

## Calendar No. 99

111TH CONGRESS }  
1st Session } SENATE { REPORT  
111-39

---

---

### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIA- TIONS BILL, 2010

—————  
JULY 7 , 2009.—Ordered to be printed  
—————

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

### REPORT

[To accompany S. 1406]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1406) mak-  
ing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and  
Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal  
year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, reports fa-  
vorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

#### *Total obligational authority, fiscal year 2010*

Total of bill as reported to the Senate .....	\$123,993,248,000
Amount of 2009 appropriations .....	126,962,906,000
Amount of 2010 budget estimate .....	123,759,120,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2009 appropriations .....	– 2,969,658,000
2010 budget estimate .....	+ 234,128,000

# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Breakdown by Title .....	4
Summary of the Bill:	
Overview and Summary of the Bill .....	5
Reports to Congress .....	5
Title I:	
Agricultural Programs:	
Production, Processing, and Marketing:	
Office of the Secretary .....	6
Office of Tribal Relations .....	9
Executive Operations .....	9
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 .....	14
Hazardous Materials Management .....	14
Departmental Administration .....	15
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	16
Office of Communications .....	17
Office of Inspector General .....	17
Office of the General Counsel .....	18
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics .....	18
Economic Research Service .....	19
National Agricultural Statistics Service .....	19
Agricultural Research Service .....	20
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	26
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs .....	36
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	036
Agricultural Marketing Service .....	48
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration .....	51
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	52
Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	52
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services .....	54
Farm Service Agency .....	55
Risk Management Agency .....	60
Corporations:	
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund .....	60
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund .....	61
Title II:	
Conservation Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	63
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	63
Title III:	
Rural Development Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	68
Rural Housing Service .....	69
Rural Business—Cooperative Service .....	77
Rural Energy for America Program .....	81
Rural Utilities Service .....	82

	Page
Title IV:	
Domestic Food Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services .....	88
Food and Nutrition Service .....	88
Title V: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs: Foreign Agricultural Service .....	97
Title VI:	
Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration:	
Food and Drug Administration .....	102
Independent Agency: Farm Credit Administration .....	110
Title VII: General Provisions .....	112
Program, Project, and Activity .....	115
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	115
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	116
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	116
Budgetary Impact of Bill .....	120
Disclosure of Congressionally Directed Spending Items .....	122
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority .....	130

## 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]

	2009	2010 Committee recommendation
Title I: Agricultural programs .....	26,091,624	29,927,132
Title II: Conservation programs .....	1,309,177	1,015,027
Title III: Rural economic and community development programs .....	7,092,791	3,046,473
Title IV: Domestic food programs .....	76,905,162	86,085,432
Title V: Foreign assistance and related programs .....	2,594,405	2,079,499
Title VI: Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....	2,051,397	2,350,089
Title VII: General provisions .....	- 816,150	- 510,404
Other appropriations (discretionary) .....	11,734,500	.....
Total, new budget (obligational) authority .....	126,962,906	123,993,248

## 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 competing priorities 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 2010.

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 provides full pay costs, as requested by the President, for agencies under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

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.

## 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.

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

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$5,174,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	5,285,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,285,000

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 \$5,285,000 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.

*Global Food Security.*—The Committee continues its strong support for programs that provide emergency food assistance throughout the world and work to achieve sustainable global food security. Elsewhere in this act, the Committee provides significant increases for Food for Peace and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education programs which provide both emergency, food systems, and nutritional development assistance. In addition, the Committee provides guidance and resources to improve the efficiency of food aid programs, enhance agricultural development activities in food-deprived regions, and provide for higher nutritional content in food aid products.

The Government Accountability Office [GAO] has made a number of recommendations to reduce the non-food costs related to assistance programs administered by USDA and USAID which are

under the jurisdiction of this Committee. A general provision in this bill references a number of those recommendations and does so in a way that fully retains the balance of interests that have established the U.S. food aid programs as the most generous and effective in the world for more than half a century.

This general provision requires agencies responsible for administering humanitarian food assistance programs under the jurisdiction of this act to provide information to the appropriations committees of the House and the Senate regarding improved program efficiencies. The Committee views humanitarian food assistance programs as a strong expression of the United States' commitment as the world leader in fighting world hunger and in providing critical assistance to extremely vulnerable populations living in desperate environments. However, the GAO has reported that in recent years the cost of these programs has escalated while the actual volume of food assistance has declined.

The Committee believes that the best way to initiate meaningful reforms in food aid program administration is for the primary agencies responsible to conduct a review and evaluation of current practices, examine recommendations by GAO (and others), and work together toward the common goal of supporting the primary objectives inherent in these programs and to maintain the integrity of these programs as envisioned by their authorization. The requirements included in this section will encourage the leading agencies to work toward consensus on ways to enhance the number of people receiving food assistance and to improve their coordination in program delivery.

In addition, another general provision in this act provides for grant(s) to develop and field test new food products designed to cost-effectively improve the nutritional delivery and functional form of food assistance products provided through the McGovern-Dole and Food for Peace title II programs, and to best address recipient needs within the logistical operating environment of these field-based programs. The Committee is aware of the potential to greatly enhance the short and long-term health of individuals, especially infants and young children, suffering from malnutrition if improvements in nutritional content, product composition, packaging, and other components of food products were realized. Also, humanitarian food assistance is frequently delivered in some of the harshest physical environments in the world and in areas where transportation and storage logistics are extremely challenging.

The Committee is aware of significant advances in food science and technology that should be utilized to cost-effectively improve products beneficial for use in food assistance programs and the Secretary is directed, acting through the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, to carry out a grants program better to incorporate those and other advances as part of McGovern-Dole and Food for Peace title II programs. The Secretary is further encouraged to give priority to proposals from non-governmental organizations that demonstrate private sector partnering and in-kind contributions.

In addition, the Secretary is encouraged, through the authorities of the Research, Education, and Economics mission area, to conduct assessments of methods and tools used by non-governmental orga-

nizations and international agencies to assess nutritional gaps among populations served by U.S. humanitarian food assistance programs with recommendations on how to improve such programs in the field at the lowest possible cost. The Secretary should also undertake an assessment on the most cost-effective technologies for the purification and supply of safe water which could be implemented in the field to benefit these highly vulnerable populations and to make recommendations on the most cost-effective and commercially available systems that require priority research assistance.

The Committee expects a report on the status of these activities. In addition, the Committee expects a report by September 1, 2010, regarding the actual awarding of such grant or grants, the findings of relevant field tests, and the projected applications of new products in food assistance programs.

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 act 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 Committee believes that the establishment of sustainable food systems is the proper alternative to emergency food assistance. This will require increased awareness in under-developed countries of effective farm practices and the dynamics of agriculture on local and regional economies. Resources and guidance provided in this act will help U.S. Federal agencies and non-Federal partners, including land grant institutions, play an increased role in this important transition in the direction of global food security.

The differing nutritional needs of populations, particularly in areas with high incidence of HIV/AIDS and other diseases, makes the composition and quality of foods available through programs such as Food for Peace and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program extremely important elements in the delivery of humanitarian food assistance. Elsewhere in this act, the Committee makes recommendations for improvements to the quality and nutritional content of food products that are included in U.S. foreign food assistance programs. The Committee strongly believes that these measures will result in substantial short and long-term health benefits among food aid beneficiaries, especially among the most vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, and those facing life-threatening disease. The Secretary is directed to continue working with the State Department and, in particular the USAID, and affected stakeholders toward modifications which are necessary to improve nutritional benefits while maintaining efficiency



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

OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	\$1,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,000,000

The Office of Tribal Relations will interact with USDA program agencies to understand pending actions that may affect Indian tribes. This interaction and programmatic knowledge will improve USDA’s ability to conduct consultation activities, thereby better addressing the needs of USDA tribal constituents and improving relationships.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Office of Tribal Relations.

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, the Office of Homeland Security and the Office of Advocacy and Outreach.

CHIEF ECONOMIST

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$10,651,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	16,732,000
Committee recommendation .....	13,032,000

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, and cost-benefit analysis related to domestic and international food and agriculture issues, provides policy direction for renewable energy development, conducts analyses of climate change impacts on agriculture and forestry, 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 \$13,032,000 for the Office of the Chief Economist. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$3,000,000 for the Office of Energy and Climate Change.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$14,711,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	15,559,000
Committee recommendation .....	15,219,000

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 \$15,219,000 for the National Appeals Division. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$200,000 for information technology modernization.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$9,054,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	9,436,000
Committee recommendation .....	9,436,000

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 decisionmaking process; and provides department-wide 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 \$9,436,000 for the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$974,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	2,994,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,859,000

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 \$1,859,000 for the Office of Homeland Security. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$750,000 for a protective security detail and \$115,000 for national intelligence analysis.

OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH

Appropriations, 2009 .....	
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	\$3,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	

The purpose of the Office of Advocacy and Outreach is to increase the accessibility of USDA programs to underserved constituents. The Office would oversee the Office of Small Farms Coordination and the Advisory Committee for Beginning Farmers and Ranchers. In addition, the Office would coordinate the activities of various USDA programs and agencies that have as a mission purpose the provision of assistance to underserved constituents and would generally encourage and advocate for full participation by all Americans in USDA programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for the Office of Advocacy and Outreach.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$17,527,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	63,579,000
Committee recommendation .....	63,579,000

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 Technology 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 \$63,579,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer. This amount is an increase of \$46,052,000 above the fiscal year 2009 level.

*Information Technology Security.*—The Committee is greatly concerned by security failures of the Department’s various information technology components. The Department produces and compiles a number of information documents that are extremely market sensitive or otherwise of a nature that the public release of such information must be tightly controlled. It is completely unacceptable for these information systems to be accessed by unauthorized entities. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes the full increase requested by the President for upgrading the security of the Department’s information systems, including increases of \$19,000,000 for security assessments, \$14,500,000 for security tool deployment, and \$12,300,000 for the Agriculture and Security Operations Center. Further, the Committee expects a report on the introduction of these improvements to the Department’s information system, including a timetable for their full implementation, and a summary of all Department-wide activities relating to information security.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$5,954,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	6,566,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,566,000

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 \$6,566,000 for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$871,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	895,000
Committee recommendation .....	895,000

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights provides oversight of civil rights and related functions. This includes coordi-

nation 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 \$895,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$21,551,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	23,922,000
Committee recommendation .....	23,422,000

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 \$23,422,000 for the Office of Civil Rights. The Committee remains concerned by reports relating to the Department's long civil rights history and expects the Department to continue working toward resolution of associated claims. To better assist the Department in this regard, the Committee's recommendation for the Office of Civil Rights includes increases of \$250,000 each for alternative dispute resolution standardization, alternative dispute resolution training, and for investigations. In addition, the recommendation includes an increase of \$750,000 to address civil rights-related deficiencies as identified by the General Accountability Office.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$687,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	806,000
Committee recommendation .....	806,000

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 \$806,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$268,244,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	346,182,000
Committee recommendation .....	274,482,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$24,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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 \$274,482,000 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 2009 and budget request levels:

[In thousands of dollars]

	2009 enacted	2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
Rental Payments .....	168,901	237,901	168,901
Building Operations .....	61,843	94,781	92,081
DHS Building Security .....	13,500	13,500	13,500
Public Law 111-5 .....	24,000	.....	.....
Total .....	268,244	346,182	274,482

The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$27,000,000 for the consolidation of leased space, which is an activity the Department has identified for the achievement of long-term savings. The Secretary is directed to provide a report to the Committee on the progress of this consolidation and a detailed estimate on the amount and timing of near and long-term savings. In addition, the Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$3,000,000 for security support.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$5,100,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	5,125,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,125,000

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 \$5,125,000 for Hazardous Materials Management.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$27,011,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	43,319,000
Committee recommendation .....	41,319,000

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 \$41,319,000 for Departmental Administration.

*Global Food Security.*—The President’s budget includes \$13,000,000 for Provincial Reconstruction Teams to provide policy advice, technical assistance, and related support activities in the rural areas of select countries. The Committee takes very seriously its responsibility to support sustainable food systems in under-developed countries, and believes the basic initiative proposed by the President has substantial merit. The Committee feels strongly that the development of sustainable food systems is the proper alternative to emergency food assistance.

Elsewhere in this act, the Committee makes recommendations to enhance efficiencies in the administration of food aid programs, improve the nutrient content of food aid products, and to encourage the Secretary to play a lead role with Federal and non-governmental partners in the task of helping achieve global food security.

Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$13,000,000 for Departmental assistance to agricultural producers and allied entities in areas of the world (not limited to those countries identified by the President) where the development of sustainable food systems, as part of overall regional economic stability, remains a high priority.

The Committee expects these funds to be used in a manner that best promotes long-term development of rural economies and food systems by relying on the expertise of USDA agencies and their partners, such as land grant institutions. In much of the world, there is a desperate need for technical assistance in the areas of agricultural production, land and water conservation, rural development systems, and a better understanding of the structure and dynamics of local and regional economic structures. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is perhaps the best repository in the world for the collection and dissemination of this expertise, and the opportunity now exists for the expansion of this knowledge base to occur, on a global humanitarian scale, in much the same way that the Extension Service and other USDA agencies have served U.S. agriculture.

The Committee expects a report on the allocation of resources under this directive with a follow-up report by June 1, 2010, regarding the countries served, the agencies and partners selected for these activities, the program objectives and goals achieved, and other information relating to this program including the practicality of expansion to other regions in the future.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL  
RELATIONS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$3,877,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	3,968,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,968,000

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 \$3,968,000 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, 2009 .....	\$9,514,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	9,922,000
Committee recommendation .....	9,722,000

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 \$9,722,000 for the Office of Communications.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$108,266,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	88,781,000
Committee recommendation .....	88,025,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$22,500,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

The Office of 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 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 \$88,025,000 for the Office of Inspector General. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$500,000 for investigations related to food safety and civil rights. In addition, the recommendation includes the fiscal year 2009 level for OIG to continue to address violations of section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) and to co-

ordinate with State and local law enforcement personnel in this effort.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$41,620,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	44,651,000
Committee recommendation .....	43,551,000

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 Department 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 \$43,551,000 for the Office of the General Counsel.

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

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$609,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	895,000
Committee recommendation .....	895,000

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; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; Economic Research Service; and National Agricultural Statistics Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$895,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.

The Committee is aware that the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 authorized a program for competitive research and education grants for the study of antibiotic resistant bacteria and safe and effective alternatives for antibiotics in animal agriculture. The Committee encourages USDA to work with other entities, as appropriate, to analyze sources of antibiotic resistance as they pertain to food production and processing methods and develop and recommend new practices to reduce the development and transfer to humans of antibiotic resistance. The Committee directs USDA to report on its activities to this effect.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$79,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	82,478,000
Committee recommendation .....	82,078,000

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 \$82,078,000 for the Economic Research Service. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$900,000 for research on the economics of environmental service markets and policies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and \$500,000 to carry out the Organic Production and Market Data Initiative.

The Committee directs the Economic Research Service to prepare and publish a report on consumer perceptions of canned fruits and vegetables. The Economic Research Service shall share these findings with the Food and Nutrition Service to assist in the development of an effective marketing and promotional pilot program for canned fruits and vegetables under the Healthy Incentives Pilot program authorized under the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$151,565,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	161,830,000
Committee recommendation .....	161,830,000

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 \$161,830,000 for the National Agricultural Statistics Service. The Committee rec-

ommendation includes increases of \$5,750,000 for the restoration of the Agricultural Chemical Use Program, and \$1,600,000 to provide a data series on bio-energy production and utilization. Included in this amount is \$37,908,000 for the Census of Agriculture.

*Organic Data Collection.*—The Committee is pleased that NASS is currently conducting an Organics Production follow-on survey. The Committee encourages NASS to take all necessary steps to collect in-depth coverage on acreage, yield, production, inventory, production practices, sales and expenses, marketing channels, and demographics of the organic industry, and includes \$250,000 for this purpose.

*Rice Stocks Reporting.*—Market transparency provided by timely stocks reporting enhances the ability of rice farmers to profitably market their crop. The Committee expects that NASS will implement a September 1 stocks report for rice to include old crop stocks.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$1,140,406,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	1,153,368,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,181,632,000

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 nutri-

tion 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 \$1,181,632,000 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 2010 appropriation does not accept the budget proposals to transfer the Office of Pest Management Policy to the Office of the Chief Economist or to decrease funds for property management.

The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000, as requested in the budget for increased research on new varieties and hybrids of bioenergy feedstocks and the development of new production practices to maximize sustainable yield of high quality feedstocks. The Committee recommendation also includes increases of \$3,816,000, as requested in the budget, for increased research on livestock and crop production, including strengthening grain disease research to protect the world grain supply at Manhattan, Kansas; Corvallis, Oregon; and St. Paul, Minnesota. Further, the Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$8,513,000, as requested in the budget, for increased research relating to human nutrition, including the prevention of childhood obesity. Finally, the Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$2,250,000, as requested in the budget, for increased research for assessing and managing climate change risks to agricultural production systems, including the development of new crop varieties that can thrive under stress of weather variability and the development of agricultural management strategies for systems that are economically competitive and environmentally sustainable at Akron, Colorado.

The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$2,000,000 for research regarding cranberry production, including the development of more environmentally sound growing methods; and \$2,000,000 for increased research regarding Asian Citrus Psyllid/Citrus Greening Disease.

The Committee recommendation does not concur with the President's fiscal year 2010 budget proposals as it relates to the following projects: Aquaculture Initiatives, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute, Stuttgart, Arkansas; Bioremediation Research, Beltsville, Maryland; Center for Agroforestry, Booneville, Arkansas; Dale Bumpers Small Farms Research Center, Booneville, Arkansas; Diet Nutrition and Obesity Research (Pennington), New Orleans, Louisiana; Endophyte Research, Booneville, Arkansas; Formosan Subterranean Termites Research, New Orleans, Louisiana; Foundry Sand By-Products Utilization, Beltsville, Maryland; Improved Crop Production Practices, Auburn, Alabama; Medicinal and Bioactive Crops, Washington, DC; National Center for Agricultural Law, Beltsville, Maryland; Poultry Diseases, Beltsville, Maryland; Seismic and Acoustic Technologies in Soils Sedimentation

Laboratory, Oxford, Mississippi; Sorghum Research, Little Rock, Arkansas; Tropical Aquaculture Feeds (Oceanic Institute), Hilo, Hawaii; and Water Use Reduction, Dawson, Georgia.

The Committee recommendation provides the following funding: Biomass Crop Production, Brookings, South Dakota, \$1,250,000; Biomedical Materials in Plants (Biotech Foundation), Beltsville, Maryland, \$1,700,000; Biotechnology Research and Development Corporation, Washington, DC, \$3,500,000; Human Nutrition Research, Boston, Massachusetts, \$350,000; Human Nutrition Research, Houston, Texas, \$300,000; New England Plant, Soil, and Water Research Laboratory, Orono, Maine, \$2,249,000; Northwestern Center for Small Fruits, Corvallis, Oregon, \$275,000; Phytoestrogen Research, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$1,750,000; Potato Diseases, Beltsville, Maryland, \$40,000; Water Management Research Laboratory, Brawley, California, \$340,000; Wild Rice, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$300,000; Genomics Specialist, St. Paul, Minnesota, \$200,000; Dairy Forage Research Center, Marshfield, Wisconsin, \$2,500,000; North Carolina Human Nutrition Center, Kannapolis, North Carolina, \$1,000,000; Computer Vision Engineer and Technician, Appalachian Fruit Research Station, Kearneysville, West Virginia, \$400,000; and Forage Crop Stress Tolerance and Virus Disease Management, Prosser, Washington, \$200,000.

*Aquaculture.*—The Committee agrees with the merger of the Aquaculture Fisheries Center, Pine Bluff, Arkansas, with the Harry K. Dupree Stuttgart National Aquaculture Research Center. However, the Committee does not agree with the budget proposal as it relates to the Aquaculture Fisheries Center in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and directs that the important work of the Center be continued at full funding. Further, the Committee directs that \$350,000 from this amount be used for a specific cooperative agreement with the Aquaculture/Fisheries Center at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.

*Arthropod-Borne Animal Diseases Research Laboratory.*—The Committee supports the administration's request to relocate the Arthropod Borne Animal Disease Research Laboratory [ABADRL]. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 to relocate ABADRL from its current location to Manhattan, Kansas.

*Bighorn Sheep Health.*—Bighorn sheep disease is a major issue for domestic sheep producers in the West. Potential disease transmission arising from interactions between wild and domestic sheep pose significant challenges with considerable economic impact. ARS shall provide the Committee with a report on its current research on this subject as well as a research proposal to develop methods to control infectious diseases at the domestic animal-wildlife interface with specific focus on bighorn sheep health. When preparing this report the Committee encourages the Department to work with scientists at the Animal Disease Research Unit, co-located at the University of Idaho and Washington State University and the U.S. Sheep Experiment Station in DuBois, Idaho.

*Bioenergy Feedstock.*—Northern Great Plains Research Laboratory in Mandan, North Dakota, is a partner in the agency's high priority bioenergy feedstock program to develop strategies to integrate bioenergy production into existing U.S. agricultural systems.

The Mandan laboratory is studying new production practices and systems that can maximize yields of high quality feedstock in the Northern Great Plains. The Committee recommendation restores \$543,000 at the Mandan ARS laboratory, which shall be made available for the location's bioenergy feedstock research program.

*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.

*Food Allergies.*—The Committee expects ARS to fund research related to food allergies at no less than the fiscal year 2009 level, and encourages the agency to consider how processing technologies can alter the characteristics of allergens in foods, to assess any potential to reduce allergenicity in foods through food processing technologies, and develop better immunoassays for detection of food allergen residues before and after food processing.

*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 recommendation includes an increase of \$1,000,000, as proposed in the budget as part of increased research on Human Nutrition, to the ARS Grand Forks Human Nutrition Research Center, which provides unique contributions related to these nutrition-related challenges. 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 recommendation therefore includes \$1,000,000, as proposed in the budget as part of increased research on Human Nutrition, to the Children's Nutrition Center in Little Rock, Arkansas and \$3,937,000, as requested in the budget, for increased research on human nutrition headquartered in Little Rock, Arkansas.

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.

The Committee recommendation also includes \$1,000,000 for the establishment of an Agriculture Research Service Human Nutrition Center on the North Carolina Research Campus in Kannapolis, North Carolina.

*Invasive Weed Management.*—The Committee is aware of the severity of the invasive weed problem in the Northwestern United States, including cheat grass, medusa head rye, salt cedar, and tall white top and Eurasian water milfoil. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$500,000 for increased research to address invasive species genetics, population ecology, and management for these critical problems.

*Muscadine Grape Research.*—The Committee recognizes that the muscadine grape's unique natural properties allow for great potential in nutraceutical and food additive uses provided more varietal characterization and horticulture improvements. The Committee requests ARS and its Poplarville, Mississippi facility to report to the Committee on an appropriate multi-year research and development strategy that could assist small fruit growers and processors to take full commercial advantage of this native plant.

*National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility.*—The National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility [NBAF] will research biological threats involving zoonotic and foreign animal diseases. The facility will allow basic research; diagnostic development, testing and validation; advanced countermeasure development; and training for high-consequence livestock diseases. The Department of Homeland Security recently selected the Manhattan Campus Site in Manhattan, Kansas for the construction of NBAF, which will serve as the successor site to the Plum Island Animal Disease Center [PIADC]. In order to begin the transition from the PIADC to NBAF, the Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for a cooperative agreement with Kansas State University for research into Rift Valley Fever, African Swine Fever, and Peste des Petits Ruminants.

*Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center.*—The Committee concurs with the staffing plan at the Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center and the Committee recommendation includes \$700,000 to support two new scientists in organic/sustainable agriculture and value-added/biofuel production.

*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 an increase of \$1,000,000 for ARS research related to pollinator species.

*Shellfish Research.*—Natural oyster production has fallen dramatically from a combination of factors leading to increased mortality, including low disease resistance and prevention. The Committee understands the need for comprehensive research on shellfish and shellfish disease in the Northeast, and provides an in-



crease of \$500,000 for ARS to coordinate research, including genetic research, among institutions with expertise.

*Termite Research.*—The Committee supports continuation of the development and deployment of sustainable areawide control of termites through community engagement and development of control methods for Pacific-Asian invasive termites and the Committee recommendation includes \$200,000 for this purpose. The Committee further recommends that the administrative venue for this initiative be the Agriculture Research Service Mid South Area to realize the synergy of the termite research and outreach conducted at the Southern Regional Research Center in New Orleans.

*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 \$3,500,000, an increase of \$2,000,000, to speed efforts to develop Ug99-resistant wheat varieties.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$222,752,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	.....
Committee recommendation .....	47,027,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$176,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111–5.

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 \$47,027,000 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
Agricultural Research Center; Beltsville, MD .....	3,000
Agricultural Research Center; Logan, UT .....	4,527
Agricultural Research Center; Pullman, WA .....	3,740
Animal Bioscience Facility; Bozeman, MT .....	2,500

## AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Appalachian Fruit Laboratory; Kearneysville, WV .....	2,000
ARS Biotechnology Lab; Locom, MS .....	1,500
ARS Forage-Animal Production Research Facility; Lexington, KY .....	2,000
ARS Research and Development Center; Auburn, AL .....	3,500
ARS Waste Management Research Facility; Bowling Green, KY .....	2,000
Dairy Forage Agricultural Research Center; Prairie du Sac, WI .....	4,000
Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center; Stoneville, MS .....	4,000
National Plant and Genetics Security Center; Columbia, MO .....	3,500
Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center; Hilo, HI .....	5,000
Sugarcane Research Laboratory; Houma, LA .....	2,000
Systems Biology Research Facility; Lincoln, NE .....	3,760
Total .....	47,027

*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.

*Red River Valley, North Dakota.*—The Committee is aware of the facility improvement needs at the Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center in Fargo, North Dakota, and directs ARS to provide an updated report on the feasibility, requirements, and scope for facility needs at this location. The report should detail any expansion of building size, costs, associated facilities, scientific capacity, and other requirements for operations. The report should also detail existing and planned program and resource requirements for this location.

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Section 7511(f)(2) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 amends the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6971) by establishing an agency to be known as the National Institute of Food and Agriculture [NIFA]. The Secretary shall transfer to NIFA, effective not later than October 1, 2009, any and all other authorities administered by the Administrator of the Cooperative State, Research, Education and Extension Service. 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, 2009 .....	\$691,043,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	622,892,000
Committee recommendation .....	757,821,000

Research and Education programs administered by NIFA are USDA's principal entrée to the university system of the United States for the purpose of conducting agricultural research and education programs as authorized by the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i); the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act of 1962, as amended (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.); the Competitive,

Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i); the National Agricultural, Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.); the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note); the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–185), as amended; the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624); the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171); and the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246). Through these authorities, USDA participates with State and other cooperators to encourage and assist the State institutions in the conduct of agricultural research and education through the State Agricultural Experiment Stations of the 50 States and the territories; by approved Schools of Forestry; the 1890 Land-Grant Institutions and Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University; 1994 Land-Grant Institutions; by Colleges of Veterinary Medicine; and other eligible institutions. The appropriated funds provide Federal support for research and education programs at these 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 \$757,821,000 for research and education activities of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture. In addition to the appropriation for research and education activities, this bill makes available \$149,000,000 in mandatory funding for research related to organics, specialty crops, beginning farmer and rancher, renewable energy, and other research. Therefore, NIFA will have a total of \$906,821,000 in funding for research and related activities in fiscal year 2010, which is an increase of \$77,778,000 above the previous year.

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

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES [In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Hatch Act .....	215,000
McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Research Program .....	30,000
Evans-Allen program (1890 Colleges, Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University) .....	49,000
Animal Health and Disease Research .....	1,000
Special Research Grants:	
Advanced Genetic Technologies (KY) .....	650
Advancing Biofuel Production (TX) .....	300
Aegilops Cylindrica (WA) .....	200
Agricultural Diversification (HI) .....	153
Agricultural Entrepreneurial Alternatives (PA) .....	248
Agriculture Science (OH) .....	450
Air Quality (TX, KS) .....	300
Animal Science Food Safety Consortium (AR, IA, KS) .....	1,000
Aquaculture (LA) .....	150
Aquaculture (MS) .....	361
Aquaculture Product and Marketing Development (WV) .....	550

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION  
ACTIVITIES—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Avian Bioscience (DE) .....	150
Barley for Rural Development (MT, ID) .....	547
Bio Energy Production and Carbon Sequestration (TN) .....	1,000
Biodesign and Bioprocessing (VA) .....	223
Biomass-based Energy Research (OK, MS) .....	839
Brucellosis Vaccine (MT) .....	305
Cataloging Genes Associated with Drought and Disease Resistance (NM) .....	176
Center for One Medicine .....	500
Center for Rural Studies (VT) .....	350
Childhood Obesity and Nutrition (VT) .....	250
Citrus Canker/Greening (FL) .....	200
Competitiveness of Agricultural Products (WA) .....	400
Cool Season Legume Research (ID, ND, WA) .....	350
Cotton Insect Management and Fiber Quality (GA) .....	346
Cranberry/Blueberry (MA) .....	160
Cranberry/Blueberry Disease and Breeding (NJ) .....	550
Crop Integration and Production (SD) .....	400
Dairy and Meat Goat Research (TX) .....	200
Dairy Farm Profitability (PA) .....	372
Delta Revitalization Project (MS) .....	176
Drought Mitigation (NE) .....	600
Efficient Irrigation (NM, TX) .....	575
Emerald Ash Borer (OH) .....	550
Environmentally Safe Products (VT) .....	250
Floriculture (HI) .....	300
Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute (IA, MO, NV) .....	1,213
Food and Fuel Initiative (IA) .....	298
Forages for Advancing Livestock Production (KY) .....	473
Fresh Produce Food Safety (CA) .....	750
Genetically Enhanced Plants for Micro-nutrients and Genomics for Southern Crop Stress and Disease (MS) .....	797
Global Change, UV Monitoring .....	1,408
Grain Sorghum (KS) .....	1,000
Grass Seed Cropping for Sustainable Agriculture (OR, WA) .....	150
High Performance Computing (UT) .....	263
Human Nutrition (LA) .....	526
Infectious Disease Research (CO) .....	650
Inland Marine Aquaculture (VA) .....	400
Institute for Food Science and Engineering (AR) .....	500
Integrated Economic, Environmental and Technical Analysis of Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems (IN) .....	188
Invasive Plant Management (MT) .....	270
Joint U.S.-China Biotechnology Research and Extension (UT) .....	210
Leopold Center Hypoxia (IA) .....	105
Livestock and Dairy Policy (NY) .....	200
Maple Research (VT) .....	165
Midwest Center for Bioenergy Grasses (IN) .....	188
Midwest Poultry Consortium (IA) .....	250
Milk Safety (PA) .....	821
National Beef Cattle Genetic Evaluation Consortium (CO, GA, NY) .....	655
National Center for Soybean Biotechnology (MO) .....	690
Nematode Resistance Genetic Engineering (NM) .....	209
Nevada Arid Rangelands (NV) .....	500
New Century Farm (IA) .....	350
New Crop Opportunities (KY) .....	525
New Satellite and Computer-based Technology for Agriculture (MS) .....	654
Oil Resources from Desert Plants (NM) .....	176
Organic Cropping (OR) .....	149
Organic Cropping (WA) .....	264
Organic Waste Utilization (NM) .....	69
Pierce's Disease (CA) .....	2,000

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (NIFA)—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION  
ACTIVITIES—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Policy Analysis for a National Secure and Sustainable Food, Fiber, Forestry, and Energy Program (TX) .....	200
Potato Research (ID, ME, OR, WA) .....	1,037
Precision Agriculture (KY) .....	671
Preharvest Food Safety (KS) .....	500
Protein Utilization (IA) .....	600
Rangeland Ecosystems Dynamics (ID) .....	300
Renewable Energy Products (ND) .....	1,000
Ruminant Nutrition Consortium (SD) .....	563
Rural Policies Institute (IA) .....	889
Russian Wheat Aphid (CO) .....	250
Seed Technology (SD) .....	350
Small Fruit Research (ID, OR, WA) .....	300
Soil-Borne Disease Prevention in Irrigated Agriculture (NM) .....	187
Southern Great Plains Dairy Consortium (NM) .....	350
Soybean Cyst Nematode (MO) .....	556
Soybean Research (IL) .....	400
Specialty Crops (AR) .....	175
Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resources (PA) .....	142
Sustainable Beef Supply (MT) .....	200
Sustainable Engineered Materials from Renewable Sources (VA) .....	250
Sustainable Production and Processing Research for Lowbush Specialty Crops (ME) .....	200
Tillage, Silviculture, Waste Management (LA) .....	200
Tropical and Subtropical Research/T-Star (HI) .....	800
Virtual Plant Database Enhancement Project (MO) .....	588
Virus-free Wine Grape Cultivars, Wine Grape Foundation Block (WA) .....	260
Viticulture Consortium (CA) .....	1,200
Water Conservation (KS) .....	500
Wetland Plants (LA) .....	200
Wheat Genetic Research (KS) .....	1,000
Wildlife/Livestock Disease Research Partnership (WY) .....	300
Wood Utilization (ID, LA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC, OR, WV) .....	4,841
World Food and Health Initiative (IL) .....	250
<b>Total, Special Research Grants .....</b>	<b>50,456</b>
<b>Improved Pest Control:</b>	
Expert IPM Decision Support System .....	158
Integrated Pest Management .....	2,450
Minor Crop Pest Management, IR-4 .....	12,360
Pest Management Alternatives .....	1,455
<b>Total, Improved Pest Control .....</b>	<b>16,423</b>
Critical Ag Materials Act of 1984 .....	1,083
Aquaculture Centers, section 1475 .....	3,928
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education .....	14,500
1994 Institutions Research Program .....	2,000
Supplemental and Alternative Crops, section 1473 D .....	850
AFRI .....	295,181
Joe Skeen Institute for Rangeland Restoration (NM, TX, MT) .....	983
New Era Rural Technology Program .....	750
Farm Business Management and Benchmarking Program .....	2,000
Sun Grant Program .....	1,500
<b>Federal Administration:</b>	
Ag-based Industrial Lubricants (IA) .....	405
Agriculture Development in the American Pacific (HI) .....	400
Agriculture Waste Utilization (WV) .....	500
Animal Health Research and Diagnostics (KY) .....	300
Applied Agriculture and Environmental Research (CA) .....	350
Aquaculture (PA) .....	164

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION  
ACTIVITIES—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Biotechnology Research (MS) .....	480
Center for Dairy and Beef Excellence (PA) .....	340
Clemson University Veterinary Institute (SC) .....	1,000
Cotton Research (TX) .....	200
Council for Agriculture Science and Technology (IA) .....	110
Data Information System (REEIS) .....	2,704
Ethnobotanicals (MD) .....	550
Farmland Preservation (OH) .....	160
Florida Biomass to Fuels Conversion Program .....	300
International Center for Food Technology Development to Expand Markets (IN) .....	750
Kansas Biobased Polymer Initiative .....	750
Medicinal and Bioactive Crops (TX) .....	300
Midwest Agribusiness Trade and Information Center (IA) .....	187
Mississippi Valley State University .....	1,002
NE Center for Invasive Plants (CT, VT, ME) .....	295
Office of Extramural Programs .....	440
Pay, Move and Administrative Costs .....	9,212
Peer Panels .....	397
PM-10 Study (WA) .....	150
Polymer Research (KS) .....	2,000
Rural Systems (MS) .....	215
Shrimp Aquaculture (MS) .....	300
Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia (OH) .....	500
Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia (MI) .....	150
Water Pollutants (WV) .....	500
<b>Total, Federal Administration .....</b>	<b>25,111</b>
<b>Higher Education:</b>	
Graduate Fellowships Grants .....	3,859
Institution Challenge Grants .....	5,654
1890s Institution Capacity Building Grants .....	16,500
Multicultural Scholars .....	981
Hispanic Serving Institutions Education Grants Program .....	7,737
Tribal Colleges Education Equity Grants Program .....	3,342
Secondary/2-Year Post Secondary .....	983
Veterinary Medical Services Act .....	5,000
Alaska Native-Serving and Native-Hawaiian Serving Institutions .....	3,200
Resident Instruction Grants for Insular Areas .....	800
<b>Total, Higher Education Grants .....</b>	<b>48,056</b>
<b>Total, Research and Education .....</b>	<b>757,821</b>

*Agriculture and Food Research Initiative.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$296,681,000 for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative [AFRI].

Section 7406 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 specifies priority areas within the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative [AFRI], including an 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 Policy Research.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,213,000 for the Food and Agriculture Policy Institute, of which \$340,000 shall be used to conduct analysis of rangeland, cattle, and hay with the University of Nevada-Reno.

*Alaska Native-Serving and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions Education Grants.*—The Committee recommends \$3,200,000 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 \$850,000 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.

*Food Allergies.*—The Committee notes that evidence suggests that the prevalence of food allergies are increasing. It has been reported that food allergy is the leading cause of anaphylaxis outside the hospital setting. Currently, there is no treatment or cure, and the only way of dealing with such allergies is strict avoidance. The Committee encourages USDA, through AFRI, to fund meritorious research regarding food allergies, including efforts to determine

risk factors for food allergies and the development of models for allergic sensitization to foods.

*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 NIFA 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.

*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 2010, 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, 2010 regarding the status of grant awards for fiscal year 2010 and the specific objectives to be sought in each case.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$11,880,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	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, 2009 .....	\$474,250,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	487,005,000
Committee recommendation .....	491,292,000

Cooperative extension work was established by the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended. 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 \$491,292,000 for extension activities of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

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

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Smith-Lever Act, section 3(b)&(c) .....	300,000
Smith-Lever, section 3d Programs:	
Food and Nutrition Education [EFNEP] .....	68,139
Farm Safety .....	4,863
New Technologies for Ag Extension .....	2,000
Improve Rural Quality of Life .....	.....
Pest Management .....	10,085
Children, Youth, and Families at Risk .....	8,427
Youth Farm Safety Education and Certification .....	493
Federally-Recognized Tribes Extension Program .....	3,090
Sustainable Agriculture .....	4,705
Total, section 3d Programs .....	101,802
1890 Colleges, Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University .....	41,354
Rural Health and Safety Education .....	1,738
1890 Facilities (sec. 1447) .....	18,540
Grants to Youth Serving Institutions .....	1,767
Renewable Resources Extension Act [RREA] .....	4,128
Extension Services at the 1994 Institutions .....	4,000
Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database [FARAD] .....	1,000
Women and Minorities in STEM Fields .....	500
Federal Administration:	
Ag in the Classroom .....	553
Childhood Farm Safety (IA) .....	75
Conservation Technology Transfer (WI) .....	376
Dairy Education (IA) .....	175
E-commerce (MS) .....	231
Efficient Irrigation (NM, TX) .....	475
Extension Specialist (MS) .....	98
Food Production Education (VT) .....	120
General Administration, including Pay Costs .....	8,012
Health Education Leadership (KY) .....	590

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—EXTENSION ACTIVITIES—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Institute for Sustainable Agriculture (WI) .....	400
Invasive Phragmites Control and Outreach (MI) .....	155
Iowa Vitality Center .....	250
Maine Cattle Health Assurance Program .....	700
National Center for Farm Safety (IA) .....	170
Nutrition Enhancement (WI) .....	950
Ohio-Israel Agriculture Initiative .....	700
Pilot Technology Transfer (MS, OK) .....	209
Potato Integrated Pest Management—Late Blight (ME) .....	450
Range Improvement (NM) .....	223
Urban Horticulture (WI) .....	376
Urban Horticulture and Marketing (IL) .....	175
Veterinary Technology Satellite Programs (KS) .....	1,000
<b>Total, Federal Administration .....</b>	<b>16,463</b>
<b>Total, Extension Activities .....</b>	<b>491,292</b>

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$56,864,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	56,864,000
Committee recommendation .....	56,864,000

Section 406, as amended, 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 \$56,864,000 for integrated activities of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

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

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES  
 [In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Section 406 Legislative Authority:	
Water Quality .....	12,649
Food Safety .....	14,596
Regional 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
<b>Total, Section 406 .....</b>	<b>41,990</b>
International Science and Education Grants Program .....	3,000
Critical Issues Program .....	732
Regional Rural Development Centers Program .....	1,312
Homeland Security, Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative .....	9,830
<b>Total, Integrated Activities .....</b>	<b>56,864</b>

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND  
REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$737,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	895,000
Committee recommendation .....	895,000

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 \$895,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$876,675,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	872,423,000
Committee recommendation .....	911,394,000

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 \$911,394,000 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 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
<b>PEST AND DISEASE EXCLUSION:</b>			
Agricultural Quarantine Inspection [AQI] .....	26,979	26,000	29,000
Cattle Fever Ticks .....	9,907	13,157	13,157
Foreign Animal Disease/Foot and Mouth Disease .....	4,000	4,004	4,004
Fruit Fly Exclusion & Detection .....	62,320	62,920	62,920
Import/Export .....	12,963	13,298	13,298
Overseas Technical & Trade Operations .....	15,725	16,172	16,172
Screwworm .....	27,635	27,714	27,714
Tropical Bont Tick .....	425	429	429
Subtotal, Pest and Disease Exclusion .....	159,954	163,694	166,694
<b>PLANT AND ANIMAL HEALTH MONITORING:</b>			
Animal Health Monitoring & Surveillance .....	129,180	127,122	130,614
Animal & Plant Health Reg. Enforcement .....	13,694	13,983	13,983
Avian Influenza .....	60,594	60,243	60,243
Emergency Management Systems .....	15,619	15,794	15,794
National Veterinary Stockpile .....	3,739	3,757	3,757
Pest Detection .....	27,776	26,756	28,113
Select Agents .....	5,128	5,176	5,176
Subtotal, Plant and Animal Health Monitoring .....	255,730	252,831	257,680
<b>PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT:</b>			
Aquaculture .....	5,887	5,806	5,972
Biological Control .....	9,737	9,967	10,467
Brucellosis .....	9,584	9,057	9,707
Chronic Wasting Disease .....	17,014	15,607	16,875
Contingency Funds .....	2,025	2,058	2,058
Cotton Pests .....	29,590	25,047	23,390
Emerging Plant Pests .....	133,677	143,831	159,300
Golden Nematode .....	816	831	831
Grasshopper .....	5,552	4,578	6,078
Gypsy Moth .....	4,843	4,920	5,170

## ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
Imported Fire Ant .....	1,893	1,902	1,902
Johne's Disease .....	6,821	5,937	6,876
Noxious Weeds .....	1,993	1,171	1,790
Plum Pox .....	2,195	2,206	2,206
Pseudorabies .....	2,446	2,510	2,510
Scrapie .....	17,733	17,906	17,906
Tuberculosis .....	15,657	15,516	15,764
Wildlife Services Operations .....	76,047	70,502	76,281
Witchweed .....	1,510	1,517	1,517
Subtotal, Pest and Disease Management .....	345,020	340,869	366,600
ANIMAL CARE:			
Animal Welfare .....	21,522	21,979	21,979
Horse Protection .....	499	500	500
Subtotal, Animal Care .....	22,021	22,479	22,479
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SERVICES:			
Biotechnology Regulatory Services .....	12,877	12,791	13,050
Environmental Compliance .....	2,669	2,715	2,715
Plant Methods Development Labs .....	9,712	9,949	9,949
Veterinary Biologics .....	16,922	17,325	17,325
Veterinary Diagnostics .....	23,585	23,778	26,073
Wildlife Services Methods Development .....	17,986	15,793	18,630
Subtotal, Scientific and Technical Services .....	83,751	82,351	87,742
MANAGEMENT:			
APHIS Information Technology Infrastructure .....	4,474	4,474	4,474
Physical/Operational Security .....	5,725	5,725	5,725
Subtotal, Management .....	10,199	10,199	10,199
TOTAL, APHIS .....	876,675	872,423	911,394

The Committee encourages the Secretary to continue use of contingency funding from Commodity Credit Corporation monies, as in past fiscal years, to cover additional emergencies as the Secretary determines necessary.

## PEST AND DISEASE EXCLUSION

*Agricultural Quarantine Inspection [AQI]*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$29,000,000 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 \$3,000,000 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.

*Fruit Fly Exclusion and Detection*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$62,920,000 for the fruit fly exclusion and detection program, of which no less than the fiscal year 2009 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 \$130,614,000 for the animal health monitoring and surveillance program, which includes \$350,000 for the Trichinae certification program.

*Animal Identification.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$14,607,000 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.

*Disease Surveillance.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$700,000 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 diagnostic 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.

*Animal and Plant Health Regulatory Enforcement*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$13,983,000 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 \$60,243,000 for avian influenza activities.

*Emergency Management Systems*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,794,000 for emergency management systems.

*National Veterinary Stockpile*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,757,000 for the National Veterinary Stockpile.

*Pest Detection*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$28,113,000 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 \$5,972,000 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.

*Invasive Aquatic Species.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$94,000 for the State of Vermont's Lake Champlain's Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative for the control of invasive aquatic species, which cause 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 \$4,600,000 for the control of VHS in the Great Lakes States.

*Biological Control*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$10,467,000 for biological control.

*Hemlock Woolly Adelgid.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$500,000 for control of Hemlock Woolly Adelgid in Tennessee.



*Brucellosis Eradication*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$9,707,000 for brucellosis eradication.

*Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$650,000 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 \$16,875,000 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.

*Contingency Funds*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,058,000 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 \$23,390,000 for the cotton pests program.

*Emerging Plant Pests*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$159,300,000 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 2010, as necessary.

The Committee is concerned about the ever-increasing number of nonnative plant pests and diseases discovered in the United States. Significant Federal, State, and grower resources are being spent on controlling these pests and diseases, such as Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter and Pierce's Disease, Asian Citrus Psyllid and Huanglongbing Disease, Light Brown Apple Moth, and other plant pests. These pests pose a real threat to the long-term economic viability of U.S. agriculture. The Committee urges APHIS to address this issue and to undertake extremely careful review of requests for importation from growing regions that are home to pests or diseases that do not exist in the United States so as not to add to the current pest and disease crisis.

*Asian Long Horned Beetle.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$30,021,000 for Asian long horned beetle.

*Citrus Health Response Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$45,687,000 for the citrus health response program.

*Emerald Ash Borer.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$39,705,000 for emerald ash borer. This invasive species has been found in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Wisconsin, and West 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.

*Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$22,983,000 for glassy-winged sharpshooter.

*Karnal Bunt.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,151,000 for karnal bunt.

*Light Brown Apple Moth.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,008,000 for Light Brown Apple Moth.

*Miscellaneous Pests.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,102,000 for miscellaneous pests.

*Potato Cyst Nematode.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$8,327,000 for potato cyst nematode.

*Sirex Woodwasp.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for sirex woodwasp.

*Sudden Oak Death (Phytophthora ramora).*—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,347,000 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 \$469,000 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 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 \$6,078,000 for the grasshopper program.

*Mormon Cricket.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for grasshopper and cricket survey and control activities in the State of Nevada.

#### *Gypsy Moth*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,170,000 for the gypsy moth program.

*Gypsy Moth, New Jersey.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$250,000 to support and enhance gypsy moth control in communities and public lands in the State of New Jersey.

*Johne's Disease*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$6,876,000 for Johne's disease.

*Noxious Weeds*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,790,000 for the noxious weeds program.

*Cogongrass Control.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$208,000 for an invasive species program to prevent the spread of cogongrass in Mississippi, and requests that the agency take necessary steps to address this invasive weed as a regional infestation problem.

*Nez Perce Bio-Control Center.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$176,000 for the Nez Perce Bio-Control Center to increase the availability and distribution of biological control organisms used in an integrated weed management system.

*Noxious Weed Management.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$235,000 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.

*Tuberculosis*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,764,000 for the tuberculosis program.

*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 recommendation includes \$248,000 for bovine tuberculosis eradication efforts in the State of Michigan.

*Wildlife Services Operations*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$76,281,000 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.

*Animal Management and Control.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$496,000 for animal 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 animal damage to cropland and forests.

*Blackbird Management.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$265,000 to conduct methods development and continue control measures for minimizing blackbird damage in North and South

Dakota. The Committee recommendation also includes \$94,000 for blackbird management activities in Louisiana.

*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 \$465,000 for cormorant management and control, which includes \$139,000 for the State of Michigan, \$103,000 for the Lake Champlain basin, and \$223,000 for Delta States' operations.

*Integrated Predation Management Activities.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$280,000 for integrated predation management activities in the State of West Virginia.

*Oral Rabies Vaccination.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$23,810,000 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 \$926,000 for the tri-State predator control program in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming to respond to wolf depredation and monitor wolf populations.

*Wildlife Services, Hawaii.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,230,000 for Wildlife Service Operations in Hawaii. These operations include support for the State office to provide on-site coordination of prevention and control activities in Hawaii and the American Pacific, support for a permanent facility in Hilo for vertebrate pest control in Hawaii and the Pacific Region, continued rodent control efforts in active agricultural areas, prevention of the movement of Brown Tree Snakes from Guam to Hawaii, efforts to control coqui frog infestations, and other wildlife services activities.

*Wildlife Services South Dakota.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$519,000 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 \$21,979,000 for the animal care unit for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act.

*Horse Welfare.*—The Committee directs the Government Accountability Office [GAO] to conduct an investigation on the status of horse welfare in this country as it relates to the cessation of horse slaughter operations. In particular, the Committee believes that GAO should consider, at least, how the horse industry has re-

sponded to the closure of U.S. horse slaughter facilities in terms of both the numbers of horse sales, exports, adoptions, or abandonments; the implications these changes have had on farm income and trade; the extent to which horses in the United States are slaughtered for any purpose; any impacts to State and local governments and animal protection organizations; how the Department oversees the transport of horses destined for slaughter in foreign countries, particularly Canada and Mexico; the manner in which the Department coordinates with the Department of the Interior and State governments to assist them in identifying, holding and transporting unwanted horses for foreign export; and general conclusions regarding the welfare of horses as a result of a ban on horse slaughter for human consumption. The Committee expects a report in this investigation by March 1, 2010.

#### SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

##### *Biotechnology Regulatory Services*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$13,050,000 for biotechnology regulatory services.

*Genetically Modified Products.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$259,000 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 \$9,949,000 for the Plant Methods Development Laboratories Program.

*Sericea Lespedeza.*—*Sericea lespedeza* is an important field crop in the southeastern United States. *Sericea lespedeza* also poses environmental challenges to ecosystems in tall grass prairie lands in the Great Plains region. APHIS is encouraged to collaborate with conservation programs in the Great Plains region where *sericea lespedeza* is an invasive species to find economically and ecologically appropriate approaches.

##### *Veterinary Diagnostics*

*Committee Recommendation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$26,073,000 for veterinary diagnostics, which includes an increase of \$1,657,000 for APHIS costs associated with the agency's mission at the National Centers for Animal Health in Ames, Iowa.

*Agriculture Compliance Laboratory.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$69,000 for the animal health diagnostic laboratory in the State of Delaware.

*Disease Prevention.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$69,000 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 \$500,000 for the National Agriculture Bio-

security 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 \$18,630,000 for wildlife services methods development.

*Berryman Institute.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 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 Station, Texas.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$290,000 for the National Wildlife Research Station located in the State of Texas for activities related to emerging 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.

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.

The following is a list of congressionally designated projects:

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS

Project	Program	Amount
Agriculture Compliance Laboratory Equipment, Delaware Department of Agriculture.	Veterinary diagnostics .....	\$69,000
Animal management and control, APHIS Mississippi .....	Wildlife services operations .....	496,000
Berryman Institute, Jack Berryman Institute Utah and Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station.	Wildlife services methods development.	1,500,000
Bio-safety and antibiotic resistance, University of Vermont .....	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	240,000
Blackbird management, APHIS Louisiana .....	Wildlife services operations .....	94,000
Blackbird management, APHIS North and South Dakota .....	Wildlife services operations .....	265,000
Bovine tuberculosis eradication Michigan, Michigan Department of Agriculture.	Tuberculosis .....	248,000

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS—  
Continued

Project	Program	Amount
California county pest detection augmentation program, California Department of Food and Agriculture.	Pest detection .....	619,000
California county pest detection import inspection program, California Department of Food and Agriculture.	Pest detection .....	738,000
Cogongrass control, Mississippi Department of Agriculture .....	Noxious weeds .....	208,000
Cooperative livestock protection program, APHIS Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.	Wildlife services operations .....	223,000
Cormorant control, APHIS Michigan .....	Wildlife services operations .....	139,000
Cormorant control, APHIS Mississippi .....	Wildlife services operations .....	223,000
Cormorant control, APHIS Vermont and Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department.	Wildlife services operations .....	103,000
Disease prevention, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.	Veterinary diagnostics .....	69,000
Disease surveillance in North Dakota, North Dakota State University and Dickinson State University.	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	700,000
Genetically modified products, Iowa State University .....	Biotechnology regulatory services .....	259,000
Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee, Idaho Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Livestock, Wyoming Livestock Board.	Brucellosis .....	650,000
Gypsy moth, New Jersey, New Jersey Department of Agriculture ..	Gypsy moth .....	250,000
Hawaii interline, APHIS Hawaii .....	Agricultural quarantine inspection .....	3,000,000
Hawaii wildlife services activities, APHIS Hawaii .....	Wildlife services operations .....	2,230,000
Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, Tennessee, University of Tennessee .....	Biological control .....	500,000
Integrated predation management activities, APHIS West Virginia.	Wildlife services operations .....	280,000
Invasive aquatic species, Lake Champlain Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative, Vermont.	Aquaculture .....	94,000
Mormon cricket Nevada, APHIS Nevada .....	Grasshopper .....	1,000,000
National Agriculture Biosecurity Center, Kansas State University.	Veterinary diagnostics .....	500,000
National farm animal identification and records, Holstein Association.	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	343,000
National Wildlife Research Station, Texas A&M .....	Wildlife services methods development.	290,000
New Mexico rapid syndrome validation program, New Mexico State University.	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	404,000
Nez Perce Bio-control Center, Nez Perce Tribe .....	Noxious weeds .....	176,000
Noxious weed management, Nevada Department of Agriculture ..	Noxious weeds .....	235,000
Tri-State predator control, APHIS Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.	Wildlife services operations .....	926,000
Varroa mite suppression, APHIS Hawaii .....	Emerging plant pests .....	469,000
Wildlife Services South Dakota, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks.	Wildlife services operations .....	519,000
TOTAL, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	.....	18,059,000

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$4,712,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	4,712,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,712,000

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 \$4,712,000 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, 2009 .....	\$86,711,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	90,848,000
Committee recommendation .....	90,848,000

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 \$90,848,000 for marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

*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 \$6,667,000 for the National Organic Program [NOP]. The Committee encourages the agency to fund independent and comprehensive scientific reviews of substances and materials proposed for use in organic agriculture, prior to their consideration by the National Organic Standards Board, as required by the Organic Foods Production Act [OFPA]. The Committee further encourages the agency to finalize the pending pasture rule for organic livestock and initiate rule-making to address the issue of the origin of livestock. Finally, the Committee expects the NOP to move forward with respect to Peer



Review Panel requirements of the OFPA and USDA's organic regulations.

#### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2009 .....	\$62,888,000
Budget limitation, 2010 .....	64,583,000
Committee recommendation .....	64,583,000

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 \$64,583,000 on administrative expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

#### FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY

##### (SECTION 32)

#### MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$17,270,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	20,056,000
Committee recommendation .....	20,056,000

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 2008–2010:

#### ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2008–2010

	Fiscal year 2008 actual	Fiscal year 2009 estimate	Fiscal year 2010 estimate
Appropriation (30 percent of Customs Receipts) .....	\$7,563,683,777	\$7,979,334,788	\$8,061,101,371
Rescission .....	– 684,000,000	– 293,530,000	– 43,000,000
Less Transfers:			
Food and Nutrition Service .....	– 6,253,548,000	– 6,455,802,000	– 6,747,877,000
Commerce Department .....	– 84,594,777	– 108,510,788	– 114,224,371
Total, Transfers .....	– 6,338,142,777	– 6,564,312,788	– 6,862,101,371
Budget Authority .....	541,541,000	1,121,492,000	1,156,000,000
Unobligated Balance Available, Start of Year .....	500,000,000	293,529,985	343,491,985
Offsetting Collections .....	53,516,377		

## ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2008–2010—Continued

	Fiscal year 2008 actual	Fiscal year 2009 estimate	Fiscal year 2010 estimate
Recoveries of Prior Year Obligations .....	11,861	.....	.....
Available for Obligation .....	1,095,069,238	1,415,021,985	1,499,491,985
Less Obligations:			
Child Nutrition Programs (Entitlement Commodities) .....	464,937,227	465,000,000	465,000,000
12 Percent Commodity Floor Requirement .....	.....	.....	176,000,000
Accounting Adjustment .....	2,750,442	.....	.....
State Option Contract .....	174,201	.....	5,000,000
Removal of Defective Commodities .....	49,914,151	2,500,000	2,500,000
Emergency Surplus Removal .....	53,653,928	279,167,505	.....
Direct Payments .....	.....	750,000	.....
Disaster Relief .....	1,722,264	5,000,000	5,000,000
Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases .....	180,777,638	119,500,000	199,000,000
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program .....	.....	108,000,000	101,000,000
Whole Grain Products Study [FSA] .....	.....	4,000,000	.....
Estimated Future Needs .....	.....	38,261,495	193,108,000
Total, Commodity Procurement .....	753,929,851	1,022,179,000	1,146,608,000
Administrative Funds:			
Commodity Purchase Support .....	32,594,780	22,081,000	22,336,000
WebSCM—Additional Funding .....	.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
Marketing Agreements and Orders .....	15,014,622	17,270,000	20,056,000
Total, Administrative Funds .....	47,609,402	49,351,000	52,392,000
Total, Obligations .....	801,539,253	1,071,530,000	1,199,000,000
Unobligated Balance Available, End of Year .....	293,529,985	343,491,985	300,491,985

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a transfer from section 32 funds of \$20,056,000 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, 2009 .....	\$1,334,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	1,334,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,334,000

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 \$1,334,000 for payments to States and possessions for Federal-State marketing projects and activities.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$40,342,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	41,964,000
Committee recommendation .....	41,564,000

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 \$41,564,000 for salaries and expenses of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$500,000 for enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Limitation, 2009 .....	\$42,463,000
Budget limitation, 2010 .....	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, 2009 .....	\$613,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	813,000
Committee recommendation .....	813,000

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 processed egg products. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$813,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.

#### FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$971,566,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	1,018,520,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,018,520,000

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; reviews 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 \$1,018,520,000 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

*Codex Alimentarius.*—Codex Alimentarius is critical for the protection of consumer health globally and facilitating international trade. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$3,884,000 exclusively for the activities of the U.S. Codex office including international outreach and education.

*Humane Slaughter.*—The Committee continues to include \$3,000,000, as requested in the budget, for maintenance of the Humane Animal Tracking System. Further, the Committee notes that the budget request will maintain no less than 150 full-time equivalent positions which have been provided solely for humane slaughter enforcement. The Committee is pleased that FSIS is currently hiring additional Public Health Veterinarians and Consumer Safety Inspectors to be located at Federally inspected plants who slaughter a high number of cull cattle, and directs FSIS to report on this hiring activity.

The Committee has previously encouraged FSIS to consider a number of objective scoring techniques to measure more precisely the extent to and the occasions in which regulatory actions may be appropriate, including means by which FSIS personnel can actually document improvements or failures in animal handling and slaughter operations. These scoring techniques may include, but not be limited to, overall facility ratings in regard to layout, a systematic approach to monitoring HMSA requirements, or other means to establish an objective measure of operational performance. The Committee directs FSIS to provide a report on the potential for these actions.

*Poultry Imports.*—With respect to imports of processed poultry products, the Committee has concerns that the People’s Republic of China may not have in place the tracing mechanisms required to guarantee that only eligible raw material is used in further processing, that raw inputs or final products destined for the United States market are not commingled with ineligible inputs or products, or that the end product is sufficiently cooked so that all pathogens have been killed. The Committee believes that standards relating to food safety (including the safety of imported products) must be based on a strong scientific basis. Accordingly, the Committee recommends a general provision requiring special measures by the Secretary to guarantee food safety for United States consumers relating to poultry products from China including enhanced audit systems, port of entry inspections, and the establishment of an information system relating to audits and plant inspections.

*State Meat Inspection.*—The Committee notes that USDA is promulgating regulations regarding interstate shipment of meat and poultry from eligible State-inspected plants, in accordance with Public Law 110–246. The Committee further notes that the Final Rule is expected to be published by December 2009 and strongly encourages USDA to collaborate with State agencies, as appropriate, on this effort.

The following table represents the Committee’s specific recommendations for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
Food Safety Inspection:			
Federal .....	871,150	903,067	903,067
State .....	64,703	65,654	65,654

## FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
International .....	18,916	19,445	19,445
Codex Alimentarius .....	3,827	3,884	3,884
PHDCIS .....	12,970	26,470	26,470
Total .....	971,566	1,018,520	1,018,520

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN  
AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$646,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	895,000
Committee recommendation .....	895,000

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 \$895,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

*Food Aid Quality.*—The Committee expects that commodities procured by USDA and provided for the purpose of international humanitarian food assistance meet adequate levels of quality assurance to fully comply with program requirements. Toward that goal, the Department has conducted an initial assessment of food aid quality systems and the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 authorized the Secretary to use Food for Peace title II funds to implement food quality assurance measures. The Committee encourages the Secretary to move forward with the development and implementation of quality systems improvements, such as those identified through the initial assessment, and to utilize existing authorities to improve the quality, shelf life, bioavailability, and safety of food aid commodities and products procured by the Department.

Additionally, the Secretary is directed to conduct an assessment to evaluate the most cost-effective and practical means to assure the safety and quality of food assistance products procured through local and regional purchase authorities. The Committee expects the USAID Administrator to cooperate with such assessment by providing data on food assistance products (types, quantities, cost, etc.) procured locally and regionally through the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, PEPFAR and other relevant authorities, and the requirements and systems in place to assure the quality and safety of such products.

The Committee expects a report on the activities under this heading.

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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations	Transfers from program accounts	Total, FSA, salaries, and expenses
Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	1,220,273	312,487	1,532,760
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	1,253,777	321,340	1,575,117
Committee recommendation .....	1,253,777	316,340	1,570,117

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$50,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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, Food for Peace 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,570,117,000 for salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency.

*National Agriculture Imagery Program.*—The Committee recommends that funds be allocated to purchase high resolution sat-

ellite 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.

The Committee recognizes the potential for substantial overlap between the National Agriculture Imagery Program [NAIP] and the Commerce Department’s responsibilities to map broadband accessibility in rural areas, as required by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5). High resolution imagery will be the foundation of an effective broadband mapping system and the Committee is concerned that these two initiatives not duplicate efforts. NAIP has a demonstrated history with USDA of delivering effective results at acceptable costs. The Committee directs the Secretary to engage the Secretary of Commerce in discussions concerning utilizing the established NAIP program, through reimbursable agreements, to help address broadband mapping requirements of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The Committee also encourages the Secretary to pursue reimbursable agreements with other agencies and Departments that benefit from NAIP services.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$4,369,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	4,369,000
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, 2009 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	5,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,000,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for Grassroots Source Water Protection.



## DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,700,000
Budget estimate, 2010 <sup>1</sup> .....	930,000
Committee recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	930,000

<sup>1</sup> Current estimate. Such sums as may be necessary are provided.

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 such sums as may be necessary, estimated in fiscal year 2010 to be \$930,000, for repayment to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

## AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account is used to provide direct and guaranteed farm ownership, farm operating, conservation, Indian highly fractioned land, 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 and to establish Beginning Farmer and Rancher Individual Development grant accounts.

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.

*Conservation Loans.*—Made to farmers, ranchers, and other entities controlled by farmers and ranchers and primarily engaged in agricultural production. Direct and guaranteed loans may be used for conservation projects that support a USDA-approved conservation plan. Guarantees cover 75 percent of the principal loan amount.

*Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans.*—Made to Indian tribal members to purchase highly fractionated lands, as authorized by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

*Beginning Farmer and Rancher Individual Development Grants.*—Made to beginning farmers and ranchers who lack significant assets and have incomes below either 80 percent of the State’s median income, or 200 percent of the State’s poverty income level. Grants provide for matching-funds savings accounts to be used for specified farming-related expenses.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a total loan level of \$4,149,457,000 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 2009 and the budget request levels:

#### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 budget	Committee recommendation
Farm ownership:			
Direct .....	222,298	392,990	392,990
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111–32 .....	360,000	.....	.....
Guaranteed .....	1,238,768	1,500,000	1,500,000
Farm Operating:			
Direct .....	575,095	700,000	700,000
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111–5 .....	173,367	.....	.....
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111–32 .....	400,000	.....	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	1,017,497	1,150,000	1,150,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized, as provided in Public Law 111–32 .....	50,201	.....	.....
Guaranteed subsidized .....	269,986	144,467	144,467
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition .....	3,940	2,000	2,000
Conservation Loans:			
Direct .....	.....	75,000	75,000
Guaranteed .....	.....	75,000	75,000
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	.....	10,000	10,000

## AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 budget	Committee recommendation
Boll Weevil Eradication .....	100,000	60,000	100,000
Total, Farm loans (excluding Public Law 111-5 and Public Law 111-32) .....	3,427,584	4,109,457	4,149,457
Total, Farm loans, as provided by Public Law 111-5 and Public Law 111-32 .....	983,568	.....	.....
Total, Farm loans .....	4,411,152	4,109,457	4,149,457

## LOAN SUBSIDIES, GRANTS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Subsidies			Grants	Administrative expenses		Total ACIF
	Direct loan	Guaranteed loan	Total		Appropriations	Transfer to FSA	
Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	171,227	67,905	239,132	.....	317,323	309,403	556,455
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	51,072	53,050	104,122	5,000	326,093	318,173	435,215
Committee recommendation .....	51,072	53,050	104,122	.....	321,093	313,173	425,215

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$91,710,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5 and Public Law 111-32.

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 programs under credit reform:

[In thousands of dollars]

	2009 enacted	2010 budget	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:			
Farm ownership:			
Direct .....	12,715	16,034	16,034
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111-32 .....	22,860	.....	.....
Guaranteed .....	4,088	5,550	5,550
Farm operating:			
Direct .....	67,804	33,180	33,180
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111-5 .....	20,440	.....	.....
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111-32 .....	47,160	.....	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	25,336	26,910	26,910
Guaranteed unsubsidized, as provided in Public Law 111-32 .....	1,250	.....	.....
Guaranteed subsidized .....	37,231	20,312	20,312
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition .....	248	.....	.....
Conservation Loans:			
Direct .....	.....	1,065	1,065
Guaranteed .....	.....	278	278
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	.....	793	793
Total, loan subsidies, excluding Public Law 111-5 and Public Law 111-32 .....	147,422	104,122	104,122
Total loan subsidies provided by Public Law 111-5 and Public Law 111-32 .....	91,710	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

	2009 enacted	2010 budget	Committee recommendation
Total, loan subsidies .....	239,132	104,122	104,122
Individual Development Accounts .....		5,000	
ACIF expenses .....	317,323	326,093	321,093

### RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$77,177,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	80,325,000
Committee recommendation .....	79,425,000

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 \$79,425,000 for the Risk Management Agency.

### CORPORATIONS

#### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$6,582,945,000
Budget estimate, 2010 <sup>1</sup> .....	7,502,601,000
Committee recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	7,502,601,000

<sup>1</sup> 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 \$7,502,601,000 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, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$11,106,324,000
Budget estimate, 2010 <sup>1</sup> .....	13,878,054,000
Committee recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	13,878,054,000

<sup>1</sup> 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 2010 to be \$13,878,054,000, for the payment to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

#### HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

Limitation, 2009 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	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 the Commodity Credit Corporation's hazardous waste management program.

TITLE II  
CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$758,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	895,000
Committee recommendation .....	895,000

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 \$895,000 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.

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, 2009 .....	\$853,400,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	867,197,000
Committee recommendation .....	949,577,000

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 \$949,577,000 for Conservation Operations. The recommendation includes the following: \$9,930,000 for Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative; \$93,939,000 for Soil Surveys; \$10,965,000 for Snow Survey and Water Forecasting; \$11,088,000 for Plant Materials Centers; \$751,214,000 for conservation technical assistance; \$21,711,000 for congressionally directed spending; and \$50,730,000 for RC&D's.

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

*Resource Conservation and Development.*—The Committee includes funding within the appropriation for Conservation Operations to support the Resource Conservation and Development [RC&D] program. The agency may use up to \$50,730,000, the amount available in fiscal year 2009, to continue this program. If the Secretary chooses to provide funding for this program, the Committee expects the agency to fund meritorious RC&D councils with a proven track record in promoting conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources. Further, the Committee expects a report on the allocation of these funds including: the RC&D council receiving funds, the amount provided, and what activities the council will undertake.



For fiscal year 2010, 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.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE—CONSERVATION OPERATIONS—  
CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Accelerated Soil Mapping Survey (WY) .....	200
Agricultural Development and Resource Conservation (HI) .....	1,400
Agricultural Wildlife Conservation Center (MS) .....	939
Appropriate Wetland and Wet-Mesic Species (IA) .....	134
CEMSA with Iowa Soybean Association (IA) .....	288
Center for Invasive Species Eradication (TX) .....	1,000
Chenier Plain Sustainability Initiative (LA) .....	500
Conservation Fuels Management and Restoration (NV) .....	269
Conservation Internships (WI) .....	120
Conservation Technical Assistance in New Jersey .....	236
Conservation Technical Assistance in Tennessee .....	1,000
Conservation Technology Transfer (WI) .....	516
Delta Conservation Demonstration (MS) .....	376
Delta Water Study (MS) .....	235
Farm Viability Program (VT) .....	300
Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission Cooperative Agreement (GA) .....	800
Gilbert M. Grosvenor Center for Geographic Education Watershed Project (TX) .....	300
Grazing Land Conservation (WI) .....	732
Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control .....	404
Great Plain Riparian Initiative (NE) .....	500
Green River Water Quality and Biological Diversity Project (KY) .....	100
Hungry Canyons Alliance (IA) .....	282
Illinois Conservation Initiative (IL) .....	576
Kentucky Soil Erosion Control .....	724
Mississippi Conservation Initiative .....	2,000
Municipal Water District of Orange County for Efficient Irrigation (CA) .....	150
Nitrate Pollution Reduction (RI) .....	155
Operation Oak Program .....	100
Phosphorous Loading in Lake Champlain (VT) .....	179
Phosphorous Reduction Cooperative Agreement (KS) .....	1,000
Potomac River Tributary (WV) .....	168
Riparian Restoration (NM) .....	200
Risk Management Initiative (WV) .....	673
Soil Phosphorus Studies (WV) .....	202
Soil Survey (RI) .....	134
Technical Assistance Grants to Kentucky Soil Conservation Districts .....	545
UMASS—Amherst Ecological Conservation Initiative (MA) .....	140
Utah Conservation Initiative .....	2,500
Watershed Demonstration Project (IA) .....	134
Watershed Planning Staff (HI) .....	500
Yankee Tank Dam (KS) .....	1,000
<b>Total, Conservation Operations .....</b>	<b>21,711</b>

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$314,289,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	.....
Committee recommendation .....	24,394,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$290,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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, flood-water, 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, flood-water, 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 \$24,394,000 for Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations. The Committee encourages NRCS to fund the highest ranked projects identified in State priority lists and work to complete the final phase of multipurpose structures.

The following is a list of congressionally designated projects:

#### NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE—WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS—CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Ashley Valley Flood Control (UT) .....	300
Dry Creek Watershed (CA) .....	500
Dunloup Creek (WV) .....	1,500
DuPage County Watershed (IL) .....	1,000
Lahaina Watershed (HI) .....	1,000
Lost River (WV) .....	4,000
Lower Hamakua (HI) .....	1,800
Missouri Watershed projects (MO) .....	2,000
Pocasset River (RI) .....	2,000
Upcountry Maui (HI) .....	2,000
Upper Clark Fork Watershed (MT) .....	200
Wailuku-Alenaio (HI) .....	250
<b>Total, Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations .....</b>	<b>16,550</b>

#### WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$90,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	40,161,000
Committee recommendation .....	40,161,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$50,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111–5.

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 \$40,161,000 for the Watershed Rehabilitation Program.

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, 2009 .....	\$50,730,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	

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 provides funding for Resource Conservation and Development within the appropriation for Conservation Operations.

### 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, 2009 .....	\$646,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	895,000
Committee recommendation .....	895,000

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 \$895,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 appropriation	2010 budget request	
Appropriation .....	192,484	195,987	207,237
Transfer from:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Loan Program Account .....	460,217	468,593	468,593
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Program Account .....	39,245	39,959	39,959
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account .....	4,853	4,941	4,941
Total RD salaries and expenses .....	696,799	709,480	720,730

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 \$720,730,000 for salaries and expenses of Rural Development. Rural Development’s administrative support, particularly in the area of information technology, has not kept pace with the explosive growth in its portfolio. The Committee is providing additional funds to ensure that as Rural Development’s responsibilities expand into new spheres, including renewable energy, Rural Development has adequate resources to handle the tasks.

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 private sector; and (4) leverage the economic benefits through the use of low-cost credit programs.

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2009 (budget authority) <sup>1</sup> .....	\$861,168,000
Budget estimate, 2010 (budget authority) .....	624,325,000
Committee recommendation (budget authority) .....	711,313,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$200,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$711,313,000 for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account [RHIF].

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 2010, as well as for administrative expenses. The following table presents the loan subsidy levels as compared to the 2009 levels and the 2010 budget request:

#### RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 appropriation	2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
<b>Loan Levels:</b>			
Single-Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	1,121,488	1,121,488	1,226,501
Direct, as provided in Public Law 111-5 .....	1,000,000	.....	.....
Guaranteed, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	6,223,859	6,204,444	12,000,000
Guaranteed, as provided by Public Law 111-5 .....	10,472,000	.....	.....
Housing Repair (sec. 504) .....	34,410	34,412	34,412
Direct rental housing (sec. 515) .....	69,512	69,512	69,512
Guaranteed rental housing (sec. 538) .....	129,090	129,090	129,090
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	5,045	5,045	5,045
Credit sales of acquired property .....	11,447	11,448	11,448
Self help land development loans (sec. 523) .....	4,970	4,970	4,970
Total loan levels, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	7,599,821	7,580,409	13,480,978
Total loan levels, provided by Public Law 111-5 .....	11,472,000	.....	.....
Total, loan levels .....	19,071,821	7,580,409	13,480,978
<b>Loan Subsidies:</b>			
Single-Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	75,364	40,710	44,522
Direct, as provided by Public Law 111-5 .....	67,000	.....	.....
Guaranteed, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	79,043	89,624	172,800
Guaranteed, as provided by Public Law 111-5 .....	133,000	.....	.....
Housing Repair (sec. 504) .....	9,246	4,422	4,422
Direct rental housing (sec. 515) .....	28,611	18,935	18,935
Guaranteed rental housing (sec. 538) .....	8,082	1,485	1,485
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	.....	.....	.....
Credit sales of acquired property .....	523	556	556
Self help land development loans (sec. 523) .....	82	.....	.....
Total loan subsidies, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	200,951	155,732	242,720
Total loan subsidies as provided by Public Law 111-5 .....	200,000	.....	.....

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 appropriation	2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
Total, loan subsidies .....	400,951	155,732	242,720
Administrative expenses .....	460,217	468,593	468,593
Total, loan subsidies and administrative expenses .....	861,168	624,325	711,313

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$902,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	1,091,430,000
Committee recommendation .....	980,000,000

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 \$980,000,000 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 funding increase recommended over fiscal year 2009 is due to the increase in contracts requiring renewal.

## MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$27,714,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	26,616,000
Committee recommendation .....	39,651,000

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 Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program includes funding for housing vouchers, a multi-family revolving loan program, and a program for the preservation and revitalization of affordable multi-family housing projects. Rural Development's multi-family 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 Multi-family 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 \$39,651,000 for the Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program, including \$18,000,000 for vouchers, \$1,791,000 for revolving loan funds, and \$19,860,000 for a housing preservation demonstration program.

The Committee is aware of the large and growing demand for housing vouchers to protect multi-family housing residents from substantial rent increases if owners pre-pay their loans and leave the multi-family housing program. Sufficient funding is provided for expiring vouchers and new vouchers anticipated to be issued in fiscal year 2010.

When originated this pilot was envisioned to provide limited, transitional assistance to aid tenants in obtaining alternative living arrangements with affordable rents. However, as it is being operated the Department is silent to tenants regarding program duration, leaving the impression that voucher assistance will be provided indefinitely. Unless revised, funding needs for vouchers will grow without limits to unacceptable and unsustainable levels. The Committee directs the Secretary to review experiences and lessons learned under this pilot, and propose a program that is limited in duration and transitional in nature.



## MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$38,727,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	38,727,000
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.

The Committee is concerned that the Rural Housing Service does not have a permanent contract in place for technical assistance for the Mutual and Self Help Housing program, which is an important element in the agency's affordable housing efforts. The Committee understands that the original solicitation for a contract was issued in October 2007. A subsequent solicitation was then published in February 2009. Despite over 16 months of applications, evaluations, and internal deliberations there is still no agreement in place for self help technical assistance. The Committee directs the Rural Housing Service to submit a status report on the self help technical assistance contract within 30 days of enactment of this act.

## RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$41,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	41,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	41,500,000

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 \$41,500,000 for the Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program.

The following table compares the grant program levels recommended by the Committee to the fiscal year 2009 levels and the budget request:

#### RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 level	2010 request	
Very low-income housing repair grants .....	31,600	31,600	31,600
Compensation for construction defects .....	500	500	500
Housing preservation grants .....	9,400	9,400	9,400
Total .....	41,500	41,500	41,500

#### FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$18,269,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	16,968,000
Committee recommendation .....	16,968,000

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 \$16,968,000 for the cost of Direct Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants.

The following table compares the loan and grant levels recommended by the Committee to the fiscal year 2009 levels and the budget request:

#### FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2009	2010 request	Committee recommendation
Direct loan level .....	21,678	21,677	21,677
Direct loan subsidy .....	9,135	7,834	7,834
Grants .....	9,134	9,134	9,134

#### RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$193,830,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	54,993,000
Committee recommendation .....	54,993,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$130,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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 quasi-public 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 \$54,993,000 for the Rural Community Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

#### RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 appropriation	2010 budget request	Committee recommendations
Community facility direct loans <sup>1</sup> .....	83,871	3,864	3,864
Community facility guaranteed loans .....	6,358	6,626	6,626
Community facility grants <sup>2</sup> .....	83,373	20,373	20,373
Economic impact initiative grants .....	10,000	13,902	13,902
Rural community development initiative .....	6,256	6,256	6,256
Tribal college grants .....	3,972	3,972	3,972
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>193,830</b>	<b>54,993</b>	<b>54,993</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$67,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$63,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

*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: Administrative and Judicial Complex (New Mexico); Bethel Public Safety Building (Alaska); City of Cordova Gas utility (Alaska); City of Craig Community Association Waste Boiler Tie-In (Alaska); City of Munising Fire/Police Building (Michigan); City of Sault Sainte Marie—Ashmun Bay Boat Access and Channel Project (Michigan); Community Center Rehabilitation Project (Michigan); Community Center/EMS & Fire Facility (Florida); Cordova Center (Alaska); Fire Station Renovations, Town of Haynesville (Louisiana); Kekaha Siphons and Flumes Repair (Hawaii); Keweenaw National Historic Park-Village of Calumet Theater Building (Michigan); Kohala Irrigation System Repair (Hawaii); Lewbowski Theater Rebuilding Project (Michigan); Louisiana Tech University Rural Development Center (Louisiana); Luce County Community Center (Michigan); Mid-Ohio Foodbank (Ohio); Mora County Complex (New Mexico); Multi-Use Facility (New Mexico); Pepekeo Community Hydroelectric Generation (Hawaii); Public Safety Building (Alaska); Seaside School District Relocation (Oregon); Siena Heights University Community Center (Michigan); Slaughter and Processing Facilities Planning and Design (Hawaii); The Greening of the Upper Peninsula Children's Museum (Michigan); Torrance County Community Facilities (New Mexico); Traditional Ceremonial Facility (New Mexico); and YMCA Facility Renovation, Bogalusa (Louisiana).

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, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$237,385,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	97,116,000
Committee recommendation .....	97,116,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$150,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111–5.

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 \$97,116,000 for the Rural Business Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

#### RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 appropriation	2009 budget request	Committee recommendations
Business and industry guaranteed loans <sup>1</sup> .....	173,196	52,927	52,927
Business enterprise grants <sup>2</sup> .....	58,727	38,727	38,727
Business opportunity grants .....	2,483	2,483	2,483
Delta Regional Authority grants .....	2,979	2,979	2,979
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>237,385</b>	<b>97,116</b>	<b>97,116</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$130,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$20,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

*Rural Business Program Account.*—The Committee recommends \$500,000 for transportation technical assistance.

The Committee directs that of the \$4,000,000 recommended for grants to benefit Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, \$250,000 shall be used to implement an American Indian and Alaska Native passenger transportation development and assistance initiative.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 level	2010 request	
Estimated loan level .....	33,536	33,536	33,536
Direct loan subsidy .....	14,035	8,464	8,464
Administrative expenses .....	4,853	4,941	4,941
<b>Total, loan subsidies and administrative expenses</b> .....	<b>18,870</b>	<b>13,405</b>	<b>13,405</b>

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, com-

munity 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 \$13,405,000 for the Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 level	2010 request	
Estimated loan level .....	33,077	33,077	33,077

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 recommends a loan program level of \$33,077,000, to be funded from earnings on the Cushion of Credit and fees on guaranteed underwriting loans made pursuant to section 313A of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$12,636,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	38,636,000
Committee recommendation .....	38,854,000

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 pro-

vide 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 \$38,854,000 for Rural Cooperative Development Grants.

Of the funds recommended, \$2,800,000 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 \$3,463,000 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 \$21,867,000 for value-added agricultural product market development grants.

RURAL MICROENTERPRISE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 .....	.....
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	\$22,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	22,000,000

This program, authorized by section 379E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981 et seq.), provides micro-entrepreneurs with the skills necessary to establish new rural microenterprises, as well as support these types of businesses with technical and financial assistance. The program provides loans and grants to intermediaries that assist micro-entrepreneurs. The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 makes available \$4,000,000 of mandatory funding for fiscal year 2010.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$22,000,000 for the Rural Microenterprise Investment Program.

The following table provides the Committee’s recommendation as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:



## RURAL MICROENTERPRISE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 level	2010 request	Committee recommendation
Estimated loan level .....	.....	51,522	51,522
Loan subsidy .....	.....	11,000	11,000
Grants .....	.....	11,000	11,000

## RURAL EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$8,130,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for Rural Enterprise Zones and Enterprise Community Grants due to the expiration of the authorization of these entities.

## RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	\$68,130,000
Committee recommendation .....	\$68,130,000

The Rural Energy for America Program is authorized under section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107). 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 \$68,130,000 for the Rural Energy for America Program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendation as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

## RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 level	2010 request	Committee recommendation
Estimated loan level .....	28,380	246,334	246,334
Guaranteed loan subsidy .....	2,750	33,600	33,600
Grants .....	2,250	34,530	34,530

## BIOREFINERY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009 .....	
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	\$17,339,000
Committee recommendation .....	17,339,000

The Biorefinery Assistance Program is authorized under section 9003 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002. Under this program assistance is provided to aid in the development of new and emerging technologies for expanding production of advanced biofuels. Grants are available for development and con-

struction of demonstration-scale biorefineries and guaranteed loans are available for development, construction or retrofitting commercial-scale biorefineries.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,339,000 for the Biorefinery Assistance Program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendation as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

#### BIOREFINERY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 level	2010 request	Committee recommendation
Estimated loan level .....	.....	48,884	48,884
Guaranteed loan subsidy .....	.....	17,339	17,339

*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: Arkansas Virtual Enterprise Center (Arkansas); Biofuel Supply Chain Development (Wisconsin); Connect ME (Maine); Fort Belknap Buffalo Program (Montana); Keweenaw Bay Indian Community Commer Stamp Sand Reuse Project (Michigan); Matanuska Susitna Borough Agricultural Food Processing and Product Development Center (Alaska); Mentoring and Community Agriculture Initiative (Vermont); Montana Food and Agriculture Innovation Center Action Plan (Montana); Nevada Wool Growers (Nevada); Rural Business Energizer Program (Maine); Rural Enterprises of Oklahoma (Oklahoma); Rural Entrepreneurs Revitalization Fund (Michigan); San Joaquin County Agricultural Center Solar Project (California); and Scottsboro Electric Economic Development (Alabama).

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 revital-

izing 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 ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,936,268,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	546,230,000
Committee recommendation .....	568,730,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$1,380,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

The water and waste disposal program is authorized by sections 306, 306A, 309A, 306C, 306D, 306E, 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 \$568,730,000 for the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account.

The Committee recommends \$70,000,000 for water and waste disposal systems grants for Native Americans, including Native Alaskans, the Colonias, and residents of Hawaiian Homelands. 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 \$14,000,000 available for the circuit rider program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

## RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2009 appropriation <sup>1</sup>	2010 budget request	Committee recommendation
Not specified .....	538,768	.....	.....
Water and waste disposal direct loans <sup>2</sup> .....	412,000	77,071	77,071
Water and waste disposal grants <sup>3</sup> .....	968,000	464,228	469,228
Solid waste management grants .....	.....	3,441	3,441
Water well system grants .....	.....	993	993
Water and waste water revolving funds .....	.....	497	497
High energy cost grants .....	17,500	.....	17,500
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,936,268</b>	<b>546,230</b>	<b>568,730</b>

<sup>1</sup> In fiscal year 2009, the Committee did not specify the distribution of funding among water and waste disposal loans and grants.

<sup>2</sup> \$412,000,000 provided in Public Law 111-5.

<sup>3</sup> \$968,000,000 provided in Public Law 111-5.

*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: 76th Street Sanitary Sewer Force Main Relocation (Michigan); Aberdeen Water Treatment Plant and Wellfield Project (Ohio); Akiachak Solid Waste Facility (Alaska); Benton County Fairgrounds Waste Water Collection and Drainage Project (Oregon); Blaine Water Reclamation Facility (Washington); Blue River Hills Improvement District (Kansas); Buena Vista Wastewater Improvement Project (Michigan); Cathlamet Water Treatment Plant (Washington); City of Eagle Point Reservoir Retrofit (Oregon); City of LaBelle Water Treatment Plant (Florida); County of Coloma Water Tower Replacement (Michigan); Elk County Rural Water District #2 (Kansas); Expanded Solid Waste Transfer Station (Florida); Fayetteville Water Authority (Alabama); Ferriday Town Water System (Louisiana); Green River Pumping Project (Utah); Griffith Spring Collection Box and Building Replacement (New Mexico); Hubbard Creek Impoundment Improvement Project (Oregon); Imperial Keystone Regional Water Reclamation Facility and Wastewater Collection System (California); Kane County Water Improvement Initiative (Utah); Kettle Falls Water Treatment Facility (Washington); Lake County Kelseyville Wastewater System (California); Lawtey Wastewater Collection Facilities and Equipment Project-Phase II (Florida); New Holland Water Tower Replacement (Ohio); Old Highway 62/Royal Avenue Water Main Replacement (Oregon); Ozark Mountain Regional Public Water Authority (Arkansas); Partridge Creek Diversion (Michigan); San Luis Obispo County Los Osos Wastewater Project (California); Spalding Sewer Lift Station (Oregon); Sutter County Regional Wastewater Project (California); Town of Repton (Alabama); Tulare Rural Community Water Systems (California); Village of Blanchester (Ohio); Village of Spencer (Ohio); Washoe Tribe (Nevada); Wastewater Treatment Plant (Florida); and Willapa Regional Wastewater Facility (Washington).

*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 2010, 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 2009 and budget request levels:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 level	2010 request	
Loan authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct, 5 percent .....	100,000	100,000	100,000
Direct FFB .....	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
Guaranteed underwriting .....			500,000
Subtotal .....	6,600,000	6,600,000	7,100,000
Telecommunications:			
Direct, 5 percent .....	145,000	145,000	145,000
Direct, Treasury rate .....	250,000	250,000	250,000
Direct, FFB .....	295,000	295,000	295,000
Subtotal .....	690,000	690,000	690,000
Total, loan authorizations .....	7,290,000	7,290,000	7,790,000
Loan subsidies:			
Telecommunications:			
Direct, Treasury rate .....	525		
Subtotal .....	525		
Total, loan subsidies .....	525		
Administrative expenses .....	39,245	39,959	39,959
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Programs Account .....	39,770	39,959	39,959
(Loan authorization) .....	7,290,000	7,290,000	7,790,000

The Rural Utilities Service, Electric Programs, is directed to develop loan security procedures and instruments for renewable energy loans that distinguishes the differences between privately developed project financing and system financing as is traditionally used with rural electric cooperatives.

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

LOANS AND GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 level	2010 request	
Loan and Grant Levels:			
Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program:			
Grants .....	34,755	29,790	37,755
Broadband program, excluding Public Law 111-5:			
Treasury rate loans .....	400,487	531,699	531,699
Treasury rate loans budget authority .....	15,619	38,495	38,495
Grants .....	13,406	13,406	13,406
Total broadband budget authority, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	63,780	81,691	89,656
Total broadband program level, excluding Public Law 111-5 .....	448,648	574,895	582,860
Budget authority, provided by Public Law 111-5 .....	2,500,000	.....	.....
Budget authority, from all sources .....	2,563,780	81,691	89,656

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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$89,656,000 for the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program. The Committee recommendation includes \$4,965,000 for public broadcasting systems grants to allow noncommercial educational television broadcast stations that serve rural areas to convert from analog to digital operations.

The Committee is concerned about the longstanding, unmet health needs in the Mississippi Delta. The Committee recommendation includes \$3,000,000 to address critical health care needs in the region, as authorized by section 379G of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

The Committee continues its support for extending high speed broadband service to the most remote, un-served areas of rural America. Substantial funds have been made available in annual appropriations bills, and \$2,500,000,000 was provided to USDA for this purpose in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 [ARRA]. The Committee recognizes that reaching the most remote and un-served areas requires substantial Government investment, and recommends full funding of the President's budget request for continued investment. However, the Committee insists that USDA should utilize these funds effectively and directs the Secretary to include in the quarterly spending plans and obligations reports required by ARRA comparable information on the use of annual appropriations funding.

*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: Batavia, New York Rural Broadband Expansion Plan 2009 (New York); Creating Connectivity Across Nez Perce Lands (Idaho); East Central Vermont Community Fiber Network (Vermont); Eastern Shore Broadband Buildout (Virginia); Expanding Home Telehealth for the Aging Population in New York State (New York); Humboldt County Redundant Broadband Link (California); Jamestown, NY to Whitesville, NY Fiber Build (New York); Open Access Fiber Optic Broadband Deployment on the Northern Neck and Middle Peninsula (Virginia); Otsego County Telecommunications Open Access Model (New York); Project Bluebird (Virginia); Rural Broadband Initiative for Economic Development (New York); Rural Medical Education Project (Nevada); and Tribal Internet Utility Services (New Mexico).

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, 2009 .....	\$610,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	813,000
Committee recommendation .....	813,000

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 nutrition assistance activities. The Office has oversight and management responsibilities for the Food and Nutrition Service.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$813,000 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 \$253,250,000 in fiscal year 2010 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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation	Section 32 transfers	Total
Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	8,596,109	6,455,802	15,051,911
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	10,049,369	6,747,877	16,797,246
Committee recommendation .....	10,051,707	6,747,877	16,799,584

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$100,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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 \$10,051,707,000, plus transfers from section 32 of \$6,747,877,000, for a total of \$16,799,584,000 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	2009 estimate	2010 budget	Committee recommendation
School Lunch Program .....	8,472,755	9,821,347	9,821,347
School Breakfast Program .....	2,633,048	2,866,683	2,866,683
Child and Adult Care Food Program .....	2,513,852	2,686,523	2,686,523
Summer Food Service Program .....	357,984	377,752	377,752
Special Milk Program .....	14,941	13,590	13,590
State administrative expenses .....	178,994	193,268	193,268
Commodity procurement and computer support .....	750,701	802,570	802,570
Team Nutrition .....	15,000	15,016	15,016
Food safety education .....	2,500	2,510	2,510
Coordinated review .....	5,636	5,751	5,751
CACFP training and technical assistance .....	3,500	3,537	3,537
Child Nutrition Program Studies and Evaluations .....	3,000	3,000	5,338
Hunger-Free Community Grants .....	.....	5,000	5,000
Healthier U.S. School Challenge .....	.....	699	699

The Committee recommends \$15,016,000 for TEAM nutrition. Included in this amount is \$5,500,000 for food service training grants

to States; \$3,000,000 for technical assistance materials; \$800,000 for National Food Service Management Institute cooperative agreements; \$1,000,000 for print and electronic food service resource systems; \$1,500,000 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 \$3,216,000 for other activities.

In addition, the Committee recommendation includes \$2,338,000 to allow the agency to increase efforts to work directly with State and local administrators and provide technical assistance to promote early detection of erroneous payment problems and to develop appropriate improvement strategies. Funding will support increased technical assistance to States in areas such as data analysis, policy interpretation and training development.

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

*Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.*—Section 4304 of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act provided \$101,000,000 for a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program to be made available on July 1, 2010. Of this amount, the Committee has included a general provision to delay availability of \$76,000,000 of these funds until October 1, 2010. 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 2011. The full funding amount of \$101,000,000 will be available for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for the school year beginning July 1, 2010, as specified in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act.

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

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$7,360,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	7,777,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	7,552,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$500,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111-5.

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 9.8 million participants at an average food cost of \$45.01 per person per month in fiscal year 2010.

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 \$7,552,000,000 for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. The Committee notes that \$487,000,000 in contingency funds will be available in fiscal year 2010 making a total of \$8,039,000,000 available for WIC in fiscal year 2010.

The Committee recommendation fully funds estimated WIC participation in fiscal year 2010 and makes significant program improvements. The Committee recommendation includes \$80,000,000 for breastfeeding support initiatives, \$60,000,000 for State management information systems, and \$14,000,000 for infrastructure improvements. In addition, the Committee recommendation provides funding to increase fruit and vegetable vouchers for all women up to the Institute of Medicine recommendation. The Committee also includes authorizing language that exempts military combat pay from WIC eligibility determination.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(In thousands of dollars)

	Expenses	Amount in reserve	Puerto Rico and American Samoa	TEFAP commodity purchases	Total
Appropriations, 2009 .....	48,951,741	3,000,000	1,767,505	250,000	53,969,246
Public Law 111-5 (fiscal year 2009) .....					4,859,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	56,217,970	3,000,000	1,880,626	253,250	61,351,846
Committee recommendation .....	56,217,970	3,000,000	1,880,626	253,250	61,351,846

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 SNAP 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 benefit 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 fraud investigations and prosecutions.

States are required to implement an employment and training program for the purpose of assisting members of households participating in SNAP 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 \$61,351,846,000 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.

*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, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$380,800,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	233,388,000
Committee recommendation .....	233,388,000

<sup>1</sup>Includes \$150,000,000 for The Emergency Food Assistance Program provided in Public Law 111-5.

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 makes \$253,250,000 available for the purchase of TEFAP commodities in fiscal year 2010. 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 \$233,388,000 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 \$162,818,000 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 \$20,000,000 for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and directs the Secretary to obligate these funds within 45 days.

*Food Bank Infrastructure Grants.*—The Committee recommends a general provision providing \$7,000,000 for Food Bank Infrastruc-

ture Grants as authorized under section 209 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 with particular emphasis placed on Indian tribal organizations.

*The Emergency Food Assistance Program.*—The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 provides \$253,250,000 for TEFAP commodities to be purchased with Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funds. The Committee recommendation includes \$49,950,000 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, 2009 .....	\$142,595,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	150,139,000
Committee recommendation .....	147,801,000

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 \$147,801,000 for Nutrition Programs Administration.

*Dietary Guidelines.*—The Committee notes that during the coming year, USDA will receive the report of the 2010 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee, and will then have the responsibility to formulate and issue science-based dietary guidance. In view of the need to communicate clear messages and motivate changes in consumer behavior, the Committee recommends that USDA provide a limited number of easily understandable, readily actionable guidelines that will encourage consumers to build their diets around nutrient-dense foods.

*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 organi-

zations throughout the country, including the St. John's Bread & Life Program in Brooklyn, New York to provide technical and financial assistance where appropriate, to help these organizations further their goals.



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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations	Transfers from loan accounts	Total
Appropriations, 2009 .....	165,436	4,985	170,421
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	180,367	6,465	186,832
Committee recommendation .....	180,367	6,465	186,832

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 97 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 facilities financing guarantees, (2) Food for Peace, (3) section 416b Overseas Donations Program, (4) Market Access Program, and (5) 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 \$186,832,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including a direct appropriation of \$180,367,000.

*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 \$3,606,000 for Capital Security Cost Sharing [CSCS], as proposed in the budget. The Committee funds the fiscal year 2010 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 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 2009 level.

*Market Access Program.*—The Committee continues the full mandatory funding for the Market Access Program and expects the Department to administer the program as authorized in 7 U.S.C. 5623, without changing the eligibility requirements for participation of cooperative organizations, small businesses, trade associations, and other entities.

*Specialty Crops.*—The Committee is aware of FAS activities to provide technical assistance for the promotion of specialty crop exports and encourages the agency to continue these activities.

#### FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE I PROGRAM ACCOUNT

##### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$2,736,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	2,812,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,812,000

##### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,812,000 for administrative expenses to continue servicing existing Food for Peace title I agreements.

## FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$2,320,900,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	1,690,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,690,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes supplemental funding of \$395,000,000 as provided in Public Law 110–252 and supplemental funding of \$700,000,000 as provided in Public Law 111–32.

The Committee recognizes the important mission of the Food for Peace 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 landlocked 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 \$1,690,000,000 for Food for Peace 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.

*Safe Box.*—The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 contained a provision mandating a minimum level of Food for Peace title II resources be used for non-emergency assistance (\$400,000,000 in fiscal year 2010), 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, 2009 .....	\$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	199,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	199,500,000

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 \$199,500,000 for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

*Nutrient Fortification Pilot.*—The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 from within the amount appropriated to conduct pilot projects to develop, pilot, and field test new and improved micronutrient fortified products designed to meet the energy and nutrient needs of populations served by the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program. This program serves school-age children, pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants, and children under five, and these populations are the most susceptible to long-term health implications due to the composition and content of daily food intake. These funds may be provided to non-governmental organizations and international agencies to provide technical assistance to carry out improvements in the products distributed through the McGovern-Dole program. The Committee expects a report on the status of this program with a follow-up report on the progress made to date by September 1, 2010.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(EXPORT CREDIT PROGRAMS AND GSM-102)

(In thousands of dollars)

	Guaranteed loan levels <sup>1</sup>	Guaranteed loan subsidy <sup>1</sup>	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2009 .....	5,470,000	40,000	5,333
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	5,500,000	11,130	6,820
Committee recommendation .....	5,500,000	11,130	6,820

<sup>1</sup> 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 noncommer-

cial 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. 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 blend 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 four separate areas, Human Drugs, Animal Drugs, Medical Devices and Biologics. FDA is responsible for the life cycle of products, including premarket review and postmarket surveillance of human and animal drugs, medical devices and biological products to ensure their safety and effectiveness. 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, blood products, and other biologics.

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, and MRIs. Radiological products include items such as 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 lead to 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	User fees	Total
Appropriations, 2009 .....	2,038,964	612,911	2,651,875
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	2,337,656	687,280	3,024,936
Committee recommendation .....	2,337,656	687,280	3,024,936

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,337,656,000 for FDA salaries and expenses. The Committee also recommends \$578,162,000 in Prescription Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$57,014,000 in Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act user fee collections; \$17,280,000 in Animal Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$5,106,000 in Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$19,318,000 in Mammography Quality Standards Act fee collections; and \$10,400,000 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 following table reflects the Committee’s recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2009 and budget request levels:

## FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 request	
Centers and related field activities:			
Foods .....	648,722	782,915	782,915
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition [CFSAN] .....	210,486	236,418	236,418
Field Activities .....	438,236	546,497	546,497
Human Drugs .....	413,482	457,814	457,814
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research [CDER] .....	302,386	329,588	329,588
Field Activities .....	111,096	128,226	128,226
Biologics .....	183,451	206,438	206,438
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research [CBER] .....	148,134	166,182	166,182
Field Activities .....	35,317	40,256	40,256
Animal Drugs .....	116,471	135,475	135,475
Center for Veterinary Medicine [CVM] .....	73,035	82,452	82,452
Field Activities .....	43,436	53,023	53,023
Medical and radiological devices .....	280,587	315,377	315,377
Center for Devices and Radiological Health [CDRH] .....	209,061	234,974	234,974
Field Activities .....	71,526	80,403	80,403
National Center for Toxicological Research [NCTR] .....	52,511	58,745	58,745
Other Activities .....	120,560	143,712	143,712
Rent and related activities .....	88,829	91,158	91,158
Rental payments to GSA .....	134,351	146,022	146,022
Total, FDA salaries and expenses, new budget authority .....	2,038,964	2,337,656	2,337,656

The Committee recommendation includes the following increases in budget authority for FDA salaries and expenses activities, as requested in the budget: \$29,536,000 for cost-of-living adjustments; \$14,000,000 for rental payments to GSA and other rent-related activities; \$151,967,000 for food safety investments; \$98,189,000 for investments relating to safer drugs, biologics and medical devices; and \$5,000,000 for development of policies proposed in the budget.

Of the increases provided, \$151,967,000 will be used for food safety investments. This funding will allow FDA to hire additional investigators to conduct additional domestic and foreign food and feed inspections and field exams; improve laboratory capacity and technologies to test additional samples for analysis in FDA laboratories; and build and expand existing relationships with regulatory partners, including State and local governments. This funding will also be used to promote industry training and develop additional controls to support industry prevention efforts, with specific controls for high-risk commodities; increase the Agency's understanding of food and feed vulnerabilities and risks and ability to detect contamination; work on more rapid response efforts; improve



risk communication during a food safety event; and upgrade and integrate information technology systems necessary to appropriately screen, sample and enforce FDA regulations.

Of the increases provided, \$98,189,000 will be used for activities related to drug, device and biologics safety. This includes funds for increased foreign and domestic medical product inspections and improved laboratory capacity and sample processing. FDA will also conduct increased work on blood, tissue and vaccine safety, including the hiring of additional staff and increasing training to support product development and the development of new screening tests for emerging blood-borne diseases. Further, FDA will implement safety requirements related to the FDA Amendments Act; increase activities relating to adverse event information collection and analysis; conduct research on bioequivalence standards for generic forms of novel products; improve enforcement against fraudulent products; develop noninvasive techniques to better understand the risks of anesthetic use in children; and upgrade and integrate information technology systems.

The Committee expects FDA to continue all projects, activities and programs at no less than the fiscal year 2009 level, unless otherwise specified.

*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.

*Antibiotic Development.*—Regulatory uncertainty in the antibiotic drug arena has been a serious impediment to new antibiotic development. Although a number of indication-specific draft guidance documents have recently been published, there are several serious infection diseases for which guidance is still needed, including hospital acquired pneumonia, ventilator-associated pneumonia, and complicated skin and skin structure infections. The Committee directs FDA to issue guidance for these diseases. Further, the Committee is aware that as part of the 2001 Interagency Public Health Action Plan to Combat Antimicrobial Resistance, FDA, along with CDC, agreed to be the designated lead to identify ways to promote the development and/or appropriate use of priority antibacterial drugs for humans, for which current market incentives are inadequate. The FDA is encouraged to work with other governmental entities and interested parties to begin this work, including commissioning a study with an outside entity if necessary, and to report to the Committee on those efforts.

*Antimicrobial Resistance.*—The Committee directs FDA to continue to implement all directives contained in the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act and the Animal Drug User Fee Act regarding antimicrobial resistance. The Committee also encourages FDA to conduct a focused reassessment on the human importance ranking of antibiotics, in consultation with infectious disease experts, to determine the appropriateness of the current ranking of these drugs according to their importance in human medicine.

*Budget Justification.*—The Committee directs the agency to submit the fiscal year 2011 budget request in a format that follows the same account structure as the fiscal year 2010 budget request unless otherwise approved by the Committee. Further, the Committee directs that in future budget requests, all performance measures and outputs, such as number of staff hired and number of inspection performed, be measured according to budget authority requests. The Committee directs FDA to provide any performance measures and outputs related to proposed or current law user fees separately and independent of one another.

Finally, the Committee notes that the administration's budget request included increases of nearly 15 percent in budget authority. However, the budget justification related all of these increases into two major themes, "Food Safety" and "Medical Product Safety" without any significant detail on how this funding would be used. The Committee eventually received some level of detail regarding the request, and directs FDA to provide significantly more detailed information, including a high level of details on each budgetary theme, in future budget requests.

*Cosmetics.*—The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$2,000,000 for the cosmetics program. With this increase, total funding for cosmetics activities at FDA will be \$10,200,000 in fiscal year 2010, which includes the Office of Cosmetics and Colors in the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and inspection activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs.

*Critical Path and Modernizing Drug Safety.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$18,000,000 for the critical path initiative, including not less than \$6,000,000 for critical path partnerships as authorized by section 566 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act). The Committee expects that this funding will be used to further FDA's work on critical path opportunities and to promote collaborations with other government agencies, academia, patient groups, and other interested parties including, but not limited to, the Critical Path Institute, the National Institute for Pharmaceutical Technology and Education, the Coalition Against Major Diseases, and the Coalition Against Tuberculosis.

Of the \$6,000,000 provided for critical path partnerships, not less than \$2,000,000 shall be used to support research partnerships for the treatment and/or rapid diagnosis of tropical diseases as defined by section 524 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Committee is particularly concerned with treatments for tuberculosis [TB] and drug-resistant TB. Worldwide, almost 2 million people die from TB and more than 9 million people develop active disease every year. The rise of drug-resistant TB can result in a global, untreatable epidemic. The Committee believes that the use of single drugs too often results in drug resistance, and that more effective combinations of treatment are needed. Therefore, the Committee directs the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research to enter into a competitive agreement with an entity eligible for funding under section 566 of the FD&C Act to assist with the development of new combinations of drugs for the rapid and effective therapy of tuberculosis.

The Committee directs FDA to report on critical path spending quarterly. Reports should include activities undertaken with the

\$18,000,000 provided for the overall initiative, and more specifically projects awarded with the \$6,000,000 in partnership funding. The report shall include the amount of each project or activity, the center responsible for the funding, a description of the specific project or activity being funded, and in the case of partnership funding, the recipient of the funds.

*Definition of Food.*—The Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007 included section 912, which prohibits interstate commerce of food to which certain articles have been added. On July 29, 2008, FDA published a Federal Register notice seeking comments on this section. One of the questions for which FDA requested comments was the applicability of section 912 to dietary supplements, given that dietary supplements already clearly exclude certain articles as defined in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Committee notes that comments were due on October 27, 2008, and more than 8 months later, FDA still has not resolved this issue. The Committee directs FDA to dispose of this issue.

*Demonstration Grants for Improving Pediatric Device Availability.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,000,000 for Demonstration Grants for Improving Pediatric Device Availability, as authorized by the Food and Drug Amendments Act of 2007.

*Epilepsy Drug Safety Research.*—The Committee is concerned about recent reports of unexpected side effects, including seizures, when epileptic individuals switch among different manufacturers' versions of the same therapeutic agent. The Committee directs the FDA to submit a report not later than September 30, 2010 detailing FDA's advice on planned research on the impact of substituting bioequivalent anti-epileptic drugs on epileptic individuals and detailing FDA proposed guidance or actions to minimize the health impact or side effects as a result of the agency's research on switching bioequivalent anti-epileptic drugs.

*Generic Drugs.*—The Committee recommendation includes no less than \$92,966,000 for the generic drugs program at FDA, of which \$51,545,000 is for the Office of Generic Drugs. Total funding for the Office of Generic Drugs is an increase of \$10,000,000 above the fiscal year 2009 level.

*Human Resources.*—The Committee is concerned that FDA is not being appropriately serviced by the Rockville Human Resources [HR] Center. In 2004, HHS consolidated all human resource functions into five human resource centers. FDA, along with several other agencies, is serviced by the Rockville HR Center. An audit conducted by the Office of Personnel Management [OPM] and HHS in 2008, found that the Rockville HR Center was failing in many areas, and the center's authority to hire individuals from outside the Government was suspended. As a result, FDA made the decision to independently contract with OPM to facilitate FDA's continued need to hire individuals from outside of Government. It may be more than a year before the Rockville HR Center gets all of its hiring authority back. Currently, FDA is paying HHS for a service that is not being provided as contractually agreed, and is outsourcing additional human resource activities to OPM in order to fill the gap left by the Rockville HR Center. The Committee has invested significant resources at FDA so the agency can backfill positions

and hire new staff to meet increasing agency demands. The Committee believes FDA will be better serviced by a fully functioning human resource operation. Therefore, the Committee directs HHS and FDA to come to a resolution that ensures FDA is being serviced by a fully functioning HR center and report to the Committee on the measures that are being taken to meet FDA's hiring needs.

*Infant Formula.*—The Committee is aware that, in recent years, infant formula manufacturers have increasingly added new ingredients to infant formulas, such as long chain polyunsaturated fatty acids, prebiotics, and probiotics. The stated goal of such food ingredient additions is to obtain certain beneficial outcomes with respect to infant health and nutrition. These products are heavily marketed as offering specific health and developmental advantages through nutrition but at the same time cost more than traditional infant formulas. Without a doubt, all infants should have access to infant formulas that promote healthy growth and development. However, the Committee is concerned that product development in the infant formula industry is outpacing FDA's regulatory actions with respect to new infant formulas and the claims associated with them. The Committee directs the FDA to submit to Congress, within 120 days of enactment, a report containing a list of new infant formulas introduced into interstate commerce in the last decade; information on the agency's efforts to issue structure/function claim guidance for infant formulas; the health claim petitions (either statutory or qualified) pertaining to infant growth, development or nutrition received by FDA; and actions taken by FDA in response to the petitions for these claims for infant formula, including the number of rejections and the reasons for each rejection.

*Mammography.*—The Committee is aware that the Mammography Quality Standards Act [MQSA] has resulted in improved quality of mammography to make mammograms a more reliable tool to detect breast cancers. Appropriated funds pay for inspections in Government entities and in facilities where at least 50 percent of mammograms performed are funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, as well as other important activities. The Committee recommends no less than \$5,296,000 in appropriated funds, as well as \$19,318,000 in user fee collections, for activities related to MQSA.

*Neglected Diseases.*—The Committee is concerned about the challenge of increasing the number of approved treatments for diseases that, although not necessarily rare, may have few if any therapeutic options. The Committee recognizes that the definition of a rare disease or condition under the Orphan Drug Act includes many tropical diseases or conditions that affect more than 200,000 persons in the United States.

Because the Orphan Drug Act already embraces therapies to treat many tropical diseases, the Committee urges FDA to take active steps to stimulate orphan status and support their development. Where appropriate, FDA should engage in partnerships and collaborations to identify compounds that may be suitable to treat this subset of orphan diseases and work in a proactive way to identify compounds to treat such diseases.

*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 \$6,000,000 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.

*Packaged Ice Manufacturing.*—The Committee recognizes that ice is a food product produced in the United States for both interstate and intrastate commerce, and has been made aware of concerns regarding individual retail outlets that manufacture and bag ice. The Committee directs FDA to work to educate manufacturers regarding safe production of ice, including the issuance of a Food Facts sheet informing the public about existing FDA regulations that apply to ice manufacturers. Further, the Committee directs FDA to consider whether or not formal regulations regarding the safe handling, processing, and packaging of packaged ice sold for human consumption would be an appropriate measure.

*Pediatric Cancer.*—The Committee continues to note the lack of new therapies associated with high-risk neuroblastoma. Unlike other pediatric cancers, 5-year survival rates for this devastating disease have remained unchanged at approximately 20 percent for decades. The Committee encourages FDA to continue to give priority attention to new therapies and treatment protocols for Stage IV neuroblastoma patients.

*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.

*Standards of Identity.*—The Committee recognizes that honey is produced in the United States, traded internationally and consumed as both a packaged food and as a food ingredient, and believes FDA needs to work to prevent misbranded honey and honey-derived products from entering the U.S. market. The Committee is aware that the FDA has been in receipt of a proposed standard of identity for honey for 3 years, and directs FDA to respond to this proposal and, if deemed appropriate, begin working toward a U.S. standard of identity for honey.

*Tobacco Regulation.*—On June 22, 2009, the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act was signed into law giving FDA authority to regulate tobacco products. The tobacco program will be fully supported by user fees. However, in the interim period before FDA starts collecting fees, the law permits the agency to use appropriated funds for start up costs. The Committee expects that start up costs funded with appropriations will be minimal and that the agency will work diligently to initiate collection of the fee so appropriated funds will no longer be necessary for operation of the tobacco program. The Committee instructs FDA to report quarterly on tobacco program implementation. These reports should include significant milestones in implementing the tobacco program, the

amount of appropriated funds used for tobacco regulation by program, the specific activities from which appropriated funds are taken, and the impact this reduction in funds will have on the activity, if any. The Committee notes that at the time of the writing of this bill the specific U.S.C. citation for collection of the tobacco fee was not available. The Committee will authorize collection of this fee in fiscal year 2010.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2009 .....	\$12,433,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	12,433,000
Committee recommendation .....	12,433,000

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, 2009 .....	\$49,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 .....	54,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	54,500,000

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 depend-

ent, 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 \$54,500,000 on administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration [FCA].

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 provides the Secretary of Agriculture with needed transfer authorities for the Rural Development Disaster Assistance Fund.

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 places conditions on the closing or relocation of Rural Development State Offices.

Section 715. This section prohibits the closing of the Food and Drug Administration's St. Louis, Missouri laboratory.



Section 716. This section provides program funding for remote rural communities suffering from extreme outmigration.

Section 717. 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 718. 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 719. This section makes funds for certain conservation programs available until expended to disburse certain obligations made in the current fiscal year.

Section 720. This section prohibits funds to carry out certain sections of Public Law 110-246.

Section 721. This section makes certain former Rural Utilities Service borrowers eligible for the Rural Economic Development loan and grant program.

Section 722. 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 723. This section provides for grants to develop and field test new food products designed to cost-effectively improve the nutritional delivery and functional form of food assistance products.

Section 724. This section provides for processing of Rural Development documents.

Section 725. This section makes selected communities eligible for certain Rural Development programs, pending receipt of the 2010 Census.

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. The section includes language amending the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act.

Section 730. This section modifies matching requirements for certain research grants.

Section 731. This section provides funds for Rural Development and the Farm Service Agency information technology expenses.

Section 732. This section allows for exemptions of combat pay for WIC eligibility.

Section 733. This section clarifies lack of access to risk management products.

Section 734. This section provides funding for the purpose of evaluating program performance in the WIC program.

Section 735. This section provides for certain funding activities in the WIC program.

Section 736. This section requests information regarding humanitarian food assistance.

Section 737. This section provides funding for food bank infrastructure grants as authorized in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

Section 738. This section provides funding for the Geographically Disadvantaged Farmers Program as authorized in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

Section 739. This section provides funding for the Durum Wheat Quality Program as authorized in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

Section 740. This section provides funding for a grant for workforce development initiatives to address out-migration in rural areas.

Section 741. This section provides funding to carry out a pilot program for hardwood trees.

Section 742. This section clarifies certain program eligibility criteria.

Section 743. This section includes language regarding reconstituted infant formula.

Section 744. This section includes language regarding poultry imports.

## PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2010, 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, Food and Drug Administration, 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, 2010, and the accompanying Senate Report.

If a sequestration order is necessary, in implementing the Presidential order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction required for fiscal year 2010 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 2010 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 does not recommend funding for programs which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2010.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(c), RULE XXVI OF THE  
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 7, 2009, the Committee ordered reported en bloc an original bill (S. 1406) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and an original bill (S. 1407) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, with each subject to amendment and subject to the budget allocations, and authorized the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate-reported bill as a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure, by a recorded vote of 30-0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Inouye	
Mr. Byrd	
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. Pryor	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Alexander	
Ms. Collins	
Mr. Voinovich	
Ms. Murkowski	

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 36—CROP INSURANCE**

**§ 1531. Supplemental agricultural disaster assistance**

**(a)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(g)** \* \* \*

**(1)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(7)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(A)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(F) Lack of access**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary may provide assistance (*including multiyear assistance*) under this section to eligible producers on a farm that—

(i) suffered a production loss *or multiyear production losses* due to a natural cause during the 2008 crop year; and

**TITLE 19—CUSTOMS DUTIES**

**CHAPTER 12—TRADE ACT OF 1974**

**§ 2497. Supplemental agricultural disaster assistance**

**(a)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(g)** \* \* \*

**(1)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(7) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(A) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(F) Lack of access**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary may provide assistance (*including multiyear assistance*) under this section to eligible producers on a farm that—

- (i) suffered a production loss or *multiyear production losses* due to a natural cause during the 2008 crop year; and

**TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE**

**CHAPTER 13—SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS**

**§ 1758. Program requirements**

(a) \* \* \*

(1)(A) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(14) *COMBAT PAY.*—

(A) *DEFINITION OF COMBAT PAY.*—*In this paragraph, the term “combat pay” means any additional payment under chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, or otherwise designated by the Secretary to be appropriate for exclusion under this paragraph, that is received by or from a member of the United States Armed Forces deployed to a designated combat zone, if the additional pay—*

- (i) *is the result of deployment to or service in a combat zone; and*
- (ii) *was not received immediately prior to serving in a combat zone.*

(B) *EXCLUSION.*—*Combat pay shall not be considered to be income for the purpose of determining the eligibility for free or reduced price meals of a child who is a member of the household of a member of the United States Armed Forces.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**§ 1766. Child and adult care food program**

(a) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(r) \* \* \*

(1) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**(5) Limitation**

The Secretary shall limit reimbursement under this subsection for meals served under a program to institutions located in ~~ten~~ *eleven* States, of which ~~eight~~ *nine* States shall be *Wisconsin*, Vermont, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Delaware, and Michigan and two States shall be approved by the Secretary through a competitive application process.

\* \* \* \* \*

**CHAPTER 13A—CHILD NUTRITION**

**§ 1786. Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children**

(a) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(2)(A) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(B) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(C) *COMBAT PAY.*—*For the purpose of determining income eligibility under this section, a State agency shall exclude from income any additional payment under chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, or otherwise designated by the Secretary to be appropriate for exclusion under this subparagraph, that is received by or from a member of the United States Armed Forces deployed to a designated combat zone, if the additional pay—*

*(i) is the result of deployment to or service in a combat zone; and*

*(ii) was not received immediately prior to serving in a combat zone.*

**[(C)] (D)** \* \* \*

**CONSOLIDATED SECURITY, DISASTER ASSISTANCE, AND CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009, PUBLIC LAW 110-329**

**DIVISION B—DISASTER RELIEF AND RECOVERY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008**

**TITLE I—RELIEF AND RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS**

**GENERAL PROVISIONS, THIS CHAPTER**

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 10101. (a) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) **PURPOSE AND AVAILABILITY OF FUND.**—Subject to subsection (d), amounts in the Rural Development Disaster Assistance

Fund shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, until expended, to provide additional amounts for authorized activities of agencies of the Rural Development Mission Area in areas affected by a disaster declared by the President or the Secretary of Agriculture. Amounts so provided shall be in addition to any other amounts available to carry out the activity. *In carrying out this section, the Secretary may transfer funds into existing or new accounts as determined by the Secretary.*

**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 2010: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies:				
Mandatory .....	100,179	100,179	89,627	<sup>1</sup> 89,627
Discretionary .....	23,050	23,050	24,886	<sup>1</sup> 24,886
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2010 .....				<sup>2</sup> 97,683
2011 .....				3,856
2012 .....				1,104
2013 .....				253
2014 and future years .....				193
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2010 .....	NA	33,914	NA	34,450

<sup>1</sup> Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

<sup>2</sup> 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, providing, 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](http://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
APHIS	Agriculture Compliance Laboratory Equipment, Delaware Department of Agriculture	\$69,000	Carper and Kaufman
APHIS	Animal management and control, APHIS Mississippi	\$496,000	Cochran
APHIS	Beryman Institute, Jack Beryman Institute Utah and Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station.	\$1,500,000	Bennett, Cochran, and Wicker
APHIS	Bio-safety and antibiotic resistance, University of Vermont	\$240,000	Leahy
APHIS	Blackbird management, APHIS Louisiana	\$94,000	Landrieu
APHIS	Blackbird management, APHIS North and South Dakota	\$265,000	Conrad, Dorgan, and Johnson
APHIS	Bovine tuberculosis eradication Michigan, Michigan Department of Agriculture	\$248,000	Klobuchar, Levin, and Stabenow
APHIS	California county pest detection augmentation program, California Department of Food and Agriculture	\$619,000	Feinstein
APHIS	California county pest detection import inspection program, California Department of Food and Agriculture	\$738,000	Boxer and Feinstein
APHIS	Cogongrass control, Mississippi Department of Agriculture	\$208,000	Cochran
APHIS	Cooperative livestock protection program, APHIS Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture	\$223,000	Casey and Specter
APHIS	Comorant control, APHIS Michigan	\$139,000	Levin and Stabenow
APHIS	Comorant control, APHIS Mississippi	\$223,000	Cochran
APHIS	Comorant control, APHIS Vermont and Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department	\$103,000	Leahy
APHIS	Disease prevention, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	\$69,000	Landrieu
APHIS	Disease surveillance in North Dakota, North Dakota State University and Dickinson State University	\$700,000	Conrad and Dorgan
APHIS	Genetically modified products, Iowa State University	\$259,000	Grassley and Harkin
APHIS	Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee, Idaho Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Livestock, Wyoming Livestock Board.	\$650,000	Barrasso, Baucus, Crapo, Enzi, Risch, and Tester
APHIS	Gypsy moth, New Jersey, New Jersey Department of Agriculture	\$250,000	Lautenberg and Menendez
APHIS	Hawaii interline, APHIS Hawaii	\$3,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
APHIS	Hawaii wildlife services activities, APHIS Hawaii	\$2,230,000	Akaka and Inouye
APHIS	Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, Tennessee, University of Tennessee	\$500,000	Alexander
APHIS	Integrated predation management activities, APHIS West Virginia	\$280,000	Byrd
APHIS	Invasive aquatic species, Lake Champlain Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative, Vermont	\$94,000	Leahy
APHIS	Mormon crickets, APHIS Nevada	\$1,000,000	Reid
APHIS	National Agriculture Biosecurity Center, Kansas State University	\$500,000	Brownback and Roberts
APHIS	National farm animal identification and records, Holstein Association	\$343,000	Leahy
APHIS	National Wildlife Research Station, Texas A&M	\$290,000	Hutchison
APHIS	New Mexico rapid syndrome validation program, New Mexico State University	\$404,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
APHIS	Nez Perce Bio-control Center, Nez Perce Tribe	\$176,000	Crapo and Risch
APHIS	Noxious weed management, Nevada Department of Agriculture	\$235,000	Reid
APHIS	Tri-State predator control, APHIS Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming	\$926,000	Barrasso, Baucus, Crapo, Enzi, Risch, and Tester
APHIS	Varroa mite suppression, APHIS Hawaii	\$469,000	Akaka and Inouye

APHIS	Wildlife Services South Dakota, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks	\$519,000	Johnson
ARS/BF	Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, MD	\$3,000,000	Cardin and Mikulski
ARS/BF	Agricultural Research Center, Logan, UT	\$4,527,000	Bennett
ARS/BF	Agricultural Research Center, Pullman, WA	\$3,740,000	Cantwell and Murray
ARS/BF	Animal Bioscience Facility, Bozeman, MT	\$2,500,000	Baucus and Tester
ARS/BF	Appalachian Fruit Laboratory, Kearneysville, WV	\$2,000,000	Byrd
ARS/BF	ARS Biotechnology Lab, Locom, MS	\$1,500,000	Cochran
ARS/BF	ARS Forage-Animal Production Research Facility, Lexington, KY	\$2,000,000	McConnell
ARS/BF	ARS Research and Development Center, Auburn, AL	\$3,500,000	Shelby
ARS/BF	ARS Waste Management Research Facility, Bowling Green, KY	\$2,000,000	McConnell
ARS/BF	Dairy Forage Agricultural Research Center, Prairie du Sac, WI	\$4,000,000	Kohl
ARS/BF	Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center, Stoneville, MS	\$4,000,000	Cochran
ARS/BF	National Plant and Genetics Security Center, Columbia, MO	\$3,500,000	Bond
ARS/BF	Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center, Hilo, HI	\$5,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
ARS/BF	Sugarcane Research Facility, Houma, LA	\$2,000,000	Landrieu and Vitter
ARS/BF	Systems Biology Research Facility, Lincoln, NE	\$3,760,000	Ben Nelson
ARS/S&E	Anthropod-Borne Animal Diseases Research Laboratory, ARS, Manhattan, KS	\$1,500,000	Brownback
ARS/S&E	Aquaculture Fisheries Center, ARS, Harry K. Dupree National Aquaculture Center, AR	\$519,000	Lincoln and Pryor
ARS/S&E	Aquaculture Initiatives, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute, ARS, Stuttgart, AR	\$1,597,000	Martinez
ARS/S&E	Biomass Crop Production, ARS, Brookings, SD	\$1,250,000	Johnson and Thune
ARS/S&E	Biomedical Materials in Plants, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$1,700,000	Cardin and Mikulski
ARS/S&E	Bioremediation Research, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$111,000	Cardin
ARS/S&E	Biotechnology Research and Development Corporation, ARS, Washington, DC	\$2,750,000	Durbin
ARS/S&E	Center for Agroforestry, ARS, Booneville, AR	\$660,000	Bond
ARS/S&E	Computer Vision Engineer, ARS, Kearneysville, WV	\$400,000	Byrd
ARS/S&E	Dairy Forage Research Center, ARS, Marshfield, WI	\$2,500,000	Kohl
ARS/S&E	Dale Bumpers Small Farms Research Center, ARS, Booneville, AR	\$1,805,000	Lincoln and Pryor
ARS/S&E	Diet Nutrition and Obesity Research, ARS, New Orleans, LA	\$623,000	Landrieu and Vitter
ARS/S&E	Endophyte Research, ARS, Booneville, AR	\$994,000	Lincoln and Pryor
ARS/S&E	Forage Crop Stress Tolerance and Virus Disease Management, ARS, Prosser, WA	\$200,000	Murray
ARS/S&E	Fomosan Subtanean Termites Research, ARS, New Orleans, LA	\$3,490,000	Landrieu
ARS/S&E	Foundry Sand By-Products Utilization, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$638,000	Cardin
ARS/S&E	Genomics, ARS, University of Minnesota	\$200,000	Klobuchar
ARS/S&E	Human Nutrition Research, ARS, Boston, MA	\$350,000	Kennedy and Kerry
ARS/S&E	Human Nutrition Research, ARS, Houston, TX	\$300,000	Hutchison
ARS/S&E	Improved Crop Production Practices, ARS, Auburn, AL	\$1,293,000	Sessions
ARS/S&E	Medicinal and Bioactive Crops, ARS, Washington, DC	\$111,000	Cardin
ARS/S&E	National Bio and Agro Defense Facility, ARS, Manhattan, KS	\$1,500,000	Brownback
ARS/S&E	National Center for Agricultural Law, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$654,000	Harkin, Lincoln, and Pryor
ARS/S&E	New England Plant, Soil, and Water Research Laboratory, ARS, Orono, ME	\$2,249,000	Collins

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
ARS/S&E	North Carolina Human Nutrition Center, ARS, Kannapolis, NC	\$1,000,000	Burr and Hagan
ARS/S&E	Northern Great Plains Research Laboratory, ARS, Mandan, ND	\$543,000	Conrad and Dorgan
ARS/S&E	Northwest Center for Small Fruits Research, ARS, Corvallis, OR	\$275,000	Merkley, Murray, and Wyden
ARS/S&E	Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center Staffing, ARS, Hilo, HI	\$700,000	Akaka and Inouye
ARS/S&E	Phytoestrogen Research, ARS, New Orleans, LA	\$1,750,000	Landrieu
ARS/S&E	Potato Diseases, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$40,000	Cardin
ARS/S&E	Poultry Diseases, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$408,000	Cardin and Mikulski
ARS/S&E	Seismic and Acoustic Technologies in Soils Sedimentation Laboratory, ARS, Oxford, MS	\$332,000	Cochran
ARS/S&E	Sorghum Research, ARS, Little Rock, AR	\$135,000	Lincoln and Pryor
ARS/S&E	Termitte Species in Hawaii, ARS, New Orleans, LA	\$200,000	Akaka and Inouye
ARS/S&E	Tropical Aquaculture Feeds, ARS, Hilo, HI	\$1,438,000	Akaka and Inouye
ARS/S&E	Water Management Research Laboratory, ARS, Brawley, CA	\$340,000	Boxer and Feinstein
ARS/S&E	Water Use Reduction, ARS, Dawson, GA	\$657,000	Chambliss and Isakson
ARS/S&E	Wild Rice, ARS, St. Paul, MN	\$300,000	Klobuchar
General Provision	Agricultural pest facility, APHIS Hawaii	\$2,600,000	Akaka and Inouye
General Provision	Market Development, Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Foods, and Markets	\$1,000,000	Leahy
General Provision	Market Development, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	\$2,000,000	Kohl
General Provision	Phase II construction, National Center for Natural Products Research, Oxford, Mississippi	\$3,497,000	Cochran and Wicker
General Provision	Specialty Markets, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	\$350,000	Kohl
General Provision	Workforce development and out-migration, Kansas Farm Bureau Foundation	\$250,000	Brownback
NIFA/Extension	Childhood Farm Safety, Farm Safety 4 Just Kids, Urbandale, IA	\$75,000	Grassley and Harkin
NIFA/Extension	Conservation Technology Transfer, University of Wisconsin Extension	\$376,000	Kohl
NIFA/Extension	Dairy education, Iowa State University	\$175,000	Harkin
NIFA/Extension	E-commerce, Mississippi State University	\$231,000	Cochran and Wicker
NIFA/Extension	Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	\$475,000	Bingaman, Cornyn, and Hutchinson
NIFA/Extension	Extension specialist, Mississippi State University	\$98,000	Cochran and Wicker
NIFA/Extension	Food Production Education, Vermont Community Foundation, Middlebury, VT	\$120,000	Sanders
NIFA/Extension	Health education leadership, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	\$590,000	McConnell
NIFA/Extension	Institute for Sustainable Agriculture, University of Wisconsin-Madison	\$400,000	Kohl
NIFA/Extension	Invasive Phragmites Control and Outreach, Ducks Unlimited	\$155,000	Levin and Stabenow
NIFA/Extension	Iowa Vitality Center, Iowa State University	\$250,000	Grassley and Harkin
NIFA/Extension	Maine Cattle Health Assurance Program, Maine Department of Agriculture	\$700,000	Collins
NIFA/Extension	National Center for Farm Safety, Northeast Iowa Community College	\$170,000	Harkin
NIFA/Extension	Nutrition enhancement, University of Wisconsin Extension and Wisconsin Department of Public Institutions	\$950,000	Kohl
NIFA/Extension	Ohio-Israel Agriculture Initiative, The Negev Foundation, OH	\$700,000	Brown and Voinovich
NIFA/Extension	Pilot technology transfer, Mississippi State University, Oklahoma State University	\$209,000	Cochran, Inhofe, and Wicker

NFA/Extension	Potato Integrated Pest Management—Late Blight, University of Maine	\$450,000	Collins and Snowe
NFA/Extension	Range improvement, New Mexico State University	\$223,000	Bingaman and Tom Udall
NFA/Extension	Urban horticulture and marketing, Chicago Botanic Garden, Glencoe, IL	\$175,000	Durbin
NFA/Extension	Urban horticulture, University of Wisconsin Extension and Growing Power	\$376,000	Kohl
NFA/Extension	Veterinary Technology Satellite Program, Colby Community College	\$1,000,000	Brownback
NFA/RE/FA	Agriculture based industrial lubricants, University of Northern Iowa	\$405,000	Grassley and Harkin
NFA/RE/FA	Agriculture development in the American Pacific, University of Hawaii	\$400,000	Akaka and Inouye
NFA/RE/FA	Agriculture waste utilization, West Virginia State University	\$500,000	Byrd
NFA/RE/FA	Animal Health Research and Diagnostics, Murray State University	\$300,000	McConnell
NFA/RE/FA	Applied Agriculture and Environment Research, California State University	\$350,000	Boxer and Feinstein
NFA/RE/FA	Aquaculture, Cheyney University, PA	\$164,000	Specter
NFA/RE/FA	Biotechnology Research, Alcorn State University, MS	\$480,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/RE/FA	Centers for Dairy and Beef Excellence, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture	\$340,000	Specter
NFA/RE/FA	Clemson University Veterinary Institute, SC	\$1,000,000	Graham
NFA/RE/FA	Cotton research, Texas Tech University	\$200,000	Cornyn and Hutchison
NFA/RE/FA	Council for Agriculture Science and Technology, Ames, IA	\$110,000	Harkin
NFA/RE/FA	Ethnobotanicals, Frostburg State University, MD	\$550,000	Cardin
NFA/RE/FA	Farmland Preservation, The Ohio State University	\$160,000	Brown
NFA/RE/FA	Florida Biomass to Biofuels Conversion Program, University of Central Florida	\$300,000	Martinez and Bill Nelson
NFA/RE/FA	International Center for Food Technology Development to Expand Markets, Purdue University	\$750,000	Lugar
NFA/RE/FA	Kansas Biobased Polymer Initiative, Kansas Bioscience Authority	\$750,000	Brownback
NFA/RE/FA	Medicinal and Bioactive Crops, Stephen S. Austin State University	\$300,000	Hutchison
NFA/RE/FA	Midwest Agribusiness Trade and Information Center MATRIC, Iowa State University	\$187,000	Grassley and Harkin
NFA/RE/FA	Mississippi Valley State University	\$1,002,000	Cochran
NFA/RE/FA	NE Center for Invasive Plants, University of Connecticut, the University of Vermont, and the University of Maine	\$295,000	Collins and Snowe
NFA/RE/FA	PM-10 air quality study, Washington State University	\$150,000	Murray
NFA/RE/FA	Polymer Research, Pittsburg State University, KS	\$2,000,000	Brownback
NFA/RE/FA	Rural systems, Jackson State University, MS	\$215,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/RE/FA	Shrimp aquaculture, University of Southern Mississippi	\$300,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/RE/FA	Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia, Michigan Department of Natural Resources	\$150,000	Levin and Stabenow
NFA/RE/FA	Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia, University of Toledo, OH	\$500,000	Brown and Voinovich
NFA/RE/FA	Water pollutants, Marshall University, WV	\$500,000	Byrd
NFA/SRG	Advanced genetic technologies, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	\$650,000	McConnell
NFA/SRG	Advancing Biofuel Production, Baylor University, TX	\$300,000	Hutchison
NFA/SRG	Aegilops cylindrica/Biomass (jointed goatgrass), Washington State University	\$200,000	Cantwell and Murray
NFA/SRG	Agricultural Diversification, University of Hawaii	\$153,000	Akaka and Inouye
NFA/SRG	Agricultural Entrepreneurial Alternatives, Pennsylvania State University	\$248,000	Specter
NFA/SRG	Agricultural Science, The Ohio State University	\$450,000	Voinovich
NFA/SRG	Air quality, Kansas State University; Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	\$300,000	Cornyn, Hutchison, and Roberts

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
NFA/SRG	Animal Science Food Safety Consortium, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture, Iowa State University, Kansas State University	\$1,000,000	Grassley, Harkin, Lincoln, Pryor, and Roberts
NFA/SRG	Aquaculture product & marketing development, West Virginia University	\$550,000	Byrd
NFA/SRG	Aquaculture, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	\$150,000	Landrieu and Vitter
NFA/SRG	Aquaculture, Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station	\$361,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/SRG	Avian bioscience, University of Delaware	\$150,000	Carper and Kaufman
NFA/SRG	Barley for Rural Development, Montana State University, University of Idaho	\$547,000	Baucus, Crapo, Risch and Tester
NFA/SRG	Bio Energy Production and Carbon Sequestration, University of Tennessee	\$1,000,000	Alexander
NFA/SRG	Biodesign and Processing, Virginia Tech University	\$223,000	Warner and Webb
NFA/SRG	Biomass-based energy research, Oklahoma State University, Mississippi State University	\$839,000	Cochran, Inhofe, and Wicker
NFA/SRG	Brucellosis Vaccine, Montana State University	\$305,000	Baucus and Tester
NFA/SRG	Cataloging Genes Associated with Drought and Disease Resistance, New Mexico State University	\$176,000	Bingaman and Udall
NFA/SRG	Center for One Medicine	\$500,000	Burris and Durbin
NFA/SRG	Center for rural studies, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	\$350,000	Leahy
NFA/SRG	Childhood obesity and nutrition, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	\$250,000	Leahy
NFA/SRG	Citrus canker/greening, University of Florida	\$200,000	Martinez
NFA/SRG	Competitiveness of agricultural products, Washington State University and the University of Washington	\$400,000	Murray
NFA/SRG	Cool season legume research, North Dakota State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	\$350,000	Cantwell, Conrad, Crapo, Dorgan, Murray, and Risch
NFA/SRG	Cotton insect management and Fiber Quality, University of Georgia	\$346,000	Chambliss and Isakson
NFA/SRG	Cranberry/Blueberry disease & breeding, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey	\$550,000	Lautenberg and Menendez
NFA/SRG	Cranberry/Blueberry, University of Massachusetts	\$160,000	Kennedy and Kerry
NFA/SRG	Crop integration and production, South Dakota State University	\$400,000	Johnson and Thune
NFA/SRG	Dairy and meat goat research, Prairie View A&M University	\$200,000	Hutchison
NFA/SRG	Dairy farm profitability, Pennsylvania State University	\$372,000	Casey and Specter
NFA/SRG	Delta revitalization project, Mississippi State University	\$176,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/SRG	Drought mitigation, University of Nebraska	\$600,000	Ben Nelson
NFA/SRG	Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Extension Service and Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	\$575,000	Bingaman, Cornyn, Hutchison, Tom Udall
NFA/SRG	Emerald Ash Borer, The Ohio State University	\$550,000	Voinovich
NFA/SRG	Environmentally safe products, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	\$250,000	Leahy
NFA/SRG	Floriculture, University of Hawaii	\$300,000	Akaka and Inouye
NFA/SRG	Food & Fuel Initiative, Iowa State University	\$298,000	Grassley and Harkin
NFA/SRG	Food and Agriculture Policy Institute	\$1,213,000	Bond, Grassley, Harkin, Isakson, Reid
NFA/SRG	Forages for Advancing Livestock Production, University of Kentucky	\$473,000	McConnell
NFA/SRG	Fresh Produce Food Safety, University of California	\$750,000	Boxer and Feinstein

NFA/SRG	Genetically Enhanced Plants for Micro-nutrients and Genomics for Southern Crop Stress and Disease, Mississippi State University.	\$797,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/SRG	Grain sorghum, Kansas State University	\$1,000,000	Brownback and Roberts
NFA/SRG	Grass seed cropping systems for sustainable agriculture, Oregon State University, Washington State University.	\$150,000	Merkley, Murray, and Wyden
NFA/SRG	High Performance Computing, Utah State University	\$263,000	Bennett
NFA/SRG	Human nutrition, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA	\$526,000	Landrieu and Vitter
NFA/SRG	Infectious disease research, Colorado State University	\$650,000	Bennet and Mark Udall
NFA/SRG	Inland Marine Aquaculture, Virginia Tech University	\$400,000	Warner and Webb
NFA/SRG	Institute for Food Science and Engineering, University of Arkansas	\$500,000	Lincoln and Pryor
NFA/SRG	Integrated Economic, Environmental and Technical Analysis of Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems, Purdue University	\$188,000	Lugar
NFA/SRG	Invasive Plant Management, Montana State University	\$270,000	Baucus and Tester
NFA/SRG	Joint U.S. China Biotechnology Research and Extension, Utah State University	\$210,000	Bennett
NFA/SRG	Leonid Center hypoxia project, Iowa State University	\$105,000	Harkin
NFA/SRG	Livestock & dairy policy, Cornell University, NY	\$200,000	Gilibrand and Schumer
NFA/SRG	Maple research, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	\$165,000	Leahy
NFA/SRG	Midwest Center for Bioenergy Grasses, Purdue University	\$188,000	Lugar
NFA/SRG	Midwest poultry consortium, Iowa State University	\$250,000	Grassley, Harkin and Klobuchar
NFA/SRG	Milk safety, Pennsylvania State University	\$82,000	Casey and Specter
NFA/SRG	National beef cattle genetic evaluation consortium, Colorado State University, Cornell University, University of Georgia.	\$655,000	Chambless, Bennet and Schumer
NFA/SRG	National Center for Soybean Technology, University of Missouri-Columbia	\$690,000	Bond
NFA/SRG	Nematode resistance genetic engineering, New Mexico State University	\$209,000	Bingaman and Tom Udall
NFA/SRG	Nevada arid rangelands initiative, University of Nevada Reno	\$500,000	Reid
NFA/SRG	New Century Farm, Iowa State University	\$350,000	Grassley and Harkin
NFA/SRG	New crop opportunities, Lexington, KY	\$525,000	McConnell
NFA/SRG	New Satellite and Computer-Based Technology for Agriculture, Mississippi State University	\$654,000	Cochran and Wicker
NFA/SRG	Oil resources from desert plants, New Mexico State University	\$176,000	Bingaman and Tom Udall
NFA/SRG	Organic cropping, Oregon State University	\$149,000	Merkley and Wyden
NFA/SRG	Organic waste utilization, Washington State University	\$264,000	Cantwell and Murray
NFA/SRG	Organic waste utilization, New Mexico State University	\$69,000	Bingaman and Tom Udall
NFA/SRG	Pierce's disease, University of California	\$2,000,000	Boxer and Feinstein
NFA/SRG	Policy Analyses for a National Secure & Sustainable Food, Fiber, Forestry and Energy Program, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX.	\$200,000	Hutchison
NFA/SRG	Potato research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University, University of Maine.	\$1,037,000	Cantwell, Collins, Crapo, Merkley, Murray, Risch, Snowe, Wyden
NFA/SRG	Precision agriculture, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	\$67,000	McConnell
NFA/SRG	Preharvest food safety, Kansas State University	\$500,000	Brownback and Roberts
NFA/SRG	Protein utilization, Iowa State University	\$600,000	Grassley and Harkin

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
NFA/SRG	Rangeland Ecosystems Dynamics, University of Idaho	\$300,000	Crapo and Risch
NFA/SRG	Renewable Energy and Products, North Dakota State University	\$1,000,000	Conrad and Dorgan
NFA/SRG	Ruminant nutrition consortium, South Dakota State University	\$563,000	Johnson and Thune
NFA/SRG	Rural Policies Research Institute	\$889,000	Harkin
NFA/SRG	Russian wheat aphid, Colorado State University	\$250,000	Bennet and Mark Udall
NFA/SRG	Seed technology, South Dakota State University	\$350,000	Johnson and Thune
NFA/SRG	Small fruit research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University	\$300,000	Cantwell, Crapo, Merkley, Murray, Risch, Wyden
NFA/SRG	Soil-Borne Disease Prevention in Irrigated Agriculture, New Mexico State University	\$187,000	Bingaman and Tom Udall
NFA/SRG	Southern Great Plains Dairy Consortium, New Mexico State University	\$350,000	Bingaman and Tom Udall
NFA/SRG	Soybean Cyst Nematode, University of Missouri	\$556,000	Bond
NFA/SRG	Soybean research, National Soybean Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois	\$400,000	Burris and Durbin
NFA/SRG	Specialty Crops, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture	\$175,000	Lincoln and Pryor
NFA/SRG	Sustainable agriculture & natural resources, Pennsylvania State University	\$142,000	Specter
NFA/SRG	Sustainable beef supply, Montana State University	\$200,000	Baucus
NFA/SRG	Sustainable Engineered Materials from Renewable Resources, Virginia Tech	\$250,000	Warner and Webb
NFA/SRG	Sustainable Production and Processing Research for Lowbush Specialty Crops, University of Maine	\$200,000	Collins and Snowe
NFA/SRG	Tillage, Silviculture, Waste Management, Louisiana State University	\$200,000	Landrieu
NFA/SRG	Tropical and subtropical research/STAR, University of Hawaii	\$800,000	Akaka and Inouye
NFA/SRG	Virtual plant database enhancement project, Missouri Botanical Garden	\$588,000	Bond
NFA/SRG	Virus-free Wine Grape Cultivars, Wine Grape Foundation Block, Washington State University	\$260,000	Cantwell and Murray
NFA/SRG	Viticulture consortium, University of California	\$1,200,000	Boxer
NFA/SRG	Water conservation, Kansas State University	\$500,000	Brownback and Roberts
NFA/SRG	Wetland plants, Louisiana State University	\$200,000	Landrieu
NFA/SRG	Wheat genetic research, Kansas State University	\$1,000,000	Brownback and Roberts
NFA/SRG	Wildlife/Livestock Disease Research Partnership, WY	\$300,000	Barrasso
NFA/SRG	Wood utilization (ID, LA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC, OR, WV)	\$4,841,000	Burr, Byrd, Cochran, Collins, Crapo, Klubach, Landrieu, Levin, Risch, Snowe, Stabenow, Wicker, and Wyden
NFA/SRG	World Food and Health Initiative (IL)	\$250,000	Burris and Durbin
NRCS/CO	Accelerated Soil Mapping Survey, NRCS Wyoming	\$200,000	Enzi
NRCS/CO	Agricultural Development and Resource Conservation, Hawaii RC&D Councils	\$1,400,000	Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/CO	Agricultural Wildlife Conservation Center, MS	\$935,000	Cochran
NRCS/CO	Appropriate Wetland and Wet-Mesic Species, Tallgrass Prairie Center, University of Northern Iowa	\$134,000	Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Center for Invasive Species Eradication, Texas AgLife Research, College Station, TX	\$1,000,000	Hutchison
NRCS/CO	Certified Environmental Management Systems for Agriculture, Iowa Soybean Association	\$288,000	Grassley and Harkin



NRCS/CO	Chenier Plain Sustainability Initiative, McNeese State University	\$500,000	Landrieu
NRCS/CO	Conservation Fuels Management and Restoration, Wildfire Support Group, NV	\$269,000	Reid
NRCS/CO	Conservation Internships, Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association	\$120,000	Kohl
NRCS/CO	Conservation Technical Assistance, NRCS New Jersey	\$236,000	Lautenberg and Menendez
NRCS/CO	Conservation Technical Assistance, NRCS Tennessee	\$1,000,000	Alexander
NRCS/CO	Conservation Technology Transfer, University of Wisconsin	\$516,000	Kohl
NRCS/CO	Delta Conservation Demonstration, Washington County, MS	\$376,000	Cochran
NRCS/CO	Delta Water Study, NRCS Mississippi	\$235,000	Cochran
NRCS/CO	Farm Viability Program, Vermont Housing and Conservation Board	\$300,000	Leahy
NRCS/CO	Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission Cooperative Agreement	\$800,000	Chambliss
NRCS/CO	Gilbert M. Grosvenor Center for Geographic Education Watershed Project, Texas State University	\$300,000	Hutchison
NRCS/CO	Grazing Land Conservation Initiative, NRCS Wisconsin	\$732,000	Kohl
NRCS/CO	Great Lakes Basin Soil and Erosion Control, Great Lakes Commission	\$404,000	Levin, Stabenow, and Voinovich
NRCS/CO	Great Plain Riparian Initiative, National Wild Turkey Federation	\$500,000	Ben Nelson
NRCS/CO	Green River Water Quality and Biological Diversity Project, Western Kentucky Research Foundation	\$100,000	McConnell
NRCS/CO	Hungry Canyons Alliance, IA	\$282,000	Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Illinois Conservation Initiative, Illinois Department of Natural Resources	\$576,000	Durbin
NRCS/CO	Kentucky Soil Erosion Control, NRCS Kentucky	\$724,000	Bunning and McConnell
NRCS/CO	Mississippi Conservation Initiative, NRCS Mississippi	\$2,000,000	Cochran
NRCS/CO	Municipal Water District of Orange County for Efficient Irrigation, CA	\$150,000	Boxer and Feinstein
NRCS/CO	Nitrate Pollution Reduction, NRCS Rhode Island	\$155,000	Reed
NRCS/CO	Operation Oak Program, National Wild Turkey Federation	\$100,000	Chambliss, Cochran, and Graham
NRCS/CO	Phosphorus Loading in Lake Champlain, Poultry Conservation District	\$179,000	Leahy
NRCS/CO	Phosphorus Reduction Cooperative Agreement, Kansas Livestock Foundation	\$1,000,000	Brownback
NRCS/CO	Potomac River Tributary Strategy, NRCS West Virginia	\$168,000	Byrd
NRCS/CO	Riparian Restoration along the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian Rivers, New Mexico Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts	\$200,000	Bingaman
NRCS/CO	Risk Management Initiative, NRCS West Virginia	\$673,000	Byrd
NRCS/CO	Soil Phosphorus Studies, NRCS West Virginia	\$202,000	Byrd
NRCS/CO	Soil Surveys, NRCS Rhode Island	\$134,000	Reed
NRCS/CO	Technical Assistance Grants to Kentucky Soil Conservation Districts, Kentucky Division of Conservation	\$545,000	Bunning and McConnell
NRCS/CO	UMASS-Amherst Ecological Conservation Initiative, MA	\$140,000	Kennedy and Kerry
NRCS/CO	Utah Conservation Initiative, NRCS Utah	\$2,500,000	Bennett
NRCS/CO	Watershed Demonstration Project, Iowa Soybean Association	\$134,000	Grassley and Harkin
NRCS/CO	Watershed Planning Staff, NRCS Pacific Island Area	\$500,000	Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/CO	Yankee Tank Dam, NRCS Kansas	\$1,000,000	Brownback and Roberts
NRCS/WFPO	Ashley Valley Flood Control, Uintah County, UT	\$300,000	Hatch
NRCS/WFPO	Dry Creek Watershed, City of Rocklin, CA	\$500,000	Feinstein
NRCS/WFPO	Dunlop Creek Watershed Project, NRCS West Virginia	\$1,500,000	Byrd
NRCS/WFPO	DuPage County Watershed, IL	\$1,000,000	Durbin

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Account	Project	Funding	Member
NRCS/WFPO	Lahaina Watershed, NRCS Hawaii	\$1,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/WFPO	Lost River, NRCS West Virginia	\$4,000,000	Byrd
NRCS/WFPO	Lower Hamakua Ditch Watershed, NRCS Hawaii	\$1,800,000	Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/WFPO	Missouri Watershed Projects, NRCS Missouri	\$2,000,000	Bond
NRCS/WFPO	Pocasset River Watershed, NRCS Rhode Island	\$2,000,000	Reed
NRCS/WFPO	Upcountry Maui Watershed, NRCS Hawaii	\$2,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
NRCS/WFPO	Upper Clark Fork Watershed, Watershed Restoration Coalition, MT	\$200,000	Tester
NRCS/WFPO	Waiuku-Alenai, NRCS Hawaii	\$250,000	Akaka and Inouye
RCDS	Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas, National Center for Appropriate Technology, Butte, MT	\$2,800,000	Baucus, Feinstein, Harkin, Johnson, Lincoln, Pryor, Specter, and Tester

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010  
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	5,174	5,285	5,285	+111	.....
Office of Tribal Relations	.....	1,000	1,000	+1,000	.....
Executive Operations:					
Office of Chief Economist	10,651	16,732	13,032	+2,381	-3,700
National Appeals Division	14,711	15,559	15,219	+508	-340
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	9,054	9,436	9,436	+382	.....
Office of Homeland Security	974	2,994	1,859	+885	-1,135
Office of Advocacy and Outreach	.....	3,000	.....	.....	-3,000
Office of the Chief Information Officer	17,527	63,579	63,579	+46,052	.....
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	5,954	6,566	6,566	+612	.....

Total, Executive Operations .....	58,871	117,866	109,691	+ 50,820	- 8,175
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights .....	871	895	895	+ 24	.....
Office of Civil Rights .....	21,551	23,922	23,422	+ 1,871	- 500
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration .....	687	806	806	+ 119	.....
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rentals .....	(268,244)	(346,182)	(274,482)	(+ 6,238)	(- 71,700)
Payments to GSA .....	168,901	237,901	168,901	.....	- 69,000
Department of Homeland Security .....	13,500	13,500	13,500	.....	.....
Building operations and maintenance .....	61,843	94,781	92,081	+ 30,238	- 2,700
Emergency appropriations .....	24,000	.....	.....	- 24,000	.....
Hazardous materials management .....	5,100	5,125	5,125	+ 25	.....
Departmental administration .....	27,011	43,319	41,319	+ 14,308	- 2,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	3,877	3,968	3,968	+ 91	.....
Office of Communications .....	9,514	9,922	9,722	+ 208	- 200
Office of the Inspector General .....	85,766	88,781	88,025	+ 2,259	- 756
Emergency appropriations .....	22,500	.....	.....	- 22,500	.....
Office of the General Counsel .....	41,620	44,651	43,551	+ 1,931	- 1,100
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics .....	609	895	895	+ 286	.....
Economic Research Service .....	79,500	82,478	82,078	+ 2,578	- 400
National Agricultural Statistics Service .....	151,565	161,830	161,830	+ 10,265	.....
Census of Agriculture .....	(37,265)	(37,908)	(37,908)	(+ 643)	.....
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses .....	1,140,406	1,153,368	1,181,632	+ 41,226	+ 28,264
Buildings and facilities .....	46,752	.....	47,027	+ 275	+ 47,027
Emergency appropriations .....	176,000	.....	.....	- 176,000	.....
Total, Agricultural Research Service .....	1,363,158	1,153,368	1,228,659	- 134,499	+ 75,291
National Institute of Food and Agriculture:					
Research and education activities .....	691,043	622,892	757,821	+ 66,778	+ 134,929
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund .....	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)	.....	.....
Extension activities .....	474,250	487,005	491,292	+ 17,042	+ 4,287
Integrated activities .....	56,864	56,864	56,864	.....	.....
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service .....	1,222,157	1,166,761	1,305,977	+ 83,820	+ 139,216
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs .....	737	895	895	+ 158	.....
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses .....	876,675	872,423	911,394	+ 34,719	+ 38,971
Inspections (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA .....	.....	(20,000)	.....	.....	(- 20,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Buildings and facilities .....	4,712	4,712	4,712		
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	881,387	877,135	916,106	+ 34,719	+ 38,971
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services .....	86,711	90,848	90,848	+ 4,137	
Standardization (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA .....	(62,888)	(64,583)	(64,583)	(+ 1,695)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected) .....	1,169,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	+ 131,000	
Permanent, Section 32 .....	17,270	20,056	20,056	+ 2,786	
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32) .....	(10,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+ 10,000)	
Commodity purchases support system .....	1,334	1,334	1,334		
Payments to States and possessions .....					
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service program .....	1,347,203	1,496,821	1,496,821	+ 149,618	
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses .....	40,342	41,964	41,564	+ 1,222	- 400
Limitation on inspection and weighing services .....	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	613	813	813	+ 200	
Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	971,566	1,018,520	1,018,520	+ 46,954	
Lab accreditation fees .....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing .....	6,536,735	6,608,619	6,776,866	+ 240,131	+ 168,247
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services .....	646	895	895	+ 249	
Farm Assistance Programs .....					
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses .....	1,170,273	1,253,777	1,253,777	+ 83,504	
Emergency appropriations .....	50,000			- 50,000	
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(348)	(355)	(355)	(+ 7)	

(Transfer from Public Law 480) .....	(2,736)	(2,812)	(2,812)	(+ 76)	.....
(Transfer from ACF) .....	(309,403)	(318,173)	(313,173)	(+ 3,770)	(- 5,000)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts .....	(312,487)	(321,340)	(316,340)	(+ 3,853)	(- 5,000)
Total, Salaries and expenses .....	(1,532,760)	(1,575,117)	(1,570,117)	(+ 37,357)	(- 5,000)
State mediation grants .....	4,369	4,369	4,369	.....	.....
Grassroot source water protection program .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....
Dairy indemnity program .....	1,700	930	930	- 770	.....
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency .....	1,231,342	1,264,076	1,264,076	+ 32,734	.....
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct .....	(222,298)	(392,990)	(392,990)	(+ 170,692)	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	(360,000)	.....	.....	(- 360,000)	.....
Guaranteed .....	(1,238,768)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+ 261,232)	.....
Subtotal .....	(1,461,066)	(1,892,990)	(1,892,990)	(+ 431,924)	.....
Farm operating loans:					
Direct .....	(575,095)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(+ 124,905)	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	(573,367)	.....	.....	(- 573,367)	.....
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(1,017,497)	(1,150,000)	(1,150,000)	(+ 132,503)	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	(50,201)	.....	.....	(- 50,201)	.....
Subsidized guaranteed .....	(269,986)	(144,467)	(144,467)	(- 125,519)	.....
Subtotal .....	(1,862,578)	(1,994,467)	(1,994,467)	(+ 131,889)	.....
Indian tribe land acquisition loans .....	(3,940)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(- 1,940)	.....
Conservation loans:					
Direct .....	.....	(75,000)	(75,000)	(+ 75,000)	.....
Guaranteed .....	.....	(75,000)	(75,000)	(+ 75,000)	.....
Subtotal .....	.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(+ 150,000)	.....
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+ 10,000)	.....
Boll weevil eradication loans .....	(100,000)	(60,000)	(100,000)	.....	(+ 40,000)
Total, loan authorizations .....	(3,427,584)	(4,109,457)	(4,149,457)	(+ 721,873)	(+ 40,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct .....	12,715	16,034	16,034	+ 3,319	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	22,860	.....	.....	-22,860	.....
Guaranteed .....	4,088	5,550	5,550	+ 1,462	.....
Subtotal .....	39,663	21,584	21,584	- 18,079	.....
Farm operating loans:					
Direct .....	67,804	33,180	33,180	- 34,624	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	67,600	.....	.....	- 67,600	.....
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	25,336	26,910	26,910	+ 1,574	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	1,250	.....	.....	- 1,250	.....
Subsidized guaranteed .....	37,231	20,312	20,312	- 16,919	.....
Subtotal .....	199,221	80,402	80,402	- 118,819	.....
Indian tribe land acquisition .....	248	.....	.....	- 248	.....
Direct .....	.....	1,065	1,065	+ 1,065	.....
Guaranteed .....	.....	278	278	+ 278	.....
Subtotal .....	.....	1,343	1,343	+ 1,343	.....
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	.....	793	793	+ 793	.....
Individual Development Accounts .....	.....	5,000	.....	.....	- 5,000
Total, loan subsidies .....	239,132	109,122	104,122	- 135,010	- 5,000
ACF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA) .....	309,403	318,173	313,173	+ 3,770	- 5,000
Administrative expenses .....	7,920	7,920	7,920	.....	.....

Total, ACIF expenses .....	317,323	326,093	321,093	+ 3,770	- 5,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund .....	556,455	435,215	425,215	- 131,240	- 10,000
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,427,584)	(4,109,457)	(4,149,457)	(+ 721,873)	(+ 40,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency .....	1,787,797	1,699,291	1,689,291	- 98,506	- 10,000
Risk Management Agency, Administrative and operating expenses .....	77,177	80,325	79,425	+ 2,248	- 900
Total, Farm Assistance Programs .....	1,865,620	1,780,511	1,769,611	- 96,009	- 10,900
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund .....	6,582,945	7,502,601	7,502,601	+ 919,656	.....
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses .....	11,106,324	13,878,054	13,878,054	+ 2,771,730	.....
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses) .....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	.....	.....
Total, Corporations .....	17,689,269	21,380,655	21,380,655	+ 3,691,386	.....
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs .....	26,091,624	29,769,785	29,927,132	+ 3,835,508	+ 157,347
(By transfer) .....	(312,487)	(321,340)	(316,340)	(+ 3,853)	(- 5,000)
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,427,584)	(4,109,457)	(4,149,457)	(+ 721,873)	(+ 40,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(110,351)	(112,046)	(112,046)	(+ 1,695)	.....
TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	758	895	895	+ 137	.....
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations .....	853,400	867,197	949,577	+ 96,177	+ 82,380
Watershed and flood prevention operations .....	24,289	.....	24,394	+ 105	+ 24,394
Emergency appropriations .....	290,000	.....	.....	- 290,000	.....
Watershed rehabilitation program .....	40,000	40,161	40,161	+ 161	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	50,000	.....	.....	- 50,000	.....
Resource conservation and development .....	50,730	.....	.....	- 50,730	.....
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	1,308,419	907,358	1,014,132	- 294,287	+ 106,774

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total, title II, Conservation Programs .....	1,309,177	908,253	1,015,027	-294,150	+106,774
TITLE III—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	646	895	895	+249	.....
Rural Development:					
Rural development expenses:					
Salaries and expenses .....	192,484	195,987	207,237	+14,753	+11,250
(Transfer from RHF) .....	(460,217)	(468,593)	(468,593)	(+8,376)	.....
(Transfer from RDLFP) .....	(4,853)	(4,941)	(4,941)	(+88)	.....
(Transfer from RETLP) .....	(39,245)	(39,959)	(39,959)	(+714)	.....
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts .....	(504,315)	(513,493)	(513,493)	(+9,178)	.....
Total, Rural development expenses .....	(696,799)	(709,480)	(720,730)	(+23,931)	(+11,250)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502) .....	(1,121,488)	(1,121,488)	(1,226,501)	(+105,013)	(+105,013)
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(6,223,859)	(6,204,444)	(12,000,000)	(+5,776,141)	(+5,795,556)
Subtotal, Single family .....	(7,345,347)	(7,325,932)	(13,226,501)	(+5,881,154)	(+5,900,569)
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	(34,410)	(34,412)	(34,412)	(+2)	.....
Rental housing (sec. 515) .....	(69,512)	(69,512)	(69,512)	.....	.....
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	(5,045)	(5,045)	(5,045)	.....	.....
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538) .....	(129,090)	(129,090)	(129,090)	.....	.....
Multi-family housing credit sales .....	(1,447)	(1,448)	(1,448)	(+1)	.....
Single family housing credit sales .....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....	.....
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523) .....	(4,970)	(4,970)	(4,970)	.....	.....



Total, Loan authorizations .....	(7,599,821)	(7,580,409)	(13,480,978)	(+ 5,881,157)	(+ 5,900,569)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502) .....	75,364	40,710	44,522	- 30,842	+ 3,812
Emergency appropriations .....	67,000			- 67,000	
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	79,043	89,624	172,800	+ 93,757	+ 83,176
Emergency appropriations .....	133,000			- 133,000	
Subtotal, Single family .....	354,407	130,334	217,322	- 137,085	+ 86,988
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	9,246	4,422	4,422	- 4,824	
Rental housing (sec. 515) .....	28,611	18,935	18,935	- 9,676	
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538) .....	8,082	1,485	1,485	- 6,597	
Multi-family housing credit sales .....	523	556	556	+ 33	
Self-help housing/land develop. (sec. 523) .....	82			- 82	
Total, Loan subsidies .....	400,951	155,732	242,720	- 158,231	+ 86,988
RHF administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	460,217	468,593	468,593	+ 8,376	
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program .....	861,168	624,325	711,313	- 149,855	+ 86,988
(Loan authorization) .....	(7,599,821)	(7,580,409)	(13,480,978)	(+ 5,881,157)	(+ 5,900,569)
Rental assistance program:					
Rental assistance (Sec. 521) .....	891,112	1,080,042	968,612	+ 77,500	- 111,430
Eligible households (Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)) .....	5,958	5,958	5,958		
New construction (Sec. 515) .....	2,030	2,030	2,030		
New construction (Farm Labor Housing) .....	3,400	3,400	3,400		
Total, Rental assistance program .....	902,500	1,091,430	980,000	+ 77,500	- 111,430
Rural housing voucher program .....	4,965	4,965	18,000	+ 13,035	+ 13,035
Multifamily housing revitalization program account .....	19,860	19,860	19,860		
Multifamily housing preservation revolving loans .....	2,889	1,791	1,791	- 1,098	
Total, Multifamily housing revitalization .....	27,714	26,616	39,651	+ 11,937	+ 13,035
Mutual and self-help housing grants .....	38,727	38,727	38,727		
Rural housing assistance grants .....	41,500	41,500	41,500		
Farm labor housing program account:					
(Loan authorization) .....	(21,678)	(21,677)	(21,677)	(- 1)	
Loan subsidy .....	9,135	7,834	7,834	- 1,301	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Grants .....	9,134	9,134	9,134		
Total, Farm Labor Housing Program Account .....	18,269	16,968	16,968	- 1,301	
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct .....	(294,948)	(294,962)	(294,962)	(+ 14)	
Guaranteed .....	(206,425)	(206,417)	(206,417)	(- 8)	
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(501,373)	(501,379)	(501,379)	(+ 6)	
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Community facility:					
Direct .....	16,871	3,864	3,864	- 13,007	
Guaranteed .....	67,000			- 67,000	
Emergency appropriations .....	6,358	6,626	6,626	+ 268	
Grants .....	20,373	20,373	20,373		
Emergency appropriations .....	63,000			- 63,000	
Rural community development initiative .....	6,256	6,256	6,256		
Economic impact initiative grants .....	10,000	13,902	13,902	+ 3,902	
Tribal college grants .....	3,972	3,972	3,972		
Total, RCP Loan subsidies and grants .....	193,830	54,993	54,993	- 138,837	
Subtotal, grants and payments .....	292,326	152,188	152,188	- 140,138	
Total, Rural Housing Service .....	2,083,708	1,894,559	1,883,152	- 200,556	- 11,407
(Loan authorization) .....	(8,122,872)	(8,103,465)	(14,004,034)	(+ 5,881,162)	(+ 5,900,569)



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Loan subsidy .....	2,750	33,600	33,600	+ 30,850	.....
Grants .....	2,750	34,530	34,530	+ 31,780	.....
Total, Renewable energy program .....	5,500	68,130	68,130	+ 62,630	.....
Biorefinery Assistance Program:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Loan authorization) .....	.....	(48,884)	(48,884)	(+ 48,884)	.....
Loan subsidy .....	.....	17,339	17,339	+ 17,339	.....
Total, Biorefinery Assistance Program .....	.....	17,339	17,339	+ 17,339	.....
Total, Rural Business—Cooperative Service .....	282,539	256,626	256,844	- 25,695	+ 218
(Loan authorization) .....	(1,087,992)	(1,406,355)	(1,406,355)	(+ 318,363)	.....
Rural Utilities Service:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rural water and waste disposal program account:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Loan authorizations:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Direct .....	(75,000)	(1,022,163)	(1,022,163)	(+ 1,022,163)	.....
Guaranteed .....	.....	(75,000)	(75,000)	.....	.....
Total, Loan authorization .....	75,000	1,097,163	1,097,163	+ 1,022,163	.....
Loan subsidies and grants:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subsidy and grants .....	537,278	.....	.....	- 537,278	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	968,000	.....	.....	- 968,000	.....
Direct subsidy .....	.....	77,071	77,071	+ 77,071	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	412,000	.....	.....	- 412,000	.....
Water and waste grants .....	.....	464,228	469,228	+ 469,228	+ 5,000
Solid waste management grants .....	.....	3,441	3,441	+ 3,441	.....
Water and waste financing revolving fund .....	497	497	497	.....	.....
Water well system grants .....	993	993	993	.....	.....

High energy cost grants .....	17,500			17,500			+ 17,500
Total, Water loan subsidies and grants .....	1,936,268	546,230		568,730	-1,367,538		+ 22,500
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:							
Loan authorizations:							
Electric:							
Direct, 5 percent .....	(100,000)	(100,000)		(100,000)			
Direct, FFB .....	(6,500,000)	(6,500,000)		(6,500,000)			
Guaranteed underwriting .....				(500,000)	(+500,000)		(+ 500,000)
Subtotal, Electric .....	(6,600,000)	(6,600,000)		(7,100,000)	(+ 500,000)		(+ 500,000)
Telecommunications:							
Direct, 5 percent .....	(145,000)	(145,000)		(145,000)			
Direct, Treasury rate .....	(250,000)	(250,000)		(250,000)			
Direct, FFB .....	(295,000)	(295,000)		(295,000)			
Subtotal, Telecommunications .....	(690,000)	(690,000)		(690,000)			
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(7,290,000)	(7,290,000)		(7,790,000)	(+ 500,000)		(+ 500,000)
Loan subsidies:							
Telecommunications:							
Direct, Treasury rate .....	525						
Subtotal, Telecommunications .....	525						
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	39,245	39,959		39,959			
Subtotal, RETLP administrative expenses .....	39,245	39,959		39,959			
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account .....	(7,290,000)	(7,290,000)		(7,790,000)	(+ 500,000)		(+ 500,000)
(Loan authorization) .....							
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:							
Loan authorizations:							
Broadband telecommunications .....	(400,487)	(531,699)		(531,699)	(+ 131,212)		
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(400,487)	(531,699)		(531,699)	(+ 131,212)		
Loan subsidies and grants:							
Distance learning and telemedicine:							
Grants .....	34,755	29,790		37,755	+ 3,000		+ 7,965

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct .....	15,619	38,495	38,495	+ 22,876	.....
Grants .....	13,406	13,406	13,406	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	2,500,000	.....	.....	- 2,500,000	.....
Total, Loan subsidies and grants .....	2,563,780	81,691	89,656	- 2,474,124	+ 7,965
Broadband loans (rescission) .....	- 6,404	.....	.....	+ 6,404	.....
Total, Rural Utilities Service .....	4,533,414	667,880	698,345	- 3,835,069	+ 30,465
(Loan authorization) .....	(7,765,487)	(8,918,862)	(9,418,862)	(+ 1,653,375)	(+ 500,000)
Total, title III, Rural Development Programs .....	7,092,791	3,015,947	3,046,473	- 4,046,318	+ 30,526
(By transfer) .....	(504,315)	(513,493)	(513,493)	(+ 9,178)	.....
(Loan authorization) .....	(16,976,351)	(18,428,682)	(24,829,251)	(+ 7,852,900)	(+ 6,400,569)
TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services .....	610	813	813	+ 203	.....
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs .....	8,496,109	10,044,369	10,046,707	+ 1,550,598	+ 2,338
Emergency appropriations .....	100,000	.....	.....	- 100,000	.....
Competitive grants .....	.....	5,000	5,000	+ 5,000	.....
Transfer from section 32 .....	6,455,802	6,747,877	6,747,877	+ 292,075	.....
Total, Child nutrition programs .....	15,051,911	16,797,246	16,799,584	+ 1,747,673	+ 2,338
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC) .....	6,860,000	7,777,000	7,552,000	+ 692,000	- 225,000
Emergency appropriations .....	500,000	.....	.....	- 500,000	.....
Supplemental nutrition assistance program:					
Expenses .....	48,843,897	56,105,314	56,105,314	+ 7,261,417	.....

Indian reservations (FDPIR) .....	114,914	112,656	112,656	112,656	- 2,258	.....
Reserve .....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	.....	.....
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa .....	1,760,435	1,880,626	1,880,626	1,880,626	+ 120,191	.....
The emergency food assistance program .....	250,000	253,250	253,250	253,250	+ 3,250	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	150,000	.....	.....	.....	- 150,000	.....
Total, Food stamp program .....	54,119,246	61,351,846	61,351,846	61,351,846	+ 7,232,600	.....
Commodity assistance program:						
Commodity supplemental food program .....	160,430	162,818	162,818	162,818	+ 2,388	.....
Farmers market nutrition program .....	19,800	20,000	20,000	20,000	+ 200	.....
Emergency food assistance program .....	49,500	49,500	49,500	49,500	.....	.....
Pacific island and disaster assistance .....	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	.....	.....
Total, Commodity assistance program .....	230,800	233,388	233,388	233,388	+ 2,588	.....
Nutrition programs administration .....	142,595	150,139	147,801	147,801	+ 5,206	- 2,338
Total, Food and Nutrition Service .....	76,904,552	86,309,619	86,084,619	86,084,619	+ 9,180,067	- 225,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs .....	76,905,162	86,310,432	86,085,432	86,085,432	+ 9,180,270	- 225,000
TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
Foreign Agricultural Service						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation .....	165,436	180,367	180,367	180,367	+ 14,931	.....
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(4,985)	(6,465)	(6,465)	(6,465)	(+ 1,480)	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses program level .....	(170,421)	(186,832)	(186,832)	(186,832)	(+ 16,411)	.....
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Title II—Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level .....	(1,225,900)	(1,690,000)	(1,690,000)	(1,690,000)	(+ 464,100)	.....
Appropriation .....	1,225,900	1,690,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	+ 464,100	.....
Emergency appropriations .....	395,000	.....	.....	.....	- 395,000	.....
Overseas contingency operations .....	700,000	.....	.....	.....	- 700,000	.....
Salaries and expenses:						
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA) .....	2,736	2,812	2,812	2,812	+ 76	.....
Subtotal .....	2,736	2,812	2,812	2,812	+ 76	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level .....	(1,225,900)	(1,690,000)	(1,690,000)	(+ 464,100)	.....
Appropriation .....	1,228,636	1,692,812	1,692,812	+ 464,176	.....
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS) .....	4,985	6,465	6,465	+ 1,480	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA) .....	348	355	355	+ 7	.....
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account .....	5,333	6,820	6,820	+ 1,487	.....
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants .....	100,000	199,500	199,500	+ 99,500	.....
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs .....	2,594,405	2,079,499	2,079,499	- 514,906	.....
(By transfer) .....	(4,985)	(6,465)	(6,465)	(+ 1,480)	.....
TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation .....	2,038,964	2,337,656	2,337,656	+ 298,692	.....
Prescription drug user fee act .....	(510,665)	(578,162)	(578,162)	(+ 67,497)	.....
Medical device user fee act .....	(52,547)	(57,014)	(57,014)	(+ 4,467)	.....
Animal drug user fee act .....	(15,260)	(17,280)	(17,280)	(+ 2,020)	.....
Generic animal drug user fees .....	(4,831)	(5,106)	(5,106)	(+ 275)	.....
Subtotal (including user fees) .....	(2,622,267)	(2,995,218)	(2,995,218)	(+ 372,951)	.....
New User Fees (Legislative proposals) (NA):					
Generic drug user fees .....		(36,000)			(- 36,000)
Food and Feed Export Certification .....		(4,152)			(- 4,152)



Reinspection fees	(25,848)	(-25,848)		
Subtotal, New User fees (NA)	(66,000)	(-66,000)		
Food Facility Registration and Inspection	(75,000)	(-75,000)		
Mammography clinics user fees (outlay savings)	(19,318)		(19,318)	
Export and color certification	(10,300)		(10,400)	(+100)
Buildings and facilities	12,433		12,433	
Total, Food & Drug Administration (w/user fees)	(2,664,318)	(3,037,369)	(3,037,369)	(+373,051)
Total, Food and Drug Administration	2,051,397	2,350,089	2,350,089	+298,692
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(49,000)	(54,500)	(54,500)	(+5,500)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	2,051,397	2,350,089	2,350,089	+298,692
TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS				
Denali Commission	434			-434
Section 32 (rescission)	-293,530	-43,000	-52,000	+241,530
Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and facilities (rescission)		-49,885		+49,885
Nat'l Center for Natural Products Research (Sec. 725)	3,497		3,497	+3,497
Hawaii APHIS facility (Sec. 726)	469		2,600	+2,131
Hardwoods Trees (Sec. 728)	794		800	+6
Hunger Fellowships (Sec. 731)	2,347		3,000	+653
Market development (MI, VT) (Sec. 732)	1,877		3,000	+3,000
Rural Community Out Migration			499	+499
Food Aid Products			4,000	+4,000
Food Bank Infrastructure			7,000	+7,000
Graham Avenue business improvement district (Sec. 732)	94			-94
Geographic Disadvantaged			2,600	+2,600
Product Access			1,000	+1,000
Durum Wheat			4,000	+4,000
Kansas Farm Bureau Foundation			250	+250
Specialty market (Sec. 732)	338		350	+12
Farm Bill Administration (emergency appropriations)	4,000			-4,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives program	-270,000	-250,000	-250,000	+20,000
Limit Agriculture management assistance (Sec. 1524)		-5,000		+5,000
Limit wildlife habitat incentives program		-43,000		+43,000
Limit farmland protection program		-30,000		+30,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued  
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Limit Section 32 (Sec. 723)	-52,470	.....	.....	+52,470	.....
Limit fruit and vegetable program (Sec. 723)	-49,000	.....	-76,000	-27,000	-76,000
Limit healthy forests reserve program	.....	.....	.....	.....	+5,000
Limit Wetlands Reserve program	.....	-5,000	.....	.....	+184,000
Limit Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention program	.....	-184,000	.....	.....	+30,000
Limit National Clean Plant Network	.....	-30,000	.....	.....	+5,000
Limit Dam Rehab	-165,000	-5,000	-165,000	.....	-135,000
Total, title VII, General provisions	-816,150	-674,885	-510,404	+305,746	+164,481
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008 (PUBLIC LAW 110-252)					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Public Law 480 Title II Grants (emergency)	395,000	.....	.....	-395,000	.....
DISASTER RELIEF AND RECOVERY SUPPLEMENTAL (PUBLIC LAW 110-329)					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
General Provision					
Sec. 20001, Bill Emerson humanitarian trust (emergency)	10,000	.....	.....	-10,000	.....
AMERICAN RECOVERY & REINVESTMENT ACT, 2009 (PUBLIC LAW 111-5)					
TITLE I—AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, & RURAL DEVELOPMENT					
Department of Agriculture	11,329,500	.....	.....	-11,329,500	.....
Rural Housing Service Loan authorizations	(11,472,000)	.....	.....	(-11,472,000)	.....

Total, Other appropriations .....	11,734,500				-11,734,500	
Grand total .....	126,962,906	123,759,120	123,993,248	123,993,248	-2,969,658	+234,128
Appropriations .....	(108,615,130)	(123,852,005)	(124,045,248)	(124,045,248)	(+15,430,118)	(+193,243)
Emergency Appropriations .....	(17,947,710)				(-17,947,710)	
Overseas contingency operations .....	(700,000)				(-700,000)	
Rescissions .....	(-299,934)				(+247,934)	(+40,885)
(By transfer) .....	(821,787)	(-92,885)	(-52,000)	(-52,000)	(+14,511)	(-5,000)
(Loan authorization) .....	(31,875,935)	(841,298)	(836,298)	(836,298)	(+14,511)	(-5,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(159,351)	(22,538,139)	(28,978,708)	(28,978,708)	(-2,897,227)	(+6,440,569)
		(166,546)	(166,546)	(166,546)	(+7,195)	
RECAPITULATION						
Title I—Agricultural programs .....	26,091,624	29,769,785	29,927,132	29,927,132	+3,835,508	+157,347
Mandatory .....	(18,877,239)	(22,701,641)	(22,701,641)	(22,701,641)	(+3,824,402)	
Discretionary .....	(7,214,385)	(7,068,144)	(7,225,491)	(7,225,491)	(+11,106)	(+157,347)
Title II—Conservation programs (discretionary) .....	1,309,177	908,253	1,015,027	1,015,027	-294,150	+106,774
Title III—Rural development programs (discretionary) .....	7,092,791	3,015,947	3,046,473	3,046,473	-4,046,318	+30,526
Title IV—Domestic food programs .....	76,905,162	86,310,432	86,085,432	86,085,432	+9,180,270	-225,000
Mandatory .....	(68,921,157)	(78,144,092)	(78,146,430)	(78,146,430)	(+9,225,273)	(+2,338)
Discretionary .....	(7,984,005)	(8,166,340)	(7,939,002)	(7,939,002)	(-45,003)	
Title V—Foreign assistance and related programs (discretionary) .....	2,594,405	2,079,499	2,079,499	2,079,499	-514,906	
Title VI—Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration (discretionary) .....	2,051,397	2,350,089	2,350,089	2,350,089	+298,692	
Title VII—General provisions (discretionary) .....	-816,150	-674,885	-510,404	-510,404	+305,746	+164,481
Other appropriations (discretionary) .....	11,734,500				-11,734,500	
Total .....	126,962,906	123,759,120	123,993,248	123,993,248	-2,969,658	+234,128