2006, the Secretary announced a change in the Wetlands Reserve Program that would take into account the value of recreational and similar uses in determining the appraised value of easements offered under this program. The Committee directs the Secretary to minimize the effect this change will have in regard to geographical participation in the Wetlands Reserve Program and report to the Committee within 120 days of enactment of this act on the impact this policy change may have on utilization of this program in all regions of the country and the steps taken to minimize such change.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] was established pursuant to Public Law 103–354, the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6962). The NRCS works with conservation districts, watershed groups, and Federal and State agencies to bring about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide for agricultural production on a sustained basis, and reduce flood damage and sedimentation.

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2008	\$834,013,000
Budget estimate, 2009	794,773,000
Committee recommendation	866,899,000

Conservation operations are authorized by Public Law 74–46 (16 U.S.C. 590a–590f). Activities include:

Conservation Technical Assistance.—Provides assistance to district cooperators and other land users in the planning and application of conservation treatments to control erosion and improve the quantity and quality of soil resources, improve and conserve water, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, conserve energy, improve woodland, pasture and range conditions, and reduce upstream flooding; all to protect and enhance the natural resource base.

Inventory and monitoring provides soil, water, and related resource data for land conservation, use, and development; guidance of community development; identification of prime agricultural producing areas that should be protected; environmental quality protection; and for the issuance of periodic inventory reports of resource conditions.

Resource appraisal and program development ensures that programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the conservation of soil, water, and related resources shall respond to the Nation's long-term needs.

Plant Materials Centers.—Assembles, tests, and encourages increased use of plant species which show promise for use in the treatment of conservation problem areas.

Snow Survey and Water Forecasting.—Provides estimates of annual water availability from high mountain snow packs and relates to summer stream flow in the western States and Alaska. Information is used by agriculture, industry, and cities in estimating future water supplies.

Soil Surveys.—Inventories the Nation's basic soil resources and determines land capabilities and conservation treatment needs. Soil survey publications include interpretations useful to cooperators, other Federal agencies, State, and local organizations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$866,899,000 for Conservation Operations.

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends funding, as specified below, for new and ongoing conservation activities. Amounts recommended by the Committee for specific conservation

measures shall be in addition to levels otherwise made available to States.

Agricultural Development and Resource Conservation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$400,000 to continue a community-based agricultural development and resource conservation program with the four RC&D Councils in Hawaii.

Agricultural Wildlife Conservation Center [AWCC].—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for the AWCC. The AWCC is part of NRCS and supports the development of wildlife habitat technology through a competitive grants program available to many cooperative conservation partners, including fish and wildlife conservation groups, universities, and State agencies. The AWCC will ensure new technology is available to farmers and ranchers nationwide through NRCS field offices.

Alaska Association of Conservation Districts.—The Committee recommendation includes \$920,000 for conservation efforts in the State of Alaska. This project assists conservation district cooperators and other land users in the planning and application of conservation treatments.

Big Sandy Tri-State Watershed Inventory and Analysis.—The Committee recommendation includes \$115,000 for the Big Sandy Tri-State Watershed. This project will initiate watershed inventory and analysis activities, which include identifying abandoned mine lands, assessing associated water quality impacts, and coordinating with partners to complete the master plan

Carson City Waterfall Fire Restoration.—The Committee recommendation includes \$287,000 for the Carson City erosion control project in the State of Nevada. The purpose of this project is to develop a plan for preventing wildfires, manage erosion control, and reforestation.

Certified Environmental Management Systems for Agriculture.—The Committee recommendation includes \$300,000 for Certified Environmental Management Systems for Agriculture. This project guides the producer through planning, implementing, evaluating and reviewing business decisions that affect the environment.

Chenier Plain Sustainability Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$250,000 for the Chenier Plain Sustainability Initiative in the State of Louisiana. This project will restore wetlands and marshes in the Chenier Plain as well as the replanting of native grasses.

Conservation Internships.—The Committee recommendation includes \$120,000 for conservation internships. Together with State and local resources, these funds provide internships for college students preparing for careers in natural resource management. This real world training helps these emerging natural resource professionals navigate the day-to-day challenges faced by farmers and Federal, State, and local natural resource planners.

Conservation Outreach and Education.—The Committee recommendation includes \$215,000 for a conservation outreach and education program in the City of Foley, Alabama. The goal of this project is to increase awareness of the importance of conservation practices through the development of an educational conservation program and teaching facilities.

Conservation Planning.—The Committee recommendation includes \$450,000 for cranberry conservation work in the States of Wisconsin and Massachusetts. The purpose of this project is to help farmers increase cranberry production while reducing the effects on the environment. Cranberry growers can develop conservation plans to ensure that cranberry cultivation is done in a manner that protects water quality, prevents soil erosion and manages nutrient and pesticide use.

Conservation Technical Assistance.—The Committee recommendation includes \$251,000 for conservation technical assistance in the State of New Jersey. These funds will address water quality issues and small farm operations. In addition, funding will provide technical assistance towards agricultural operations in the New Jersey Highlands.

Conservation Technology Transfer.—The Committee recommendation includes \$550,000 for conservation technology transfer in the State of Wisconsin. This program brings together NRCS, the University of Wisconsin Extension, and the University of Wisconsin Platteville in a collaborative effort to demonstrate effective conservation practices. Working on real farms under a variety of cropping and land use systems, they help farmers adopt effective conservation practices that have been tested under their local conditions.

Delta Conservation Demonstration.—The Committee recommendation includes \$400,000 for a demonstration project in Washington County, Mississippi. This project will develop an education and training program for the short and long term natural resources conservation training needs of the NRCS, the Mississippi Soil and Water Conservation Commission, and the Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

Delta Water Study.—The Committee recommendation includes \$250,000 for the Delta Water Study. The purpose of this study is to support and expedite the survey, design, and installation of weirs in Williams Bayou in Washington County, Bee Lake in Holmes County, both in the State of Mississippi, and other activities as part of the Delta Study objectives.

Driftless Area Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$310,000 for conservation in the Driftless area in the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota. This project will help to reduce the significant soil erosion, sedimentation, and run-off affecting water quality in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. Excess sediment and nutrients severely damage local rivers and wetlands, and are being washed down the Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico.

Environmental Compliance.—The Committee recommendation includes \$220,000 for environmental compliance in the State of Wisconsin. This project helps agriculture producers comply with Federal, State and local land use and environmental protection initiatives. Together they will develop a model “one stop” program which will help producers efficiently navigate these changing and multi-faceted requirements.

Farm Viability Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$251,000 for a farm viability program in the State of Vermont. This program helps producers assess the long-term via-

bility of their farming operation by implementing plans to improve their long-term business prospects.

Georgia Soil and Water Commission.—The Committee recommendation includes \$800,000 for a cooperative agreement in the State of Georgia. This project provides agricultural water storage facilities for irrigation of cropland and improves the efficiencies of existing irrigation systems.

Gilbert M. Grosvenor Center for Geographic Education Watershed Project.—The Committee recommendation includes \$300,000 for watershed projects in the State of Texas. This project will address pressing issues related to the nearly 300 watershed in Texas that have been identified as impaired, threatened or at-risk. The impact includes unsafe water supplies, degraded fisheries, river and reservoir siltation, and impaired habitat.

Grazing Land Conservation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$780,000 for grazing land conservation activities in the State of Wisconsin. This project supports applied research, on-farm demonstrations, education activities, and technical services through the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to support producers wishing to switch to a grazing system or wanting to enhance their existing systems.

Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$9,930,000 for the grazing lands conservation initiative.

Great Lakes Basin Soil and Erosion Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$430,000 for Great Lakes Basin soil and erosion control. Sediment from agriculture is a major contaminant in drinking water. The goal of this program is to prevent soil, nitrogen, and phosphorus from entering the Great Lakes and regional waters by reducing soil erosion and controlling sedimentation. The Committee expects that funding for this project include appropriate accountability provisions, including a full reporting of conservation measures implemented and demonstrable accomplishments.

Green River Water Quality and Biological Diversity Project.—The Committee recommendation includes \$89,000 for a cooperative agreement in the State of Kentucky. The goal of this project is to monitor the water quality and biological diversity of the Green River and surrounding watershed to evaluate the effectiveness of State conservation efforts to limit erosion in the watershed and mitigate pesticide and nutrient loading from nearby agricultural operations.

Hungry Canyons Alliance.—The Committee recommendation includes \$300,000 to address soil erosion in the Loess Hills area in the State of Iowa. Streambed degradation in the loess soils of western Iowa has caused damage to infrastructure and loss of land. The goal of this project is to provide financial and technical assistance for streambed stabilization projects; to conduct research in effective methods of streambed stabilization; and to provide demonstration of streambed stabilization projects.

Illinois River Agricultural Water Conservation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$200,000 for the Illinois River Agricultural Water Conservation Project in the State of Illinois. The goal of this project is to conduct wetland demonstration projects to protect against flood damage, reduce soil erosion and improve water

quality associated with the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers; and to facilitate landowner adoption of multi-purpose soil, water and wetland conservation practices in cooperation with local soil and water conservation districts.

Kentucky Soil Erosion Control.—The Committee recommendation includes \$771,000 for soil erosion control in the State of Kentucky. The goal of this project is to plan, design, construct, and implement best management practices to protect the resource base and provide environmental benefits.

Little Wood River Irrigation District Gravity Pressure Delivery System.—The Committee recommendation includes \$143,000 for a gravity delivery system in the State of Idaho. This project will convert an open canal gravity delivery system to a closed gravity pressurized system which will result in energy and water savings.

Mississippi Conservation Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,218,000 for the Mississippi Conservation Initiative. This project assists several cities and towns in Mississippi with drainage improvements. The improvements consist of water retention ponds, de-snagging, repair and technical assistance of existing dams, and assistance with project development on several sites.

Molokai Agriculture Development and Resource Conservation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$71,000 for agriculture development and resource conservation on the Island of Molokai, Hawaii.

Municipal Water District of Orange County for Efficient Irrigation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$143,000 for a water conservation and efficient irrigation project in the State of California. The goal of this project is to conserve 30,000 acre-feet of water in Orange County, California.

National Geospatial Development Center.—The Committee encourages NRCS to continue activities at the National Geospatial Development Center in Morgantown, West Virginia.

Nitrate Pollution Reduction.—The Committee recommendation includes \$165,000 for nitrate pollution reduction in the State of Rhode Island. This project would permit NRCS to work with the University of Rhode Island, agricultural producers, and rural residents to develop nitrate control strategies that reduce nitrate contamination in aquifers and watersheds.

On-farm Management Systems Evaluation Network.—The Committee recommendation includes \$150,000 for an On-Farm Management Systems Evaluation Network. The purpose of this project is to coordinate a network of growers using GPS, yield monitors, and remote sensing technologies to improve nitrogen management in corn.

Operation Oak Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$100,000 for the Operation Oak Program. This program supplies oak and other mast producing hardwood species seedlings to landowners to meet the needs of timber production and wildlife management and to reverse the decline of hardwood regeneration in the South.

Phosphorous Loading in Lake Champlain.—The Committee recommendation includes \$179,000 to reduce phosphorous loadings to Lake Champlain in the State of Vermont. The phosphorous levels

in parts of Lake Champlain are so high that they cause excessive algal growth causing accelerated aging of the lake. The goal of this project is to find new agricultural and wastewater management technologies to reduce phosphorous in the lake.

Plant Material Centers.—The Committee recommendation includes \$10,928,000 for NRCS plant material centers. In addition, \$113,000 is included for the Hawaii Plant Material Center.

Potomac River Tributary Strategy.—The Committee recommendation includes \$179,000 for Potomac River tributary strategy in the State of West Virginia. This project will assist agriculture producers in the Potomac Highlands to develop Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans to address water quality issues in the Potomac River and the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

Riparian Restoration.—The Committee recommendation includes \$179,000 for riparian restoration along the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian Rivers in the State of New Mexico. This project emphasizes restoration of areas affected by invasive species.

Risk Management Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$717,000 for a risk management initiative in the State of West Virginia. This project provides on-farm technical assistance to educate producers about planning better pasture and livestock management to enhance economic development and protect the environment.

Sand County Foundation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$950,000 for the Sand County Foundation. This project is operating a multi-year, multi-State experiment to demonstrate, test, and evaluate the cost effectiveness of techniques to reduce runoff of nitrogen from agricultural practices.

Soil Phosphorus Studies.—The Committee recommendation includes \$215,000 for soil phosphorus studies in the State of West Virginia. This project supports farm operators, particularly poultry and beef, to meet environmental regulations regarding the management of phosphorus on their lands by conducting soil analysis and building technical information specific to the State.

Snow Survey.—The Committee recommendation includes \$10,806,000 for snow surveys.

Soil Survey.—The Committee recommendation includes \$92,229,000 for nationwide soil surveys. In addition, \$143,000 is included for soil surveys in the State of Rhode Island and \$200,000 for soil surveys in the State of Wyoming.

Technical Assistance Grants.—The Committee recommendation includes \$580,000 for technical assistance grants to Kentucky Soil Conservation Districts. These funds will assist landowners with the planning, design, and implementation of best management practices to protect natural resources and ensure that producers participating in farm bill conservation programs receive adequate technical assistance.

Utah Conservation Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,617,000 for the Utah Conservation Initiative. This project funds conservation projects throughout Utah, including work focusing on water quality and quantity; invasive species; and range, riparian, and wildlife habitat restoration.

Water Conservation.—The Committee recommendation includes \$400,000 for a water conservation project in the State of Colorado.

Because of declining water availability in the South Platte River Basin, combined with increasing demand for water by competing interests, the implementation of new conservation technologies is necessary. The goal of this project is to allow the resumption of use of irrigation wells for agriculture and continued water management for competing users.

Watershed Demonstration Project.—The Committee recommendation includes \$143,000 for a watershed demonstration project in the State of Iowa. The goal of this project is to document and demonstrate progress in meeting national water quality objectives for agriculture at a watershed level. The means to accomplish this involves a partnership effort with local producers, industry, researchers, and government agencies.

Water Quality.—The Committee recommendation includes \$251,000 to improve water quality through the Utah confined animal feed operation/animal feeding operation pilot project.

Wildlife Habitat Improvement.—The Committee recommendation includes \$200,000 for wildlife habitat improvement in the State of Illinois. Wildlife professionals are concerned about the rapid decline of prairie-dependent wildlife and plants. This project would allow for hundreds of thousands of additional acres of wildlife habitat to be improved creating miles of corridors of natural prairie.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2008	\$29,790,000
Budget estimate, 2009	
Committee recommendation	29,790,000

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.) (16 U.S.C. 1001–1005, 1007–1009) provides for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and their political subdivisions in a program to prevent erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds or rivers and streams and to further the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service has general responsibility for administration of activities, which include cooperation with local sponsors, State, and other public agencies in the installation of planned works of improvement to reduce erosion, floodwater, and sediment damage; conserve, develop, utilize, and dispose of water; plan and install works of improvement for flood prevention, including the development of recreational facilities and the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat; and loans to local organizations to help finance the local share of the cost of carrying out planned watershed and flood prevention works of improvement.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$29,790,000 for Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations.

Of this amount the following are provided: \$1,000,000 for Churchill Woods Dam Removal, Illinois; \$1,500,000 for Dunlop Creek Watershed Project, West Virginia; \$1,650,000 for East Locust Creek, Missouri; \$350,000 for Little Otter Creek, Missouri; \$8,500,000 for Lost River, West Virginia; \$206,000 for Lower

Hamakua Ditch Watershed, Hawaii; \$350,000 for Pocasset River Watershed, Rhode Island; \$206,000 for Upcountry Maui Watershed, Hawaii; and \$500,000 for Upper Locust Creek, Missouri.

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$19,860,000
Budget estimate, 2009	5,920,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

The watershed rehabilitation program account provides for technical and financial assistance to carry out rehabilitation of structural measures, in accordance with section 14 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, approved August 4, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1012, U.S.C. 1001, et seq.), as amended by section 313 of Public Law 106-472, November 9, 2000, and by section 2803 of Public Law 110-246.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the Watershed Rehabilitation Program. In addition to this appropriation \$30,000,000 of mandatory funding is provided under the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

The Committee directs that funding under this program be provided for rehabilitation of structures determined to be of high priority need in order to protect property and ensure public safety.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2008	\$50,730,000
Budget estimate, 2009	
Committee recommendation	50,730,000

The Natural Resources Conservation Service has general responsibility under provisions of section 102, title I of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.), for developing overall work plans for resource conservation and development projects in cooperation with local sponsors; to help develop local programs of land conservation and utilization; to assist local groups and individuals in carrying out such plans and programs; to conduct surveys and investigations relating to the conditions and factors affecting such work on private lands; and to make loans to project sponsors for conservation and development purposes and to individual operators for establishing soil and water conservation practices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$50,730,000 for Resource Conservation and Development.

HEALTHY FORESTS RESERVE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$1,986,000
Budget estimate, 2009	
Committee recommendation	1,986,000

The Healthy Forests Reserve Program [HFRP] was authorized by title V of Public Law 108-148 (16 U.S.C. 6571-6578). The purpose of the HFRP is to restore and enhance forest ecosystems to promote the recovery of threatened and endangered species; to improve bio-

diversity; and to enhance carbon sequestration. The program operates on a voluntary basis with private landowners utilizing cost-share agreements or easements of varying duration. The Federal Government assists participating landowners with the cost of the approved conservation practices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,986,000 for the Healthy Forests Reserve Program.

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–354) abolished the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Development Administration, and Rural Electrification Administration and replaced those agencies with the Rural Housing and Community Development Service, (currently, the Rural Housing Service), Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service (currently, the Rural Business—Cooperative Service), and Rural Utilities Service and placed them under the oversight of the Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development, (currently, Rural Development). These agencies deliver a variety of programs through a network of State, district, and county offices.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2008	\$628,000
Budget estimate, 2009	695,000
Committee recommendation	646,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's rural economic and community development activities. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Rural Housing Service, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, and the Rural Utilities Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$646,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.

Renewable Energy.—The Committee is concerned about the effects high corn prices, due in large part to the use of corn in ethanol production, are having on other areas of agriculture, namely increased livestock feed prices, reductions in the effectiveness of food aid resources, and increased costs associated with domestic nutrition programs such as the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. The Committee encourages the Department to focus on a broad range of renewable fuel feedstocks as part of their various renewable fuel programs to the extent practicable.

Rural Housing.—The Committee is aware of the severe flooding that took place in the town of Fort Kent, Maine, which resulted in major evacuations, displacement, and damaged housing for many residents. The Committee urges the department to assist with community efforts to rebuild multi-family and single-family housing.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee recognizes that the community of Tchula, Mississippi, has requested technical and programmatic assistance for housing, business, telecommunication, and other essential community needs. The Committee expects the Secretary to provide additional resources, and encourages the use of available national reserve funds.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 appropriation	2009 budget request	
Appropriation	168,722	258,185	210,748
Transfer from:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Loan Program Account	449,609	399,422	449,757
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Program Account	38,339	37,819	38,353
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account	4,739	4,574	4,741
Total RD salaries and expenses	661,409	700,000	703,599

These funds are used to administer the loan and grant programs of the Rural Utilities Service, the Rural Housing Service, and the Rural Business—Cooperative Service, including reviewing applications, making and collecting loans and providing technical assistance and guidance to borrowers; and to assist in extending other Federal programs to people in rural areas.

Under credit reform, administrative costs associated with loan programs are appropriated to the program accounts. Appropriations to the salaries and expenses account will be for costs associated with grant programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends \$703,599,000 for salaries and expenses of Rural Development, including a direct appropriation of \$210,748,000.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

The Rural Housing Service [RHS] was established under the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, dated October 13, 1994.

The mission of the Service is to improve the quality of life in rural America by assisting rural residents and communities in obtaining adequate and affordable housing and access to needed community facilities. The goals and objectives of the Service are: (1) facilitate the economic revitalization of rural areas by providing direct and indirect economic benefits to individual borrowers, families, and rural communities; (2) assure that benefits are communicated to all program eligible customers with special outreach efforts to target resources to underserved, impoverished, or economically declining rural areas; (3) lower the cost of programs while retaining the benefits by redesigning more effective programs that work in partnership with State and local governments and the pri-

vate sector; and (4) leverage the economic benefits through the use of low-cost credit programs, especially guaranteed loans.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a loan and grant level of \$6,705,503,000 for the Rural Housing Service housing programs.

Section 502 Single Family Housing Programs.—The Committee recommends \$1,121,488,000 for Direct Single Family Housing loans and \$4,190,521,000 for Unsubsidized Guaranteed Single Family Housing loans.

Section 515/Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program.—The Committee recommends \$27,714,000 to continue the Department's efforts to address the preservation of the section 515 portfolio through financial options to project owners, including vouchers. The Committee recommends \$4,965,000 for rural housing vouchers, \$2,889,000 for the multi-family revolving loan program, and \$19,860,000 to restructure existing section 515 loans.

The Committee recommends \$69,510,000 for the section 515 program. In recent years a substantial amount of the section 515 appropriation has been used for needed repairs and rehabilitation in the portfolio. The Committee believes project rehabilitation can be more effectively performed through the revitalization initiative. To that end, funding that would have been used for section 515 repair and rehabilitation is provided directly to the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program Account.

The following table presents loan and grant program levels recommended by the Committee, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 levels and the 2009 budget request:

LOAN AND GRANT LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008	2009 request	
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account loan levels:			
Single family housing (sec. 502):			
Direct	1,121,486	1,121,488
Guaranteed	4,190,521	4,848,899	4,190,521
Housing Repair (Sec. 504)	34,409	17,678	34,409
Multi-family Housing guarantees (Sec. 538)	129,090	300,000	129,090
Rental housing (Sec. 515)	69,510	69,510
Site loans (Sec. 524)	5,045	5,045	5,045
Credit Sales of acquired property	11,476	11,476	11,476
Self-help land development fund	4,965	4,303	4,965
Farm labor housing:			
Loans	27,545	17,798
Grants	9,930	7,500
Multi-family housing revitalization:			
Rural housing vouchers	4,965	4,965
Multi-family housing preservation	19,860	19,860
Revolving loans	6,422	6,422
Mutual and Self Help Housing	38,727	38,727
Rental assistance	478,715	997,000	1,005,000
Rural housing assistance grants	38,727	43,500	38,727
Total, rural housing loans and grants	6,737,270	6,720,301	6,705,503

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

This fund was established in 1965 (Public Law 89–117) pursuant to section 517 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 517(d)), as amended. This fund may be used to insure or guarantee rural housing loans for single-family homes, rental and cooperative housing, and rural housing sites. Rural housing loans are made to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and essential farm service buildings that are modest in size, design, and cost. Rental housing insured loans are made to individuals, corporations, associations, trusts, or partnerships to provide moderate-cost rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons in rural areas. These loans are repayable in terms up to 30 years. Loan programs are limited to rural areas, which include towns, villages, and other places of not more than 10,000 population, which are not part of an urban area. Loans may also be made in areas with a population in excess of 10,000, but less than 20,000, if the area is not included in a standard metropolitan statistical area and has a serious lack of mortgage credit for low- and moderate-income borrowers.

LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508) established the RHIF program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in 2009, as well as for administrative expenses. The following table presents the loan subsidy levels as compared to the 2008 levels and the 2009 budget request:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Loan subsidies:			
Single family (sec. 502):			
Direct	105,083	75,364
Guaranteed	50,047	13,526	53,042
Housing Repair (Sec. 504)	9,727	4,750	9,246
Multi-family Housing guarantees (Sec. 538)	12,134	1,710	20,241
Rental housing (Sec. 515)	29,618	28,610
Site loans (Sec. 524)
Credit Sales of acquired property	548	523	533
Multi-family housing revitalization	27,804	27,714
Self-help land development fund	141	71	82
Total, loan subsidies	235,102	20,580	214,832
Administrative expenses	449,609	399,422	449,757

FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Grants
Appropriations, 2008	\$27,545,000	\$11,916,000	\$9,930,000
Budget estimate, 2009
Committee recommendation	17,798,000	7,500,000	7,500,000

The direct farm labor housing loan program is authorized under section 514 and the rural housing for domestic farm labor housing

grant program is authorized under section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The loans, grants, and contracts are made to public and private nonprofit organizations for low-rent housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor. Grant assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of a project. Loans and grants may be used for construction of new structures, site acquisition and development, rehabilitation of existing structures, and purchase of furnishings and equipment for dwellings, dining halls, community rooms, and infirmaries.

Under credit reform, administrative costs associated with loan programs are appropriated to the program accounts. Appropriations to the salaries and expenses account will be for costs associated with grant programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for the cost of Direct Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants.

MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$27,804,000
Budget estimate, 2009 ¹	
Committee recommendation	27,714,000

¹ The President's budget proposes to rescind \$20,000,000 from prior year appropriations.

The Rural Housing Voucher Program was authorized under the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1940r) to assist very low income families and individuals who reside in rental housing in rural areas. Housing vouchers may be provided to residents of rental housing projects financed by section 515 loans that have been pre-paid after September 30, 2005. Voucher amounts reflect the difference between comparable market rents and tenant-paid rent prior to loan prepayment. Vouchers allow tenants to remain in existing projects or move to other rental housing.

The Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program includes funding for housing vouchers, a multifamily revolving loan program, and a program for the preservation and revitalization of affordable multifamily housing projects. Rural Development's multifamily housing portfolio faces dual pressures for loan prepayments and repair/rehabilitation stemming from inadequate reserves resulting in deferred property maintenance.

Provision of affordable rental housing can be accomplished more economically by revitalizing existing housing stock rather than funding new construction. The Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program includes revitalization tools for maintenance of existing units and vouchers to protect tenants in those projects that prepay. Flexibility is provided to allow Rural Development to utilize funding among vouchers and the two programs to meet the most urgent local needs for tenant protection and project revitalization.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$27,714,000 for the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program.

By making adjustments to the Multi-Family Housing Revitalization Program, it is the intent of the Committee to recognize the

success of the preservation and revitalization program, to encourage its continuation, and remains committed to providing the Secretary the resources and options necessary to further the program's success.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$478,715,000
Budget estimate, 2009	997,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,005,000,000

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1490a) established a rural rental assistance program to be administered through the rural housing loans program. The objective of the program is to reduce rents paid by low-income families living in Rural Housing Service financed rental projects and farm labor housing projects. Under this program, low-income tenants will contribute the higher of: (1) 30 percent of monthly adjusted income; (2) 10 percent of monthly income; or (3) designated housing payments from a welfare agency.

Payments from the fund are made to the project owner for the difference between the tenant's payment and the approved rental rate established for the unit.

The program is administered in tandem with Rural Housing Service section 515 rural rental and cooperative housing programs and the farm labor loan and grant programs. Priority is given to existing projects for units occupied by rent over-burdened low-income families and projects experiencing financial difficulties beyond the control of the owner; any remaining authority will be used for projects receiving new construction commitments under sections 514, 515, or 516 for very low-income families with certain limitations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,005,000,000 for the Rental Assistance Program.

Rental Assistance.—The Committee provides funding to meet the needs of expiring and new rental assistance contracts for section 515 and 514/516 multi-family housing projects. The Committee includes statutory language requiring rental assistance to be held in 514/516 projects for a minimum period of time.

Rental assistance contracts are, again, funded for 1 year durations. One year contract durations will enable the Department to provide more accurate estimates of contract cost increases and the number of contracts expiring and requiring renewal. The large funding increase recommended over fiscal year 2008 is due to the considerable increase in contracts requiring renewal.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$38,727,000
Budget estimate, 2009
Committee recommendation	38,727,000

The Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants Program is authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949. Grants are made to local organizations to promote the development of mutual or self-help

programs under which groups of usually 6 to 10 families build their own homes by mutually exchanging labor. Funds may be used to pay the cost of construction supervisors who will work with families in the construction of their homes and for administrative expenses of the organizations providing the self-help assistance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$38,727,000 for Mutual and Self-help Housing Grants.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$38,727,000
Budget estimate, 2009	43,500,000
Committee recommendation	38,727,000

The Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program consolidates funding for rural housing grant programs. This consolidation of housing grant funding provides greater flexibility to tailor financial assistance to applicant needs.

Very Low-income Housing Repair Grants.—The Very Low-Income Housing Repair Grants Program is authorized under section 504 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The rural housing repair grant program is carried out by making grants to very low-income families to make necessary repairs to their homes in order to make such dwellings safe and sanitary, and remove hazards to the health of the occupants, their families, or the community.

These grants may be made to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a convenient and sanitary water supply, supplying screens, repairing or providing structural supports or making similar repairs, additions, or improvements, including all preliminary and installation costs in obtaining central water and sewer service. A grant can be made in combination with a section 504 very low-income housing repair loan.

No assistance can be extended to any one individual in the form of a loan, grant, or combined loans and grants in excess of \$27,500, and grant assistance is limited to persons, or families headed by persons who are 62 years of age or older.

Supervisory and Technical Assistance Grants.—Supervisory and technical assistance grants are made to public and private non-profit organizations for packaging loan applications for housing assistance under sections 502, 504, 514/516, 515, and 533 of the Housing Act of 1949. The assistance is directed to very low-income families in underserved areas where at least 20 percent of the population is below the poverty level and at least 10 percent or more of the population resides in substandard housing. In fiscal year 1994 a Homebuyer Education Program was implemented under this authority. This program provides low-income individuals and families education and counseling on obtaining and/or maintaining occupancy of adequate housing and supervised credit assistance to become successful homeowners.

Compensation for Construction Defects.—Compensation for construction defects provides funds for grants to eligible section 502 borrowers to correct structural defects, or to pay claims of owners

arising from such defects on a newly constructed dwelling purchased with RHS financial assistance. Claims are not paid until provisions under the builder's warranty have been fully pursued. Requests for compensation for construction defects must be made by the owner of the property within 18 months after the date financial assistance was granted.

Rural Housing Preservation Grants.—Rural housing preservation grants (section 533) of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1490m) authorizes the Rural Housing Service to administer a program of home repair directed at low- and very low-income people.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$38,727,000 for the Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program.

The following table compares the grant program levels recommended by the Committee to the fiscal year 2008 levels and the budget request:

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Very low-income housing repair grants	29,790	30,000	29,790
Supervisory and technical assistance grants		1,000	
Compensation for construction defects		500	
Housing preservation grants	8,937	12,000	8,937
Total	38,727	43,500	38,727

Consideration to Applications.—Rural housing loans, grants and technical assistance support site development, construction, purchase, repair and rehabilitation of single family owner-occupied, multi-family, farm labor, and congregate housing. The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications relating to the provision of safe and sanitary housing for the following: Century Community Development Partnership Affordable Housing Project (Florida), and County of Riverside, Thermal Affordable Housing (California).

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to the established review process.

In determining income eligibility requirements for the program established in Sec. 791 of Public Law 109–97, the Rural Housing Service shall give consideration for participation in the program to applicants whose household income is at or below the area's adjusted median household income level.

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2008	\$68,469,000
Budget estimate, 2009	23,767,000
Committee recommendation	67,732,000

Community facility loans were created by the Rural Development Act of 1972 (7 U.S.C. 1926 et seq.) to finance a variety of rural

community facilities. Loans are made to organizations, including certain Indian tribes and corporations not operated for profit and public and quasipublic agencies, to construct, enlarge, extend, or otherwise improve community facilities providing essential services to rural residents. Such facilities include those providing or supporting overall community development, such as fire and rescue services, healthcare, transportation, traffic control, and community, social, cultural, and recreational benefits. Loans are made for facilities which primarily serve rural residents of open country and rural towns and villages of not more than 20,000 people. Healthcare and fire and rescue facilities are the priorities of the program and receive the majority of available funds.

The Community Facility Grant Program authorized in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–127), is used in conjunction with the existing direct and guaranteed loan programs for the development of community facilities, such as hospitals, fire stations, and community centers. Grants are targeted to the lowest income communities. Communities that have lower population and income levels receive a higher cost-share contribution through these grants, to a maximum contribution of 75 percent of the cost of developing the facility.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$67,732,000 for the Rural Community Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee’s recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

RURAL COMMUNITY PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 appropriation	2009 budget request	Committee recommendations
Community facility direct loans	16,370	17,299	16,871
Community facility guaranteed loans	7,596	6,468	6,358
Community facility grants	20,373	20,373
Economic impact initiative grants	13,902	13,902
Rural community development initiative	6,256	6,256
Tribal college grants	3,972	3,972
Total	68,469	23,767	67,732

Consideration to Applications.—Community Facilities loans and grants provide financial assistance to construct, enlarge, or otherwise improve essential community facilities for health care, public safety and other essential public services. The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications relating to essential community facilities for the following: Alpena Wildlife Sanctuary Interpretive Center (Michigan), Cassia County Historical Society Museum (Idaho), City of Munising Fire/Police Building (Michigan), Deer Creek Center for Field Research and Education (Oregon), Environmental Education Center Capital Improvement Project (Michigan), Garfield County/GSENM/Park Service/Forest Service All American Bikeway (Utah), Garfield County/GSENM/Park Service Archeological & Paleontological Research Center & Educational Facility (Utah), Germfask

Township Community/Senior Center Renovation (Michigan), Howells Opera House Restoration (Idaho), Kansas Hometown Prosperity Alliance (Kansas), Lamar-Dixon Expo Center (Louisiana), Santaquin Agricultural and Equestrian Heritage Center (Utah), Senior Connection Expansion and Remodel Project (Idaho), Slidell Memorial Hospital Flood Mitigation (Louisiana), Vernonia School Reconstruction (Oregon), and Village of Calumet Heritage Site Renovation (Michigan).

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to the established review process.

RURAL BUSINESS—COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Rural Business—Cooperative Service [RBS] was established by Public Law 103-354, Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, dated October 13, 1994. Its programs were previously administered by the Rural Development Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Agricultural Cooperative Service.

The mission of the Rural Business—Cooperative Service is to enhance the quality of life for all rural residents by assisting new and existing cooperatives and other businesses through partnership with rural communities. The goals and objectives are to: (1) promote a stable business environment in rural America through financial assistance, sound business planning, technical assistance, appropriate research, education, and information; (2) support environmentally sensitive economic growth that meets the needs of the entire community; and (3) assure that the Service benefits are available to all segments of the rural community, with emphasis on those most in need.

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2008	\$87,087,000
Budget estimate, 2009	30,450,000
Committee recommendation	87,385,000

The Rural Business and Industry Loan Program was created by the Rural Development Act of 1972, and finances a variety of rural industrial development loans. Loans are made for rural industrialization and rural community facilities under Rural Development Act amendments to the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932 et seq.) authorities. Business and industrial loans are made to public, private, or cooperative organizations organized for profit, to certain Indian tribes, or to individuals for the purpose of improving, developing or financing business, industry, and employment or improving the economic and environmental climate in rural areas. Such purposes include financing business and industrial acquisition, construction, enlargement, repair or modernization, financing the purchase and development of land, easements, rights-of-way, buildings, payment of startup costs, and supplying working capital.

Rural business enterprise grants were authorized by the Rural Development Act of 1972. Grants are made to public bodies and nonprofit organizations to facilitate development of small and

emerging business enterprises in rural areas, including the acquisition and development of land; the construction of buildings, plants, equipment, access streets and roads, parking areas, and utility extensions; refinancing fees; technical assistance; and startup operating costs and working capital.

Rural business opportunity grants are authorized under section 306(a)(11) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended. Grants may be made to public bodies and private non-profit community development corporations or entities. Grants are made to identify and analyze business opportunities that will use local rural economic and human resources: to identify, train, and provide technical assistance to rural entrepreneurs and managers; to establish business support centers; to conduct economic development planning and coordination, and leadership development; and to establish centers for training, technology, and trade that will provide training to rural businesses in the utilization of interactive communications technologies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$87,385,000 for the Rural Business Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 appropriation	2009 budget request	Committee recommendations
Business and industry guaranteed loans	42,898	30,450	43,196
Business enterprise grants	38,727	38,727
Business opportunity grants	2,483	2,483
Delta Regional Authority grants	2,979	2,979
Total	87,087	30,450	87,385

Rural Business Program Account.—The Committee recommends \$495,000 for transportation technical assistance.

The Committee directs that of the \$3,996,000 recommended for grants to benefit Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, \$248,000 be used to implement an American Indian and Alaska Native passenger transportation development and assistance initiative.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Estimated loan level	\$33,536,000	\$33,772,000	\$33,536,000
Direct loan subsidy	14,384,000	14,134,000	14,035,000
Administrative expenses	4,739,000	4,574,000	4,741,000

The rural development (intermediary relending) loan program was originally authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452). The making of rural development loans by

the Department of Agriculture was reauthorized by Public Law 99-425, the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986.

Loans are made to intermediary borrowers (small investment groups) who in turn will reloan the funds to rural businesses, community development corporations, private nonprofit organizations, public agencies, et cetera, for the purpose of improving business, industry, community facilities, and employment opportunities and diversification of the economy in rural areas.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated in 2009, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,035,000 for Rural Development (intermediary relending) loans.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Estimated loan level	\$33,077,000	\$33,077,000	\$33,077,000
Direct loan subsidy			

The Rural Economic Development Loans program was established by the Reconciliation Act of December 1987 (Public Law 100-203), which amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (Act of May 20, 1936), by establishing a new section 313. This section of the Rural Electrification Act (7 U.S.C. 901) established a cushion of credits payment program and created the rural economic development subaccount. The Administrator of RUS is authorized under the act to utilize funds in this program to provide zero interest loans to electric and telecommunications borrowers for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, including funding for feasibility studies, startup costs, and other reasonable expenses for the purpose of fostering rural economic development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee accepts the administration’s proposal to fund rural economic development loans from interest earnings on cushion of credit payments.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$27,828,000
Budget estimate, 2009	4,455,000
Committee recommendation	25,114,000

Rural cooperative development grants are authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended. Grants are made to fund the establishment and operation of centers for rural cooperative development with their primary purpose being the improvement of economic conditions in rural areas. Grants may be made to nonprofit institutions or institutions of higher education. Grants may be used to pay up to 75

percent of the cost of the project and associated administrative costs. The applicant must contribute at least 25 percent from non-Federal sources, except 1994 institutions, which only need to provide 5 percent. Grants are competitive and are awarded based on specific selection criteria.

Cooperative research agreements are authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2204b. The funds are used for cooperative research agreements, primarily with colleges and universities, on critical operational, organizational, and structural issues facing cooperatives.

Cooperative agreements are authorized under 7 U.S.C. 2201 to any qualified State departments of agriculture, university, and other State entity to conduct research that will strengthen and enhance the operations of agricultural marketing cooperatives in rural areas.

The Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas [ATTRA] program was first authorized by the Food Security Act of 1985. The program provides information and technical assistance to agricultural producers to adopt sustainable agricultural practices that are environmentally friendly and lower production costs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,114,000 for Rural Cooperative Development Grants.

Of the funds recommended, \$2,774,000 is for the Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas program through a cooperative agreement with the National Center for Appropriate Technology.

The Committee has included language in the bill that not more than \$1,463,000 shall be made available to cooperatives or associations of cooperatives whose primary focus is to provide assistance to small, minority producers.

Value Added.—The Committee recommends \$16,153,000 for value-added agricultural product market development grants.

RURAL EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$8,130,000
Budget estimate, 2009	
Committee recommendation	8,130,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,130,000 for Rural Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities Grants, with the funds to be made available in the same manner and with the same priorities as in fiscal year 2007.

Outmigration.—The Committee is concerned that rural empowerment zones, particularly zones selected because of outmigration, are having a difficult time successfully competing for USDA Rural Development programs due primarily to the fact that many programs are tied to household income levels. Often, household income levels have very little to do with the reasons for outmigration. Economic development efforts in these zones cannot advance without additional funding from competitive grant programs to supplement the funding that the Committee has earmarked for the zones for the last several years. USDA is directed to provide a report to the

Committee with suggestions on how to revise competitive grant-making criteria to take into consideration outmigration when making awards to rural empowerment zones.

RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$35,748,000
Budget estimate, 2009
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The Rural Energy for America Program is authorized under section 9007 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246). This program may fund energy audits, direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants to farmers, ranchers, and small rural businesses for the purchase of renewable energy systems and for energy efficiency improvements.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Program.

Untimely Application Processing.—The Committee is aware of eligible poultry producers who were disadvantaged in competition for renewable energy grant funding (and ultimately denied) due to laggard processing of valid and eligible applications. Processing times can vary substantially from State office to State office, unfairly penalizing applicants in slow States. Such arbitrary variations in customer service should not be tolerated. The Secretary is directed to work with these unsuccessful grant applicants to pursue any available administrative remedy. The Secretary is also directed to provide, by December 1, 2008, a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations detailing plans to equalize application processing times and eliminate interstate disparities that unfairly and capriciously harm applicants. The Department should also properly inform applicants of the inability to reapply for grant assistance after energy efficiency retrofitting has occurred.

Consideration to Applications: Rural Business and Renewable Energy Programs.—The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications for rural business and renewable energy programs for the following: Advanced Algae Conversion System (Louisiana), Biomass to Liquid Fuel Commercialization Project (Louisiana), Bioproducts and Renewable Industry Development (Minnesota), Cellulosic Biofuel Supply Chain Development (Wisconsin), Center for Biobased Economy (Vermont), Huron County Anaerobic Digester Pilot Plant (Michigan), Montana Food Innovation Center Network (Montana), Wild Rice Wood Processing and Storage (Minnesota), and Women in Technology (Hawaii). In addition, the Committee encourages the Department to consider applications for grants to rural public television broadcasting systems.

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to the established review process.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

The Rural Utilities Service [RUS] was established under the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–354), October 13, 1994. RUS administers the electric and telephone programs of the former Rural Electrification Administration and the water and waste programs of the former Rural Development Administration.

The mission of the RUS is to serve a leading role in improving the quality of life in rural America by administering its electric, telecommunications, and water and waste programs in a service oriented, forward looking, and financially responsible manner. All three programs have the common goal of modernizing and revitalizing rural communities. RUS provides funding and support service for utilities serving rural areas. The public-private partnerships established by RUS and local utilities assist rural communities in modernizing local infrastructure. RUS programs are also characterized by the substantial amount of private investment which is leveraged by the public funds invested into infrastructure and technology, resulting in the creation of new sources of employment.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT¹

Appropriation, 2008	\$558,628,000
Budget estimate, 2009	269,007,000
Committee recommendation	558,628,000

¹ Includes High Energy Cost grants.

The water and waste disposal program is authorized by sections 306, 306A, 309A, 306C, 306D, and 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq., as amended). This program makes loans for water and waste development costs. Development loans are made to associations, including corporations operating on a nonprofit basis, municipalities and similar organizations, generally designated as public or quasipublic agencies, that propose projects for the development, storage, treatment, purification, and distribution of domestic water or the collection, treatment, or disposal of waste in rural areas. Such grants may not exceed 75 percent of the development cost of the projects and can supplement other funds borrowed or furnished by applicants to pay development costs.

The solid waste grant program is authorized under section 310B(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. Grants are made to public bodies and private nonprofit organizations to provide technical assistance to local and regional governments for the purpose of reducing or eliminating pollution of water resources and for improving the planning and management of solid waste disposal facilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$558,628,000 for the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246) mandates the procedure the Department will use to establish poverty and intermediate borrower interest rates for direct Water and Waste Disposal Facility loans. This procedure mimics

earlier administration proposals requiring communities to rely more heavily on debt and less on grants. The administration asserted the program level could be maintained, budget resources would be more efficiently used, and communities would face lower debt burdens coupled with acceptable user utility rates.

The Committee remains concerned that under these provisions needed program resources will not be delivered to the poorest, most remote communities currently served. The Committee recommendation provides the same level of budget authority as in 2008, and directs the Secretary to deliver at least the same total program level to communities with similar socio-economic and geographic characteristics as would have been served in 2008 absent this procedural change. By November 15, 2008, the Secretary shall provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations detailing how the Secretary plans to implement these directives. This report shall include quantitative measures proposed to determine the socio-economic and geographic characteristics of communities served. The report shall also identify benchmarks to evaluate if in fact communities of similar characteristics are being served. By November 1, 2009, the Secretary shall provide a comprehensive analysis and report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, utilizing these measures and benchmarks, to determine the results of this experiment. If the distribution of budget authority between grants and direct loans needs to be adjusted from the Committee Report display table, the Secretary shall make those adjustments as necessary.

The Committee recommends \$65,000,000 for water and waste disposal systems grants for Native Americans, including Native Alaskans and the Colonias, allocated in a manner consistent with the fiscal year 2007 allocations. The Committee recognizes the special needs and problems for delivery of basic services to these populations. The Secretary is directed to provide a report to the Committee that identifies the specific areas in which water and waste disposal program resources have been provided, where additional resources are most needed, and the relative costs of program delivery to the various areas and regions covered by the authorities identified for use of these specific funds. The Committee expects from the Secretary a spending plan of how the funds will be used, quarterly notification on grant obligations, and a year end summary report. In addition, the Committee makes up to \$13,750,000 available for the circuit rider program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 appropriation ¹	2009 budget request	Committee recommendation ¹
Water and waste disposal direct loans	69,609	49,169
Water and waste disposal grants	464,228	216,373
Solid waste management grants	3,441	3,465
Water well system grants	993
Water and waste water revolving funds	497
High energy cost grants	19,860	19,860

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT—Continued

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2008 appropriation ¹	2009 budget request	Committee recommendation ¹
Total	558,628	269,007	558,628

¹ \$538,768,000 is provided for Water and Waste Disposal programs, excluding High Energy Cost grants, which is the same level provided in fiscal year 2008. The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246) mandated a change in the procedure for establishing borrower interest rates for the direct loan program. OMB has not provided a loan subsidy rate under this new procedure. This program change was instituted to allow a more effective use of budget authority, by requiring communities to take on more debt at lower interest rates, coupled with smaller grant levels. The Secretary is directed to distribute this budget authority as needed to ensure at least the same aggregate program level will be attained in fiscal year 2009 as in fiscal year 2008, serving communities with similar socio-economic and geographic characteristics as would be served in fiscal year 2008 absent this procedural change.

Consideration to Applications.—Water and Waste Disposal loans and grants provide financial support and technical assistance for development and operation of safe and affordable water supply systems and waste disposal facilities. Funds may be used to construct, repair, expand or otherwise improve water supply and distribution, and waste collection and treatment systems. The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to consider applications for water and waste disposal loans and grants for the following projects: City of Coburg Wastewater System (Oregon), City of Fanning Springs Wastewater Project (Florida), City of Healdsburg Wastewater Treatment Project (California), City of Imperial Water and Wastewater Treatment Plants (California), City of Ville Platte-Water Distribution System (Louisiana), Cumberland Waterline Extension Project (Ohio), City of Ney Wastewater System (Ohio), Gooseberry Lake Water Supply Project (Iowa), Perry Township Waterline Extension Project (Ohio), Regional Utility Service Systems (Iowa), Rural Fire Protection Task Force Dry Hydrant Program (Vermont), Shasta County Elk Trail Water System Improvements (California), Tanglewild-Thompson Place Water System (Washington), Tulare County Rural Community Water Systems (California), and Zions View/Strawberry Point/Johnson Canyon Phase VII Project (Utah).

Water and Waste Technical Assistance and Training Grants.—The Committee expects the Secretary to continue to provide support for the National Drinking Water Clearinghouse through the water and waste technical assistance and training grant program.

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to the established review process.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) provides the statutory authority for the electric and telecommunications programs.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508) established the program account. An appropriation to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in fiscal year 2009, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following table reflects the Committee's recommendation for the rural electrification and telecommunications loans program account, the loan subsidy and administrative expenses, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Loan authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct, 5 percent	99,300	100,000	99,300
Direct, muni			
Direct FFB	6,500,000	4,000,000	6,500,000
Direct, Treasury rate			
Guaranteed			
Guaranteed underwriting	500,000		500,000
Subtotal	7,099,300	4,100,000	7,099,300
Telecommunications:			
Direct, 5 percent	143,985	145,000	143,985
Direct, Treasury rate	248,250	250,000	248,250
Direct, FFB	292,935	295,000	292,935
Subtotal	685,170	690,000	685,170
Total, loan authorizations	7,784,470	4,790,000	7,784,470
Loan subsidies:			
Electric:			
Direct 5 percent	119		
Direct, muni			
Direct FFB			
Direct, Treasury rate			
Guaranteed			
Guaranteed underwriting			
Subtotal	119		
Telecommunications:			
Direct, 5 percent	115		
Direct, Treasury rate	1,663	525	521
Direct, FFB	1,816		
Subtotal	3,594	525	521
Total, loan subsidies	3,713	525	521
Administrative expenses	38,339	37,819	38,353
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Programs Account	42,052	38,344	38,874
(Loan authorization)	7,784,470	4,790,000	7,784,470

Electric Loans.—The Committee limits the fiscal year 2009 electric program appropriation to FFB direct loans as opposed to reflecting the new authorization in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 [FCEA] for RUS direct electric loans. However, the Committee encourages the Secretary, through the RUS, to develop the documentation and regulatory adjustments necessary to offer RUS direct electric loans, consistent with the FCEA, so that consideration may be given in future years to fund such loans.

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

LOANS AND GRANT LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Loan and Grant Levels:			
Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program:			
Direct loans			
Grants	34,755	20,000	34,755
Broadband program:			
Treasury rate loans	297,900	297,923	297,900
Grants	13,406		13,406
Total DLT grants and loan authorization	346,061	317,923	346,061

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

LOANS AND GRANTS

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 level	2009 request	
Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program:			
Direct loan subsidies			
Grants	34,755	20,000	34,755
Broadband program:			
Treasury rate loan subsidies	6,405	11,619	11,618
Grants	13,406		13,406
Total grants and loan subsidies	54,566	31,619	59,779

The Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program is authorized by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq.), as amended by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127). This program provides incentives to improve the quality of phone services, to provide access to advanced telecommunications services and computer networks, and to improve rural opportunities.

This program provides the facilities and equipment to link rural education and medical facilities with more urban centers and other facilities providing rural residents access to better health care through technology and increasing educational opportunities for rural students. These funds are available for loans and grants.

The Committee is concerned with the longstanding, unmet health care needs in the Mississippi Delta and encourages the Department to use these funds to promote increased health access and education to address critical health care needs in the region.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$59,779,000 for the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program. The Committee recommendation includes \$4,965,000 for public broadcasting systems grants to allow noncommercial educational tele-

vision broadcast stations that serve rural areas to convert from analog to digital operations.

Broadband Grants.—In addition, of the funds recommended, \$13,406,000 in grants shall be made available to support broadband transmission and local dial-up Internet services for rural areas.

Consideration to Applications—Broadband and Distance Learning, Telemedicine Loans, and Grants.—The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications for broadband and distance learning, telemedicine loans and grants for the following: Broadband Deployment on the Northern Neck and Middle Peninsula (Virginia), Delta Health Alliance (Mississippi), Eastern Shore Broadband Buildout (Virginia), Electronic Medical Records System, Glens Falls Hospital (New York), Gilmer/Braxton Research Technology Institute Broadband Internet Project (West Virginia), Municipal Cable Project, Town of Massena (New York), and Otsego County Telecommunications Plan (New York).

The Committee expects the Department to consider only those applications judged meritorious when subjected to the established review process.

TITLE IV
DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND
CONSUMER SERVICES

Appropriations, 2008	\$593,000
Budget estimate, 2009	655,000
Committee recommendation	610,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services provides direction and coordination in carrying out the laws enacted by the Congress with respect to the Department's food and consumer activities. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food and Nutrition Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$610,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

The Food and Nutrition Service represents an organizational effort to eliminate hunger and malnutrition in this country. Nutrition assistance programs provide access to a nutritionally adequate diet for families and persons with low incomes and encourage better eating patterns among the Nation's children. These programs include:

Child Nutrition Programs.—The National School Lunch and School Breakfast, Summer Food Service, and Child and Adult Care Food programs provide funding to the States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam for use in serving nutritious lunches and breakfasts to children attending schools of high school grades and under, to children of preschool age in child care centers, and to children in other institutions in order to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and broaden the markets for agricultural food commodities. Through the Special Milk Program, assistance is provided to the States for making reimbursement payments to eligible schools and child care institutions which institute or expand milk service in order to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation and transfer from section 32.

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC].—This program safeguards the health of pregnant, post partum, and breast-feeding women, infants, and children up to age 5 who are at nutritional risk because of inadequate nutrition and income by providing supplemental foods. The delivery of supplemental foods may be done through health clinics, vouchers

redeemable at retail food stores, or other approved methods which a cooperating State health agency may select. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.—This program seeks to improve nutritional standards of needy persons and families. Assistance is provided to eligible households to enable them to obtain a better diet by increasing their food purchasing capability, usually by furnishing benefits in the form of electronic access to funds. The program also includes Nutrition Assistance to Puerto Rico.

The program also includes the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, which provides nutritious agricultural commodities to low-income persons living on or near Indian reservations who choose not to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, Public Law 110–246, provides that \$250,000,000 from funds appropriated in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program account be used to purchase commodities for The Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP].

Commodity Assistance Program [CAP].—This program provides funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP], the Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program, Disaster Assistance, Pacific Island Assistance, and administrative expenses for TEFAP.

CSFP provides supplemental foods to infants and children up to age 6, and to pregnant, post partum, and breast-feeding women with low incomes, and who reside in approved project areas. In addition, this program operates commodity distribution projects directed at low-income elderly persons.

TEFAP provides commodities and grant funds to State agencies to assist in the cost of storage and distribution of donated commodities.

Nutritious agricultural commodities are provided to residents of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands. Cash assistance is provided to distributing agencies to assist them in meeting administrative expenses incurred. It also provides funding for use in non-Presidentially declared disasters, and for FNS’ administrative costs in connection with relief for all disasters. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

Nutrition Programs Administration.—Most salaries and Federal operating expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service are funded from this account. Also included is the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion [CNPP] which oversees improvements in and revisions to the food guidance systems, and serves as the focal point for advancing and coordinating nutrition promotion and education policy to improve the health of all Americans.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

	Appropriation	Section 32 transfers	Total
Appropriations, 2008	\$7,647,965,000	\$6,253,548,000	\$13,901,513,000
Budget estimate, 2009	7,925,700,000	6,529,983,000	14,455,683,000
Committee recommendation	7,733,849,000	6,721,834,000	14,455,683,000

The Child Nutrition Programs, authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (Public Law 79–396) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–642), provide Federal assistance to State agencies in the form of cash and commodities for use in preparing and serving nutritious meals to children while they are attending school, residing in service institutions, or participating in other organized activities away from home. The purpose of these programs is to help maintain the health and proper physical development of America’s children. Milk is provided to children either free or at a low cost, depending on their family income level. FNS provides cash subsidies to States for administering the programs and directly administers the program in the States which choose not to do so. Grants are also made for nutritional training and surveys and for State administrative expenses. Under current law, most of these payments are made on the basis of reimbursement rates established by law and applied to lunches and breakfasts actually served by the States. The reimbursement rates are adjusted annually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for food away from home.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,733,849,000, plus transfers from section 32 of \$6,721,834,000, for a total of \$14,455,683,000 for the Child Nutrition Programs.

The Committee’s recommendation provides for the following annual rates for the child nutrition programs.

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

[In thousands of dollars]

Child nutrition programs	2008 estimate	2009 budget	Committee recommendation
School Lunch Program	8,180,933	8,346,166	8,346,166
School Breakfast Program	2,389,988	2,522,286	2,522,286
Child and Adult Care Food Program	2,288,838	2,386,780	2,386,780
Summer Food Service Program	310,634	328,934	328,934
Special Milk Program	14,618	13,867	13,867
State administrative expenses	175,636	184,057	184,057
Commodity procurement and computer support	518,061	647,627	647,627
Team Nutrition	13,300	13,300	13,300
Food safety education	2,000	2,000	2,000
Coordinated review	5,505	5,636	5,636
CACFP training and technical assistance	2,000	2,030	2,030
SNDA data collection and analysis	2,000	2,000
CACFP error estimates	1,000	1,000

The Committee recommends \$13,300,000 for TEAM nutrition. Included in this amount is \$5,000,000 for food service training grants to States; \$2,500,000 for technical assistance materials; \$800,000 for National Food Service Management Institute cooperative agreements; \$800,000 for print and electronic food service resource systems; \$1,000,000 to assist USDA’s Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion in development and maintenance of MyPyramid and Dietary Guidelines materials in support of nutrition education for program participants and their families; and \$3,200,000 for other activities.

The Committee expects FNS to utilize the National Food Service Management Institute to carry out the food safety education program.

Farm to Cafeteria.—The Committee is aware of interest in the Farm to Cafeteria program, which links farms and schools to bring locally-grown food into the school lunch program. This program was authorized in the Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act of 2004. However, no funding was provided then, and funding has not yet been requested in the administration’s budget. The Committee supports the intent of this program, and strongly encourages USDA to work to identify funding sources through which Farm to Cafeteria grants can begin to be made.

Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.—Section 4304 of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act provided \$65,000,000 for a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program to be made available on July 1, 2009. Of this amount, the Committee has included a general provision to delay availability of \$49,000,000 of these funds until October 1, 2009. The Committee notes that this general provision does not lower the funding amount provided in the Food, Conservation and Energy Act for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, but simply delays a portion of the funding until the beginning of fiscal year 2009. The full funding amount of \$65,000,000 will be available for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for the school year beginning July 1, 2009, as specified in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS,
AND CHILDREN [WIC]

Appropriations, 2008	\$6,020,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	6,100,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,750,000,000

The special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children [WIC] is authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Its purpose is to safeguard the health of pregnant, breast-feeding and post partum women and infants, and children up to age 5 who are at nutritional risk because of inadequate nutrition and inadequate income. The budget estimate assumes an average monthly participation of 8.6 million participants at an average food cost of \$43.55 per person per month in fiscal year 2009.

The WIC program food packages are designed to provide foods which studies have demonstrated are lacking in the diets of the WIC program target population. The authorized supplemental foods are iron-fortified breakfast cereal, fruit or vegetable juice which contains vitamin C, dry beans, peas, and peanut butter.

There are three general types of delivery systems for WIC foods: (1) retail purchase in which participants obtain supplemental foods through retail stores; (2) home delivery systems in which food is delivered to the participant’s home; and (3) direct distribution systems in which participants pick up food from a distribution outlet. The food is free of charge to all participants.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,750,000,000 for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC].

The Committee recommends no less than \$14,850,000 for breastfeeding support initiatives.

Estimates.—The Committee recommendation of \$6,750,000,000 takes into account several changes from the budget request.

First, both food cost and participation estimates have increased significantly since the budget request was submitted in February. USDA's Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children July 2008 Report to Congress assumes WIC participation will be nearly 9 million per month, as opposed to 8.6 million assumed in the President's budget request. It further assumes that monthly food costs will be \$45.37, as opposed to \$43.55 included in the President's budget request. These new assumptions result in a budget shortfall of \$450,000,000, according to the July report.

Second, the Committee recommendation again does not include a limitation on State nutrition services and administration [NSA] grants as proposed in the budget and assumed in the July report. The budget request included a reduction of \$150,000,000 associated with this limitation. The Committee still does not agree that reducing support for critical WIC services including nutrition education, obesity prevention, breastfeeding promotion and support, healthcare referrals, and immunization screening is a wise or acceptable method of achieving budget savings.

Third, although the budget request states that the funding request for WIC will include \$150,000,000 to restore the contingency fund, this is a disingenuous statement. The budget request assumes the use of the entire contingency fund to maintain WIC participation. No funding is requested in the President's budget that would be available for unforeseen events, which is the purpose of a contingency fund. Therefore, the Committee recommendation is currently estimated to be sufficient to meet program needs, and includes an additional \$50,000,000 to restore the contingency fund.

The Committee is aware that food cost and participation estimates continue to change, and is pleased that USDA is also continuing to monitor estimates and plans to reassess the fiscal year 2009 budget request in September, according to the July report. We will continue to monitor this situation and take additional action as necessary to ensure that funding provided in fiscal year 2009 is sufficient to serve all eligible applicants.

Health Care Services Referral.—While the Committee continues to support and encourage State and local agency efforts to utilize WIC as an important means of participation referral to other health care services, it also continues to recognize the constraints that WIC programs are experiencing as a result of expanding health care priorities and continuing demand for core WIC program activities. The Committee wishes to clarify that while WIC plays an important role in screening and referral to other health care services, it was never the Committee's intention that WIC should perform aggressive screening, referral and assessment functions in

such a manner that supplants the responsibilities of other programs, nor was it the Committee's intention that WIC State and local agencies should assume the burden of entering into and negotiating appropriate cost sharing agreements. The Committee again includes language in the bill to preserve WIC funding for WIC services authorized by law to ensure that WIC funds are not used to pay the expenses or to coordinate operations or activities other than those allowable pursuant to section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1996, unless fully reimbursed by the appropriate Federal agency.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Expenses	Amount in reserve	Puerto Rico and American Samoa	TEFAP commodity purchases	CSFP expenses	Total
Appropriations, 2008	35,021,473	3,000,000	1,621,250	140,000	39,782,723
Budget estimate, 2009 ..	38,502,380	3,000,000	1,684,424	140,000	22,000	43,348,804
Committee recommendation	38,502,880	3,000,000	1,684,424	250,000	43,437,304

The Food Stamp Program was reauthorized through fiscal year 2012 and renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program [SNAP] in the The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program attempts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition among low-income persons by increasing their food purchasing power. Eligible households receive SNAP benefits with which they can purchase food through regular retail stores.

Other programs funded through the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program include Nutrition Assistance to Puerto Rico and American Samoa, the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, the Emergency Food Assistance Program, and the Community Food Projects program.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is currently in operation in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Participating households receive food benefits, the value of which is determined by household size and income. The cost of the benefits is paid by the Federal Government. As required by law, the Food and Nutrition Service annually revises household stamp allotments to reflect changes in the cost of the thrifty food plan.

Administrative Costs.—All direct and indirect administrative costs incurred for certification of households, issuance of benefits, quality control, outreach, and fair hearing efforts are shared by the Federal Government and the States on a 50–50 basis.

State Antifraud Activities.—Under the provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, States are eligible to be reimbursed for 50 percent of the costs of their food stamp fraud investigations and prosecutions.

States are required to implement an employment and training program for the purpose of assisting members of households participating in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in gaining skills, training, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment. The Department of Agriculture

has implemented a grant program to States to assist them in providing employment and training services.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$43,437,304,000 for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Of the amount recommended, \$3,000,000,000 is made available as a contingency reserve. The Committee recommendation includes language that permits the Food and Nutrition Service to conduct studies and evaluations consistent with the budget request.

Commodity Supplemental Food Program.—The Committee recommendation does not include a provision, requested in the budget, that would provide transitional benefits to Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP] participants. The Committee recommends an appropriation for CSFP in the Commodity Assistance Program which makes the provision in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program unnecessary.

Food Access.—The Committee is aware that there are areas of low-income, rural, and tribal communities in the United States with limited access to affordable, healthy, and fresh foods, also known as “food deserts.” Although initial data indicates that these communities are spread throughout the Nation, no comprehensive study has been conducted to provide a benchmark analysis of their incidence and their characteristics nationally. The Committee directs the Department to lead an inter-agency review on food deserts, as authorized in section 7527 of Public Law 110–246, and to provide a report to the Committee on this review within 1 year of enactment of this act.

Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations.—The Committee encourages the Secretary to continue the purchase of bison from producer-owned and Native American owned cooperatives for the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations. Although funding is not provided specifically for bison purchase, historically these purchases have been important for the Native American population both economically and nutritionally.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2008	\$210,288,000
Budget estimate, 2009	70,370,000
Committee recommendation	225,370,000

The Commodity Assistance Program includes funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and funding to pay expenses associated with the storage and distribution of commodities through The Emergency Food Assistance Program.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP].—Authorized by section 4(a) of the Agricultural and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note), as amended in 1981 by Public Law 97–98, this program provides supplemental food to infants and children up to age 6, and to pregnant, post partum, and breast-feeding women who have low incomes, and reside in approved project areas. In addition, the program operates commodity distribution projects directed at low-income elderly persons 60 years of age or older.

The foods for CSFP are provided by the Department of Agriculture for distribution through State agencies. The authorized commodities include: iron-fortified infant formula, rice cereal, cheese, canned juice, evaporated milk and/or nonfat dry milk, canned vegetables or fruits, canned meat or poultry, egg mix, dehydrated potatoes, farina, and peanut butter and dry beans. Elderly participants may receive all commodities except iron-fortified infant formula and rice cereal.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP].—Authorized by the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.), as amended, the program provides nutrition assistance to low-income people through prepared meals served on site and through the distribution of commodities to low-income households for home consumption. The commodities are provided by USDA to State agencies for distribution through State-established networks. State agencies make the commodities available to local organizations, such as soup kitchens, food pantries, food banks, and community action agencies, for their use in providing nutrition assistance to those in need.

Funds are administered by FNS through grants to State agencies which operate commodity distribution programs. Allocation of the funds to States is based on a formula which considers the States' unemployment rate and the number of persons with income below the poverty level.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 increases funding available for the purchase of TEFAP commodities from \$140,000,000 to \$250,000,000. In addition to the commodities purchased specifically for TEFAP, commodities obtained under agriculture support and surplus removal programs are donated to States for distribution through TEFAP.

Pacific Island Assistance.—This program provides funding for assistance to the nuclear-affected islands in the form of commodities and administrative funds. It also provides funding for use in non-Presidentially declared disasters and for FNS' administrative costs in connection with relief for all disasters.

Farmers' Market Nutrition Program.—The Farmers' Market Nutrition Program [FMNP] provides WIC or WIC-eligible participants with coupons to purchase fresh, nutritious, unprepared foods, such as fruits and vegetables, from farmers' markets. This benefits both participants and local farmers by increasing the awareness and use of farmers' markets by low-income households.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$225,370,000 for the Commodity Assistance Program. The Committee continues to encourage the Department to distribute Commodity Assistance Program funds equitably among the States, based on an assessment of the needs and priorities of each State and the State's preference to receive commodity allocations through each of the programs funded under this account.

Commodity Supplemental Food Program.—The Committee recommends \$155,000,000 for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

Farmers' Market Nutrition Program.—The Committee is aware that the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program provides fresh fruits and vegetables to low-income mothers and children, benefiting not only WIC participants, but local farmers as well. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$19,800,000 for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and directs the Secretary to obligate these funds within 45 days.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program.—The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 provides \$250,000,000 for TEFAP commodities to be purchased with Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funds. The Committee recommendation includes \$49,500,000 for TEFAP administrative funding. In addition, the Committee recommendation grants the Secretary authority to transfer up to an additional 10 percent from TEFAP commodities for this purpose.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2008	\$141,581,000
Budget estimate, 2009	150,251,000
Committee recommendation	142,595,000

The Nutrition Programs Administration appropriation provides for most of the Federal operating expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service, which includes the Child Nutrition Programs; Special Milk Program; Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]; Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico; the Commodity Assistance Program, including the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and the Emergency Food Assistance Program; and Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and Pacific Island Assistance.

The major objective of Nutrition Programs Administration is to efficiently and effectively carry out the nutrition assistance programs mandated by law. This is to be accomplished by the following: (1) giving clear and consistent guidance and supervision to State agencies and other cooperators; (2) assisting the States and other cooperators by providing program, managerial, financial, and other advice and expertise; (3) measuring, reviewing, and analyzing the progress being made toward achieving program objectives; and (4) carrying out regular staff support functions.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$142,595,000 for Nutrition Programs Administration.

Child and Adult Care Food Program [CACFP].—The Committee is concerned that the Food and Nutrition Service has not yet determined the CACFP reimbursement needed to serve meals and snacks consistent with the dietary guidelines, although they were directed by this Committee to do so. CACFP provides a significant benefit to low-income children and their families. Meals provided through CACFP ensure that developing children receive key nutrients in adequate amounts each day they are in child care, as well assist families in stretching limited food resources. Therefore, the Committee again directs FNS to determine the reimbursement

needed to serve meals and snacks consistent with dietary guidelines, including contracting with an outside source such as the Institute of Medicine if necessary, and to report its findings back to this Committee.

Nutrition Initiatives.—The Committee is aware of the important work being undertaken by numerous State, local, and private organizations in order to reduce hunger and increase nutrition education throughout the United States. The Committee applauds these efforts, and encourages USDA to work with interested organizations throughout the country, including the Mid-Ohio FoodBank in Columbus, Ohio; Ozarks Food Harvest in Springfield, Missouri; Oakland Livingston Human Service Agency in Oakland and Livingston Counties, Michigan; the St. John's Bread & Life Program in Brooklyn, New York; and the Vermont Community School Gardens Program in Burlington, Vermont to provide technical and financial assistance where appropriate, to help these organizations further their goals.

Policy Documents.—The Committee directs the Food and Nutrition Service to make all policy documents related to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] (including, but not limited to, instructions, memoranda, guidance, and questions and answers) available to the public on the internet within 1 week of their release to state WIC administrators.

TITLE V
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS
FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriations	Transfers from loan accounts	Total
Appropriations, 2008	\$158,280,000	\$4,950,000	\$163,304,000
Budget estimate, 2009	168,042,000	4,985,000	173,027,000
Committee recommendation	169,042,000	4,985,000	174,027,000

The Foreign Agricultural Service [FAS] was established March 10, 1953, by Secretary’s Memorandum No. 1320, supplement 1. Public Law 83–690, approved August 28, 1954, transferred the agricultural attachés from the Department of State to the Foreign Agricultural Service.

The mission of FAS overseas is to represent U.S. agricultural interests, to promote export of domestic farm products, improve world trade conditions, and report on agricultural production and trade in foreign countries. FAS staff are stationed at 77 offices around the world where they provide expertise in agricultural economics and marketing, as well as provide attaché services.

FAS carries out several export assistance programs to counter the adverse effects of unfair trade practices by competitors on U.S. agricultural trade. The Export Enhancement Program uses CCC-owned commodities as export bonuses to provide export enhancements to U.S. producers. The Market Access Program [MAP] conducts both generic and brand-identified promotional programs in conjunction with nonprofit agricultural associations and private firms financed through reimbursable CCC payments.

The General Sales Manager was established pursuant to section 5(f) of the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation and 15 U.S.C. 714–714p. The funds allocated to the General Sales Manager are used for conducting the following programs: (1) CCC Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–102), including supplier credit guarantees and facilities financing guarantees, (2) Intermediate Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–103), (3) Public Law 480, (4) section 416 Overseas Donations Program, (5) Export Enhancement Program, (6) Market Access Program, and (7) programs authorized by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act including barter, export sales of most CCC-owned commodities, export payments, and other programs as assigned to encourage and enhance the export of U.S. agricultural commodities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends \$174,027,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including a direct appropriation of \$169,042,000.

Biotechnology.—To promote the export of domestic farm products and improve world agriculture trade conditions, the Foreign Agricultural Service must increase its efforts to improve the understanding among trading partners of the safety of biotechnology and the thoroughness of the U.S. regulatory oversight of biotechnology. As trading partners construct regulatory systems for biotechnology and commodity trade, FAS is frequently requested to provide experts for the purpose of educating foreign government officials on the U.S. regulatory system. If the United States fails to participate in such discussions, those attempting to limit the access to foreign markets by U.S. producers will be presented an opportunity to undermine confidence in the benefits and safety of the technology while reducing trade opportunities for American producers. The Committee directs FAS to allocate adequate funding to meet the needs of our trading partners so that officials from the Department of Agriculture may, when requested, educate foreign regulators on the safety of the technology and the thoroughness of the U.S. regulatory process.

Borlaug Fellows Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for the Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Fellows Program. This program provides training for international scientists and policymakers from selected developing countries. The fellows work closely with U.S. specialists in their fields of expertise and apply that knowledge in their home countries. The Committee recognizes the importance of this program in helping developing countries strengthen their agricultural practices and food security.

Capital Security Cost Sharing.—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,500,000 for Capital Security Cost Sharing [CSCS], as proposed in the budget. The Committee funds the fiscal year 2009 CSCS assessment at the level requested by FAS with the understanding that space assignments made by the Department of State in newly constructed embassies will meet current and projected FAS space requirements.

Cochran Fellowship Program.—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 for the Cochran Fellowship Program. The Committee encourages the Secretary to continue to provide additional support for the program through the Commodity Credit Corporation Emerging Markets Program.

Currency Exchange Rates.—The Committee continues to include language in a general provision in the bill, as requested in the budget, to allow up to \$2,000,000 of the amount appropriated to the FAS to remain available until expended solely for the purpose of offsetting fluctuations in international currency exchange rates, subject to documentation.

Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program.—The Committee expects the FAS to fund the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program at no less than the fiscal year 2008 level.

Specialty Crops.—The Committee is aware of FAS activities to provide technical assistance for the promotion of specialty crop exports and includes \$200,000 to support these activities.

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Credit level	Loan subsidy	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2008	\$2,661,000
Budget estimate, 2009	2,761,000
Committee recommendation	2,761,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,761,000 for administrative expenses to continue servicing existing Public Law 480 title I agreements.

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for any new Public Law 480 title I agreements, consistent with the Administration’s request, and believes that food aid resources can be used more effectively in the title II grant program. The Committee has continued to focus food aid resources on title II grants, but does provide funding to support previously entered into title I agreements.

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$1,210,864,000
Supplemental appropriation, 2008 ¹	1,245,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	1,225,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,225,900,000

¹ Of this amount, \$395,000,000 is available on October 1, 2008.

The Committee recognizes the important mission of the Public Law 480 Program to combat hunger and malnutrition; promote broad-based equitable and sustainable development; expand international trade; develop and expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities; and to foster and encourage the development of private enterprise and democratic participation in developing countries. The Committee strongly supports the continued efficient operation of this important program.

Commodities Supplied in Connection With Dispositions Abroad (Title II) (7 U.S.C. 1721–1726).—Commodities are supplied without cost through foreign governments to combat malnutrition and to meet famine and other emergency requirements. Commodities are also supplied for nonemergencies through public and private agencies, including intergovernmental organizations. The Commodity Credit Corporation pays ocean freight on shipments under this title, and may also pay overland transportation costs to a land-locked country, as well as internal distribution costs in emergency situations. The funds appropriated for title II are made available to private voluntary organizations and cooperatives to assist these organizations in meeting administrative and related costs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,225,900,000 for Public Law 480 title II grants. The Committee does not support

the President’s proposal to reduce the amount available for direct food assistance to cover administrative costs instead of providing for those costs through the Commodity Credit Corporation as is the current practice. Instead, the Committee believes it is more important to provide a higher level of direct humanitarian assistance to help meet the world’s growing hunger crisis.

Monetization.—The Committee directs the administration not to place arbitrary limits on monetization under the Public Law 480 title II program. In food-deficit, import-reliant countries, monetization stimulates the economy and allows needed commodities to be provided in the marketplace. Food aid proposals should be approved based on the merits of the program plan to promote food security and improve people’s lives, not on the level of monetization.

Safe Box.—The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 contained a provision mandating a minimum level of Public Law 480 title II resources be used for non-emergency assistance (\$375,000,000 in fiscal year 2009), thereby creating a “safe box” for non-emergency funds. While the Committee fully agrees with the importance of non-emergency food aid, this language has the potential to complicate the delivery of food assistance in an emergency situation. The Committee should be notified immediately once a determination is made that the need for emergency assistance will exceed the amount available and the non-emergency “safe box” will be breached. In addition, the Secretary, in consultation of the Administrator of USAID, should submit quarterly reports to the Committee on the status of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, as well as notify the Committee when any draw down of the Trust occurs.

MC GOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM GRANTS

Appropriations, 2008	\$99,300,000
Budget estimate, 2009	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

The McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program helps support education, child development, and food security for some of the world’s poorest children. The program provides for donations of U.S. agricultural products, as well as financial and technical assistance, for school feeding and maternal and child nutrition projects in low-income, food-deficit countries that are committed to universal education. Commodities made available for donation through agreements with private voluntary organizations, cooperatives, intergovernmental organizations, and foreign governments may be donated for direct feeding or for local sale to generate proceeds to support school feeding and nutrition projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

The Committee strongly supports the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program as an important tool in improving food security for school-age children in developing countries and provides a mod-

est increase over the fiscal year 2008 level. This program often provides children the only nourishing meal they may receive in any given day and has been successful in promoting educational programs that are a vital link to improving life and living conditions throughout the world.

These funds are in addition to \$84,000,000 that is included in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, but the Committee notes that those resources were provided as a one-time infusion of funds which could be depleted in a single year. Unlike other mandatory funding in that statute, no allowance was made to ensure a funding stream through the term of the legislation. While the Committee hopes to be able to include increases above the established discretionary baseline for this program beyond fiscal year 2009, no such commitment can be made since, unlike the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, discretionary allocations are provided on an annual basis and it is impossible to predict what resources may be available for future year appropriations. Therefore, the Committee directs that in obligating funds available in fiscal year 2009, no commitments for out-year requirements should be made in excess of levels equal to the current year discretionary baseline plus funds made available through the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(EXPORT CREDIT PROGRAMS AND GSM-102)

	Guaranteed loan levels ¹	Guaranteed loan subsidy ¹	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2008	\$2,274,000,000	\$52,914,000	\$5,328,000
Budget estimate, 2009	2,675,000,000	25,715,000	5,353,000
Committee recommendation	2,675,000,000	25,715,000	5,353,000

¹ No appropriation required since export credit authorizations are permanent authority.

In 1980, the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] instituted the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM-102) under its charter authority. With this program, CCC guarantees, for a fee, payments due U.S. exporters under deferred payment sales contracts (up to 36 months) for defaults due to commercial as well as noncommercial risks. The risk to CCC extends from the date of export to the end of the deferred payment period covered in the export sales contract and covers only that portion of the payments agreed to in the assurance agreement. Operation of this program is based on criteria which will assure that it is used only where it is determined that it will develop new market opportunities and maintain and expand existing world markets for U.S. agricultural commodities. The program encourages U.S. financial institutions to provide financing to those areas where the institutions would be unwilling to provide financing in the absence of the CCC guarantees. Other credit activities may also be financed under the Export Credit Guarantee programs including supplier credit guarantee, under which CCC guarantees payments due to importers under short term financing (up to 180 days) that exporters extend directly to importers for the purchase of U.S. agricultural products. CCC also provides facilities financing guarantees.

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 establishes the program account. The subsidy costs of the CCC export guarantee programs are exempt from the requirement of advance appropriations of budget authority according to section 504(c)(2) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, Public Law 101-508. Appropriations to this account will be used for administrative expenses.

TITLE VI
RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG
ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The Food and Drug Administration [FDA] is a scientific regulatory agency whose mission is to promote and protect the public health and safety of Americans. FDA's work is a blending of science and law. The Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007 [FDAAA] (Public Law 110-85) reaffirmed the responsibilities of the FDA: to ensure safe and effective products reach the market to a timely way, and to monitor products for continued safety after they are in use. In addition, FDA is entrusted with two critical functions in the Nation's war on terrorism: preventing willful contamination of all regulated products, including food, and improving the availability of medications to prevent or treat injuries caused by biological, chemical or nuclear agents.

The FDA Foods program has the primary responsibility for assuring that the food supply, quality of foods, food ingredients and dietary supplements are safe, sanitary, nutritious, wholesome, and honestly labeled, and that cosmetic products are safe and properly labeled. The variety and complexity of the food supply has grown dramatically while new and more complex safety issues, such as emerging microbial pathogens, natural toxins, and technological innovations in production and processing, have developed. This program plays a major role in keeping the United States food supply among the safest in the world.

The FDA Drugs programs are comprised of three separate areas, Human Drugs, Animal Drugs and Biologics. FDA is responsible for the life cycle of the product, including premarket review and postmarket surveillance of human, animal and biological products to ensure their safety and efficacy. For Human Drugs this includes assuring that all drug products used for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of disease are safe and effective. Additional procedures include the review of investigational new drug applications; evaluation of market applications for new and generic drugs, labeling and composition of prescription and over-the-counter drugs; monitoring the quality and safety of products manufactured in, or imported into, the United States; and, regulating the advertising and promotion of prescription drugs. The Animal Drugs and Feeds Program ensures only safe and beneficial veterinary drugs, intended for the treatment and/or prevention of diseases in animals and the improved production of food-producing animals, are approved for marketing.

The FDA Biologics program assures that blood and blood products, blood test kits, vaccines, and therapeutics are pure, potent, safe, effective, and properly labeled. The program inspects blood banks and blood processors, licenses and inspects firms collecting human source plasma, evaluates and licenses biologics manufacturing firms and products; lot releases licensed products; and monitors adverse events associated with vaccine immunization.

The FDA Devices and Radiological program ensures the safety and effectiveness of medical devices and eliminates unnecessary human exposure to manmade radiation from medical, occupational, and consumer products. In addition, the program enforces quality standards under the Mammography Quality Standards Act (Public Law 108–365). Medical devices include thousands of products from thermometers and contact lenses to heart pacemakers, hearing aids, MRIs, microwave ovens, and video display terminals.

FDA's National Center for Toxicological Research in Jefferson, Arkansas, serves as a specialized resource, conducting peer-review scientific research that provides the basis for FDA to make sound science-based regulatory decisions through its premarket review and postmarket surveillance. The research is designed to define and understand the biological mechanisms of action underlying the toxicity of products and developing methods to improve assessment of human exposure, susceptibility and risk of those products regulated by FDA.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation	Prescription drug user fees	Medical device user fees	Animal drug user fees	Mammography clinics inspection fees	Export and certification fees	Total
Appropriations, 2008	1,714,337	459,412	48,431	13,696	18,398	9,500	2,263,774
Supplemental appropriation, 2008 ¹	150,000	150,000
Budget estimate, 2009 ²	2,033,770	497,108	52,547	13,698	19,318	10,300	2,626,741
Committee recommendation	2,038,964	497,108	52,547	15,260	19,318	10,300	2,633,497

¹ Supplemental funding is available until September 30, 2009.

² Includes a budget amendment of \$265,000,000.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,038,964,000 for FDA salaries and expenses. The Committee also recommends \$497,108,000 in Prescription Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$52,547,000 in Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act user fee collections; \$15,260,000 in Animal Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$19,318,000 in Mammography Quality Standards Act fee collections; and \$10,300,000 in export and certification fees, as assumed in the President's budget. The Committee recommendation includes bill language which prohibits FDA from developing, establishing, or operating any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

The Committee notes that ADUFA user fees need to be reauthorized for fiscal year 2009. ADUFA legislation is currently being negotiated by the appropriate authorizing committees. The Committee has included amounts that represent the current adminis-

tration proposal for ADUFA user fees. The Committee will follow the reauthorization of this fee and adjust the fee collection amount if necessary.

The following table reflects the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2008 and budget request levels:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES
[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2008 enacted	2009 request	
Centers and related field activities:			
Foods	509,867	660,534	660,534
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition [CFSAN]	172,035	210,587	210,587
Field Activities	337,832	449,947	449,947
Human Drugs	353,269	407,491	409,781
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research [CDER]	266,131	293,234	294,999
Field Activities	87,138	114,257	114,782
Biologics	155,229	180,675	181,795
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research [CBER]	125,834	145,344	146,292
Field Activities	29,395	35,331	35,503
Animal Drugs	97,037	114,234	114,355
Center for Veterinary Medicine [CVM]	59,738	71,714	71,824
Field Activities	37,299	42,520	42,531
Medical and radiological devices	237,992	277,381	278,421
Center for Devices and Radiological Health [CDRH]	177,839	206,675	207,356
Field Activities	60,153	70,706	71,065
National Center for Toxicological Research [NCTR]	44,006	51,816	52,127
Other Activities	97,496	122,198	122,510
Rent and related activities	88,829	88,829	88,829
Rental payments to GSA	130,612	130,612	130,612
Total, FDA salaries and expenses, new budget authority	1,714,337	2,033,770	2,038,964

The Committee recommendation includes the following increases in budget authority for FDA salaries and expenses activities: \$25,000,000 for cost-of-living adjustments; \$155,194,000 for food safety activities; \$104,433,000 for drug, biologics and device safety, including the Critical Path Initiative; and \$40,000,000 for activities to modernize FDA's science and workforce. This Committee recommendation fully funds the President's budget request for the FDA, including additional funding requested in the budget amendment submitted on June 9, 2008. The Committee recommendation does not include base program reductions assumed in the budget request.

Of the amount recommended, \$155,194,000 shall be used for activities related to food protection. The funding shall be used to open additional FDA offices overseas and improve FDA's capacity to

identify risk factors and more rapidly mitigate any food safety problems. This includes more rapid detection of contamination and more rapid trace back abilities to determine the source of any outbreak of food borne illness. Further, this funding will be used to hire additional foreign and domestic inspectors to increase the number of import food exams, the number of foreign food facility inspections and the number of domestic food safety inspections; and to create a new communication system to more rapidly inform the public of any outbreak of food borne illness.

Of the amount recommended, \$104,433,000 shall be used for activities related to drug, device, and biologics safety. The funding shall be used to increase foreign and domestic facility inspections, improve laboratory infrastructure and rapid analysis tools, implement the safety requirements outlined in the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act, and upgrade the agency's information technology to enable data sharing and enhanced analysis of adverse events.

Of the amount recommended, \$40,000,000 will be used to enhance science programs across the agency, with specific focus on areas of emerging science where the FDA currently lacks the expertise necessary to regulate complex products under development. This will include funding for research, science training and professional development for current FDA staff, and efforts to recruit additional scientific staff to the agency.

Agricultural Products Food Safety Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,757,000 for the FDA's contract with New Mexico State University's Physical Sciences Laboratory to operate the Food Technology Evaluation Laboratory, which conducts evaluation and development of rapid screening methodologies, technologies, and instrumentation; and provides technology deployment, modeling, and data analysis for food safety and product safety, including advanced risk-based systems for screening and inspection, to facilitate FDA's regulations and responsibilities in food safety, product safety, homeland security, bioterrorism, and other initiatives.

Antibiotics in Shrimp.—The Committee is concerned about the contamination of farm-raised shrimp imports with banned antibiotics. The Food and Drug Administration currently inspects less than 2 percent of imported shrimp. The Committee strongly encourages FDA to develop, in cooperation with State testing programs, a program for increasing the inspection of imported shrimp for banned antibiotics.

Budget Justification.—The Committee directs the agency to submit the fiscal year 2010 budget request in a format that follows the same account structure as the fiscal year 2009 budget request unless otherwise approved by the Committee.

Codex Alimentarius.—Within the total funding available, at least \$2,495,000 is for FDA activities in support of Codex Alimentarius.

Collaborative Drug Safety Research.—The Committee recommendation includes \$559,000 to continue the collaborative research agreement on cardiac biomarkers between FDA, the Critical Path Institute, and the University of Utah. The Committee notes that this research project has been extremely successful and has developed a genetic test that will help guide warfarin, a commonly

prescribed blood thinner, dosing. It is estimated that integrating genetic testing into warfarin therapy could allow Americans to avoid 85,000 serious bleeding events and 17,000 strokes annually, reducing health care spending by approximately \$1,000,000,000 annually.

Critical Path and Modernizing Drug Safety.—The Committee recommendation includes \$16,000,000 for critical path initiatives, including not less than \$4,000,000 for competitive contracts or grants to universities and non-profit organizations to support critical path projects. The Committee expects that this funding will be used to further FDA's work on critical path opportunities, including the 76 opportunities published in 2006 and other opportunities identified since 2006, and to promote collaborations with other Government agencies, academia, patient groups, and other interested parties including, but not limited to, the Predictive Safety Testing Consortium, which is currently reviewing the validity of new tests to detect drug induced kidney damage; the National Institute for Pharmaceutical Technology and Education, a multi-university consortium working to further research and education programs in the science and engineering of product development and manufacturing; the Coalition Against Major Diseases, which is working to generate quantitative disease progression models that can be made available for all to use in designing clinical trials; and the Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative, which aims to improve the efficiency and safety of clinical trials.

Demonstration Grants for Improving Pediatric Device Availability.—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,000,000 for Demonstration Grants for Improving Pediatric Device Availability, as authorized by the Food and Drug Amendments Act of 2007. The Committee is aware that medical device products are developed for adults, limiting children's access to safe and effective medical devices. This program will provide grants to nonprofit pediatric medical device consortia, which will assist scientists and innovators with technical and financial resources to improve the number of medical devices available to children.

Dietary Supplements.—FDA has indicated that the ability to identify and analyze specific components in ingredients, including botanical ingredients, is an essential component of research and regulatory programs directed at ensuring the safety and effectiveness of dietary supplements. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,713,000 for review of botanicals in dietary supplements. This work is being carried out by FDA in collaboration with the National Center for Natural Products Research, Oxford, Mississippi.

Generic Drugs.—The Committee recommendation includes no less than \$81,526,000 for the generic drugs program at FDA, of which \$41,358,000 is for the Office of Generic Drugs.

In Vitro High Throughput Immune Response Assessment Technologies.—The Committee is aware of rapid in vitro high throughput immune response assessment technologies for evaluating the human immune response to vaccines. These technologies may facilitate the rapid screening of novel vaccine candidates, thus reducing the time and cost associated with development. Specifically, these approaches may be highly useful for conducting potency test-

ing and predicting the performance of new vaccines. The Committee directs FDA to continue to evaluate these technologies to determine how they might be used to rapidly facilitate vaccine development and FDA review.

Mammography.—The Committee recommends no less than the fiscal year 2008 level in appropriated funds for activities related to the Mammography Quality Standards Act [MQSA]. Appropriations for this program fund research grants and various activities to develop and enforce quality standards for mammography services, including a Federal advisory committee, accreditation bodies, inspections of government entities and facilities that provided 50 percent or more mammography screenings with grants provided through the Center for Disease Control's National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, issuance and renewal of certificates, appeal procedures, certification of personnel, and imposing sanctions for noncompliance.

On June 26, 2008, the Committee received a report, as requested by Senate Report 110–134, on actions being taken to implement recommendations made in the Institute of Medicine report entitled “Breast Imaging Quality Standards”. The report stated that FDA held an open public meeting on September 28 and 29, 2006, and has been considering potential amendments to MQSA, which would address the IOM report, since this meeting. To date, FDA has not acted on any of these recommendations. The Committee believes this is an unacceptable delay, and directs the FDA to report back within 120 days of enactment of this Act on which amendments that FDA will propose to MQSA, if any, in response to the IOM report recommendations and provide a timeline for these amendments.

National Center for Food Safety and Technology.—With the growing threat of foodborne illness to the public health, the Committee believes that collaborative research in food safety should continue among Government, academia, and private industry. The national model for that collaboration has been the National Center for Food Safety and Technology [NCFST] in Summit-Argo, Illinois. The Committee recommendation includes \$2,212,000 for NCFST to continue the important work done there. This funding should be exclusive of any initiative funds which the FDA may provide in addition to NCFST.

Office of Women's Health.—The Committee believes that it is imperative for FDA to pay sufficient attention to gender-based research, ensuring that products approved by the FDA are safe and effective for women as well as men. The Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 for the Office of Women's Health. The Committee encourages FDA to ensure that the Office of Women's Health is sufficiently funded to carry out its activities, and to enhance its funding if necessary.

Orphan Products Grants.—The Committee recommendation includes \$14,035,000 for the Orphan Products Grants Program within the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research.

Pediatric Cancer.—The Committee notes the poor survival rates and lack of new therapies associated with many pediatric cancers, including high-risk neuroblastoma. The Committee encourages the FDA to prioritize review of new treatments and clinical trials for

pediatric oncology patients and requests a report on these activities within 120 days of the enactment of this act.

Seafood Economic Integrity.—The Committee recognizes the importance of seafood to a healthy diet, but is concerned that FDA does not focus sufficient attention on economic integrity issues, particularly with respect to mislabeling of species, weights, country of origin, and treatment. The Committee encourages FDA to work with States to more aggressively combat fraud in parts of the seafood industry.

Seafood Safety.—The Committee supports the ongoing work of the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference [ISSC] and its joint efforts with the FDA and the shellfish industry to formulate shellfish safety regulations through the National Shellfish Sanitation Program. The Committee recommendation includes \$148,000 for the Office of Seafood Inspection to continue these activities and \$185,000 be directed to the ISSC for the *Vibrio Vulnificus* Education Program.

Standardized Food Safety Certification.—The Committee is aware that the Hawaii Department of Agriculture has proposed a State-wide standardized food safety certification system. The Committee encourages the FDA to work with the State of Hawaii on this system and to provide funding if appropriate.

Standards of Identity.—The Committee is aware of the ongoing debate surrounding increased importation and use of milk protein concentrate. The Committee remains concerned with FDA’s current lack of enforcement of standards of identity as it relates to the potential use of milk protein concentrate in standardized cheese and the labeling thereof.

Waste Management Education and Research Consortium.—The Committee recommendation includes \$73,000 for the FDA to continue its support for the Waste Management Education and Research Consortium and its work in food safety technology verification and education.

Western Region FDA Center of Excellence.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,490,000 for the Western Region FDA Center of Excellence at the University of California at Davis [UCD]. California and the western States provide the majority of the Nation’s fruits, vegetables, and specialty crops, and lead the Nation in import and export of food products. This Center is a cooperative research center with FDA and UCD and addresses food safety and security areas of focus identified by FDA to be of greatest need in the Western United States.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2008	\$2,433,000
Budget estimate, 2009 ¹	12,433,000
Committee recommendation	12,433,000

¹ Includes a budget amendment of \$10,000,000

FDA maintains offices and staff in 49 States and in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, including field laboratories and specialized facilities, as well as the National Center for Toxicological Research complex. Repairs, modifications, improvements, and construction to FDA headquarters and field facilities must be made to preserve the properties, ensure employee safety, meet changing

program requirements, and permit the agency to keep its laboratory methods up to date.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,433,000 for FDA buildings and facilities. This funding shall be used to upgrade FDA facilities and laboratories which are currently below public safety standards and incapable of performing agency requirements.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2008	\$46,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009	50,000,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The Farm Credit Administration [FCA] is the independent agency in the executive branch of the Government responsible for the examination and regulation of the banks, associations, and other institutions of the Farm Credit System.

Activities of the Farm Credit Administration include the planning and execution of examinations of Farm Credit System institutions and the preparation of examination reports. FCA also establishes standards, enforces rules and regulations, and approves certain actions of the institutions.

The administration and the institutions under its jurisdiction now operate under authorities contained in the Farm Credit Act of 1971, Public Law 92-181, effective December 10, 1971. Public Law 99-205, effective December 23, 1985, restructured FCA and gave the agency regulatory authorities and enforcement powers.

The act provides for the farmer-owned cooperative system to make sound, adequate, and constructive credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, rural residences, and associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, and to modernize existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs.

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 authorized the formation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation [FAMC] to operate a secondary market for agricultural and rural housing mortgages. The Farm Credit Administration, under section 8.11 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, is assigned the responsibility of regulating this entity and assuring its safe and sound operation.

Expenses of the Farm Credit Administration are paid by assessments collected from the Farm Credit System institutions and by assessments to the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$50,000,000 on administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration [FCA]. The Committee recommendation that the limitation does not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII
GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends the following provisions:

Section 701. This section makes funds available for the purchase, replacement, and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Section 702. This section makes funds for certain accounts within the Department of Agriculture available until expended.

Section 703. This section gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to transfer unobligated balances to the Working Capital Fund.

Section 704. This section limits the funding provided in the bill to 1 year, unless otherwise specified.

Section 705. This section limits negotiated indirect costs on cooperative agreements between the Department of Agriculture and nonprofit organizations to 10 percent.

Section 706. This section makes appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct guaranteed loans available until expended to disburse obligations for certain Rural Development programs.

Section 707. This section makes funds available for the expenses and activities of certain advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces at the Department of Agriculture.

Section 708. This section prohibits the use of funds to establish an inspection panel at the Department of Agriculture.

Section 709. This section requires Department of Agriculture agencies to provide reimbursement to other Department of Agriculture agencies for employees detailed for longer than 30 days.

Section 710. This section prohibits the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health and Human Services from transmitting questions or responses as a result of the appropriations hearing process to non-Department employees.

Section 711. This section prohibits the purchase of new information technology equipment and equipment in excess of \$25,000 without the prior approval of the Chief Information Officer.

Section 712. This section prohibits the reprogramming of funds for programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less without the prior notification of the Committee on Appropriations.

Section 713. This section prohibits the use of funds for user fee proposals that fail to provide sufficient budget impact information.

Section 714. This section prohibits the closing of the Food and Drug Administration's St. Louis, Missouri laboratory.

Section 715. This section limits the amount of funding available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the release of commodities under the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust.

Section 716. This section prohibits the promulgation of a final rule related to animal and plant health programs.

Section 717. This section provides \$434,000 for the Denali Commission to address deficiencies in solid waste management in the State of Alaska. The Committee directs the Commission to work with the State of Alaska to develop a legal framework for a solid waste management authority that can become self-sustaining and is authorized to establish a revolving loan fund to support solid waste projects.

Section 718. This section makes funds for certain conservation programs available until expended to disburse certain obligations made in the current fiscal year.

Section 719. This section makes certain former Rural Utilities Service borrowers eligible for the Rural Economic Development loan and grant program.

Section 720. This section gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to make funding and other assistance available for damage to non-Federal lands damaged by fires initiated by the Federal Government, and waives cost-sharing requirements.

Section 721. This section prohibits funds to carry out certain sections of Public Law 110-246.

Section 722. This section provides funding for the National Center for Natural Products Research to construct and/or renovate facilities to enhance the research conducted on botanicals and dietary supplements at the National Center in conjunction with FDA's Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. This research aids FDA's regulatory mission in ensuring the safety and effectiveness of dietary supplements by identifying, isolating, and analyzing specific components of botanicals and dietary supplements.

Section 723. This section provides funding to complete the environmental assessment for and continue the design of a facility that will allow the creation of sterile fruit flies of all varieties of established fruit fly pests.

Section 724. This section establishes a forestry pilot program for lands affected by Hurricane Katrina.

Section 725. This section makes certain locations eligible for certain Rural Development programs.

Section 726. This section provides funding for the Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships.

Section 727. This section provides funding for section 6402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, to support development and expansion of the specialty cheese industry.

Section 728. This section authorizes certain watershed projects.

Section 729. This section includes language amending the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.

Section 730. This section prohibits funding certain activities.

Section 731. This section directs the NRCS to settle claims associated with the Houlka Master Watershed Project.

Section 732. This section modifies matching requirements for certain research grants.

Section 733. This section refers to congressional spending.

Section 734. This section makes commercial fishermen eligible for certain operating loans.

Section 735. This section exempts from agricultural quarantine and inspection user fees certain commercial trucks originating in the United States and transiting through Canada.

Section 736. This section prohibits certain products from Argentina.

Section 737. This section relates to sales of agricultural and medical goods to Cuba.

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2009, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–119), the following information provides the definition of the term “program, project, and activity” for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. The term “program, project, and activity” shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008, the House and Senate Committee reports, and the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference.

If a sequestration order is necessary, in implementing the Presidential order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction required for fiscal year 2009 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 or Public Law 100–119 to all items specified in the explanatory notes submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in support of the fiscal year 2009 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as modified by congressional action, and in addition:

For the Agricultural Research Service the definition shall include specific research locations as identified in the explanatory notes and lines of research specifically identified in the reports of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

For the Natural Resources Conservation Service the definition shall include individual flood prevention projects as identified in the explanatory notes and individual operational watershed projects as summarized in the notes.

For the Farm Service Agency the definition shall include individual, regional, State, district, and county offices.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports accompanying general appropriations bills identify each recommended amendment which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2009:

- The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 provides authorizations for a number of programs funded under this act. This act is currently under consideration for reauthorization;
- Healthy Forests Reserve Program

—Animal Drug User Fee Act

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(c), RULE XXVI OF THE
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 17, 2008, the Committee ordered reported an original bill (S. 3289) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and authorized the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate bill as a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure, with the bill subject to amendment and subject to the budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Allard	
Mr. Alexander	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include “(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and

of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee.”

In compliance with this rule, the following changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italics; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

TITLE 7—AGRICULTURE

CHAPTER 50—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

SUBCHAPTER IV—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

§ 1991. Definitions

(a) As used in this chapter:

(1) The term “farmer” includes a person who is engaged in, or who, with assistance afforded under this chapter, intends to engage in, fish farming *and, in the case of subtitle B, commercial fishing.*

(2) The term “farming” shall be deemed to include fish farming *and, in the case of subtitle B, commercial fishing.*

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(4) PRESERVATION LOAN SERVICE PROGRAM.—The term “preservation loan service program” means homestead retention as authorized under section 2000 of this title.

(c) *DEFINITION OF FARM.—In subtitle B, the term “farm” includes a commercial fishing enterprise owned or operated by a geographically disadvantaged farmer or rancher (as defined in section 10906(a) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 2204 note; Public Law 107–171), except that for purposes of this subsection the term “farmer or rancher” as used in that section shall include a commercial fisherman).*

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER VI—DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

[§ 2009aa–10. Records

[(a) Records of the Authority

[(1) In general

[The Authority shall maintain accurate and complete records of all transactions and activities of the Authority.

[(2) Availability

[All records of the Authority shall be available for audit and examination by the Comptroller General of the United

States and the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture (including authorized representatives of the Comptroller General and the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture).

[(b) Records of recipients of Federal assistance

[(1) In general

[A recipient of Federal funds under this subchapter shall, as required by the Authority, maintain accurate and complete records of transactions and activities financed with Federal funds and report on the transactions and activities to the Authority.

[(2) Availability

[All records required under paragraph (1) shall be available for audit by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture, and the Authority (including authorized representatives of the Comptroller General, the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture, and the Authority).

[(c) Annual audit

[The Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture shall audit the activities, transactions, and records of the Authority on an annual basis.]

* * * * *

TITLE 22—FOREIGN RELATIONS AND INTERCOURSE

CHAPTER 79—TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT

§ 7209. Requirements relating to certain travel-related transactions with Cuba

[(a) Authorization of travel relating to commercial sale of agricultural commodities

[The Secretary of the Treasury shall promulgate regulations under which the travel-related transactions listed in subsection (c) of section 515.560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, may be authorized on a case-by-case basis by a specific license for travel to, from, or within Cuba for the commercial export sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to the provisions of this chapter.]

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF TRAVEL RELATING TO COMMERCIAL SALES OF AGRICULTURAL AND MEDICAL GOODS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall promulgate regulations under which the travel-related transactions listed in paragraph (c) of section 515.560 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, are authorized by general license for travel to, from, or within Cuba for the marketing and sale of agricultural and medical goods pursuant to the provisions of this title.

* * * * *

TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE
CHAPTER 13—SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

§ 1766. Child and adult care food program

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(r) **Program for at-risk school children**

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(5) Limitation

The Secretary shall limit reimbursement under this subsection for meals served under a program to institutions located in **[eight]** *nine* States, of which **[six]** *seven* States shall be *Vermont*, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Delaware, and Michigan and two States shall be approved by the Secretary through a competitive application process.

* * * * *

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2008: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies:				
Mandatory	76,307	76,307	63,526	¹ 63,526
Discretionary	20,435	20,435	21,395	¹ 21,344
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2009				² 71,646
2010				3,613
2011				1,036
2012				244
2013 and future years				186
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2008	NA	28,283	NA	24,633

¹ Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
² Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power of the purse. The Committee believes strongly that Congress should make the decisions on how to allocate the people's money.

As defined in Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the term "congressional directed spending item" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, pro-

viding, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative, formula-driven, or competitive award process.

For each item, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in such congressionally directed spending item. Such certifications are available to the public on the website of the Senate Committee on Appropriations (www.appropriations.senate.gov/senators.cfm).

Following is a list of congressionally directed spending items included in the Senate recommendation discussed in this report, along with the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the Committee of jurisdiction for each item so identified. Neither the Committee recommendation nor this report contains any limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in rule XLIV.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Account	Project	Funding	Member
AMS	Specialty Markets, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	\$360,000	Senator Kohl
APHIS	Beaver management and control, APHIS Mississippi	472,000	Senator Cochran
APHIS	Beaver management and control, APHIS North Carolina	221,000	Senator Dole
APHIS	Berryman Institute, Jack Berryman Institute Utah and Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station	1,117,000	Senators Bennett, Cochran, and Wicker
APHIS	Bio-safety and antibiotic resistance, University of Vermont	240,000	Senator Leahy
APHIS	Blackbird management, APHIS Kansas	127,000	Senator Roberts
APHIS	Blackbird management, APHIS Louisiana	100,000	Senator Landrieu
APHIS	Blackbird management, APHIS North and South Dakota	282,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan, and Johnson
APHIS	Brown tree snake, APHIS Hawaii	700,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
APHIS	California county pest detection import inspection program, California Department of Food and Agriculture	619,000	Senators Boxer and Feinstein
APHIS	California county pest detection import inspection program, California Department of Food and Agriculture	738,000	Senators Boxer and Feinstein
APHIS	Chronic Wasting Disease, Colorado Department of Agriculture	38,000	Senators Allard and Salazar
APHIS	Chronic Wasting Disease, Utah Department of Agriculture and Food	182,000	Senator Bennett
APHIS	Chronic Wasting Disease, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection	1,350,000	Senator Kohl
APHIS	Cogongrass control, Mississippi Department of Agriculture	221,000	Senator Cochran
APHIS	Cooperative livestock protection program, APHIS Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture	223,000	Senators Casey and Specter
APHIS	Comorant control, APHIS Michigan	148,000	Senators Levin and Stabenow
APHIS	Comorant control, APHIS Mississippi	237,000	Senator Cochran
APHIS	Comorant control, APHIS Vermont and Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department	110,000	Senator Leahy
APHIS	Disease prevention, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	74,000	Senators Landrieu and Vitter
APHIS	Disease surveillance in North Dakota, North Dakota State University and Dickinson State University	1,400,000	Senators Conrad and Dorgan
APHIS	Genetically modified products, Iowa State University	276,000	Senators Grassley and Harkin
APHIS	Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee, Idaho Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Livestock, Wyoming Livestock Board	692,000	Senators Barrasso, Baucus, Craig, and Crapo
APHIS	Hawaii interline, APHIS Hawaii	1,750,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
APHIS	Integrated predation management activities, APHIS West Virginia	298,000	Senator Byrd
APHIS	John's disease, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Services	1,000,000	Senator Kohl
APHIS	Lamprey control, Lake Champlain Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative, Vermont	100,000	Senator Leahy
APHIS	Mormon crickets, APHIS Utah	1,117,000	Senator Bennett
APHIS	National Agriculture Biosecurity Center, Kansas State University	276,000	Senators Brownback and Roberts
APHIS	National farm animal identification and records, Holstein Association	343,000	Senator Leahy
APHIS	National Wildlife Research Center, Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station and Mississippi State University	255,000	Senator Cochran
APHIS	National Wildlife Research Station, Texas A&M	309,000	Senator Hutchison
APHIS	Nevada weed management, Nevada Department of Agriculture	250,000	Senator Reid

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
APHIS	New Mexico rapid syndrome validation program, New Mexico State University	404,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
APHIS	Nez Perce Bio-control Center, Nez Perce Tribe	187,000	Senators Craig and Crapo
APHIS	Predator Research Station, APHIS Utah, Utah State University, Colorado State University	1,033,000	Senator Bennett
APHIS	Rodent control, APHIS Hawaii	172,000	Senator Inouye
APHIS	Tri-State predator control, APHIS Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming	986,000	Senators Barrasso, Baucus, Craig, Crapo, Enzi, and Tester
APHIS	Varroa mite suppression, APHIS Hawaii	500,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
APHIS	Wildlife Services Hawaii, APHIS Hawaii	400,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
APHIS	Wildlife Services South Dakota, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks	553,000	Senators Johnson and Thune
APHIS	Wisconsin Livestock Identification Consortium, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	1,550,000	Senator Kohl
ARS/BF	Agriculture Research Center, Pullman, WA	1,870,000	Senators Cantwell and Murray
ARS/BF	Alcorn State University Biotechnology Laboratory, Alcorn State, MS	1,780,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
ARS/BF	Animal Bioscience Facility, Bozeman, MT	1,600,000	Senators Baucus and Tester
ARS/BF	Animal Waste Management Research Laboratory, Bowling Green, KY	1,390,000	Senator McConnell
ARS/BF	Appalachian Fruit Laboratory, Kearneysville, WV	1,000,000	Senator Byrd
ARS/BF	ARS Agricultural Research Center, Logan, UT	5,561,000	Senator Bennett
ARS/BF	Dairy Forage Agricultural Center, Prairie du Sac, WI	2,558,000	Senator Kohl
ARS/BF	Forage-Animal Production Research Facility, Lexington, KY	2,085,000	Senator McConnell
ARS/BF	Hagerman Fish Culture Experiment Station, Hagerman, ID	695,000	Senators Craig and Crapo
ARS/BF	Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center, Stoneville, MS	2,000,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
ARS/BF	National Plant and Genetics Security Center, Columbia, MO	2,086,000	Senator Bond
ARS/BF	Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center, Hilo, HI	2,000,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
ARS/BF	Poultry Science Research Facility, Starkville, MS	1,780,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
ARS/BF	Sugarcane Research Laboratory, Houma, LA	3,200,000	Senators Landrieu and Vitter
ARS/BF	Systems Biology Research Facility, Lincoln, NE	1,390,000	Senators Hagel and Ben Nelson
CS/Extension	Childhood Farm Safety, Farm Safety 4 Just Kids, Urbandale, IA	74,000	Senators Grassley and Harkin
CS/Extension	Conservation Technology Transfer, University of Wisconsin Extension	400,000	Senator Kohl
CS/Extension	Dairy education, Iowa State University	169,000	Senators Harkin and Grassley
CS/Extension	E-commerce, Mississippi State University	246,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
CS/Extension	Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	475,000	Senators Bingaman, Cornyn, Domenici, Hutchison
CS/Extension	Extension specialist, Mississippi State University	98,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
CS/Extension	Health education leadership, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	628,000	Senator McConnell
CS/Extension	Iowa vitality center, Iowa State University	223,000	Senators Grassley and Harkin
CS/Extension	National Center for Farm Safety, Northeast Iowa Community College	168,000	Senator Harkin

CS/Extension	Nutrition enhancement, University of Wisconsin Extension and Wisconsin Department of Public Institutions	800,000	Senator Kohl
CS/Extension	Ohio-Israel Agriculture Initiative, The Negev Foundation, OH	496,000	Sensors Brown and Voinovich
CS/Extension	Pesticide Reduction on Vegetables, University of Wisconsin Extension	350,000	Senator Kohl
CS/Extension	Pilot technology transfer, Mississippi State University, Oklahoma State University	223,000	Sensors Cochran, Inhofe and Wicker
CS/Extension	Potato Integrated Pest Management—Late Blight, University of Maine	298,000	Sensors Collins and Snow
CS/Extension	Range improvement, New Mexico State University	223,000	Sensors Bingaman and Domenici
CS/Extension	Rural technologies, Maui Economic Development Board, HI	150,000	Sensors Akaka and Inouye
CS/Extension	Urban horticulture and marketing, Chicago Botanic Garden, Glencoe, IL	111,000	Senator Durbin
CS/Extension	Urban horticulture, University of Wisconsin Extension and Growing Power	400,000	Senator Kohl
CS/RE/FA	Agriculture development in the American Pacific, University of Hawaii	372,000	Senator Inouye
CS/RE/FA	Agriculture waste utilization, West Virginia State University	485,000	Senator Byrd
CS/RE/FA	Agriculture-based industrial lubricants, University of Northern Iowa	405,000	Sensors Grassley and Harkin
CS/RE/FA	Applied Agriculture and Environment Research, California State University	250,000	Senator Feinstein
CS/RE/FA	Aquaculture, Cheyney University, PA	164,000	Senator Specter
CS/RE/FA	Aquaculture Research, Rhode Island Coastal Resource Management Council	298,000	Senator Reed
CS/RE/FA	Biotechnology Research, Alcorn State University, MS	511,000	Senator Cochran
CS/RE/FA	Botanical research, Utah State University	670,000	Senator Bennett
CS/RE/FA	Center for North American studies, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	200,000	Sensors Domenici and Hutchison
CS/RE/FA	Centers for Dairy and Beef Excellence, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture	340,000	Senator Specter
CS/RE/FA	Cotton research, Texas Tech University	300,000	Sensors Cornyn and Hutchison
CS/RE/FA	Council for Agriculture and Technology, Ames, IA	112,000	Senator Harkin
CS/RE/FA	Ethnobotanics, Frostburg State University, MD	500,000	Sensors Cardin and Mikulski
CS/RE/FA	Farmland Preservation, The Ohio State University	112,000	Sensors Brown and Voinovich
CS/RE/FA	Feed efficiency, West Virginia University	112,000	Senator Byrd
CS/RE/FA	Florida Biomass to Biofuels Conversion Program, University of Central Florida	250,000	Sensors Martinez and Bill Nelson
CS/RE/FA	Medicinal and Bioactive Crops, Stephen F. Austin State University, TX	298,000	Senator Hutchison
CS/RE/FA	Midwest Agribusiness Trade and Information Center MATRIC, Iowa State University	187,000	Sensors Grassley and Harkin
CS/RE/FA	Mississippi Valley State University	1,067,000	Sensors Cochran and Wicker
CS/RE/FA	NE Center for Invasive Plants, University of Connecticut, the University of Vermont, and the University of Maine	150,000	Sensors Collins, Dodd, Lieberman, Snowe
CS/RE/FA	PM-10 air quality study, Washington State University	150,000	Sensors Cantwell and Murray
CS/RE/FA	Polymer Research, Pittsburg State University, KS	1,367,000	Senator Brownback
CS/RE/FA	Rural systems, Jackson State University, MS	229,000	Sensors Cochran and Wicker
CS/RE/FA	Shellfish, University of Rhode Island	261,000	Sensors Reed and Whitehouse
CS/RE/FA	Shrimp aquaculture, University of Southern Mississippi	300,000	Sensors Cochran and Wicker
CS/RE/FA	Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia, University of Toledo, OH	223,000	Sensors Brown and Voinovich
CS/RE/FA	Water pollutants, Marshall University, WV	410,000	Senator Byrd
CS/SRG	Advanced genetic technologies, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	481,000	Senator McConnell
CS/SRG	Advancing Biofuel Production, Baylor University, TX	149,000	Senator Hutchison
CS/SRG	Aegilops cylindrica / Biomass (jointed goatgrass), Washington State University	200,000	Sensors Cantwell and Murray

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
CS/SRG	Agricultural diversity, University of Minnesota, Crookston	200,000	Senators Conrad and Dorgan
CS/SRG	Agricultural Entrepreneurial Alternatives, Pennsylvania State University	248,000	Senators Casey and Specter
CS/SRG	Air quality, Kansas State University; Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	300,000	Senators Cornyn, Hutchinson, Roberts
CS/SRG	Alliance for food protection, University of Nebraska	130,000	Senators Hagel and Ben Nelson
CS/SRG	Animal disease research, University of Wyoming	258,000	Senators Barrasso and Enzi
CS/SRG	Animal Health, Forages for Advancing Livestock Production Project, KY	291,000	Senator McConnell
CS/SRG	Animal Science Food Safety Consortium, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture, Iowa State University, Kansas State University	1,000,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin, Lincoln, Pryor, Roberts
CS/SRG	Apple fire blight, Cornell University/New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Michigan	200,000	Senators Levin, Schumer, Stabenow
CS/SRG	Aquaculture product & marketing development, West Virginia University	521,000	Senator Byrd
CS/SRG	Aquaculture, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	200,000	Senators Landrieu and Vitter
CS/SRG	Aquaculture, Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station	385,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
CS/SRG	Aquaculture, North Carolina State University	242,000	Senators Burr and Dole
CS/SRG	Armilaria root rot, Michigan State University	111,000	Senators Levin and Stabenow
CS/SRG	Asparagus technology and production, Washington State University	184,000	Senators Cantwell and Murray
CS/SRG	Avian bioscience, University of Delaware	100,000	Senator Biden and Carper
CS/SRG	Barley for Rural Development, Montana State University, University of Idaho	547,000	Senators Baucus, Craig, Crapo, Tester
CS/SRG	Biodesign and Processing, Virginia Tech University	223,000	Senators Warner and Webb
CS/SRG	Biomass-based energy research, Oklahoma State University, Mississippi State University	894,000	Senators Cochran, Inhofe, Wicker
CS/SRG	Cataloging Genes Associated with Drought and Disease Resistance, New Mexico State University	187,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
CS/SRG	Center for One Medicine	250,000	Senator Durbin
CS/SRG	Center for Public Land and Rural Economies, Utah State University	223,000	Senator Bennett
CS/SRG	Center for rural studies, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	261,000	Senator Leahy
CS/SRG	Childhood obesity and nutrition, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	180,000	Senator Leahy
CS/SRG	Citrus canker/greening, University of Florida	200,000	Senators Martinez and Bill Nelson
CS/SRG	Competitiveness of agricultural products, Washington State University and the University of Washington	350,000	Senators Cantwell and Murray
CS/SRG	Cool season legume research, North Dakota State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	250,000	Senators Cantwell, Conrad, Craig, Crapo, Dorgan, Murray
CS/SRG	Cotton insect management and Fiber Quality, University of Georgia	368,000	Senators Chambliss and Isakson
CS/SRG	Cranberry/Blueberry disease & breeding, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	480,000	Senators Lautenberg and Menendez
CS/SRG	Cranberry/Blueberry, University of Massachusetts	118,000	Senators Kennedy and Kerry
CS/SRG	Crop integration and production, South Dakota State University	275,000	Senators Johnson and Thune
CS/SRG	Dairy and meat goat research, Prairie View A&M University	100,000	Senator Hutchinson
CS/SRG	Dairy farm profitability, Pennsylvania State University	372,000	Senators Casey and Specter
CS/SRG	Delta revitalization project, Mississippi State University	187,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
CS/SRG	Designing foods for health, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	500,000	Senator Hutchinson

CS/SRG	Detection and Food Safety, Auburn University, AL	1,862,000	Senators Shelby and Sessions
CS/SRG	Drought management, Utah State University	670,000	Senator Bennett
CS/SRG	Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Extension Service and Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	575,000	Senators Bingaman, Cornyn, Domenici, Hutchison
CS/SRG	Environmentally safe products, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	200,000	Senator Leahy
CS/SRG	Floriculture, University of Hawaii	259,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
CS/SRG	Food & Fuel Initiative, Iowa State University	298,000	Senators Grassley and Harkin
CS/SRG	Food safety, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	74,000	Senator Hutchison
CS/SRG	Fresh Produce Food Safety, University of California	750,000	Senators Boxer and Feinstein
CS/SRG	Functional Genomics, Utah State University	1,192,000	Senator Bennett
CS/SRG	Future foods, University of Illinois	450,000	Senator Durbin
CS/SRG	Genomics for Southern Crop Stress and Disease, Mississippi State University	849,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
CS/SRG	Global change UVB radiation, Colorado State University	1,500,000	The President, Senators Allard and Salazar
CS/SRG	Grain sorghum, Kansas State University, Texas Tech University	548,000	Senators Brownback, Hutchison, Roberts
CS/SRG	Grass seed cropping systems for sustainable agriculture, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	150,000	Senators Cantwell, Craig, Crapo, Murray, Smith, Wyden
CS/SRG	Great Basin Environmental Program, University of Nevada—Reno	225,000	Senator Reid
CS/SRG	High Performance Computing, Utah State University	559,000	Senator Bennett
CS/SRG	Human nutrition, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA	526,000	Senators Landrieu and Vitter
CS/SRG	Increasing Shelf Life of Agricultural commodities, University of Idaho	642,000	Senators Craig and Crapo
CS/SRG	Infectious disease research, Colorado State University	609,000	Senators Allard and Salazar
CS/SRG	Institute of Agriculture-Phytosensors for Crop Security, University of Tennessee	745,000	Senator Alexander
CS/SRG	Integrated Economic, Environmental and Technical Analysis of Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems, Purdue University	200,000	Senator Lugar
CS/SRG	Joint US China Biotechnology Research and Extension, Utah State University	447,000	Senator Bennett
CS/SRG	Leopold Center hypoxia project, Iowa State University	112,000	Senator Harkin
CS/SRG	Livestock & dairy policy, Cornell University, NY, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	200,000	Senators Hutchison and Schumer
CS/SRG	Livestock waste, Iowa State University	196,000	Senator Harkin
CS/SRG	Lowbush Wild Blueberry research, University of Maine	184,000	Senators Collins and Snowe
CS/SRG	Managed Drainage System for Crop Production, University of Missouri-Columbia	250,000	Senator Bond
CS/SRG	Maple research, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	165,000	Senator Leahy
CS/SRG	Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance, University of Nebraska	365,000	Senators Hagel and Ben Nelson
CS/SRG	Midwest Center for Bioenergy Grasses, Purdue University	200,000	Senator Lugar
CS/SRG	Midwest poultry consortium, Iowa State University	250,000	Senators Coleman, Grassley and Harkin
CS/SRG	Milk safety, Pennsylvania State University	821,000	Senators Casey and Specter
CS/SRG	Montana Sheep Institute, Montana State University	270,000	Senators Baucus and Tester
CS/SRG	National beef cattle genetic evaluation consortium, Colorado State University, Cornell University, University of Georgia	655,000	Senators Allard, Chambliss, Salazar, Schumer
CS/SRG	National Center for Soybean Technology, University of Missouri-Columbia	735,000	Senator Bond
CS/SRG	Nematode resistance genetic engineering, New Mexico State University	223,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
CS/SRG	Nevada arid rangelands initiative, University of Nevada—Reno	400,000	Senators Ensign and Reid
CS/SRG	New Century Farm, Iowa State University	300,000	Senators Grassley and Harkin
CS/SRG	New crop opportunities, Lexington, KY	555,000	Senator McConnell
CS/SRG	New Satellite and Computer-Based Technology for Agriculture, Mississippi State University	697,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
CS/SRG	Oil resources from desert plants, New Mexico State University	187,000	Senator Bingaman and Domenici
CS/SRG	Organic cropping, Oregon State University	149,000	Senators Smith and Wyden
CS/SRG	Organic cropping, Washington State University	264,000	Senators Cantwell and Murray
CS/SRG	Organic waste utilization, New Mexico State University	74,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
CS/SRG	Peach tree short life research, Clemson University, SC	208,000	Senator Graham
CS/SRG	Pierce's disease, University of California	1,500,000	Senators Boxer and Feinstein
CS/SRG	Policy Analyses for a National Secure & Sustainable Food, Fiber, Forestry and Energy Program, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	149,000	Senator Hutchinson
CS/SRG	Potato Cyst Nematode, University of Idaho	372,000	Senators Craig and Crapo
CS/SRG	Potato research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University, University of Maine	750,000	Senators Cantwell, Collins, Craig, Crapo, Murray, Smith, Snowe, Wyden
CS/SRG	Precision agriculture, Auburn University, AL	446,000	Senator Shelby
CS/SRG	Precision agriculture, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	502,000	Senator McConnell
CS/SRG	Preharvest food safety, Kansas State University	151,000	Senators Brownback and Roberts
CS/SRG	Protein utilization, Iowa State University	600,000	Senator Harkin
CS/SRG	Renewable Energy and Products, North Dakota State University	1,000,000	Senators Conrad and Dorgan
CS/SRG	Ruminant nutrition consortium, University of Nebraska—Lincoln, South Dakota State University	600,000	Senators Hagel, Johnson, and Ben Nelson, Thune
CS/SRG	Russian wheat aphid, Colorado State University	228,000	Senators Allard and Salazar
CS/SRG	Seed technology, South Dakota State University	300,000	Senators Johnson and Thune
CS/SRG	Small fruit research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	300,000	Senators Cantwell, Craig, Crapo, Murray, Smith, Wyden
CS/SRG	Soil and Environmental Quality, University of Delaware	75,000	Senators Biden and Carper
CS/SRG	Soil-Borne Disease Prevention in Irrigated Agriculture, New Mexico State University	187,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
CS/SRG	Southern Great Plains Dairy Consortium, New Mexico State University	250,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
CS/SRG	Soybean research, National Soybean Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois	500,000	Senator Durbin
CS/SRG	Specialty Crops, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture	175,000	Senators Lincoln and Pryor
CS/SRG	Sustainable agriculture & natural resources, Pennsylvania State University	142,000	Senators Casey and Specter
CS/SRG	Sustainable beef supply, Montana State University	200,000	Senator Tester
CS/SRG	Sustainable Engineered Materials from Renewable Resources, Virginia Tech	250,000	Senators Warner and Webb
CS/SRG	Sweet Sorghum for Energy Production, University of Nebraska—Lincoln	149,000	Senators Hagel and Ben Nelson
CS/SRG	Swine and other animal waste management, North Carolina State University	372,000	Senators Burr and Dole

CS/SRG	Tillage, silviculture, waste management, Louisiana State University	200,000	Senators Landrieu and Vitter
CS/SRG	Tri-state joint peanut research, Auburn University, AL	440,000	Senators Sessions and Shelby
CS/SRG	Tropical and subtropical research/T-STAR, University of Hawaii	800,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
CS/SRG	Uniform farm management program, University of Minnesota	250,000	Senators Klobuchar and Coleman
CS/SRG	Virtual plant database enhancement project, Missouri Botanical Garden	626,000	Senator Bond
CS/SRG	Viticulture consortium, Cornell University, University of California	1,200,000	Senators Boxer, Feinstein, Schumer
CS/SRG	Water conservation, Kansas State University	74,000	Senators Brownback and Roberts
CS/SRG	Water use efficiency and water quality enhancements, University of Georgia	368,000	Senators Chambliss and Isakson
CS/SRG	Wetland plants, Louisiana State University	200,000	Senators Landrieu and Vitter
CS/SRG	Wheat genetic research, Kansas State University	256,000	Senators Brownback and Roberts
CS/SRG	Wine Grape Foundation Block, Washington State University	237,000	Senators Cantwell and Murray
CS/SRG	Wood utilization (AK, ID, LA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC, OR, TN, WV)	4,841,000	Senators Alexander, Burr, Byrd, Cochran, Coleman, Collins, Craig, Crapo, Dole, Snowe, Stabenow, Stevens, Vitter, Wicker, Wyden
FDA	Agricultural Products Food Safety Laboratory, New Mexico State University	1,757,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
FDA	Collaborative drug safety research, Critical Path Institute and University of Utah	559,000	Senator Bennett
FDA	Dietary supplements research, National Center for Natural Products Research, Oxford, Mississippi	1,713,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
FDA	Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference Vibrio Vulnificus Education, Nationwide	185,000	Senators Cochran and Shelby
FDA	Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference, Nationwide	148,000	Senators Cochran and Shelby
FDA	National Center for Food Safety and Technology, Summit-Argo, Illinois	2,212,000	Senator Durbin
FDA	Waste Management Education and Research Consortium, New Mexico State University	73,000	Senators Bingaman and Domenici
FDA	Western Region FDA Center of Excellence, University of California Davis	1,490,000	Senators Boxer and Feinstein
GP	Fruit fly facility, APHIS Hawaii	500,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
GP	Market Development, Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Foods, and Markets	500,000	Senator Leahy
GP	Market Development, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	1,500,000	Senator Kohl
GP	Phase II construction, National Center for Natural Products Research, Oxford, Mississippi	3,724,000	Senators Cochran and Wicker
NRCS/CO	Agricultural Development and Resource Conservation, Hawaii RC&D Councils	400,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/CO	Agricultural Wildlife Conservation Center, MS	1,000,000	Senator Cochran
NRCS/CO	Alaska Association of Conservation Districts	920,000	Senator Stevens
NRCS/CO	Big Sandy Tri-State Watershed Inventory and Analysis, West Virginia Conservation Agency	115,000	Senator Byrd
NRCS/CO	Carson City Waterfall Fire Restoration, Carson City, NV	287,000	Senator Reid
NRCS/CO	Certified Environmental Management Systems for Agriculture, Iowa Soybean Association	300,000	Senators Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Chenter Plain Sustainability Initiative, McNeese State University	250,000	Senator Landrieu
NRCS/CO	Conservation Internships, Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association	120,000	Senator Kohl
NRCS/CO	Conservation Outreach and Education, City of Foley, AL	215,000	Senator Shelby
NRCS/CO	Conservation Planning, NRCS Wisconsin and Massachusetts	450,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry, and Kohl
NRCS/CO	Conservation Technical Assistance, NRCS New Jersey	251,000	Senators Lautenberg and Menendez
NRCS/CO	Conservation Technology Transfer, University of Wisconsin	550,000	Senator Kohl

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
NRCS/CO	Delta Conservation Demonstration, Washington County, MS	400,000	Senator Cochran
NRCS/CO	Delta Water Study, NRCS Mississippi	250,000	Senator Cochran
NRCS/CO	Driftless Area Initiative, NRCS Wisconsin	310,000	Sensors Klobuchar and Kohl
NRCS/CO	Environmental Compliance, Wisconsin Dairy Business Association	220,000	Senator Kohl
NRCS/CO	Farm Viability Program, Vermont Housing and Conservation Board	251,000	Senator Leahy
NRCS/CO	Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission	800,000	Sensors Chambliss
NRCS/CO	Gilbert M. Grosvenor Center for Geographic Education Watershed Project, Texas State University	300,000	Senator Hutchinson
NRCS/CO	Grazing Land Conservation Initiative, NRCS Wisconsin	780,000	Senator Kohl
NRCS/CO	Great Lakes Basin Soil and Erosion Control, Great Lakes Commission	430,000	Sensors Coleman, Klobuchar, Levin, and Stabenow
NRCS/CO	Green River Water Quality and Biological Diversity Project, Western Kentucky Research Foundation	89,000	Senator McConnell
NRCS/CO	Hawaii Plant Materials Center, NRCS Hawaii	113,000	Sensors Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/CO	Hungry Canyons Alliance, IA	300,000	Sensors Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Illinois River Agricultural Water Conservation, Illinois Department of Natural Resources	200,000	Senator Durbin
NRCS/CO	Kentucky Soil Erosion Control, NRCS Kentucky	771,000	Senator McConnell
NRCS/CO	Little Wood River Irrigation District Gravity Pressure System, ID	143,000	Sensors Craig and Crapo
NRCS/CO	Mississippi Conservation Initiative, NRCS Mississippi	1,218,000	Sensors Cochran and Wicker
NRCS/CO	Molokai Agriculture Development and Resource Conservation, Molokai RC&D	71,000	Sensors Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/CO	Municipal Water District of Orange County for Efficient Irrigation, CA	143,000	Sensors Boxer and Feinstein
NRCS/CO	Nitrate Pollution Reduction, NRCS Rhode Island	165,000	Senator Reed
NRCS/CO	On-Farm Management System Evaluation Network, Iowa Soybean Association	150,000	Sensors Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Operation Oak Program, National Wild Turkey Federation	100,000	Sensors Chambliss and Cochran
NRCS/CO	Phosphorous Loading in Lake Champlain, Poultney Conservation District	179,000	Senator Leahy
NRCS/CO	Potomac River Tributary Strategy, NRCS West Virginia	179,000	Senator Byrd
NRCS/CO	Riparian Restoration along the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian Rivers, New Mexico Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts	179,000	Senator Bingaman
NRCS/CO	Risk Management Initiative, NRCS West Virginia	717,000	Senator Byrd
NRCS/CO	Sand County Foundation, WI	950,000	Senator Kohl
NRCS/CO	Soil Phosphorus Studies, NRCS West Virginia	215,000	Senator Byrd
NRCS/CO	Soil Surveys, NRCS Rhode Island	143,000	Senator Reed
NRCS/CO	Soil Surveys, NRCS Wyoming	200,000	Sensors Barrasso and Enzi
NRCS/CO	Technical Assistance Grants to Kentucky Soil Conservation Districts, Kentucky Division of Conservation	580,000	Senator McConnell
NRCS/CO	Utah Conservation Initiative, NRCS Utah	2,617,000	Senator Bennett
NRCS/CO	Water Conservation, Central Colorado Water Conservancy District	400,000	Sensors Allard and Salazar
NRCS/CO	Water Demonstration Project, NRCS Iowa	143,000	Sensors Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Water Quality, Utah Farm Bureau	251,000	Senator Bennett

NRCS/CO	Wildlife Habitat Improvement, Illinois Department of Natural Resources	200,000	Senator Durbin
NRCS/WFPO	Churchill Woods Dam Removal, DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup, IL	1,000,000	Senator Durbin
NRCS/WFPO	Dunlop Creek Watershed Project, NRCS West Virginia	1,500,000	Senator Byrd
NRCS/WFPO	East Locust Creek, NRCS Missouri	1,650,000	Senator Bond
NRCS/WFPO	Little Otter Creek, NRCS Missouri	350,000	Senator Bond
NRCS/WFPO	Lost River, NRCS West Virginia	8,500,000	Senator Byrd
NRCS/WFPO	Lower Hamakua Ditch Watershed, NRCS Hawaii	206,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/WFPO	Pocasset River Watershed, NRCS Rhode Island	350,000	Senator Reed
NRCS/WFPO	Upcountry Maui Watershed, NRCS Hawaii	206,000	Senators Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/WFPO	Upper Locust Creek, NRCS Missouri	500,000	Senator Bond
RCDS	Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas, National Center for Appropriate Technology, Butte, MT	2,774,000	Senators Baucus, Boxer, Harkin, Johnson, Kohl, Lincoln, Ben Nelson, Pryor, Specter, Tester

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	5,061	19,749	5,174	+113	-14,575
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist					
National Appeals Division	10,414	12,584	10,651	+237	-1,933
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	14,365	15,402	14,711	+346	-691
Homeland Security staff	8,212	9,054	8,449	+237	-605
Office of the Chief Information Officer	924	2,617	974	+50	-1,643
Common computing environment	16,246	18,305	16,527	+281	-1,778
(Provided in other accounts) (NA)	(90,875)			(-90,875)	
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	5,809	6,221	5,954	+145	-267
Total, Executive Operations	55,970	64,183	57,266	+1,296	-6,917

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights	848	897	871	+23	-26
Office of Civil Rights	20,353	21,551	20,798	+445	-753
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	668	739	687	+19	-52
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	(194,878)	(231,105)	(226,432)	(+31,554)	(-4,673)
Payments to GSA	156,590	168,901	168,901	+12,311	
Department of Homeland Security		13,500	13,500	+13,500	
Building operations and maintenance	38,288	48,704	44,031	+5,743	-4,673
Hazardous materials management	4,852	12,281	4,933	+81	-7,348
Departmental administration	22,982	28,637	27,011	+4,029	-1,626
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,768	4,099	3,877	+109	-222
Office of Communications	9,273	9,961	9,514	+241	-447
Office of the Inspector General	79,492	85,766	81,517	+2,025	-4,249
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics	38,952	42,852	40,083	+1,131	-2,769
Economic Research Service	592	654	609	+17	-45
National Agricultural Statistics Service	77,397	82,106	78,209	+812	-3,897
Census of Agriculture	162,212	153,475	149,115	-13,097	-4,360
Agricultural Research Service:	(51,985)	(39,478)	(37,265)	(-14,720)	(-2,213)
Salaries and expenses	1,121,041	1,037,016	1,134,084	+13,043	+97,068
Buildings and facilities	46,752	13,220	30,995	-15,757	+17,775
Total, Agricultural Research Service	1,167,793	1,050,236	1,165,079	-2,714	+114,843
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	668,286	535,277	629,871	-38,415	+94,594
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)		
Extension activities	453,265	431,753	464,272	+11,007	+32,519
Integrated activities	55,850	20,120	55,850		+35,730
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	6,395	6,930		-6,395	-6,930
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	1,183,796	994,080	1,149,993	-33,803	+155,913

	716	792	737	+ 21	- 55
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs					
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	867,638	919,137	860,989	- 6,649	- 58,148
Buildings and facilities		7,431	2,000	+ 2,000	- 5,431
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	867,638	926,568	862,989	- 4,649	- 63,579
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	76,324	76,015	71,655	- 4,669	- 4,360
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(61,233)	(62,888)	(62,888)	(+ 1,655)	
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	16,798	17,270	17,270	+ 472	
Discretionary appropriations	9,930	32,081		- 9,930	- 32,081
Payments to States and possessions	11,627	1,334	1,685	- 9,942	+ 351
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	114,679	126,700	90,610	- 24,069	- 36,090
Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	38,514	44,005	39,182	+ 668	- 4,823
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	596	659	613	+ 17	- 46
Food Safety and Inspection Service	930,120	951,946	973,566	+ 43,446	+ 21,620
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	4,981,150	4,853,041	4,988,865	+ 7,715	+ 135,824
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services					
Farm Service Agency:	628	695	646	+ 18	- 49
Salaries and expenses					
(Common computing environment) (NA)	1,126,107	1,188,580	1,164,123	+ 38,016	- 24,457
(Transfer from export loans)	(64,175)			(- 64,175)	
(Transfer from Public Law 480)	(341)	(368)	(368)	(+ 27)	
(Transfer from ACF)	(2,661)	(2,761)	(2,761)	(+ 100)	
(Transfer from farm storage loan program account)	(301,186)	(325,093)	(323,694)	(+ 22,508)	(- 1,399)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts	(304,188)	(332,946)	(331,547)	(+ 27,359)	(- 1,399)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,430,295)	(1,521,526)	(1,495,670)	(+ 65,375)	(- 25,856)
State mediation grants	4,369	4,000	4,369		+ 369

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Grassroot source water protection program	3,687	3,687	+ 3,687
Dairy indemnity program	100	100	400	+ 300	+ 300
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	1,134,263	1,192,680	1,172,579	+ 38,316	- 20,101
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(222,298)	(252,902)	(222,298)	(- 30,604)
Guaranteed	(1,238,768)	(1,223,636)	(1,238,768)	(+ 15,132)
Subtotal	(1,461,066)	(1,476,538)	(1,461,066)	(- 15,472)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(575,095)	(628,372)	(575,095)	(- 53,277)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,017,497)	(1,012,369)	(1,017,497)	(+ 5,128)
Subsidized guaranteed	(269,986)	(260,943)	(269,986)	(+ 9,043)
Subtotal	(1,862,578)	(1,901,684)	(1,862,578)	(- 39,106)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(3,940)	(3,975)	(3,940)	(- 35)
Boll weevil eradication loans	(100,000)	(59,400)	(100,000)	(+ 40,600)
Total, loan authorizations	(3,427,584)	(3,441,597)	(3,427,584)	(- 14,013)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	9,892	14,466	12,715	+ 2,823	- 1,751
Guaranteed	4,955	4,038	4,088	- 867	+ 50
Subtotal	14,847	18,504	16,803	+ 1,956	- 1,701

Farm operating loans:									
Direct	72,980	74,085	67,804	-5,176	-6,281				
Unsubsidized guaranteed	24,623	25,208	25,336	+713	+128				
Subsidized guaranteed	36,016	35,984	37,231	+1,215	+1,247				
Subtotal	133,619	135,277	130,371	-3,248	-4,906				
Indian tribe land acquisition	124	250	248	+124	-2				
Total, loan subsidies	148,590	154,031	147,422	-1,168	-6,609				
ACIF expenses:									
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	301,186	325,093	323,694	+22,508	-1,399				
Administrative expenses	7,865	7,920	7,865		-55				
Total, ACIF expenses	309,051	333,013	331,559	+22,508	-1,454				
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	457,641	487,044	478,981	+21,340	-8,063				
(Loan authorization)	(3,427,584)	(3,441,597)	(3,427,584)		(-14,013)				
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,591,904	1,679,724	1,651,560	+59,656	-28,164				
76,121	77,177	77,177		+1,056					
Risk Management Agency, Administrative, and operating expenses									
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,668,653	1,757,596	1,729,383	+60,730	-28,213				
Corporations									
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:									
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund	4,818,099	6,582,945	6,582,945	+1,764,846					
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:									
Reimbursement for net realized losses	12,983,000	11,106,324	11,106,324	-1,876,676					
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)						
Farm Storage Facility Loans Program Account:									
Salaries and expenses:									
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)		4,724	4,724	+4,724					
Total, Corporations	17,801,099	17,693,993	17,693,993	-107,106					
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	24,450,902	24,304,630	24,412,241	-38,661	+107,611				
(By transfer)	(304,188)	(332,946)	(331,547)	(+27,359)	(-1,399)				
(Loan authorization)	(3,427,584)	(3,441,597)	(3,427,584)		(-14,013)				

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(108,696)	(110,351)	(110,351)	(+ 1,655)
TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	737	822	758	+ 21	- 64
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	834,444	794,773	866,899	+ 32,455	+ 72,126
(Common computing environment) (NA)	(20,000)	(- 20,000)
Watershed and flood prevention operations	29,790	29,790	+ 29,790
Watershed rehabilitation program	19,860	5,920	20,000	+ 140	+ 14,080
Resource conservation and development	50,730	50,730	+ 50,730
Healthy forests reserve program	1,986	1,986	+ 1,986
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	936,810	800,693	969,405	+ 32,595	+ 168,712
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	937,547	801,515	970,163	+ 32,616	+ 168,648
TITLE III—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	628	695	646	+ 18	- 49
Rural Development:					
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	168,808	258,185	210,748	+ 41,940	- 47,437
(Common computing environment)	(6,700)	(- 6,700)
(Transfer from RHF)	(449,757)	(399,422)	(449,757)	(+ 50,335)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(4,741)	(4,574)	(4,741)	(+ 167)
(Transfer from RETLP)	(38,353)	(37,819)	(38,353)	(+ 534)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(492,851)	(441,815)	(492,851)	(+ 51,036)

Total, RD expenses	(661,659)	(700,000)	(703,599)	(+ 41,940)	(+ 3,599)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502)	(1,121,486)		(1,121,488)	(+ 2)	(+ 1,121,488)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(4,190,521)	(4,848,899)	(4,190,521)		(- 658,378)
Subtotal, Single family	(5,312,007)	(4,848,899)	(5,312,009)	(+ 2)	(+ 463,110)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(34,409)	(17,678)	(34,409)		(+ 16,731)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(69,510)		(69,510)		(+ 69,510)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,045)	(5,045)	(5,045)		
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(129,090)	(300,000)	(129,090)		(- 170,910)
Multi-family housing credit sales	(1,476)	(1,447)	(1,476)		(+ 29)
Single family housing credit sales	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
Self-help housing/land development (sec. 523)	(4,965)	(4,303)	(4,965)		(+ 662)
Total, Loan authorizations	(5,566,502)	(5,187,372)	(5,566,504)	(+ 2)	(+ 379,132)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502)	105,083		75,364	- 29,719	+ 75,364
Unsubsidized guaranteed	50,047	13,526	53,042	+ 2,995	+ 39,516
Subtotal, Single family	155,130	13,526	128,406	- 26,724	+ 114,880
Housing repair (sec. 504)	9,727	4,750	9,246	- 481	+ 4,496
Rental housing (sec. 515)	29,618		28,610	- 1,008	+ 28,610
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	12,134	1,710	20,241	+ 8,107	+ 18,531
Multi-family housing credit sales	548	523	533	- 15	+ 10
Single family housing credit sales					
Self-help housing/land development (sec. 523)	141	71	82	- 59	+ 11
Total, Loan subsidies	207,298	20,580	187,118	- 20,180	+ 166,538
RHF administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	449,757	399,422	449,757		+ 50,335
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program	657,055	420,002	636,875	- 20,180	+ 216,873
(Loan authorization)	(5,566,502)	(5,187,372)	(5,566,504)	(+ 2)	(+ 379,132)
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	472,757	897,000	1,005,000	+ 532,243	+ 108,000
Rental assistance voucher program		100,000			- 100,000
(Sec. 502(e)(5)(D))	5,958			- 5,958	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total, Rental assistance program	478,715	997,000	1,005,000	+526,285	+8,000
Rural housing voucher program	4,965	4,965	+4,965
Multifamily housing revitalization program account	19,860	19,860	+19,860
Multifamily housing preservation revolving loans	2,979	2,889	-90	+2,889
Total, Multifamily housing revitalization	27,804	27,714	-90	+27,714
Mutual and self-help housing grants	38,727	38,727	+38,727
Rural housing assistance grants	38,727	43,500	38,727	-4,773
Farm labor housing program account:					
(Loan authorization)	(27,545)	(17,798)	(-9,747)	(+17,798)
Loan subsidy	11,916	7,500	-4,416	+7,500
Grants	9,930	7,500	-2,430	+7,500
Total, Farm Labor Housing Program Account	21,846	15,000	-6,846	+15,000
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct	(294,948)	(302,430)	(294,948)	(-7,482)
Guaranteed	(206,425)	(210,000)	(206,425)	(-3,575)
Total, Loan authorizations	(501,373)	(512,430)	(501,373)	(-11,057)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Community facility:					
Direct	16,370	17,299	16,871	+501	-428
Guaranteed	7,596	6,468	6,358	-110	-110
Grants	20,373	20,373	+20,373
Rural community development initiative	6,256	6,256	+6,256
Economic impact initiative grants	13,902	13,902	+13,902

Tribal college grants	3,972	3,972	+ 3,972
Total, RCP loan subsidies and grants	68,469	23,767	67,732	-737	+ 43,965
Subtotal, grants, and payments	167,769	67,267	160,186	- 7,583	+ 92,919
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,331,343	1,484,269	1,829,775	+ 498,432	+ 345,506
(Loan authorization)	(6,095,420)	(5,699,802)	(6,085,675)	(- 9,745)	(+ 385,873)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business Program Account:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans)	(993,000)	(700,000)	(993,000)	(+ 293,000)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy	42,898	30,450	43,196	+ 298	+ 12,746
Grants:					
Rural business enterprise	38,727	38,727	+ 38,727
Rural business opportunity	2,483	2,483	+ 2,483
Delta regional authority	2,979	2,979	+ 2,979
Total, RBP loan subsidies and grants	87,087	30,450	87,385	+ 298	+ 56,935
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,536)	(33,772)	(33,536)	(- 236)
Loan subsidy	14,384	14,134	14,035	-349	- 99
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	4,741	4,574	4,741	+ 167
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	19,125	18,708	18,776	-349	+ 68
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,077)	(33,077)	(+ 33,077)
Rural cooperative development grants:					
Cooperative development	4,424	2,955	4,424	+ 1,469
Appropriate technology transfer for rural areas	2,582	2,774	+ 192	+ 2,774
Cooperative research agreement	492	300	- 192	+ 300
Value-added agricultural product market development	18,867	16,153	- 2,714	+ 16,153
Grants to assist minority producers	1,463	1,500	1,463	- 37
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants	27,828	4,455	25,114	- 2,714	+ 20,659
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants	8,130	8,130	+ 8,130

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Renewable energy program:					
(Loan authorization)	(205,551)	(197,500)	(-8,051)	(+197,500)
Loan subsidy	19,860	37,000	+17,140	+37,000
Grants	15,888	13,000	-2,888	+13,000
Total, Renewable energy program	35,748	50,000	+14,252	+50,000
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	177,918	53,613	189,405	+11,487	+135,792
(Loan authorization)	(1,265,164)	(733,772)	(1,257,113)	(-8,051)	(+523,341)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural water and waste disposal program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct	(1,022,162)	(1,304,217)	(1,094,500)	(+72,338)	(-209,717)
Guaranteed	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)
Total, loan authorization	1,097,162	1,379,217	1,169,500	+72,338	-209,717
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct subsidy	69,609	49,169	142,285	+72,676	+93,116
Water and waste grants	464,228	216,373	391,552	-72,676	+175,179
Solid waste management grants	3,441	3,465	3,441	-24
Water and waste financing revolving fund	497	497	+497
Water well system grants	993	993	+993
High energy cost grants	19,860	19,860	+19,860
Total, Water loan subsidies and grants	558,628	269,007	558,628	+289,621
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5 percent	(99,300)	(100,000)	(99,300)	(-700)

Direct, FFB	(6,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(6,500,000)	(+ 2,500,000)
Guaranteed underwriting	(500,000)	(500,000)	(+ 500,000)
Subtotal, Electric	(7,099,300)	(4,100,000)	(7,099,300)	(+ 2,999,300)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5 percent	(143,985)	(145,000)	(143,985)	(- 1,015)
Direct, Treasury rate	(248,250)	(250,000)	(248,250)	(- 1,750)
Direct, FFB	(292,935)	(295,000)	(292,935)	(- 2,065)
Subtotal, Telecommunications	(685,170)	(690,000)	(685,170)	(- 4,830)
Total, Loan authorizations	(7,784,470)	(4,790,000)	(7,784,470)	(+ 2,994,470)
Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5 percent	119
Subtotal, Electric	119
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5 percent	115
Direct, Treasury rate	1,663	525	521	- 4
Direct, FFB	1,816
Subtotal, Telecommunications	3,594	525	521	- 4
Total, Loan subsidies	3,713	525	521	- 4
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	38,353	37,819	38,353	+ 534
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	42,066	38,344	38,874	+ 530
(Loan authorization)	(7,784,470)	(4,790,000)	(7,784,470)	(+ 2,994,470)
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications	(297,900)	(297,923)	(297,900)	(- 23)
Total, Loan authorizations	(297,900)	(297,923)	(297,900)	(- 23)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants	34,755	20,000	34,755	+ 14,755

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct	6,405	11,619	11,618	+ 5,213	- 1
Grants	13,406	13,406	+ 13,406
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	54,566	31,619	59,779	+ 5,213	+ 28,160
Total, Rural Utilities Service	655,260	338,970	657,281	+ 2,021	+ 318,311
(Loan authorization)	(9,179,532)	(6,467,140)	(9,251,870)	(+ 72,338)	(+ 2,784,730)
Total, title III, Rural Development Programs	2,333,957	2,135,732	2,887,855	+ 553,898	+ 752,123
(By transfer)	(492,851)	(441,815)	(492,851)	(+ 51,036)
(Loan authorization)	(16,540,116)	(12,900,714)	(16,594,658)	(+ 54,542)	(+ 3,693,944)
TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services	593	655	610	+ 17	- 45
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	7,647,965	7,925,700	7,733,849	+ 85,884	- 191,851
Transfer from section 32	6,253,548	6,529,983	6,721,834	+ 468,286	+ 191,851
Total, Child nutrition programs	13,901,513	14,455,683	14,455,683	+ 554,170
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC (emergency))	5,620,000	6,100,000	6,750,000	+ 1,130,000	+ 650,000
Total, WIC	400,000	- 400,000
Total, Food stamp program:	6,020,000	6,100,000	6,750,000	+ 730,000	+ 650,000
Expenses	35,020,473	38,410,263	38,410,763	+ 3,390,290	+ 500
Armed forces provision	1,000	- 1,000
Indian Reservations (FPIR)	92,117	92,117	+ 92,117

Reserve	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,621,250	1,684,424	1,684,424	+ 63,174
The emergency food assistance program	140,000	140,000	250,000	+ 110,000	+ 110,000
Food stamp benefits due to CSFP elimination:						
CSFP outreach grant		2,000	- 2,000
CSFP transitional benefits		20,000	- 20,000
Total, Food stamp program	39,782,723	43,348,804	43,437,304	+ 3,654,581	+ 88,500
Commodity assistance program:						
Commodity supplemental food program	139,715	155,000	+ 15,285	+ 155,000
Farmers market nutrition program	19,800	19,800	19,800	- 60
Emergency food assistance program	49,650	49,500	49,500	- 150
Pacific island and disaster assistance	1,063	1,070	1,070	+ 7
Total, Commodity assistance program	210,288	70,370	225,370	+ 15,082	+ 155,000
Nutrition programs administration	141,728	150,251	142,595	+ 867	- 7,656
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	60,056,252	64,125,108	65,010,952	+ 4,954,700	+ 885,844
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	60,056,845	64,125,763	65,011,562	+ 4,954,717	+ 885,799
TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
Foreign Agricultural Service						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	158,354	168,042	169,042	+ 10,688	+ 1,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(4,950)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(+ 35)
(Transfer from Public Law 480)
Total, Salaries and expenses program level	(163,304)	(173,027)	(174,027)	(+ 10,723)	(+ 1,000)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Title II—Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level	(1,210,864)	(1,225,900)	(1,225,900)	(+ 15,036)
Appropriation	1,210,864	1,225,900	1,225,900	+ 15,036
Salaries and expenses:						
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	2,661	2,761	2,761	+ 100

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Subtotal	2,661	2,761	2,761	+100
Total, Public Law 480: Program level	(1,210,864)	(1,225,900)	(1,225,900)	(+ 15,036)
Appropriation	1,213,525	1,228,661	1,228,661	+ 15,136
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses): Salaries and expenses (Export Loans): General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	4,950	4,985	4,985	+ 35
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	341	368	368	+ 27
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	5,291	5,353	5,353	+ 62
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants	99,300	100,000	100,000	+ 700
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,476,470	1,502,056	1,503,056	+ 26,586	+ 1,000
(By transfer)	(4,950)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(+ 35)
TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	1,714,337	2,033,770	2,038,964	+ 324,627	+ 5,194
Prescription Drug User Fee Act	(459,412)	(511,108)	(497,108)	(+ 37,696)	(- 14,000)
Medical Device User Fee Act	(48,431)	(52,547)	(52,547)	(+ 4,116)
Animal Drug User Fee Act	(13,696)	(13,698)	(13,698)	(+ 1,564)	(+ 1,562)
Generic drug (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	(16,628)	(- 16,628)
Reinspection fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	(23,276)	(- 23,276)
Food export fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	(3,741)	(- 3,741)

Animal Generic Drug (user fees) (leg propr) NA	(3,741)				(- 3,741)
Subtotal	(2,235,876)	(2,627,751)	(2,603,879)	(+ 368,003)	(- 23,872)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings)	(18,398)	(19,318)	(19,318)	(+ 920)	
Export and color certification	(9,500)	(10,300)	(10,300)	(+ 800)	
Buildings and facilities	2,433	12,433	12,433	+ 10,000	
Total, Food and Drug Administration	1,716,770	2,046,203	2,051,397	+ 334,627	+ 5,194
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(46,000)	(49,000)	(50,000)	(+ 4,000)	(+ 1,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,716,770	2,046,203	2,051,397	+ 334,627	+ 5,194
TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Denali Commission	434		434		+ 434
Hunger Fellowships			2,500	+ 2,500	+ 2,500
Section 32 (rescission)	-684,000	-57,000	-110,000	+574,000	-53,000
Specialty crop grants					
Healthy Forest Reserve					
Simplified Summer Food Program	5,000				
Food stamp program employment and training (rescission)	-10,500				
ARS buildings and facilities (rescission)					
Fruit and vegetable program	9,831	-67,180			
High energy cost grant (rescission)					
CACFP audit (rescission)	-3,500				
Hawaii APHIS facility	149		500	+ 351	+ 500
National Center for Natural Products Research	3,724		3,724		+ 3,724
Emergency Conservation program					
Hardwoods Trees	794		794		+ 794
Market development			2,000	+ 2,000	+ 2,000
Disaster assistance (emergency)	602,000				
Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses (emergency)	20,000				
Multifamily housing revitalization (rescission)		-20,000			
Broadband loans (rescission)		-6,450			
Houliha Watershed project					
Total, title VII, General provisions	-56,068	-150,630	-100,048	-43,980	+ 50,582

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2008 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2008 appropriation	Budget estimate
Grand total	90,916,423	94,765,269	96,736,226	+ 5,819,803	+ 1,970,957
Appropriations	(90,592,423)	(94,915,899)	(96,846,226)	(+ 6,253,803)	(+ 1,930,327)
Emergency Appropriations	(1,022,000)	(- 1,022,000)
Rescissions	(- 698,000)	(- 150,630)	(- 110,000)	(+ 588,000)	(+ 40,630)
(By transfer)	(801,989)	(779,746)	(829,383)	(+ 27,394)	(+ 49,637)
(Loan authorization)	(19,967,700)	(16,342,311)	(20,022,242)	(+ 54,542)	(+ 3,679,931)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(154,696)	(159,351)	(160,351)	(+ 5,655)	(+ 1,000)
RECAPITULATION					
Title I—Agricultural programs	24,450,902	24,304,630	24,412,241	- 38,661	+ 107,611
Mandatory	(17,817,997)	(17,706,639)	(17,705,939)	(- 111,058)	(- 300)
Discretionary	(6,632,905)	(6,597,991)	(6,705,302)	(+ 72,397)	(+ 107,311)
Title II—Conservation programs (discretionary)	937,547	801,515	970,163	+ 32,616	+ 168,648
Title III—Rural development programs (discretionary)	2,333,957	2,135,732	2,887,855	+ 553,898	+ 752,123
Title IV—Domestic food programs	60,056,845	64,125,763	65,011,562	+ 4,954,717	+ 885,799
Mandatory	(53,683,236)	(57,782,487)	(57,892,987)	(+ 4,209,751)	(+ 110,500)
Discretionary	(6,373,609)	(6,343,276)	(7,118,575)	(+ 744,966)	(+ 775,299)
Title V—Foreign assistance and related programs (discretionary)	1,476,470	1,502,056	1,503,056	+ 26,586	+ 1,000
Title VI—Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration (discretionary)	1,716,770	2,046,203	2,051,397	+ 334,627	+ 5,194
Title VII—General provisions (discretionary)	- 56,068	- 150,630	- 100,048	- 43,980	+ 50,582
Other appropriations (discretionary)
Total	90,916,423	94,765,269	96,736,226	+ 5,819,803	+ 1,970,957