

## Calendar No. 152

114TH CONGRESS }  
1st Session } SENATE { REPORT  
114-82

---

---

### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIA- TIONS BILL, 2016

—————  
JULY 16, 2015.—Ordered to be printed  
—————

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

### REPORT

[To accompany S. 1800]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1800) mak-  
ing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and  
Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal  
year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, reports fa-  
vorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

#### *New obligational authority*

Total of bill as reported to the Senate .....	\$144,111,103,000
Amount of 2015 appropriations .....	147,845,470,000
Amount of 2016 budget estimate .....	167,967,780,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2015 appropriations .....	– 3,734,367,000
2016 budget estimate .....	– 23,856,677,000

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Breakdown by Title .....	4
Overview and Summary of the Bill .....	5
Reports to Congress .....	6
Title I:	
Agricultural Programs:	
Production, Processing, and Marketing:	
Office of the Secretary .....	7
Executive Operations .....	10
Office of the Chief Information Officer .....	11
Office of the Chief Financial Officer .....	12
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights .....	12
Office of Civil Rights .....	13
Agriculture Buildings and Facilities .....	13
Hazardous Materials Management .....	14
Office of Inspector General .....	14
Office of the General Counsel .....	15
Office of Ethics .....	15
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics .....	15
Economic Research Service .....	16
National Agricultural Statistics Service .....	16
Agricultural Research Service .....	17
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	22
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs .....	30
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	30
Agricultural Marketing Service .....	35
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration .....	38
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	39
Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	39
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services .....	40
Farm Service Agency .....	41
Risk Management Agency .....	46
Corporations:	
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund .....	46
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund .....	47
Title II:	
Conservation Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	49
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	49
Title III:	
Rural Development Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	52
Rural Housing Service .....	53
Rural Community Facilities Program Account .....	59
Rural Business—Cooperative Service .....	60
Rural Utilities Service .....	64
Title IV:	
Domestic Food Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services .....	69
Food and Nutrition Service .....	69

	Page
Title V: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs: Foreign Agricultural Service .....	76
Title VI:	
Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration:	
Department of Health and Human Services: Food and Drug Administration .....	80
Independent Agency: Farm Credit Administration .....	90
Title VII: General Provisions .....	92
Program, Project, and Activity .....	95
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	95
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	96
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	96
Budgetary Impact of Bill .....	97
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority .....	98

## 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]

	2015	2016 Committee recommendation
Title I: Agricultural programs .....	30,446,595	26,838,162
Title II: Conservation programs .....	859,326	856,107
Title III: Rural economic and community development programs .....	2,403,423	2,493,942
Title IV: Domestic food programs .....	110,190,881	110,140,403
Title V: Foreign assistance and related programs .....	1,835,325	1,864,127
Title VI: Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....	2,597,324	2,637,766
Title VII: General provisions .....	- 512,404	- 719,404
Title VIII: Ebola Response and Preparedness .....	25,000	.....
Total, new budget (obligational) authority .....	147,845,470	144,111,103

## 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].

The discretionary programs and activities of USDA and FDA that are supported by this bill include high priority responsibilities entrusted to the Federal Government and its partners to protect human health and safety, contribute to economic recovery, and achieve policy objectives strongly supported by the American people. The ability to provide for these measures is made difficult by growing pressure on available levels of discretionary spending as a consequence of the overall public debate on Federal spending, revenues, and size of the Federal debt.

Too often, the USDA programs funded by this bill are confused with farm subsidies and other mandatory spending more properly associated with multi-year farm bills. In contrast, this bill provides annual funding for programs familiar to all Americans such as protecting food safety through the Food Safety and Inspection Service and the Food and Drug Administration, which also plays a vital role in maintaining the safety of the Nation's blood supply and availability of safe and effective medical products and other components of our health system. This bill also provides funding to fight against the introduction and spread of noxious or infectious and often invasive pests and disease that threaten our plant and animal health environments, as well as funding for many other missions of dire importance to the American people.

In the context of overall pressures on spending and the competing priorities that the Committee faces, this bill as reported provides the proper amount of emphasis on agricultural, rural development, and other programs and activities funded by the bill. It is consistent with the subcommittee's allocation for fiscal year 2016.

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.

## 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 directs that all studies and reports be provided to the Committee as electronic documents 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, 2015 .....	\$45,805,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	47,308,000
Committee recommendation .....	46,055,000

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 \$46,055,000 for the Office of the Secretary. The Committee recommendation includes the following accounts under the Office of the Secretary: Office of the Secretary; Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison; Office of Tribal Relations; Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination; Office of Advocacy and Outreach; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; Departmental Administration; Office of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations; and Office of Communications. The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee for each office and activity:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	2015 enacted	2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
Office of the Secretary .....	5,051	5,137	5,051
Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison .....	.....	250	250
Office of Tribal Relations .....	502	507	502
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination .....	1,496	1,520	1,496
Office of Advocacy and Outreach .....	1,209	1,228	1,209
Office of Assistance Secretary for Administration .....	804	816	804
Departmental Administration .....	25,124	25,688	25,124

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

	2015 enacted	2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
Office of Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	3,869	3,934	3,869
Office of Communications .....	7,750	8,228	7,750
Total .....	45,805	47,308	46,055

*Biobased Products.*—The Committee recognizes the opportunity that exists for biobased products to be used in food packaging and the food service industry. Bioplastics made from renewable resources such as canola can play an important role in this effort. The Committee encourages USDA to continue to work with companies bringing these types of products to market under the BioPreferred label.

*Captive Marine Mammals.*—The Department is directed to issue, within 6 months of enactment of this act, its proposed rule for public comment regarding captive marine mammal standards under the Animal Welfare Act in order to ensure that the handling, enclosure size, care, treatment, and transportation of marine mammals in captivity are based on the latest expert and scientific knowledge.

*Dietary Guidelines for Americans.*—The Committee is concerned that the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee’s recommendations included issues outside of the nutritional scope of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. The Committee directs the Secretary to ensure that the Guidelines are solely nutritional and dietary in nature and based on a preponderance of scientific evidence. Furthermore, the Committee includes new bill language directing the Secretary to only include nutrition and dietary information, not extraneous factors, in the final 2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

The Committee is also concerned that alcohol labeling guidance is not standardized among Federal agencies, and encourages USDA and DHHS to ensure that consumption guidance issued in the 2015 Dietary Guidelines recommendations is consistent with policies of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, the Tax and Trade Bureau, and the Food and Drug Administration, which acknowledge the variability of alcohol content for different beverage alcohol products.

*Drought Relief.*—The Secretary is directed to provide quarterly reports to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations detailing USDA’s efforts to provide drought relief to States where all or the majority counties are declared to be in a drought disaster, as well as any unmet needs or backlogs for USDA drought relief programs. The reports shall include detailed information specifying which appropriations accounts funding is derived from, the fiscal year in which it was appropriated or made available, and how much funding remains obligated but unexpended.

*Duplication Across Federal Agencies.*—The Committee is concerned about duplication of functions across Federal agencies and directs USDA to review its operations to reduce potentially duplicative functions as a way to save taxpayer dollars.



*Multi-Agency Transparency.*—The Committee expresses support for increasing transparency within all agencies of the Department of Agriculture. The agencies are encouraged to disclose costs associated with analyses required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

*Outreach to Socially Disadvantaged and Veteran Farmers and Ranchers.*—The Committee supports the efforts of the Office of Advocacy and Outreach to increase the accessibility of USDA programs to underserved constituents, and notes that \$10,000,000 in mandatory funds is available to assist socially disadvantaged and veteran farmers and ranchers in owning and operating farms and ranches to meet the growing need for financial, production, management, and other assistance to those communities and address workforce shortages.

*Pay Costs.*—The Committee does not recommend pay cost increases as requested in the budget.

*Pollinator Health.*—The Committee supports the recently announced Pollinator Research Action Plan, and the combined efforts of multiple government agencies to address pollinator health. The Committee encourages USDA to continue to work to advance the conservation of Monarchs and other economically significant pollinators through all available means, including leveraging partnerships with non-governmental organizations that possess experience working directly with agricultural producers and other conservation partners.

*Printing Costs.*—The Committee is concerned about the millions of taxpayer dollars spent on wasteful printing practices each year and the lack of clear printing policies within each of the agencies. While progress has been made to better utilize the cloud and digitalize records, little progress has been made to reform in-house printing practices. The Committee directs the Department to work with the Office of Management and Budget to reduce printing and reproduction by 34 percent and report to the Committee within 60 days after enactment of this act on what steps have been taken to reduce printing volume and costs. The report should specifically identify how much money each agency will be saving.

*Resource Conservation and Development Councils.*—Since 1964, the Resource Conservation and Development [RC&D] Councils have worked at the grassroots level with local leaders to plan, develop, and carry out programs for land and water conservation and management. The Committee encourages the Secretary to consider the maximum practical use of RC&D Councils, where such RC&D Councils meet agency performance requirements, in the delivery of USDA programs and services.

*Rural Poverty.*—The Department has statutory authorities and programs designed to help break the multigenerational trap of poverty in rural counties. The Committee recognizes that USDA may utilize existing programs and funding within RD and the Food and Nutrition Service [FNS] in order to assist families, create jobs and develop a path towards independence and self-sufficiency. Other existing resources such as the extension service and public universities can be used for coordination and outreach activities. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a detailed plan including all funding resources currently being used to combat rural pov-

erty. This comprehensive plan should account for all Federal projects, programs, and initiatives and prioritize those proposals that take innovative and job-creating approaches to housing and home ownership among low and very-low income individuals and families; improve rural livelihoods through the use of environmentally and economically sustainable approaches to small-holder agriculture that provide access to critical nutrition, jobs and revenue; and community-wide outreach, education and healthcare services that address some of the most common health risks in rural America: heart disease, stroke, malnutrition, obesity, and diabetes.

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 department-wide services. Activities under the executive operations include the Office of the Chief Economist, the National Appeals Division, and the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$17,377,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	17,465,000
Committee recommendation .....	16,777,000

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 \$16,777,000 for the Office of the Chief Economist.

*Policy Research.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for policy research under 7 U.S.C. 3155 for entities with existing institutional capacity to conduct complex economic and policy analysis and a lengthy and well-documented record of conducting policy analysis for the benefit of the Department of Agriculture, the Congressional Budget Office, or the Congress. To maximize resources, the Committee expects the Department to focus efforts on entities that have developed models, databases, and staff necessary to conduct in-depth analysis of impacts of agriculture or rural development policy proposals on rural communities, farmers, agribusiness, taxpayers, and consumers.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$13,317,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	13,566,000
Committee recommendation .....	13,317,000

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 \$13,317,000 for the National Appeals Division.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$9,392,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	9,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	9,392,000

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 department-wide coordination of the preparation and processing of regulations and legislative programs and reports.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,392,000 for the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$45,045,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	53,071,000
Committee recommendation .....	45,045,000

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 Of-

ficer 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, Kansas City, Missouri and Washington, DC. Direct ADP operational services are also provided to the Office of the Secretary, the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of Communications, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, and Departmental Management.

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 \$45,045,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer. This amount also includes not less than \$28,000,000 to support cybersecurity requirements of the Department.

*Software Licenses.*—The Committee encourages the Department's Chief Information Officer to perform periodic automated inventories of software licenses in use across the Department. The Department should compare those usage numbers to its purchased licenses and seek to increase efficiency wherever it identifies discrepancies. The Department is to consider using this information to obtain department-wide acquisitions as opposed to component-specific purchases of licenses.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$6,028,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	9,154,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,028,000

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 strategic planning 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,028,000 for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$898,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	898,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$898,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$24,070,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	24,443,000
Committee recommendation .....	24,070,000

The Office of Civil Rights provides overall leadership responsibility for all department-wide civil rights activities. These activities include employment opportunity as well as program nondiscrimination policy development, analysis, coordination, and compliance. The Office is responsible for providing leadership in facilitating the fair and equitable treatment of USDA employees, and for monitoring program activities to ensure that all USDA programs are delivered in a nondiscriminatory 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 \$24,070,000 for the Office of Civil Rights.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$55,866,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	125,469,000
Committee recommendation .....	53,618,000

Department headquarters presently operates in a two-building, Government-owned complex in downtown Washington, DC, the George Washington Carver Center in Beltsville, Maryland, and in leased buildings in the metropolitan Washington, DC, area. Under an arrangement with the General Services Administration, USDA operates, maintains, and repairs these facilities, in lieu of rental payments. 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 \$53,618,000 for Agriculture Buildings and Facilities.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$3,600,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	3,630,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,618,000

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, cleanup, monitor, and inspect for hazardous materials in areas under the Department’s jurisdiction.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,618,000 for Hazardous Materials Management, including the requested increase for cleanup efforts at high-priority sites that pose the greatest threats to human life and safety.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$95,026,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	98,902,000
Committee recommendation .....	95,294,000

The Office of Inspector General [OIG] 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 OIG 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 \$95,294,000 for the Office of Inspector General, which includes an increase of \$268,000 for GSA rent and DHS security payments, as requested in the budget. The recommendation also includes funding for OIG to address violations of section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) and to coordinate with State and local law enforcement personnel in this effort.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$44,383,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	48,075,000
Committee recommendation .....	44,383,000

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; nonlitigation 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 \$44,383,000 for the Office of the General Counsel.

OFFICE OF ETHICS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$3,654,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	4,565,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,654,000

The Office of Ethics is the centralized and consolidated office implementing USDA’s ethics program throughout the Department. The Office provides ethics services to all employees at the Department concerning advice, training, and guidance about compliance with conflict of interest and impartiality rules. This includes complying with the requirements of the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge Act, Public Law 112–105 (the STOCK Act), and the Office of Government Ethics regulatory requirements (5 CFR parts 2634 through 2641).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,654,000 for the Office of Ethics.

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

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$898,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	898,000

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 \$898,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.

*Cover Crops.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of cover crops to promote soil health and reduce nutrient runoff and encourages the National Institute of Food and Agriculture to coordinate research efforts to collect information regarding cover crop practices, adoption rates, and effects on soil health and crop yields, and to provide effective and widespread dissemination of the results of the research to agricultural producers through extension and outreach activities.

*Formula Funds.*—The Committee recognizes the good work that stems from Hatch and Smith-Lever grants and directs that the funds continue to be awarded according to existing statutory funding formulas.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$85,373,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	86,023,000
Committee recommendation .....	85,373,000

The Economic Research Service [ERS] provides economic and other social science research and analysis for public and private decisions on agriculture, food, the environment, and rural America. The information that 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 \$85,373,000 for the Economic Research Service.

*Forest Loss.*—The Committee encourages ERS to analyze the impacts of U.S. trade and import of food and commodities on global forest loss, and to identify potential U.S. policies that could reduce U.S. impacts on tropical forest loss. ERS should report to the Committee on its efforts within 180 days of enactment of this act.

*Organic Data Analysis.*—The organic industry has grown at a tremendous rate over the past several years, and accurate data for the production, pricing and marketing of organic products is essential. Therefore, the Committee encourages ERS to continue and expand the efforts relating to organic data analysis.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$172,408,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	180,346,000
Committee recommendation .....	168,108,000

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.

NASS 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 \$168,108,000 for the National Agricultural Statistics Service. The recommendation includes increases of \$500,000 for pollinator surveys, and \$957,000 for the Chemical Use program, as requested in the budget. The Committee also includes funding to reinstate a vineyard production survey to gather information essential to annual pricing and purchase agreements and long-term production planning.

*Chemical Use Data Series.*—The Committee believes that the Chemical Use Data Series provides timely, valuable information on fertilizer and chemical use data and major field crops and selected specialty crops. The Committee encourages the National Agricultural Statistics Service to continue funding the collection and analysis of chemical use data as well as practices such as integrated pest management. The Committee directs the National Agricultural Statistics Service to continue collecting Fruit Chemical Use data and Vegetable Chemical Use data in alternating years.

*Organic Data Collection.*—The Committee believes the Organic Production Survey is essential to the growth of the organic industry, and should be conducted on a regular basis to properly assess the characteristics, trends, and changes in the sector. The Committee included funding in 2014 for this purpose and expects NASS to incorporate funding for an annual organic production survey into its internal budgeting process.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$1,132,625,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	1,191,540,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,136,825,000

The Agricultural Research Service [ARS] is responsible for conducting basic, applied, and developmental research through its major program areas of New Products/Product Quality/Value Added; Livestock/Crop Production; Food Safety; Livestock/Crop Protection; Human Nutrition; and Environmental Stewardship. 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 li-

brary services through traditional library functions and modern electronic dissemination to agencies of the USDA, public and private organizations, and individuals.

As the USDA'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 and transfer solutions to agricultural problems of high national priority and provide information access and dissemination to ensure high-quality, safe food and other agricultural products; assess the nutritional needs of Americans; sustain a competitive agricultural economy; enhance the natural resource base and the environment; and provide economic opportunities for rural citizens, communities, and society as a whole.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,136,825,000 for salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Research Service. The Committee does not concur with the President's budget request regarding the termination of research programs or closure of research locations. The Committee expects extramural research to be funded at no less than the fiscal year 2015 levels.

*Aerial Application Research.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the ARS Aerial Application Technology Program. The program conducts innovative research making aerial applications more efficient, effective and precise. Research for aerial application serves the public good as a vital tool for the future, as agriculture strives to meet the food, fiber, and bio-energy demands of a growing population.

*Agroforestry.*—Agroforestry can provide on-farm financial and environmental benefits while also addressing the regional and national-scale issues of clean water, wildlife habitat, and hypoxia. Agroforesters manage trees with crops, livestock, and pasture to combine the best of both agriculture and forestry. Recognizing the importance of agroforestry to farm practices and the environment, the Committee recommendation includes no less than the fiscal year 2015 level to develop integrated strategies to manage multifunctional agricultural landscapes that combine trees with agricultural and horticultural crops, forages and grazing livestock for optimal economic, environmental, and natural resources benefits.

*Animal Welfare.*—The Committee is concerned about allegations of mistreatment of research animals at the U.S. Meat Animal Research Center [USMARC] in Clay Center, Nebraska, and is aware that USDA's Office of the Inspector General is conducting a full audit of animal welfare practices at USMARC and throughout the Agricultural Research Service [ARS]. The Committee directs ARS to ensure all its facilities conducting agricultural research comply with standards that are equivalent to the Animal Welfare Act, and to enter into an agreement with the Animal and Plant Health In-

spection Service [APHIS] to have APHIS Animal Care conduct routine inspections of ARS facilities to ensure humane treatment of animals. The Committee further directs ARS to fully review all of its animal welfare policies and procedures, and to ensure that all research facilities which conduct animal research have fully functioning Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees, with appropriate record keeping procedures. The Committee directs USDA to provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate regarding all efforts to improve or ensure all animal welfare regulations are being followed, including measures taken when problems are discovered.

*Aquaculture Disease.*—The Committee is concerned about the increasing negative impact the spread of *Aeromonas* is having on the domestic farm-raised catfish industry. The ARS Aquatic Animal Health Unit is encouraged to collaborate with land-grant university partners with expertise in aquatic animal health and fish pathogens to develop more effective culture methods and advanced biosecurity measures to counteract the infections. All research, development and outreach should focus on the immediate needs surrounding *Aeromonas* infections, but should be tailored in a way that provides broad-based solutions to reducing loss due to disease in the domestic aquaculture industry. Research should also focus on methodologies that have the potential to not only reduce risks from pathogens, but also positively impact the viability and profitability of the industry beyond the benefits provided by disease control. The Committee is particularly interested in understanding what benefits the use of in-pond raceways could have on disease prevention and mediation, the cost of production, and profitability.

*Bioenergy Research.*—ARS is encouraged to consider a wide spectrum of growing conditions and appropriate plant species in its bioenergy research to support the development of bioenergy products viable in all States and territories.

*Classical Plant Breeding.*—The Committee is aware of the need to enhance classical plant breeding, and encourages ARS to invest in research to improve genetic resources and cultivars for the benefit of U.S. producers, seed companies, processors and consumers. This research should focus on breeding improved germplasm and varieties with higher yields, improved disease and pest resistance and resilience to weather extremes. Additionally, methods and tools should be developed to enable classical breeders to choose better breeding parents and speed up variety development.

*Cranberry Research.*—The Committee recognizes the need for advancements in water conservation, pest control, disease reduction, and fruit quality improvements in cranberry production. The Committee recommendation includes \$750,000 to increase resources devoted to improving cranberry yields, pest management, disease management, and water resource management by developing fields devoted to cranberry research and collection and storage of samples for analysis in appropriate existing laboratory facilities.

*Dairy Forage Research.*—The Committee commends the ARS on its prioritization of research to develop improved forage breeding and management systems to enhance the productivity and capacity of animal production systems. This research should focus on improving the environmental efficiency of diverse integrated dairy

systems, environmental growth physiology, and the improvement of forage, forage management, and forage systems. This research serves the public good by improving the efficiency of dairy systems and addressing nutrient management pressures on water and environmental quality.

*Emerging Cereal Rust Diseases.*—The Committee is aware that emerging cereal rust diseases are a threat to domestic and world food supplies. Therefore, the Department should continue to dedicate funding to speed efforts to combat cereal rust disease, including development of Ug99-resistant wheat varieties.

*Forage Production Systems.*—The Committee recommendation includes no less than the fiscal year 2015 level to develop management practices that improve the production efficiency of grazing operations in temperate pastures.

*Forest Products.*—The Committee recognizes the important role of the forests products sector to the U.S. economy. The need to create new and improved value-added products and renewable energy from our Nation's wood supply is critical to the sustainability of the national economy. The Committee recommendation includes \$3,500,000 to support research on wood quality improvement and improvement in forest products evaluation standards and valuation techniques. ARS shall conduct this research in consultation with the Forest Products Laboratory.

*Human Nutrition Research.*—The Committee remains concerned about the high rates of obesity in this country, and believes that research into human nutrition is important to help prevent childhood obesity and the medical issues obesity brings. The Committee recommendation includes no less than the fiscal year 2015 level to expand research regarding the growth, health promotion, diet, immune function, and disease prevention of the developing child.

*National Agricultural Library.*—ARS is responsible for the Abraham Lincoln National Agricultural Library [NAL] 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. The Committee directs ARS to continue to support the dissemination of objective, scholarly, and authoritative agricultural and food law research and information by entering into partnerships with institutions of higher education that have expertise in agricultural and food law research and information.

*Nutrition Research and Aging.*—There is strong evidence that nutrition plays a critical role in preventative health, especially in aging adults. More research is needed to address our gaps in knowledge about how nutrition impacts the health of this growing population of Americans. The Agricultural Research Service is encouraged to continue research relating to the impact of nutrition on aging and health.

*Pollinator Research.*—The Committee is aware that pollinators are responsible for the production of one-third of the Nation's food supply, but the number of managed honeybee colonies in the United States has dropped in half since 1940. Because of the importance of pollinators in the production of the Nation's food supply and their impact on the stability of our agricultural economy, the

Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$2,000,000 for pollinator health.

*Potato Research.*—The Committee is concerned about the potentially devastating effect that Golden Nematodes and Pale Cyst Nematodes could have on potatoes and other agricultural commodities in contact with soil, and recognizes that in order to ensure the success of nematode quarantine in the country ARS scientists must be able to breed and test potatoes for nematode resistance and to receive and analyze soil to monitor nematode infestation in regulated areas in a secure quarantined environment.

*Research Facilities.*—The Committee notes the delivery of the report pursuant to a provision in the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 2015 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriation Act, which directed ARS to submit a report containing recommendations to better utilize Federal labs in cooperation with land-grant universities. It is concerning, however, that the report contained no such recommendations and many issues regarding the underutilization of established labs remain unresolved. The Committee therefore directs ARS, in consultation with land-grant universities and Center Directors, to submit a report to the Committee by January 30, 2016, that includes an assessment of the current utilization of each ARS facility, the views of land-grant universities and/or Center Directors, and specific recommendations to better utilize Federal labs to explore new scientific opportunities that benefit the Nation's food and agriculture system.

*Sclerotinia.*—The Committee is aware of the economic importance of controlling sclerotinia, which affects sunflowers, soybeans, canola, edible beans, peas, and lentils and encourages ARS to continue both core research and cooperative projects of the National Sclerotinia Initiative.

*Shellfish Research.*—The Committee encourages the Agricultural Research Service to increase its investment in partnerships with research institutions on research to improve shellfish survival and growth rates and to classify and preserve natural genetic variation.

*Small Grains Genomic Initiative.*—The Committee recognizes that ARS small grains genotypic research provides a critical resource to facilitate the application of genomic information and DNA marker technologies to the improvement and breeding of barley and wheat, with a current major need to update to next-generation genotypic to accelerate marker-assisted breeding. Adequate resources are also needed to enhance barley and wheat quality phenotyping, doubled haploid research and small grains genomic research, and the Committee supports the Small Grains Genomic Initiative.

*Sustainable Water Use Research.*—The Committee remains concerned about the ongoing depletion of the regional Alluvial Aquifer in the Lower Mississippi River Basin. Over 7 million acres in the region represent irrigated cropland and 90 percent of those acres rely on the groundwater supply. Increased water withdrawals and stagnant recharging jeopardize the long-term availability of the aquifer and place irrigation agriculture in the region on an unsustainable path. The Committee encourages ARS, in collaboration with university research and extension scientists and local stakeholders, to identify gaps in water management research and

focus efforts on the development of conservation and irrigation techniques to reduce water usage in agriculture production while maintaining crop quality and yield.

*Tropical and Subtropical Research.*—Research on Tropical and Subtropical crops is critical as the presence of and destruction by invasive pests such as fruit flies, coffee berry borer, and plant viruses increase and threaten crop security in the Pacific and Insular Areas, and the Committee encourages ARS to support this research.

*Wheat and Sorghum Research.*—The Committee recognizes the potential impact heat and drought can have on the yield and quality of wheat and sorghum and the need for new cultivars to adapt to changing climatic conditions. The Committee provides an increase of \$1,000,000 for research to improve the productivity and quality of wheat and sorghum during uncertain growing seasons resulting from extended droughts and increased temperatures.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$45,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	205,901,000
Committee recommendation .....	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and Facilities.

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 transferred to the Director of NIFA, effective October 1, 2009, all 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, 2015 .....	\$786,874,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	990,788,000
Committee recommendation .....	791,096,000

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 Eq-

uity 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 \$791,096,000 for research and education activities of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

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

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	Committee recommendation
Hatch Act .....	7 U.S.C. 361a-i .....	243,701
McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act .....	16 U.S.C. 582a through a-7 .....	33,961
Research at 1890 Institutions (Evans-Allen Program) .....	7 U.S.C. 3222 .....	52,485
Payments to the 1994 Institutions .....	534(a)(1) of Public Law 103–382 ..	3,439
Education Grants for 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(b) .....	19,336
Education Grants for Hispanic-Serving Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3241 .....	9,219
Education Grants for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions.	7 U.S.C. 3156 .....	3,194
Research Grants for 1994 Institutions .....	536 of Public Law 103–382 .....	1,801
Capacity Building for Non Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture .....	7 U.S.C. 3319i .....	5,000
Resident Instruction and Distance Education Grants for Insular Areas.	7 U.S.C. 3362 and 3363 .....	2,000
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(b) .....	325,000
Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment .....	7 U.S.C. 3151a .....	5,000
Veterinary Services Grant Program .....	7 U.S.C. 3151b .....	2,500
Continuing Animal Health and Disease Research Program .....	7 U.S.C. 3195 .....	4,000
Supplemental and Alternative Crops .....	7 U.S.C. 3319d .....	825
Multicultural Scholars, Graduate Fellowship and Institutions Challenge Grants.	7 U.S.C. 3152(b) .....	9,000
Secondary and 2-year Post-Secondary Education .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(j) .....	900
Aquaculture Centers .....	7 U.S.C. 3322 .....	4,000
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education .....	7 U.S.C. 5811, 5812, 5831, and 5832.	22,667
Farm Business Management .....	7 U.S.C. 5925f .....	1,450
Sun Grant Program .....	7 U.S.C. 8114 .....	2,500
Improved Pest Control:		
Minor Crop Pest Management (IR–4) .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	11,913

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES—  
Continued  
[Dollars in thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	Committee recommendation
Alfalfa Forage and Research Program .....	7 U.S.C. 5925 .....	2,000
Special Research Grants:	7 U.S.C. 450i(c).	
Global Change/UV Monitoring .....	.....	1,405
Potato Research .....	.....	2,000
Aquaculture Research .....	.....	1,350
Total, Special Research Grants .....	.....	4,755
Necessary Expenses of Research and Education Activities:		
Grants Management System .....	.....	7,830
Federal Administration—Other Necessary Expenses for Research and Education Activities.	.....	12,620
Total, Necessary Expenses .....	.....	20,450
Total, Research and Education Activities .....	.....	791,096

*Agriculture and Food Research Initiative.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$325,000,000 for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative [AFRI].

Section 7406 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 specifies priority areas with 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 notes the importance of having publicly available cultivars and breeds that are specifically bred to be adapted to the soils, climates, and farming systems of farmers of all regions. Therefore, the Committee strongly urges to make public cultivar and breed development an increased priority for funding within the AFRI program by creating a separate Request for Applications in this area. The Committee further requests a report from the agency as to its plans for implementing this important 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 15 percent of the competitive research grant funds be used for USDA's agricultural research enhancement awards program, including USDA-EPSCoR.

*Alfalfa and Forage Research.*—The Committee notes that research into alfalfa seed and alfalfa forage systems holds the potential to increase yields, increase milk production, and improve genetics. The Committee recommendation includes \$2,000,000 to support research into the improvement of yields, water conservation, creation of new uses, and the development of new storage and harvest systems.

*Aquaculture Disease Research.*—The Committee encourages USDA to support aquaculture disease and vaccine research, including research on coldwater aquaculture vaccines. There is currently no national facility for pathogen testing. Research into finfish vaccines and pathogens has the potential to accelerate the growth of



sustainable U.S. aquaculture, reduce the trade deficit attributable to imported seafood, and reduce the pressure on overfished species.

*Aquaculture Research.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the domestic aquaculture industry to the U.S. economy. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,350,000 for aquaculture research to address issues related to genetics, disease, systems, and economics.

*Cereal Crop Research.*—Research on cereal crops has historically been conducted by USDA and public universities, and the Committee recognizes the importance of continuing investment in cereal crop research. The Committee strongly encourages USDA to provide funding for cereal crop research in the areas of genetic and genomic research, plant pest research, and improved production systems.

*Countering Seafood Fraud.*—The Committee remains concerned about countering economic fraud and improving food safety of the U.S. food supply. The Committee is concerned that adequate technology is not yet available to provide for appropriate sampling of the food supply. The Committee believes NIFA should conduct research to develop technologies that will provide rapid, portable and facile screening of fish species at port sites, wholesale, and retail centers.

*Dual Use/Dual Benefit.*—The Dual Purpose with Dual Benefit: Research in Biomedicine and Agriculture Using Agriculturally Important Domestic Species is an interagency partnership grants program funded by NIFA and the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. Both NIFA and NIH should be commended for developing this important interagency program. The Committee strongly urges continuation of this partnership because it sponsors use of farm animals as dual purpose models to better understand developmental origins of disease, fat regulation and obesity, stem cell biology, assisted reproductive technologies, and infectious disease which directly benefits both agriculture and biomedicine. This program also strengthens ties between human medicine, veterinary medicine, and animal sciences, which is key to success of the One Health Initiative.

*Food Safety.*—The Committee recommends that NIFA prioritize research on funding for new food safety technologies relating to the Nation's meat supply that helps researchers, producers, and manufacturers.

*Food Safety Outreach.*—The Committee is aware that for fiscal year 2015 FDA and USDA is soliciting proposals for the establishment of one national and four regional food safety training centers. The Committee is concerned that limiting funding to one national center and four regional centers may inhibit the funding being used for on-the-ground food safety training “projects”, as authorized by the Food Safety Modernization Act. The Committee expects the Secretary to ensure that nonprofit community-based or non-governmental organizations, or organizations representing owners and operators of small and mid-sized farms, small food processors, or small fruit and vegetable merchant wholesalers can compete for funding or subcontracts for on-the-ground food safety training projects that directly reach the targeted, intended beneficiaries.

*Lowbush Blueberries.*—The Committee directs NIFA to work with research institutions to develop and refine predictive models and monitoring technologies for native and invasive pests for incorporation into integrated pest management programs for naturally seeded, native berry crops to increase the margin of food safety and product quality.

*Organic Research.*—USDA’s National Organic Standards Board [NOSB] has identified key organic research priorities, many of which would help to address challenges that have limited the growth in organic production in this country. The Committee encourages NIFA to give strong consideration to the NOSB organic research priorities when crafting the fiscal year 2016 RFAs for AFRI and the Organic Transition Program.

*Regional Research Priorities.*—The Committee encourages NIFA to consider providing funding within AFRI to assist with State and regional research priorities, with USDA oversight and review.

*Seafood.*—The Committee encourages USDA, in partnership with universities with established domestic shrimp farming programs, to support the development of a domestic industry that will help ensure the safety and quality of the Nation’s seafood supply, promote environmentally sustainable aquaculture, create new opportunities for U.S. agriculture, and forge new markets for U.S. grain and oilseed products and technology services.

*Specialty Crop Research Initiative.*—The Committee emphasizes the important role of the Specialty Crop Research Initiative in addressing the critical needs of the specialty crop industry through research and extension activities, and encourages NIFA to prioritize proposals for and enhance its overall commitment to identifying and addressing threats to pollinators from pests and diseases.

*Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education.*—The Committee is strongly supportive of the SARE program and directs USDA to ensure that research, education and extension activities carried out within SARE remain intact.

*Veterinary Corps.*—Veterinarians fulfilling the terms of a contract under USDA’s Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment Program, authorized by the National Veterinary Medical Services Act, shall be members of the National Veterinary Medical Services Corps and members who have fulfilled the terms of their contract shall be alumni of the Corps.

*Zoonotic Disease Research.*—Federal and State animal health officials have made eradicating livestock diseases with significant wildlife reservoirs a national animal health priority. This need is reflected in the Agricultural Act of 2014 which made the research and development of surveillance methods, vaccines, vaccination delivery systems or diagnostic tests a priority research area under the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act particularly for bovine brucellosis and bovine tuberculosis. The Committee recognizes the need for this research and encourages the agency to make competitive grants available to study improved management tools for zoonotic livestock diseases with significant wildlife reservoirs.

HISPANIC-SERVING AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
ENDOWMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2015 .....	
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	\$10,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	10,000,000

Section 7129 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, provides for the establishment of an endowment fund for the Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities [HSACU]. The Hispanic/Latino community is the fastest-growing sector of the American population. This investment in the Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities is needed to ensure institutions can effectively compete for NIFA competitive grants.

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, shall distribute the adjusted income as follows: 60 percent of the adjusted income shall be distributed among the Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities on a pro rata basis based on the Hispanic enrollment count of each institution; and 40 percent shall be distributed in equal shares to the Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities Endowment Fund.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$11,880,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	11,880,000
Committee recommendation .....	11,880,000

The Native American Institutions Endowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103–382, the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act, provides an endowment for the 1994 land-grant institutions (34 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, 2015 .....	\$471,691,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	483,370,000
Committee recommendation .....	488,891,000

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 and 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 \$488,891,000 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—EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	Committee recommendation
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(b) and (c) and Cooperative Extension ...	7 U.S.C. 343(b) and (c) and 208(c) of Public Law 93-471.	300,000
Extension Services at 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3221 .....	43,920
Extension Services at 1994 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3) .....	4,446
Facility Improvements at 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3222b .....	19,730
Renewable Resources Extension Act. ....	16 U.S.C. 1671 et seq. ....	4,060
Rural Health and Safety Education Programs .....	7 U.S.C. 2662(i) .....	1,500
Food and Animal Residue Avoidance Database Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7642 .....	1,250
Women and Minorities in STEM Fields .....	7 U.S.C. 5925 .....	400
Food Safety Outreach Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7625 .....	2,500
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(d):		
Food and Nutrition Education .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	67,934
Farm Safety and Youth Farm Safety Education Programs .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	4,610
New Technologies for Agricultural Extension .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	1,550
Children, Youth, and Families at Risk .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	8,395
Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	3,039
Crop Protection/Pest Management .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	17,200
Total, Section 3(d) .....		102,728

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—EXTENSION ACTIVITIES—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	Committee recommendation
Necessary Expenses of Research and Education Activities:		
Agriculture in the K–12 Classroom .....	.....	552
Federal Administration—Other Necessary Expenses for Research and Education Activities .....	.....	7,805
Total, Necessary Expenses .....	.....	8,357
Total, Extension Activities .....	.....	488,891

## INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$30,900,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	28,900,000
Committee recommendation .....	13,700,000

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 \$13,700,000 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—INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	Committee recommendation
Methyl Bromide Transition Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	2,000
Organic Transition Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	4,000
Regional Rural Development Centers .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	1,000
Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative .....	7 U.S.C. 3351 .....	6,700
Total, Integrated Activities .....	.....	13,700

*Crop Protection/Pest Management.*—The Committee recommendation moves funding for the Crop Protection/Pest Management line item from Integrated Activities to the Smith-Lever Act, section 3(d) line item within Extension Activities.

*Potato Research.*—To minimize the application of pesticides and to maximize the yield and quality of harvested potatoes, the Committee directs the Secretary to support pest management programs in potato growing States. Such programs help scientists track potential pest outbreaks and provide growers and industry professionals with current information on specific and timely treatments. Additionally, the programs help identify serious diseases, such as late blight disease, in their early stages, allowing for preventive measure to be put into place quickly to avoid crop losses.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND  
REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$898,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	898,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs provides direction and coordination in carrying out laws 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 \$898,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$871,315,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	855,803,000
Committee recommendation .....	876,465,000

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:

*Safeguarding and Emergency Preparedness/Response.*—The agency monitors plant and animal health worldwide, and sets import polices to prevent the introduction of foreign plant and animal pests and diseases. Domestically, the agency works cooperatively to conduct plant and animal health monitoring programs, pursue eradication, or limit the spread of the threat. The agency also conducts diagnostic laboratory activities that support disease prevention, detection, control, and eradication programs. In addition, the agency protects agriculture from detrimental animal predators, and through its regulatory structure helps advance genetic research while protecting against the release of harmful organisms.

*Safe Trade and International Technical Assistance.*—The agency helps resolve technical trade issues to ensure the smooth and safe movement of agricultural commodities into and out of the United States. The agency negotiates animal and plant health certification requirements and assists U.S. exporters meet foreign regulatory demands. In addition, the agency assists developing countries in improving their safeguarding systems, to protect the United States from emerging plant and animal pests and diseases.

*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.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$876,465,000 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 2015 enacted	Fiscal year 2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
Safeguarding and International Technical Assistance:			
Animal Health Technical Services .....	35,339	35,357	35,339
Aquatic Animal Health .....	2,253	2,259	2,253
Avian Health .....	52,340	52,395	52,340
Cattle Health .....	92,500	90,161	92,500
Equine, Cervid and Small Ruminant Health .....	19,500	19,534	19,500
National Veterinary Stockpile .....	3,973	3,722	3,973
Swine Health .....	24,250	24,836	24,800
Veterinary Biologics .....	16,417	16,448	16,417
Veterinary Diagnostics .....	31,540	31,594	31,540
Zoonotic Disease Management .....	9,523	19,536	9,523
Subtotal, Animal Health .....	287,635	295,842	288,185
Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (Appropriated) .....			
Cotton Pests .....	26,900	29,330	27,900
Field Crop & Rangeland Ecosystems Pests .....	11,520	8,194	11,520
Pest Detection .....	8,826	8,876	8,826
Plant Protection Methods Development .....	27,446	27,504	27,446
Specialty Crop Pests .....	20,686	20,734	20,686
Tree & Wood Pests .....	156,000	145,182	156,000
Subtotal, Plant Health .....	54,000	45,519	54,000
Subtotal, Plant Health .....	305,378	285,339	306,378
Wildlife Damage Management .....			
Wildlife Services Methods Development .....	90,027	80,583	92,627
Subtotal, Wildlife Services .....	18,856	18,908	18,856
Subtotal, Wildlife Services .....	108,883	99,491	111,483
Animal & Plant Health Regulatory Enforcement .....			
Biotechnology Regulatory Services .....	16,224	16,264	16,224
Subtotal, Regulatory Services .....	18,875	18,901	18,875
Subtotal, Regulatory Services .....	35,099	35,165	35,099
Contingency Fund .....			
Emergency Preparedness & Response .....	470	471	470
Subtotal, Emergency Management .....	16,966	16,991	16,966
Subtotal, Emergency Management .....	17,436	17,462	17,436
Subtotal, Safeguarding and Emergency Preparedness/Response .....			
	754,431	733,299	758,581
Safe Trade and International Technical Assistance:			
Agriculture Import/Export .....	14,099	19,625	15,099
Overseas Technical & Trade Operations .....	22,114	22,138	22,114

## ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 enacted	Fiscal year 2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Safe Trade .....	36,213	41,763	37,213
Animal Welfare:			
Animal Welfare .....	28,010	28,071	28,010
Horse Protection .....	697	706	697
Subtotal, Animal Welfare .....	28,707	28,777	28,707
Agency Management:			
APHIS Information Technology Infrastructure .....	4,251	4,251	4,251
Physical/Operational Security .....	5,146	5,146	5,146
GSA rent and DHS security payments .....	42,567	42,567	42,567
Subtotal, Agency Management .....	51,964	51,964	51,964
Total, Direct Appropriation .....	871,315	855,803	876,465

*Agricultural Quarantine Inspection.*—The Committee recognizes that prevention of infestations of pests and diseases is much more cost effective than subsequent control or eradication. This is an important Federal responsibility and the Committee provides \$27,900,000 for the agricultural quarantine inspections (AQI) function, including pre-departure and interline inspections.

*Animal Disease Traceability.*—The Committee provides \$13,000,000 to continue support for implementation of the new animal disease traceability system.

*APHIS Cargo Release.*—The Committee recommends that APHIS continue to work with the Department of Homeland Security's Customs and Border Protection [CBP] in order to facilitate the release of cargo at commercial import facilities by ensuring that CBP officials earn Cargo Release Authority certification for those species and groups of organisms listed in the Cargo Release Authority Plan. Such coordination will allow CBP officials to release cargo authorized by the Cargo Release Authority Plan while allowing APHIS entomologists, plant pathologists, and botanists to make release decisions upon discovery of those reportable organisms that may pose a threat to the Nation's agricultural security. APHIS is directed to report to the Committee regarding ongoing interagency coordination efforts, as well as specific steps planned for the fiscal year to improve release decisionmaking processes for import agriculture cargo.

*Chronic Wasting Disease.*—The national deer farming industry is adapting to a 2012 interim final rule that established a national, voluntary herd certification program [HCP] that provides uniform herd certification standards and will support the domestic and international marketability of U.S. cervid herds. The Committee believes the industry requires funding support to ensure that the newly implemented chronic wasting disease HCP is successful. Therefore, APHIS should spend no less than \$3,000,000 for cervid health activities. Within the funds provided, APHIS should give consideration to indemnity payments if warranted.



*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 of both Houses of Congress. 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.

*Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza [HPAI].*—The Committee is appreciative of the Department's decision to utilize emergency funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] to address surveillance, biosecurity, indemnification, site cleanup and disinfection, etc., in the face of spreading HPAI contaminations. Although infections may decline during the warm summer months, it is likely that the pace will accelerate again in the fall. The Committee expects the Secretary to continue to move expeditiously, relying on CCC funding, to support research, disease tracking, containment, and other Federal responsibilities to combat this devastating disease.

*Honey Bee Pests.*—The Committee remains concerned with declining bee populations and the tragic implications for pollination of U.S. agriculture. The Committee directs the agency to continue priority work with other Federal and State agencies and the public to manage, suppress, and eradicate varroa mites, small hive beetles, and other pests and diseases contributing to colony collapse disorder.

*Invasive Annual Grasses.*—The Secretary is encouraged to consider targeted herbicide treatments of invasive annual grasses and restoration efforts to compliment juniper control efforts on greater sage-grouse habitat on private rangelands.

*Invasive Tree Pests.*—The Committee recognizes that the forests products industry and family forest owners are under great threat from a variety of invasive forest pests. It is essential that APHIS carry out a comprehensive program to counter the spread of invasive species and work towards complete eradication of the Asian long-horned beetle, which continues to be found in new locations. The Secretary is directed to report to the Committee regarding the steps being taken to eradicate Asian long-horned beetles and emerald ash borers in northeast forests.

*National Animal Health Laboratory Network [NAHLN].*—Funding for the NAHLN shall be administered in consultation with the NAHLN Coordinating Council.

*Peer-Reviewed Accreditation.*—The Committee commends APHIS's collaboration with accrediting organizations whose accreditation program heeds rigorous publicly available standards, utilizes notable experts in the field to conduct comprehensive inspection and review, and provides opportunity for public input. As a result, APHIS has prioritized its allocation of inspection resources and inspection frequency to focus on higher risk individuals and institutions. The Committee also commends APHIS for its proactive

efforts to collaborate with these peer-reviewed accredited zoos and aquariums on critical initiatives such as: foreign animal disease surveillance; all-hazards preparedness and response; and animal welfare symposia. The Committee expects these efforts to continue and expand.

*West Nile Virus.*—The Committee remains concerned with the threats to human and animal health posed by West Nile virus and recognizes that a critical strategy for addressing these threats is necessary to prevent the infection and transmission by known vectors, including farm-raised alligators. The Committee encourages APHIS to further investigate West Nile virus and other infectious diseases affecting farm raised alligators and develop treatments and methods to prevent infection and transmission.

*Wildlife Damage Management.*—APHIS is responsible for providing Federal leadership in managing problems caused by wildlife. The Committee provides \$92,627,000 for wildlife damage control to maintain priority initiatives, including preventing the transport of invasive snakes and other harmful species.

The Committee maintains support for assistance to aquaculture producers to help mitigate wildlife depredation, particularly as it pertains to fish-eating and disease-carrying birds. The Committee provides an additional \$600,000 for damage management efforts and the development of methods to assist producers in combatting the persistent threat and economic hardship caused by cormorants, pelicans, and other birds.

The Committee provides \$26,000,000 for the National Rabies Management Program to fortify existing barriers and advance prevention and eradication efforts.

*Wildlife Services Education and Training.*—The Committee is aware of the wide range of hazardous procedures and materials utilized by APHIS personnel in the conduct of daily duties. In addition, a recent comprehensive study noted the critical need to provide standardized safety training, certification, and database management for tracking, to ensure the safest working environment possible. As such, the Committee provides \$2,000,000 within Wildlife Damage Management to establish a National Training Academy focused on those areas of greatest concern such as pyrotechnics, firearms, hazardous materials, immobilization and euthanasia drugs, pesticides, animal care and handling, land vehicles, watercraft, and zoonotic diseases.

*Wildlife Services Methods Development.*—The Committee appreciates the important work done by the National Wildlife Research Center and its affiliated field locations to resolve problems caused by the interaction of wild animals and society. The Committee provides \$18,856,000 to ensure continued development of technical and scientific information on wildlife damage management.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$3,175,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	3,175,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,175,000

The APHIS appropriation for “Buildings and Facilities” funds major nonrecurring construction projects in support of specific pro-

gram activities and recurring construction, alterations, preventive maintenance, and repairs of existing APHIS facilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$3,175,000 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, 2015 .....	\$81,192,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	83,121,000
Committee recommendation .....	81,192,000

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, 1635–1638); 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–499t); the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031–1056); and section 32 of the Act of 1935 (Public Law 74–320, 7 U.S.C. 612c).

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$81,192,000 for Marketing Services of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

*Organic Data Collection.*—The Committee encourages the Department to collect price data on organic commodities and other data relevant to the marketing of organic agricultural products.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2015 .....	\$60,709,000
Budget limitation, 2016 .....	60,982,000
Committee recommendation .....	60,982,000

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, and tobacco. 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.), and other provisions of law are designed to facilitate commerce and protect participants in the industry.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$60,982,000 on administrative expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY

(SECTION 32)

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$20,186,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	20,489,000
Committee recommendation .....	20,489,000

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 2015–2016:

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2015–2016

	Fiscal year 2015 estimate	Fiscal year 2016 budget	Fiscal year 2016 estimate
Appropriation (30 Percent of Customs Receipts) .....	\$9,714,922,892	\$10,316,645,343	\$10,316,645,343
Less Transfers:			
Food and Nutrition Service .....	– 8,355,670,824	– 8,869,645,343	– 8,869,645,343
Commerce Department .....	– 143,738,031	– 144,000,000	– 144,000,000
Total, Transfers .....	– 8,499,408,855	– 9,013,645,343	– 9,013,645,343
Prior Year Appropriation Available, Start of Year .....	187,485,963	122,000,000	122,000,000
Prior Year Collections and Recoveries .....			
Unavailable for Obligations (recoveries and offsetting collections) .....			
Transfer of Prior Year Funds to FNS (F&V) .....	– 119,000,000	– 122,000,000	– 122,000,000
Budget Authority, Farm Bill .....	1,284,000,000	1,303,000,000	1,303,000,000
Rescission of Current Year Funds .....	– 121,094,000	– 292,020,000	– 215,704,000
Appropriations Temporarily Reduced—Sequestration <sup>1</sup> .....	– 81,906,000		– 77,316,000
Unavailable for Obligations (Fruit and Veg transfer to FNS) .....	– 122,000,000	– 125,000,000	– 125,000,000
Budget Authority, Appropriations Act .....	959,000,000	885,980,000	884,980,000
Less Obligations:			
Child Nutrition Programs (Entitlement Commodities) .....	465,000,000	465,000,000	465,000,000
State Option Contract .....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Removal of Defective Commodities .....	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Emergency Surplus Removal .....	113,500,000		
Small Business Support .....		500,000	500,000

## ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2015–2016—Continued

	Fiscal year 2015 estimate	Fiscal year 2016 budget	Fiscal year 2016 estimate
Disaster Relief .....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases .....	92,500,000	206,000,000	206,000,000
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program .....	40,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
Accounting Adjustment .....	.....	.....	.....
Estimated Future Needs .....	180,604,000	106,692,000	106,692,000
<b>Total, Commodity Procurement .....</b>	<b>904,104,000</b>	<b>831,692,000</b>	<b>831,692,000</b>
<b>Administrative Funds:</b>			
Commodity Purchase Support .....	34,710,000	33,799,000	33,799,000
Marketing Agreements and Orders .....	20,186,000	20,489,000	20,489,000
<b>Total, Administrative Funds .....</b>	<b>54,896,000</b>	<b>54,288,000</b>	<b>54,288,000</b>
<b>Total Obligations .....</b>	<b>959,000,000</b>	<b>885,980,000</b>	<b>884,980,000</b>
Unobligated Balance, End of Year .....	.....	.....	.....
Unavailable for Obligations (Fruit and Veg transfer to FNS) .....	122,000,000	125,000,000	125,000,000
Balances, Collections and Recoveries Not Available .....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total End of Year Balances .....</b>	<b>122,000,000</b>	<b>125,000,000</b>	<b>125,000,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>The Budget Control Act of 2011 as amended by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 reduced all non-defense mandatory accounts by 7.3 percent in 2015 and 6.8 percent in 2016.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a transfer from section 32 funds of \$20,489,000 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 of 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, 2015 .....	\$1,235,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	1,235,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,235,000

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. Matching grants are awarded on a competitive basis 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 \$1,235,000 for Payments to States and Possessions for Federal-State marketing projects and activities.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$43,048,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	44,101,000
Committee recommendation .....	43,048,000

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 \$43,048,000 for salaries and expenses of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.

*Transportation Disruptions.*—The Committee directs USDA to develop and implement prompt and effective contingency plans to ensure that official grain inspection and weighing services resume as quickly as possible should an interruption in service occur. Additionally, in the event of a disruption, the Committee directs the Secretary to ensure that persons requesting official inspection and weighing services are informed immediately of the nature of the emergency, promptly implement the necessary mitigations to address any concerns, and provide regular updates should any disruption persist.

## LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Limitation, 2015 .....	\$50,000,000
Budget limitation, 2016 .....	55,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	55,000,000

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 \$55,000,000 on inspection and weighing services expenses.

## OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$816,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	824,000
Committee recommendation .....	816,000

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 \$816,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.

## FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$1,016,474,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	1,011,557,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,013,621,000

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 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 \$1,013,621,000 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service [FSIS]. The Committee finds the implementation schedule set forth by FSIS for revised inspections processes unrealistically rapid and provides additional funds to accomplish this transition in a more feasible manner.

*Humane Slaughter.*—The Committee directs FSIS to continue to provide annual reports to the Committee on the implementation of objective scoring methods undertaken by FSIS to enforce the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act.

The Committee also directs FSIS to ensure that personnel hired with funding previously provided specifically for Humane Methods of Slaughter Act enforcement focus their attention on overseeing compliance with humane handling rules for live animals as they arrive and are offloaded and handled in pens, chutes, and stunning areas and that all inspectors receive robust training.

*Inspections.*—The Committee is disappointed that the requirements set forth in section 12106 of Public Law 113–79 have not been met. The Committee directs the Department to meet its statutory obligation by promulgating final regulations expeditiously and meeting the implementation deadline for all domestic and imported inspection no later than 30 days after the enactment of this act.

*Recruiting Inspection Program Personnel.*—The Committee directs FSIS to submit a report that contains a comprehensive plan to increase the consideration of external candidates for frontline food safety inspection positions, with a focus on recruiting candidates with a demonstrated educational background in agriculture or health sciences, including new and recent graduates in these fields.

The following table represents the Committee’s specific recommendations for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as compared to the fiscal year 2015 and budget request levels:

## FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 enacted	Fiscal year 2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
Food safety inspection:			
Federal .....	900,641	895,481	897,788
State .....	60,905	60,976	60,905
International .....	16,589	16,744	16,589
Codex Alimentarius .....	3,759	3,776	3,759
PHDCIS .....	34,580	34,580	34,580
Total .....	1,016,474	1,011,557	1,013,621

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN  
AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$898,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	898,000

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), commodity programs, farm loans, disaster assistance, crop insurance, and some conservation and energy 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 \$898,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

The Farm Service Agency [FSA] was established October 13, 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, 2015 .....	1,200,180	309,880	1,510,060
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	1,185,251	312,873	1,498,124
Committee recommendation .....	1,180,391	309,880	1,490,271

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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,490,271,000 for salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency, including a

direct appropriation of \$1,180,391,000. The Committee supports the mission of FSA and does not agree with the reductions for salaries and personnel expenses as proposed in the budget. The Committee does not provide the increases for information technology or outreach for new and beginning farmers and ranchers as proposed in the budget.

*Algae Aquaculture.*—The Committee encourages the Farm Service Agency to consider algae aquaculture in awarding establishment and maintenance funding under the Biomass Crop Assistance Program.

*Continuous Conservation Reserve Program.*—The Secretary is strongly encouraged to, within the total acreage made available for enrollment in the conservation reserve program and without reducing the periodic availability of general signup, enroll, to the maximum extent practicable, acreage for activities included in the State Acres for Wildlife Enhancement practice or other similar administratively established wetland and habitat practices that benefit priority fish and wildlife species identified in State, regional, and national conservation initiatives with a priority for initiatives that provide large blocks of cover ideal for wildlife nesting.

*Information Technology.*—The Committee remains dedicated to ensuring FSA has reliable and functioning IT systems for optimal customer service, but the agency's investments and strategy in recent years have returned cost overruns and poor performance. As such, the Committee recommendation includes a decrease of \$10,000,000 for Modernize and Innovate the Delivery of Agricultural Systems [MIDAS]. The Committee remains concerned that despite continued investments in FSA IT generally, and MIDAS specifically, the agency lacks leadership and a clear path forward. Without shown improvement by the agency, the Committee cannot continue to provide the full amount for information technology requested in the budget.

Recently, the Office of Inspector General [OIG] and the Government Accountability Office [GAO] undertook systematic reviews of MIDAS and both reports outlined egregious and unacceptable practices undertaken by FSA during the design and implementation of MIDAS. This ultimately resulted in the decision to cease development, modernization, and enhancement activities. As OIG revealed, despite investing \$444,000,000, MIDAS is 2 years overdue and approximately \$140,000,000 over budget. This stems from ineffective project management and oversight on the part of FSA. FSA has failed to deliver a modernized, secure, and integrated IT solution that was promised to Congress and the agricultural community.

The Committee remains concerned by the GAO report that found USDA and FSA did not follow their own policies, and despite known weaknesses, management allowed the program to move forward. GAO also acknowledged that FSA “lacks the demonstrated capacity to manage successor programs” and “the agency has not established plans to improve its management”. This is not an acceptable use of tax payer dollars. The Committee continues statutory language that allows funds for IT to be obligated only after the Secretary meets certain reporting requirements. Per OIG recommendations, the Committee directs the Secretary to obtain a third-party analysis to determine if the current enterprise solution

provides the necessary functionality and is the most cost effective modernization solution. The Secretary is directed to report to the Committee by October 1, 2015 on this effort.

*Marketing Assistance Loan Program.*—The Committee directs the Secretary to operate the marketing assistance loan program in a way that encourages redemption and minimizes forfeitures of loan commodities to the Federal Government, and enables the orderly marketing of loan commodities throughout the year. Further, the Secretary shall ensure that the marketing assistance loan program remains a viable tool for all producers to use in marketing loan commodities freely and competitively.

*National Agriculture Imagery Program.*—The Committee recommends that funding shall be allocated to purchase imagery products to meet programmatic requirements.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$3,404,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	3,404,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,404,000

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. 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 \$3,404,000 for State Mediation Grants.

The Committee recognizes the rapidly growing complexity of American agriculture and as agriculture practices, markets, and technologies continue to evolve, new challenges and potential conflicts arise. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary to review ways that the State Mediation Programs can address new issues impacting agricultural producers, including issues involving agricultural leases, right-to-farm laws, and family farm transitions.

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$5,526,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	6,000,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for Grassroots Source Water Protection.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$500,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	500,000
Committee recommendation .....	500,000

Under the program, the Department makes indemnification payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products who, through no fault of their own, suffer income 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 2016 to be \$500,000, for indemnity payments to dairy farmers.

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.

*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.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a total loan level of \$6,402,114,000 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 2015 and the budget request levels:

#### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 enacted	Fiscal year 2016 budget	Committee recommendation
Farm Ownership:			
Direct .....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Guaranteed .....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Farm Operating:			
Direct .....	1,252,004	1,252,004	1,252,004
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	1,393,443	1,393,443	1,393,443
Emergency Loans .....	34,667	34,667	34,667
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition .....	2,000	2,000	2,000
Conservation Loans:			
Guaranteed .....	150,000	150,000	150,000
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Boll Weevil Eradication .....	60,000	60,000	60,000

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]

	2015 enacted	2016 budget	Committee recommendation
Farm Operating:			
Direct .....	63,101	53,961	53,961
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	14,770	14,352	14,352
Emergency Loans .....	856	1,262	1,262
Individual Development Account Grants .....		2,500	

## RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$74,829,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	76,946,000
Committee recommendation .....	74,829,000

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 Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79).

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 \$74,829,000 for the Risk Management Agency.

The Committee recognizes that there are many research priorities that competitive funding may be used to address, including the feasibility of insurance programs to cover business interruption due to integrator bankruptcy and catastrophic loss in the poultry industry. The Committee encourages RMA to support research into these priorities.

*Price Elections.*—The Committee continues to support RMA’s efforts to complete the organic price election series as required by the Agricultural Act of 2014. The Committee encourages RMA and NASS to formalize and institutionalize a plan for continuing to carry out the Organic Production Survey on an annual or biannual basis and report back to the Committee on this effort. The Committee encourages RMA to commit to the development of price factors that would allow information already collected by AMS to be used to greatly expand the number of organic price elections available.

## CORPORATIONS

## FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$8,930,502,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	8,175,224,000
Committee recommendation .....	8,175,224,000

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 \$300 per crop per county.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated to be \$8,175,224,000 in fiscal year 2016 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); the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246); and the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79).

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, 2015 .....	\$13,444,728,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	10,519,933,000
Committee recommendation .....	10,519,933,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated in fiscal year 2016 to be \$10,519,933,000, for the payment to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

Limitation, 2015 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	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, 2015 .....	\$898,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	898,000

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 \$898,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.

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, 2015 .....	\$846,428,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	831,231,000
Committee recommendation .....	855,209,000

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.

Resource appraisal and program development ensures that programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the con-

servation of soil, water, and related resources shall respond to the Nation's long-term needs.

Plant Materials Centers assemble, test, and encourage 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 inventory the Nation's basic soil resources and determine 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 \$855,209,000 for Conservation Operations. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$3,781,000 for increased rent costs, as requested in the budget, and does not accept the budget's proposed decrease of \$44,188,000 for fewer conservation plans.

*Acre-for-Acre Wetlands Mitigation.*—The Secretary is encouraged to use mitigation with the conversion of a natural wetland and equivalent wetlands functions at a ratio not to exceed a ratio of 1-to-1 acreage.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	\$200,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.) (16 U.S.C. 1000–1005, 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, and to further the conservation and proper utilization of land in authorized watersheds.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations Program.

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$12,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	

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 does not recommend an appropriation for the Watershed Rehabilitation Program.

### TITLE III

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

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

#### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$898,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	898,000

The Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development provides direction and coordination in carrying out laws 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 \$898,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.

*Bioenergy Program for Advanced Biofuels.*—The Committee is concerned with the interim rule proposed by the Department under the Bioenergy Program for Advanced Biofuels program (section 9005 of the Energy title of the farm bill, Public Law 113–79), which is intended to promote the development of different qualifying advanced fuel categories. The Committee is concerned that the allocation formula for distribution of section 9005 funds among the qualified fuel categories is inequitable, disproportionate, and inconsistent with the purpose and intent of the section 9005 program. The Committee urges the Department to administer the section 9005 program in a way that is fuel and technology-neutral. Consistent with these objectives, the Committee directs USDA to propose amendments to the interim rule to ensure that any final rule to implement section 9005 provides for a more equitable and proportional allocation of funding among the qualified advanced biofuels and the energy pathways they represent.

## RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 appropriation	2016 budget request	
Appropriation .....	224,201	226,717	228,701
Transfer from:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Loan Program Account .....	415,100	419,530	415,100
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Program Account .....	34,478	34,864	34,478
Rural Development Loan Program Account .....	4,439	4,488	4,439
Total, Rural Development salaries and expenses .....	678,218	685,599	682,718

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 \$682,718,000 for salaries and expenses of Rural Development.

## 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.

## RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2015 (budget authority) .....	\$510,943,000
Budget estimate, 2016 (budget authority) .....	511,354,000
Committee recommendation (budget authority) .....	502,741,000

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, farm labor 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 low-cost rental housing and related facilities in rural areas. These loans are repayable in terms up to 30 years.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$502,741,000 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 2015, as well as for administrative expenses. The following table presents the loan subsidy levels as compared to the 2015 levels and the 2016 budget request:

## RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2015 appropriation	2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
<b>Loan Levels:</b>			
Single-Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct .....	900,000	900,000	900,000
Guaranteed .....	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	26,279	26,278	26,278
Direct rental housing (sec. 515) .....	28,398	42,271	28,398
Guaranteed rental housing (sec. 538) .....	150,000	200,000	200,000
Site development loans (sec. 524) .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Credit sales of acquired property .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Self help land development loans (sec. 523) .....	5,000	.....	5,000
Farm labor housing loans (sec. 514) .....	23,602	23,855	23,602
Total, loan levels .....	25,148,279	25,207,404	25,198,278
<b>Loan Subsidies and Grants:</b>			
Single-Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct .....	66,420	60,750	60,750
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	3,687	3,424	3,424
Direct rental housing (sec. 515) .....	9,800	12,525	8,414
Farm labor housing loans (sec. 514) .....	7,600	6,789	6,717
Farm labor housing grants (sec. 516) .....	8,336	8,336	8,336
Total, loan subsidies and grants .....	95,843	91,824	87,641
Administrative expenses .....	415,100	419,530	415,100
Total, loan subsidies and administrative expenses .....	510,943	511,354	502,741

*Coordinated Environmental Reviews in Indian Country.*—Tribes face challenges with differing environmental review requirements when resources are leveraged from a variety of Federal housing and infrastructure programs. The Committee believes substantial efficiencies and cost-savings could be achieved by creating a coordinated project environmental review process. The Committee directs the Secretary to work with HUD, who is leading the initiative, and other agencies to investigate opportunities to design a coordinated environmental review process for tribal housing and related infrastructure development.

*Energy Efficiency.*—The Committee recognizes opportunities to reduce costs for rural housing and save taxpayer money by embracing energy efficiency standards in rural housing, with measures such as air sealing, and installing insulation, window films, and roofs.

*Housing Repair Program Limits.*—The Committee is concerned that the outdated housing repair program limits have not kept pace with modern home repair costs and is limiting the effectiveness of the program. The Committee directs the Secretary to examine the

potential impact of providing the Secretary with discretion to establish the maximum loan and grant levels, including the maximum level for unsecured 504 loans, and the maximum level of combined loans and grants available to an individual.

*Maturing Mortgages.*—The Committee is concerned about the increasing number of Section 515 multi-family housing loans that are reaching maturity and being paid off. As these loans mature and the projects leave the affordable housing program, low- and very low-income rural households could face untenable rent increases and possible eviction. The Committee has engaged the Government Accountability Office to analyze the circumstances and provide recommendations to stabilize the situation. In addition, the Secretary is directed to continue efforts to maintain the affordable multi-family housing portfolio and protect low- and very low-income rural residents from unmanageable rent increases.

*Subordinate Debt.*—The Committee is aware of USDA’s policy for Section 515 loans that prohibits the utilization of cash-flow debt on its subordinate financings (7 CFR 3560.306). The Committee acknowledges the important role that State agencies play in providing subordinate loans for rural rental housing properties, some of which allow the properties to repay the State loans only if there are surplus funds in the properties’ operating budgets. However, USDA regulations disallow that use for surplus funds, and thereby diminish financing available from State sources. The Committee directs the Secretary to develop a long-term solution to promote the preservation of affordable rural rental housing that allows State agencies to use cash-flow loan financing to fully leverage Federal funding with State dollars and provide affordable housing for rural residents.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$1,088,500,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	1,171,900,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,167,000,000

Rental assistance is authorized under section 521(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1490a). 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 the Rural Housing Service section 515 rural rental housing program 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,167,000,000 for the Rental Assistance Program.

*Rental Assistance.*—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 funded for 1-year durations and shall not be renewed within a 12-month period. The Committee recommendation does not include statutory language authorizing the Secretary to selectively renew RA agreements as proposed in the budget. In addition the Committee does not concur with the President’s budget request regarding changes to the required timeframe for which contracts must be renewed, and thus retains the currently enacted language requiring that RA agreements entered into or renewed during the current fiscal year shall be funded for a 1-year period. The Secretary is encouraged to support preservation and revitalization efforts for properties in greatest need, and utilize any unexpended balances at the end of the 1-year period toward rental assistance, debt reduction, maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation purposes.

The Committee has lost confidence in USDA’s ability to accurately estimate rental assistance needs. The Department has a well-established history of faulty calculations and subsequent ad hoc, informal, requests for additional funds to cover shortfalls. This behavior places very low- and low-income rural households at risk of untenable rent increases, and undermines the credit soundness of Rural Development’s \$11,000,000,000 multi-family housing loan portfolio. The Secretary is directed to effect process changes that will result in the fiscal year 2017 budget request revealing the true amount needed to renew all expiring rental assistance contracts. Further, the Secretary is directed to report to the Committee, within 30 days of enactment, on the Department’s path forward regarding that effort. In addition, the Committee has engaged the Government Accountability Office to perform a comprehensive review and to provide recommendations.

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$24,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	34,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	24,000,000

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 prepaid 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 and a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of affordable multi-family housing projects. Rural Development’s multi-family housing portfolio faces dual pressures for loan repayments 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 to meet the most urgent local needs for tenant protection and project revitalization.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$24,000,000 for the Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program, including \$7,000,000 for vouchers and \$17,000,000 for a housing preservation demonstration program.

#### MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$27,500,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	10,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	27,500,000

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 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 \$27,500,000 for Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants.

#### RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$32,239,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	25,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	32,239,000

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 re-

pairs, 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 \$32,239,000 for the Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program.

The following table compares the grant program levels recommended by the Committee to the fiscal year 2015 levels and the budget request:

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS  
[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 level	2016 request	
Very low-income housing repair grants .....	28,701	25,000	28,701
Housing preservation grants .....	3,538	.....	3,538
Total .....	32,239	25,000	32,239

The Committee recommends that the Rural Housing Service prioritize funding for communities with unique weather patterns in need of replacing antiquated heating systems with more efficient technologies.

#### RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$30,278,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	62,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,778,000

Community facility loans were created by the Rural Development Act of 1972 (7 U.S.C. 1926 et seq.) to finance a variety of rural community facilities. Loans are made to organizations, including certain Indian tribes and corporations not operated for profit and public and 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, fire and rescue facilities, and educational 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 \$28,778,000 for the Rural Community Facilities Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2015 and budget request levels:

#### RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Loan levels and budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 appropriation	2016 budget request	Committee recommendations
<b>Loan levels:</b>			
Community facilities direct loans .....	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Community facilities guaranteed loans .....	73,222	.....	84,746
<b>Total loan levels .....</b>	<b>2,273,222</b>	<b>2,200,000</b>	<b>2,284,746</b>
<b>Budget authority:</b>			
Community facilities guaranteed loans .....	3,500	.....	2,000
Community facilities grants .....	13,000	50,000	13,000
Economic initiative grants .....	5,778	.....	5,778
Rural community development initiative .....	4,000	4,000	4,000

## RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT—Continued

[Loan levels and budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 appropriation	2016 budget request	Committee recommendations
Tribal college grants .....	4,000	8,000	4,000
Total budget authority .....	30,278	62,000	28,778

## 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.

## RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$74,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	81,444,000
Committee recommendation .....	62,687,000

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

Rural business development grants were authorized by the Agricultural Act of 2014 and can be made to governmental and non-profit entities, and Indian tribes. Up to 10 percent of appropriated funds may be used to: identify and analyze business opportunities; identify, train, and provide technical assistance to existing or prospective rural entrepreneurs and managers; assist in the establishment of new rural businesses and the maintenance of existing businesses; conduct economic development planning, coordination and leadership development; and establish centers for training, technology, and trade. The balance of appropriated funding may be used for projects that support the development of business enterprises that finance or facilitate: the development of small and emerging private business enterprise; the establishment, expansion, and operation of rural distance learning networks; the development of rural learning programs; and the provision of technical assistance and training to rural communities for the purpose of improving passenger transportation.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$62,687,000 for the Rural Business Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2015 and budget request levels:

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
[Loan levels and budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 appropriation	2016 budget request	Committee recommendations
Loan levels:			
Business and industry guaranteed loans loan levels .....	919,765	758,222	919,765
Budget authority:			
Business and industry guaranteed loans .....	47,000	31,444	35,687
Rural business development grants .....	24,000	30,000	24,000
Delta Regional Authority grants .....	3,000	.....	3,000
Rural child poverty demonstration .....	.....	20,000	.....
Total budget authority .....	74,000	81,444	62,687

*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.

## INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM FUND

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 level	2016 request	
Estimated loan level .....	18,889	10,014	18,889
Direct loan subsidy .....	5,818	2,766	5,217
Administrative expenses .....	4,439	4,488	4,439
Total, loan subsidies and administrative expenses .....	10,257	7,254	9,656

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 113–79, the Agricultural Act of 2014.

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

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated in 2016, as well as for administrative expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,656,000 for the Intermediary Relending Program Fund.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Estimated loan level
Fiscal year 2015 level .....	33,077
Fiscal year 2016 request .....	85,004
Committee recommendation .....	48,013

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 credit 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 \$48,013,000, 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 Energy Savings Program.*—The Secretary is directed to initiate rulemaking to create a subprogram of the Rural Economic Development Loan and Grant Program to be used as a means to carry out the activities authorized by the Rural Energy Savings Program, authorized by the Agricultural Act of 2014, and within 30 days of enactment of this act report to the Committee on the status of that rule. The Secretary is further directed to maintain, to the degree practicable, no less than the fiscal year 2015 loan level for the traditional Rural Economic Development Loan and Grant Program.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$22,050,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	21,087,000
Committee recommendation .....	22,050,000

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

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$22,050,000 for Rural Cooperative Development Grants.

Of the funds recommended, \$2,500,000 is for the Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas program.

The Committee has included language in the bill that not more than \$3,000,000 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 \$10,750,000 for value-added agricultural product market development grants.

RURAL MICROENTERPRISE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	\$4,653,000
Committee recommendation .....	

This program, authorized by section 379E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981 et seq.), provides loans and grants to intermediaries that assist micro-entrepreneurs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommendation does not include funding for the Rural Microenterprise Investment Program.

RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$1,350,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	10,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	500,000

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 \$500,000 for the Rural Energy for America Program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendation as compared to the fiscal year 2015 and budget request levels:

#### RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 level	2016 request	Committee recommendation
Estimated loan level .....	12,760	75,758	7,576
Guaranteed loan subsidy .....	1,350	5,000	500
Grants .....		5,000	

*Energy Efficiency Coordination.*—The Committee encourages increased coordination and cooperation between USDA Rural Development agencies and offices to better utilize the energy efficiency and renewable energy programs available through the Rural Energy for America Program.

#### HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 2015 .....	
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	\$12,750,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,000,000

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

#### RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	\$6,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommendation does not include funding for the Rural Business Investment Program.

#### 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.

#### RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$464,857,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	483,320,000
Committee recommendation .....	496,738,000



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 quasi-public 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 \$496,738,000 for the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account.

The Committee recommends \$66,500,000 for water and waste disposal systems grants for Native Americans, including Native Alaskans, the Colonias, and residents of Hawaiian Home Lands. The Committee recognizes the special needs and problems for delivery of basic services to these populations. In addition, the Committee makes up to \$16,500,000 available for the circuit rider program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2015 and budget request levels:

#### RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Loan levels and budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015 appropriation	2016 budget request	Committee recommendation
<b>Loan levels:</b>			
Water and waste disposal direct loans .....	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Water and waste disposal guaranteed loans .....	50,000	.....	50,000
Total loan levels .....	1,250,000	1,200,000	1,250,000
<b>Budget authority:</b>			
Water and waste disposal direct loans .....	.....	31,320	31,320
Water and waste disposal guaranteed loans .....	295	.....	275
Water and waste disposal grants .....	347,150	368,900	347,150
Solid waste management grants .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
Water well systems grants .....	993	.....	993
Colonias and AK/HI/Native American grants .....	66,500	54,240	66,500
Water and waste water revolving funds .....	1,000	.....	1,000
High energy cost grants .....	10,000	.....	10,000
Circuit rider .....	15,919	11,300	16,500
Technical assistance grants .....	19,000	13,560	19,000
Total, budget authority .....	464,857	483,320	496,738

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 2016, 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 2015 and budget request levels:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 level	2016 request	
Loan authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct FFB .....	5,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Guaranteed underwriting .....	500,000	.....	750,000
Telecommunications .....	690,000	.....	690,000
Direct, Treasury Rate .....	.....	345,000	.....
Direct, FFB .....	.....	345,000	.....
Total loan authorization .....	6,190,000	6,690,000	7,440,000
Total budget authority .....	.....	104	104
Administrative expenses .....	34,478	34,864	34,478

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM  
LOANS AND GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 level	2016 request	
Loan and grant levels:			
Distance learning and Telemedicine Program:			
Grants .....	22,000	24,950	22,000

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM  
LOANS AND GRANTS—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 level	2016 request	
Broadband program:			
Treasury rate loans .....	24,077	44,239	20,576
Treasury rate loans budget authority .....	4,500	9,675	4,500
Grants .....	10,372	20,372	10,372
Total DLT and Broadband Program level .....	56,449	89,561	52,948
Total DLT and Broadband Budget authority .....	36,872	54,997	36,872

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 healthcare 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 \$36,872,000 for the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program. Funds recommended for the RUS broadband program are intended to promote broadband availability in those areas where there is not otherwise a business case for private investment in a broadband network. The Committee encourages RUS to focus expenditures on projects that bring broadband service to currently unserved households.

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

*Broadband Grants.*—Of the funds recommended, \$10,372,000 in grants shall be made available to support broadband transmission for rural areas.

*Broadband Program.*—The Agricultural Act of 2014 made several changes to the Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees Program. The changes expand the definition of eligible service areas and establish new minimum broadband speed requirements for carriers receiving loans from the program. The Committee applauds these changes and believes that a comprehensive rural broadband strategy should include investment in advanced networks that will meet the needs of a 21st century economy. The Committee directs the Department of Agriculture to expedite the

implementation of the broadband provisions of the Agricultural Act of 2014, including the new authority to increase the minimum speeds available in rural communities.

*Rural Utilities Service and Coordination on Telecommunications Services.*—The Committee recognizes the Rural Utilities Services' [RUS] vital role in expanding access to broadband services in rural America. In addition, the Committee notes the importance of the RUS coordinating its efforts with the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] on programs designed to support broadband investment in rural America. Recent FCC policy changes on deploying broadband in rural areas effect rural carriers with outstanding RUS loans and carriers aiming to use RUS loans to build out networks in the coming years. To ensure that RUS and FCC policies are aligned to optimize the use of limited resources and carriers are well equipped to serve the hardest-to-reach rural Americans, the Committee directs RUS and the FCC to coordinate on major policy decisions.

TITLE IV  
DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

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

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$816,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	824,000
Committee recommendation .....	816,000

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 \$816,000 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, postpartum, 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.

*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 low-income elderly persons age 60 and over.

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

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$21,300,170,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	21,587,277,000
Committee recommendation .....	21,524,377,000

The Child Nutrition Programs, authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (Public Law 79-396) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-642), provide Federal assistance to State agencies in the form of cash and commodities for use in preparing and serving nutritious meals to children while they are attending school, residing in service institutions, or participating in other organized activities away from home. The purpose of these programs is to help maintain the health and proper physical development of America's children. Milk is provided to children either free or at a low cost, depending on their family income level. FNS provides cash subsidies to States for administering

the programs and directly administers the program in the States which choose not to do so. Grants are also made for nutritional training and surveys and for State administrative expenses. Under current law, most of these payments are made on the basis of reimbursement rates established by law and applied to lunches and breakfasts actually served by the States. The reimbursement rates are adjusted annually to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for food away from home.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends \$21,524,377,000 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	2016 budget	Committee recommendation
School Lunch Program .....	11,777,825	11,777,825
School Breakfast Program .....	4,230,498	4,230,498
Child and Adult Care Food Program .....	3,240,646	3,240,646
Summer Food Service Program .....	535,633	535,633
Special Milk Program .....	11,314	11,314
State Administrative Expenses .....	269,652	269,652
Commodity Procurement .....	1,322,088	1,322,088
Team Nutrition/HUSSC/CMS .....	17,004	17,004
Food Safety Education .....	2,761	2,761
Coordinated Review .....	10,000	10,000
Computer Support .....	11,430	11,430
CACFP Training and Technical Assistance .....	20,267	20,267
CNP Studies and Evaluation .....	22,400	20,400
Farm to School Team .....	3,297	3,297
Payment Accuracy .....	10,562	10,562
School Meal Equipment Grants .....	35,000	25,000
Summer EBT Demonstration .....	66,900	16,000

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

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

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$6,623,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	6,623,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,513,000,000

The special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children [WIC] is authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Its purpose is to safeguard the health of pregnant, breast-feeding and postpartum women and infants, and children up to age 5 who are at nutritional risk because of inadequate nutrition and inadequate income.

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

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,513,000,000 for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC].

The Committee recommendation fully funds estimated WIC participation in fiscal year 2016. The Committee recommendation includes \$60,000,000 for breastfeeding support initiatives, \$13,600,000 for infrastructure, and \$55,000,000 for management information systems.

*WIC Food Package.*—The Committee understands the Department is working with the Institute of Medicine to make recommendations to update the WIC food packages to reflect current science and cultural factors. The Committee maintains its interest in the recommendations that will be made regarding the fish species that scientific evidence shows to be low in mercury and are in other respects nutritious, including wild salmon, for inclusion in WIC Food Packages IV, V, VI, and VII that serve children age 1 to 4 years and pregnant, postpartum, and breastfeeding women. The Committee expects the Department to conduct a thorough and efficient review of this question and issue its final report in a timely manner.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$81,837,570,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	83,692,069,000
Committee recommendation .....	81,662,069,000

The Food Stamp Program was reauthorized through fiscal year 2012 and renamed the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program [SNAP] in 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 \$81,662,069,000 for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Of the amount recommended, \$3,000,000,000 is made available as a contingency reserve.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$278,501,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	288,317,000
Committee recommendation .....	288,317,000

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

*The Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP].*—Authorized by section 4(a) of the Agricultural and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note), as amended in 1981 by Public Law 97–98 and in 2014 by Public Law 113–79, this program provides supplemental food to low-income senior citizens and in some cases low-income infants and children up to age six, low-income pregnant and postpartum women. The Agricultural Act of 2014 discontinued the admission of new pregnant and postpartum women and children into the program. Those already in the program can continue to receive assistance until they are no longer eligible.

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.

*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.

*Pacific Island and Disaster 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.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$288,317,000 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 \$221,298,000 for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. This amount fully funds participation in fiscal year 2016.

*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 \$16,548,000 for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and directs the Secretary to obligate these funds within 45 days.

*The Emergency Food Assistance Program.*—The Agricultural Act of 2014 provides \$324,000,000 for TEFAP commodities to be purchased with Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funds. The Committee recommendation includes \$49,401,000 for TEFAP transportation, storage, and program integrity. In addition, the Committee recommendation grants the Secretary authority to transfer up to an additional 10 percent from TEFAP commodities for this purpose and urges the Secretary to use this authority.

The Committee encourages the Secretary to identify opportunities for increasing the supply of TEFAP commodities in the coming fiscal year through bonus and specialty crop purchases. The Department shall make available to the States domestically produced catfish fillets for distribution to local agencies.

## NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$150,824,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	155,564,000
Committee recommendation .....	151,824,000

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 and Disaster 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 \$151,824,000 for Nutrition Programs Administration. The Committee does not recommend an increase of \$1,000,000 for MyPlate/SuperTracker per the budget request.

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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations	Transfers from loan accounts	Total
Appropriations, 2015 .....	181,423	6,394	187,817
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	191,631	6,394	198,025
Committee recommendation .....	187,225	6,394	193,619

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 98 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 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 \$193,619,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including a direct appropriation of \$187,225,000. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$3,500,000 for the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program and an increase of

\$2,302,000 for International Cooperative Administrative Support Services.

*Borlaug Fellows Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 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.

*Cochran Fellowship Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,300,000 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.

*Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program.*—The Committee expects the FAS to fund the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program.

*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.

FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE I DIRECT CREDIT AND FOOD FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$2,528,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	2,528,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,528,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,528,000 for administrative expenses to continue servicing existing Food for Peace title I agreements.

FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$1,466,000,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	1,400,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,466,000,000

*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 \$1,466,000,000 for Food for Peace title II grants.

*202(e) Authority.*—The Administrator for the U.S. Agency for International Development shall provide through the Secretary of Agriculture a report, no later than March 1, 2016, on the use of authorities under section 202(e) of the Food for Peace Act during fiscal year 2015 and planned for fiscal year 2016. This report should identify and evaluate the type, challenges, and success of such activities.

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

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$191,626,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	191,626,000
Committee recommendation .....	201,626,000

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 \$201,626,000 for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

*Local and Regional Procurement.*—The Committee provides an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for efforts to build long-term agriculture sustainability and establish a local investment in school feeding programs. With direct U.S. commodity contributions, projects supported by the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program have significantly improved the attendance, nourishment, and learning capacity of school-aged children in low-income countries throughout the impoverished world. New funding authorities would enable school feeding programs to proactively transition from direct commodity assistance to locally source agriculture products. The Committee directs the Secretary to conduct the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Project Program in accordance with the priorities of the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL FOOD AID PROCUREMENT PROJECT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2015 .....	
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	\$20,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Project Program, as requested in the budget. The Committee instead provides \$10,000,000 for this purpose through the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education Program.

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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Guaranteed loan levels	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2015 .....	5,500,000	6,748
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	5,500,000	6,748
Committee recommendation .....	5,500,000	6,748

In 1980, the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] instituted the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM-102) under its charter authority. With this program, CCC guarantees, for a fee, payments due U.S. exporters under deferred payment sales contracts (up to 36 months) for defaults due to commercial as well as noncommercial risks. The risk to CCC extends from the date of export to the end of the deferred payment period covered in the export sales contract and covers only that portion of the payments agreed to in the assurance agreement. Operation of this program is based on criteria which will assure that it is used only where it is determined that it will develop new market opportunities and maintain and expand existing world markets for U.S. agricultural commodities. The program encourages U.S. financial institutions to provide financing to those areas where the institutions would be unwilling to provide financing in the absence of the CCC guarantees. 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 AGENCY 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 in a timely way, and to monitor products for continued safety while 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, radiological, 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.

In January 2011, the Food Safety Modernization Act was signed into law. This law enables FDA to better protect public health by strengthening the food safety system. It enables FDA to focus more on preventing food safety and feed problems rather than relying primarily on reacting to problems after they occur. The law also provides FDA with new enforcement authorities designed to achieve higher rates of compliance with prevention- and risk-based food and feed safety standards and to better respond to and contain problems when they do occur. The law also gives FDA important new tools to hold imported food and feed to the same standards as domestic food and feed and directs FDA to build an integrated national food safety system in partnership with State and local authorities.

The FDA Drugs programs are comprised of four separate areas, Human Drugs, Animal Drugs, Medical Devices and Biologics. FDA is responsible for the lifecycle of products, including premarket review and postmarket surveillance of human and animal drugs, medical devices and biological products to ensure their safety and effectiveness. 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 effective 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.

In 2009, Congress granted FDA new authority to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and marketing of tobacco products. FDA exercises this responsibility by protecting the public health from the health effects of tobacco, setting scientific standards and standards for tobacco product review, conducting compliance activities to enforce its authority over tobacco, and conducting public education and outreach about the health effects of tobacco products.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation	User fees	Total
Appropriations, 2015 .....	2,588,536	1,854,820	4,443,356
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	2,734,715	2,129,308	4,864,023
Committee recommendation .....	2,628,978	1,930,685	4,559,663

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,628,978,000 for FDA salaries and expenses. The Committee also recommends \$826,072,000 in Prescription Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$134,475,000 in Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act user fee collections; \$22,140,000 in Animal Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$7,429,000 in Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$599,000,000 in Tobacco Product user fee collections; \$320,029,000 in Generic Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$21,540,000 in Biosimilar User Fee Act user fee collections; \$5,300,000 in Voluntary Qualified Importer Program collections; \$1,434,000 in food and feed recall collections; \$6,414,000 in food reinspection collections; \$20,109,000 in Mammography Quality Standards Act fee collections; and \$13,835,000 in export and certification fees, as assumed in the President's budget. The Committee recommendation includes bill language which prohibits FDA from developing, establishing, or operating any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

The Committee recommendation does not include proposed user fees for food facility registration and inspection, food import, food contact substance notification, cosmetics, and international courier imports. None of these user fee proposals have been authorized by Congress. The Committee will continue to monitor any action by the appropriate authorizing Committees regarding these proposed user fees.

The Committee expects FDA to continue all projects, activities, laboratories, and programs as included in fiscal year 2015 unless otherwise specified. The Committee accepts \$11,588,000 in proposed administrative savings; however the Committee does not support the proposed \$4,333,000 reduction to the National Center for Toxicological Research.

The Committee includes increases of \$45,000,000 for the implementation of FSMA. These increases consist of: \$20,500,000 for Inspection Modernization and Training; \$8,000,000 for the National Integrated Food Safety System; \$10,000,000 for Education and Technical Assistance for Industry; \$3,000,000 for Technical Staffing and Guidance Development; and \$3,500,000 for Import Safety. The increases provided in this bill and the increases provided since fiscal year 2011 should assist FDA in preparation for the implementation of FSMA prior to the effective dates of the seven foundational proposed rules. While the FDA has not implemented the final rules, the Committee understands that most businesses will not need to comply with the two rules for preventive controls for human food and for animal food until August 2016 and that the other five rules will not be effective until fiscal year 2017 and later. Given the diversity in the food industry, FSMA was intentionally designed to be risk-based, flexible, and science-based. A one-size fits all approach will not work. Yet, the Committee is concerned that the agency not take an overly prescriptive approach with the regulations, including the final regulation on produce safety and the final regulations on preventive controls for human and animal food. Accordingly, FDA shall ensure all FSMA regulations are risk-based, flexible, and science-based, and carefully consider the well-

established and recognized standards for food and produce safety already employed through much of the industry. FDA shall ensure that any regulatory proposal or final regulation minimizes, to the extent appropriate to protect public health, the necessity to conduct verification testing activities.

The Committee provides an increase of \$5,000,000 for medical product safety initiatives. Included in this amount is \$3,000,000 for combating antibiotic resistant bacteria as part of the National Strategy for Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria [CARB] and \$2,000,000 for the Precision Medicine Initiative. According to the FDA's fiscal year 2016 budget request, the Agency is spending approximately \$32,500,000 on antimicrobial resistance activities in fiscal year 2015. With this increase, FDA is expected to spend approximately \$35,500,000 on combating antibiotic resistance in fiscal year 2016.

The following table reflects the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2015 and budget request levels:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2015 enacted	2016 request	
Centers and related field activities:			
Foods .....	903,403	987,328	948,403
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition [CFSAN] .....	279,994	303,994	296,894
Field Activities .....	623,409	683,334	651,509
Human Drugs .....	482,287	484,678	481,245
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research [CDER] .....	346,080	352,513	349,080
Field Activities .....	136,207	132,165	132,165
Biologics .....	211,382	215,021	209,754
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research [CBER] .....	171,096	174,052	169,890
Field Activities .....	40,286	40,969	39,864
Animal Drugs .....	147,577	165,752	144,577
Center for Veterinary Medicine [CVM] .....	93,505	101,105	90,505
Field Activities .....	54,072	64,647	54,072
Medical and radiological devices .....	320,825	327,760	319,937
Center for Devices and Radiological Health .....	240,345	246,166	240,308
Field Activities .....	80,480	81,594	79,629
National Center for Toxicological Research .....	63,331	58,998	63,331
Other Activities .....	174,862	181,314	174,862
Rent and related activities .....	115,987	137,181	117,987
Rental Payments to GSA .....	168,882	176,683	168,882
Total, FDA salaries and expenses, new budget authority .....	2,588,536	2,734,715	2,628,978

*Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients.*—The Committee is concerned that the FDA has not yet approved a list of active pharmaceutical ingredients [APIs] for use by compounding pharmacists pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act [FDCA]. Within 90 days of the enactment of this act, the FDA is directed to provide a timeline for when the remaining substances will be considered, and in the meantime re-consider its policy with regard to enforcement of the bulk drug substances provisions under section 503A.

*Alcohol Based Hand Sanitizers.*—The Committee strongly supports the systematic review of healthcare antiseptic active ingredients used in alcohol based hand sanitizers [ABHS] products marketed under the over-the-counter [OTC] monograph to ensure the safety of healthcare workers and consumers, but is concerned about

the potential impacts to public health that could occur if ABHS products containing healthcare antiseptic active ingredients are reclassified in a final monograph without full review of available, appropriate science based data and risk models. The FDA is requested not to issue a final monograph regarding OTC healthcare antiseptic active ingredients that are used in ABHS products, until full and fair consideration is given to existing evidence that has been provided to FDA that supports general recognition of safety and effectiveness of OTC ABHS products, and to potential costs associated with the final monograph.

*Biosimilars.*—The Committee is concerned that FDA has failed to provide the public adequate opportunity to review and comment on regulatory standards for the approval and oversight of biosimilar drugs. Therefore, FDA is directed to provide the Committee with an estimated timeline by which the agency will: finalize all pending draft biosimilars guidance documents, publish draft biosimilar guidance documents included in its 2015 regulatory agenda, and finalize those draft guidance documents. The Committee expects to receive this report no later than 2 weeks after the Committee reports this legislation.

*Centers of Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation.*—The Committee is encouraged by the ongoing research and collaboration underway at the Centers of Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation program and commends the FDA for launching this program in 2011 and expanding it in 2014. As such, the Committee directs the Office of the Commissioner to use at least \$2,000,000 within existing funds to provide additional funding opportunities for the existing CERSI Centers to allow for the capitalization of ongoing studies and research.

*Comparative Oncology.*—The Committee recognizes the value in using data from cancers in companion animals to provide answers to important translational questions about cancer biology, diagnosis, and treatment. This research offers an important opportunity to study cancers in thousands of subjects to benefit both human patients and pets. The Committee requests FDA address the use of companion animals in diagnosis and treatment research and encourage the FDA to open grant opportunities in animal models to increase the study of the 1 million companion animals that naturally develop cancer each year.

*Cord Blood Regulation.*—The Committee directs the FDA to undergo a review and seriously consider the potential need for revision of the current regulatory requirements for cord blood licensure, particularly those related to manufacturing and storage, to ensure the correct applicability to this industry since the current regulatory requirements being applied are the same ones that apply to pharmaceutical products. In addition, the Committee directs the FDA to create an advisory task force, comprised of a minimum of public and private cord blood bankers, transplanters and patients, to provide recommendations to the agency about the current licensing requirements and changes that may be necessary.

*Cosmetics.*—The Committee provides not less than \$11,700,000 for cosmetics activities, including not less than \$7,200,000 for the Office of Colors and Cosmetics [OCAC]. Funding for OCAC is for the direct support of the operation, staffing, compliance, research

and international activities performed by this office. The Committee notes that FDA's budget submission stated that FDA would meet a March 2015 deadline, set by this Committee, to respond to a citizen petition regarding trace amounts of lead in cosmetics. This has not occurred, and this unacceptable delay is indicative of longstanding issues with FDA's review of cosmetics. Since 1976, cosmetic ingredients have been reviewed by a private Cosmetic Ingredient Review program, established by the cosmetic industry, with nonvoting FDA participation. The Committee directs FDA to work with the industry to study the transfer of this program to a more formal public-private partnership, similar to the United States Pharmacopeia, if appropriate and beneficial for consumers, and to report back to the Committee on this effort.

*Deeming Regulations.*—The Committee notes that the Family Smoking and Prevention and Tobacco Control Act, which became law in 2009, gave FDA immediate authority over certain tobacco products, and gave authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to deem other products subject to FDA regulation. On April 25, 2014, nearly 5 years after it had been granted the authority to do so, FDA issued those proposed deeming regulations, but has not yet finalized them. FDA is therefore directed to issue a final regulation addressing the deeming of other tobacco products under FDA's jurisdiction within 30 days and to act expediently to implement that regulation once finalized.

*Drug Shortages.*—The Committee is very concerned about continuing drug shortages, and the serious effects they can have on patients, including children. The Committee directs the Food and Drug Administration to report to the Committee on the work of FDA's intra-agency Drug Shortages Task Force. This report should include which offices and centers are represented on the task force, and how it works with other government agencies and outside stakeholders to address drug shortages. The report should also specify what activities the Task Force has undertaken to prevent drug shortages affecting pediatric patients, including working with outside experts on this issue.

*Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy.*—The Committee is aware that a patient-focused draft guidance for drug development on Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy was submitted to FDA in June 2014. The Committee supports this initiative and requests that FDA provide a detailed description of its plans to move forward with the development of a related guidance.

*Farm Regulations.*—The Committee remains concerned about how the FDA will determine whether and to what degree a farm or food business is subject to regulation. It is important that FDA is careful to apply new rules appropriately for the size of the operation in accordance with congressional intent.

*Foreign High Risk Inspections.*—As the importation of drugs, food, and medical devices from China continue to increase, the Committee is concerned about the FDA's ability to keep pace with the exporter universe and volume of exports. For fiscal year 2015, an additional \$2,000,000 was provided for foreign drug safety to address the growing number of human drugs produced overseas and the increasing number of imported drug shipments in order to ensure the continued safety and quality of these products. These

funds have been provided to support the agency's overseas inspections, work with industry and other stakeholders in safety in manufacturing, strengthen agency relationships with foreign regulators, and analyze trends and events that might affect the safety of FDA-regulated products exported to the United States.

The Committee is supportive of FDA as it moves toward a more, targeted, risk-based, and efficient inspection model that incorporates commercially available information on high-risk establishments. As with other Federal agencies, such as CMS, better data has helped to make sure a company exists and is in good standing prior to an inspection and to help prioritize FDA's investigations and triage safety inspections. Within the funds provided for the China Safety Initiative the Committee directs the FDA to maintain robust funding for onsite verification support and integration of results in FDA inspection planning.

*In Silico Clinical Trials.*—In Silico clinical trials use computer models and simulations to develop and assess devices and drugs, including their potential risk to the public, before being tested in live clinical trials. Advanced computer modeling may also prove useful in helping to predict how a drug or device will behave when deployed in the general population or when used in particular circumstances, thereby helping to protect the public from the unintended consequences of side effects and drug interactions. In Silico trials may potentially protect public health, advance personalized treatment, and be executed quickly and for a fraction of the cost of a full scale live trial. The FDA has advocated the use of such systems as an additional innovative research tool. Therefore, the Committee urges FDA to engage with device and drug sponsors to explore greater use, where appropriate, of In Silico trials for advancing new devices and drug therapy applications.

*In Vitro Clinical Trials.*—In Vitro clinical trials use specimens collected from patients to test how a particular cancer or disease will react to a specific therapy or combination of therapies. This personalized approach to treatment can improve a patient's quality of life by increasing the likelihood that physicians and researchers will find the proper combination of drugs uniquely suited to treat that individual's illness. An emerging new scientific methodology, In Vitro trials allow researchers to test therapeutics and treatment strategies on living human tissues without the risks posed by traditional whole patient clinical trials. Personalized treatment through In Vitro trials dismantles the "one size fits all" approach to care and enables medical professionals to diagnose and treat patients in a more efficient and effective way. While the Committee recognizes that In Vitro tests may not always predict clinical responses, it urges the FDA to continue to engage with drug sponsors to explore greater use, where appropriate, of In Vitro clinical trials for drug development programs under Investigational New Drug applications and general therapeutic indications, especially as it relates to complicated cancers and other common disease states.

*Mammography Quality Standards Act.*—The Committee recommendation includes full funding as requested for implementation of the Mammography Quality Standards Act. This program sets national quality standards for mammography facilities, equipment, personnel and operating procedures, and has improved the

quality of mammography and made mammograms a more reliable tool to detect breast cancers.

*Mammography Reports.*—The Food and Drug Administration is directed to revise its regulations regarding the summary mammography reports in lay language provided to patients to require the inclusion of information on the patient's breast tissue density; an explanation that dense tissue may mask the presence of breast cancer on mammograms; and advice that patients speak with their healthcare provider about whether they would benefit from additional tests, and about any other questions they may have. The FDA should also revise its regulations regarding the medical report provided to healthcare providers to require the inclusion of information on the patient's breast density and the masking effect such tissue may have on detecting breast cancer.

*Master Plan.*—The Committee has included \$3,000,000 for FDA to complete a feasibility study to update and issue a revised Master Plan for the White Oak campus in order to address its expanded workforce and the facilities needed to accommodate them. The Committee directs FDA to report on this effort by January 1, 2016.

*Medical Gases.*—The Committee is concerned that FDA has not initiated rulemaking to address numerous longstanding regulatory issues for medical gases despite the statutory requirement in FDASIA to issue a final rulemaking addressing all necessary changes for medical gases by July 9, 2016. Designated medical gases are a unique class of drugs that differ significantly from traditional pharmaceuticals and therefore must be addressed in the Federal drug regulations to prevent safety and enforcement issues caused by current regulations. The Committee disagrees with the FDA report to Congress sent on June 30, 2015 that despite decades of issues created by existing regulations “the current regulatory framework is adequate and sufficiently flexible to appropriately regulate medical gases.”

*Nanotechnology.*—The Committee recognizes the increased capabilities that FDA has developed to study environment, health, and safety of nanomaterials within FDA's Jefferson Laboratory Campus, including the National Center for Toxicological Research, and its consolidated headquarters at White Oak, Maryland. The Committee expects FDA to continue to support collaborative research with universities and industry on the toxicology of nanotechnology products and processes in accordance with the National Nanotechnology Initiative Environment, Health, and Safety Research Strategy as updated in October 2011.

*National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$10,800,000 for the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System, equal to the level provided in fiscal year 2015.

*Nutrition Facts Label.*—The Committee is concerned that the FDA has not published in the Federal Register the results of FDA's “Experimental Study on Consumer Responses to Nutrition Facts Labels with Various Footnote Formats and Declaration of Amount of Added Sugars” (78 FR 32394, May 30, 2013). The purpose of the study, as described by the Agency, is “to examine how consumers would comprehend and use this new information”. Given that sound science, peer review and transparency are essential to effec-

tive protection of public health, the Committee encourages the FDA to release this study for public review and comment prior to finalizing changes to the Nutrition Facts label.

*Opioid Overdose Prevention.*—The Committee notes that on June 15, 2015, the CDC issued a report on “Opioid Overdose Prevention Programs Providing Naloxone to Laypersons”, in which the CDC noted the benefits of expanding access to the life-saving drug naloxone, which reverses the effects of an opioid overdose. The Committee urges FDA to promote the development and widespread usage of naloxone products. The agency’s efforts should include working closely with product sponsors interested in marketing naloxone for use without a prescription to expedite review and decisionmaking.

*Oversight Activities.*—The Committee notes that over the past 5 years FDA’s responsibilities and resources have grown significantly. The Committee is concerned that oversight of FDA has not kept pace with the growth in the agency’s regulatory authority or funding. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for the HHS Office of Inspector General specifically for oversight of FDA activities. The funding provided under this appropriation is in addition to FDA oversight activities supported within the Inspector General’s regular appropriation. The Committee instructs the Inspector General to submit a plan, within 60 days of the enactment of this act, on the additional oversight activities planned with this funding.

*Pediatric Device Consortia Grants.*—The Committee is pleased that the nine FDA-funded Pediatric Device Consortia have assisted in the development of more than 450 proposed pediatric medical devices since its inception in 2009, as well as promoting job-growth in the healthcare sector, and as such, continues to support this critical effort. The program funds consortia to assist innovators in developing medical and surgical devices designed for the unique needs of children that often go unmet by devices currently available on the market. The Committee directs FDA to fund this program at the highest possible level within available resources, and at no less than the level funded in the previous year.

*Repackaging for Long Term Care Pharmacies.*—In February the Food and Drug Administration released a draft guidance entitled, “Repackaging of Certain Human Drug Products by Pharmacies and Outsourcing Facilities.” The Committee is concerned that in issuing the draft guidance the agency failed to consider the unique nature of long term care pharmacies and the populations they serve. Before issuing a final guidance the Committee urges the agency to consider its implications on patient access to safe and effective medications from long term care pharmacies.

*Seafood Advisory.*—The Committee remains concerned that despite numerous commitments over many years, FDA has not published final advice on seafood consumption for pregnant women, mothers, and children. The Committee is pleased that FDA released draft advice in June 2014, however, pregnant women and healthcare providers still await clear, actionable and science-based final seafood advice. Based on the recommendation of the Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee, the final FDA seafood advice shall re-evaluate the draft limit on albacore tuna to ensure it is con-



sistent with the FDA net effects report and the Joint United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization/World Health Organization Expert Consultation on the Risks and Benefits of Fish Consumption, 2010. The Committee directs FDA to publish final advice to pregnant women on seafood consumption in conjunction with all applicable parties. Finally, FDA shall provide a progress report to the Committee 30 days after the enactment of this act and every 30 days thereafter until the final seafood advice is published.

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

*Seafood List.*—The Committee directs the Commissioner to expedite consideration of whether it is appropriate to change the acceptable market name of *Gadus chalcogrammus* (formerly classified as *Theragra chalcogramma*) from “Alaska Pollock” to “Pollock” in the Seafood List. It is critical that seafood nomenclature (acceptable market names) is science-based, truthful, and not misleading to the consumer.

*Sodium.*—The Committee is concerned about FDA’s continued focus on voluntary sodium reductions and the Institute of Medicine’s [IOM] 2010 recommendation to modify the Generally Recognized as Safe [GRAS] status of sodium, particularly given the ongoing scientific discussion regarding appropriate sodium intake to maintain positive health. The IOM published a more recent study in 2013, which concluded additional research may provide further information with respect to the health effects of sodium intake on general and sub populations. The Committee recommends that a panel be convened, at the IOM or another leading Federal institution, which includes a representative array of research perspectives, including those who have raised concerns on the safety of low-sodium diets. The Committee does not believe any sodium reduction activities should be finalized until the disagreement between the impact of lower sodium on blood pressure (and an extrapolation to health) and direct research suggesting a negative impact of very low-sodium intakes is resolved.

*Sunscreen.*—The Committee is aware that in July 2014, the U.S. Surgeon General issued A Call to Action to Prevent Skin Cancer, concluding nearly 5 million people are treated annually for all skin cancers combined, with an estimated cost of \$8,100,000,000 per year. As a result, the Surgeon General called on the Federal Government to work with stakeholders to support skin cancer prevention. The Committee is pleased with the bipartisan reforms enacted in the Sunscreen Innovation Act [SIA] in 2014 to improve the process by which the FDA reviews sunscreen ingredients; however, the Committee is concerned that while skin cancer rates in the United States continue to climb, no new sunscreen ingredients have been generally recognized as safe and effective [GRASE] by the FDA since passage of the SIA. The Committee directs the FDA to provide a report that contains a detailed analysis of how FDA is balancing the Surgeon General’s Call to Action, the known public

health benefits that regular sunscreen use provides to prevent skin cancer and melanoma, and the long history of safe and effective use of sunscreens in comparable countries versus the hypothetical risk sunscreens posed to human health in FDA’s generally recognized as safe and effective [GRASE] standard. Immediate action on sunscreen applications should be a priority.

In addition, the Committee directs the FDA to work with stakeholders to ensure consumers in the United States have access to all sunscreen products that have been shown to be safe and effective; and therefore, requests that FDA, in finalizing the sunscreen monograph consistent with the SIA, include provisions related to the maximum Sun Protection Factor [SPF] and to address spray dosage forms for sunscreens.

*Vibrio*.—The Committee is aware of the public health challenge related to the naturally occurring bacteria called *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* (V.p.) that can accumulate in shellfish and believes that more scientific research is necessary to developing proper controls that will reduce the risk to consumers and sustain a healthy domestic shellfish industry. The Committee encourages the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] to increase funding for research into *Vibrio* illnesses associated with the consumption of raw molluscan shellfish, improve risk assessment models, and develop improved rapid detection methods for virulent *Vibrio* strains.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$8,788,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	8,788,000
Committee recommendation .....	8,788,000

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 \$8,788,000 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

Appropriations, 2015 .....	\$60,500,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	68,800,000
Committee recommendation .....	65,600,000

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 promulgates regulations, establishes standards, enforces rules and regulations, and approves certain actions of the institutions.

The administration and the institutions under its jurisdiction now operate under authorities contained in the Farm Credit Act of 1971, Public Law 92-181, effective December 10, 1971. Public Law 99-205, effective December 23, 1985, restructured FCA and gave the agency regulatory authorities and enforcement powers.

The act provides for the farmer-owned cooperative system to make sound, adequate, and constructive credit available to farmers and ranchers and their cooperatives, rural residences, and associations and other entities upon which farming operations are dependent, and to modernize existing farm credit law to meet current and future rural credit needs.

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 authorized the formation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation [FAMC] to operate a secondary market for agricultural and rural housing mortgages. The Farm Credit Administration, under section 8.11 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, is assigned the responsibility of regulating this entity and assuring its safe and sound operation.

Expenses of the Farm Credit Administration are paid by assessments collected from the Farm Credit System institutions and by assessments to the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$65,600,000 on administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration.

## 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 gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to transfer unobligated balances to the Working Capital Fund and clarifies longstanding practices associated with the Fund.

Section 703. This section limits the funding provided in the bill to 1 year, unless otherwise specified.

Section 704. This section limits negotiated indirect costs on cooperative agreements between the Department of Agriculture and nonprofit organizations to 10 percent.

Section 705. 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 706. This section prohibits the purchase of new information technology equipment in excess of \$25,000 without the prior approval of the Chief Information Officer.

Section 707. This section makes funds for certain conservation programs available until expended to disburse certain obligations made in the current fiscal year.

Section 708. This section makes certain former Rural Utilities Service borrowers eligible for the Rural Economic Development loan and grant program.

Section 709. This section provides funds for Rural Development and the Farm Service Agency information technology expenses.

Section 710. This section includes language regarding first-class travel.

Section 711. This section includes language regarding the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 712. 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 713. This section includes language regarding the limitation on direct costs for grants awarded by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

Section 714. This section includes language regarding the availability of funds for certain Department of Agriculture programs.

Section 715. This section includes language regarding the availability of funds for certain Department of Agriculture programs.

Section 716. This section prohibits the use of funds for user fee proposals that fail to provide sufficient budget impact information.

Section 717. This section prohibits the reprogramming of funds for programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$500,000 or 10 per-

cent, whichever is less without the prior notification of the Committee on Appropriations.

Section 718. This section includes language for the establishment of a fee under the business and industry loan program.

Section 719. 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 720. This section includes language regarding pre-packaged news.

Section 721. 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 722. This section includes language regarding reconstituted infant formula.

Section 723. This section includes language regarding spending plans.

Section 724. This section provides funding for the Geographically Disadvantaged Farmers Program.

Section 725. This section includes language regarding section 502 single family direct loans.

Section 726. This section includes language regarding loans and loan guarantees.

Section 727. This section includes language regarding credit card refunds.

Section 728. This section provides funding to carry out a program for hardwood trees.

Section 729. This section includes language regarding menu labeling.

Section 730. This section includes language regarding the Emergency Community Water Assistance Grant Program.

Section 731. This section includes language regarding the Water Bank Program.

Section 732. This section includes language regarding Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

Section 733. This section includes language regarding the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

Section 734. This section includes language regarding the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative.

Section 735. This section includes language regarding housing programs.

Section 736. This section includes language regarding the Rural Housing Service.

Section 737. This section includes a rescission of funds.

Section 738. This section includes a rescission of funds.

Section 739. This section includes language regarding industrial hemp.

Section 740. This section includes language regarding disclosure of information for pharmaceuticals.

Section 741. This section includes language regarding the Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

Section 742. This section includes language regarding agricultural research.

Section. 743. This section includes language regarding beef imports from Argentina and Brazil.

Section. 744. This section includes language regarding the use of funds for certain horse inspection activities.

Section 745. This section includes language regarding school meals programs.

## PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2016, 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, 2016, 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 2016 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 2016 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.

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 is filing an original bill, which is not covered under this rule, but reports this information in the spirit of full disclosure.

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2016:

- Child Nutrition Program State Administrative Expenses
- Farmers Market Nutrition Program
- Grain Inspection Service
- Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants  
and Children  
Summer Food Service Program

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 16, 2015, the Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, provided, that the bill be subject to amendment and that the bill be consistent with its budget allocation, by a recorded vote of 28–2, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Cochran	Mrs. Murray
Mr. McConnell	Mr. Reed
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Alexander	
Ms. Collins	
Ms. Murkowski	
Mr. Graham	
Mr. Kirk	
Mr. Blunt	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Hoeven	
Mr. Boozman	
Mrs. Capito	
Mr. Cassidy	
Mr. Lankford	
Mr. Daines	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Leahy	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Udall	
Mrs. Shaheen	
Mr. Merkley	
Mr. Coons	
Mr. Schatz	
Ms. Baldwin	
Mr. Murphy	

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 appro-



priate 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.”

The Committee bill as recommended contains no such provisions.

### 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 in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the subcommittee allocation for 2016: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies:				
Mandatory .....	116,234	116,234	108,949	<sup>1</sup> 108,949
Discretionary .....	20,510	20,510	21,641	<sup>1</sup> 21,632
Security .....				NA
Nonsecurity .....	20,510	20,510	NA	NA
Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism .....				
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2016 .....				<sup>2</sup> 116,060
2017 .....				4,721
2018 .....				990
2019 .....				358
2020 and future years .....				267
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2016 .....	NA	39,573	NA	<sup>2</sup> 33,112

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

<sup>2</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016**  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
<b>TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the Secretary .....	5,051	5,137	5,051		-86
Office of Tribal Relations .....	502	507	502		-5
Military Veterans Agricultural Liaison (Leg. proposal) .....		250	250	+ 250	
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination .....	1,496	1,520	1,496		-24
Office of Advocacy and Outreach .....	1,209	1,228	1,209		-19
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration .....	804	816	804		-12
Departmental Administration .....	25,124	25,688	25,124		-564
<b>Subtotal, Departmental Administration .....</b>	<b>25,928</b>	<b>26,504</b>	<b>25,928</b>		<b>-576</b>
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	3,869	3,934	3,869		-65
Office of Communications .....	7,750	8,228	7,750		-478
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary .....</b>	<b>45,805</b>	<b>47,308</b>	<b>46,055</b>	<b>+ 250</b>	<b>-1,253</b>
<b>Executive Operations:</b>					
Office of the Chief Economist .....	17,377	17,465	16,777	-600	-688
National Appeals Division .....	13,317	13,566	13,317		-249
Office of Budget and Program Analysis .....	9,392	9,500	9,392		-108
<b>Subtotal, Executive Operations .....</b>	<b>40,086</b>	<b>40,531</b>	<b>39,486</b>	<b>-600</b>	<b>-1,045</b>
Office of the Chief Information Officer .....	45,045	53,071	45,045		-8,026
Office of the Chief Financial Officer .....	6,028	9,154	6,028		-3,126
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights .....	898	907	898		-9
Office of Civil Rights .....	24,070	24,443	24,070		-373
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments .....	(55,866)	(125,469)	(53,618)	(-2,248)	(-71,851)

Building operations and maintenance .....	55,866	125,469	53,618	- 2,248	- 71,851
Hazardous materials management .....	3,600	3,630	3,618	+ 18	- 12
Office of Inspector General .....	95,026	98,902	95,294	+ 268	- 3,608
Office of the General Counsel .....	44,383	48,075	44,383	.....	- 3,692
Office of Ethics .....	3,654	4,565	3,654	.....	- 911
<b>Total, Departmental Administration .....</b>	<b>364,461</b>	<b>456,055</b>	<b>362,149</b>	<b>- 2,312</b>	<b>- 93,906</b>
<b>Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics .....</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>- 9</b>
Economic Research Service .....	85,373	86,023	85,373	.....	- 650
National Agricultural Statistics Service .....	172,408	180,346	168,108	- 4,300	- 12,238
Census of Agriculture .....	(47,842)	(45,747)	(41,842)	(- 6,000)	(- 3,905)
<b>Agricultural Research Service:</b>					
Salaries and expenses .....	1,132,625	1,191,540	1,136,825	+ 4,200	- 54,715
Buildings and facilities .....	45,000	205,901	.....	- 45,000	- 205,901
<b>Total, Agricultural Research Service .....</b>	<b>1,177,625</b>	<b>1,397,441</b>	<b>1,136,825</b>	<b>- 40,800</b>	<b>- 260,616</b>
<b>National Institute of Food and Agriculture:</b>					
National Institute of Food and Agriculture (Leg. proposal) .....	.....	1,503,058	.....	.....	- 1,503,058
Research and education activities .....	786,874	.....	791,096	+ 4,222	+ 791,096
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund .....	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)	.....	.....
Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities Endowment Fund .....	.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+ 10,000)	.....
Extension activities .....	471,691	.....	488,891	+ 17,200	+ 488,891
Integrated activities .....	30,900	.....	13,700	- 17,200	+ 13,700
<b>Total, National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....</b>	<b>1,289,465</b>	<b>1,503,058</b>	<b>1,293,687</b>	<b>+ 4,222</b>	<b>- 209,371</b>
<b>Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs .....</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>- 9</b>
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses .....	871,315	855,803	876,465	+ 5,150	+ 20,662
Buildings and facilities .....	3,175	3,175	3,175	.....	.....
<b>Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....</b>	<b>874,490</b>	<b>858,978</b>	<b>879,640</b>	<b>+ 5,150</b>	<b>+ 20,662</b>
<b>Agricultural Marketing Service:</b>					
Marketing Services .....	81,192	83,121	81,192	.....	- 1,929
Standardization activities (user fees) .....	(64,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	(+ 1,000)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected) .....	(60,709)	(60,982)	(60,982)	(- 273)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (Section 32):					
Permanent, Section 32 .....	1,284,000	1,425,000	1,425,000	+ 141,000	.....
Marketing agreements and orders (transfer from section 32) .....	(20,186)	(20,489)	(20,489)	(+ 303)	.....
Payments to States and Possessions .....	1,235	1,235	1,235	.....	.....
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service program .....	1,427,136	1,570,338	1,568,409	+ 141,273	- 1,929
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses .....	43,048	44,101	43,048	.....	- 1,053
Limitation on inspection and weighing services .....	(50,000)	(55,000)	(55,000)	(+ 5,000)	.....
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	816	824	816	.....	- 8
Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	1,016,474	1,011,557	1,013,621	- 2,863	+ 2,064
Lab accreditation fees .....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....	.....
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing .....	6,392,383	7,049,553	6,492,490	+ 100,107	- 557,063
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services .....	898	907	898	.....	- 9
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses .....	1,200,180	1,185,251	1,180,391	- 19,789	- 4,860
(Transfer from Food for Peace (Public Law 480)) .....	(2,528)	(2,528)	(2,528)	.....	.....
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(354)	(354)	(354)	.....	.....
(Transfer from ACF) .....	(306,998)	(309,991)	(306,998)	.....	(- 2,993)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts .....	(309,880)	(312,873)	(309,880)	.....	(- 2,993)
Total, Salaries and expenses .....	(1,510,060)	(1,498,124)	(1,490,271)	(- 19,789)	(- 7,853)
State mediation grants .....	3,404	3,404	3,404	.....	.....

Grassroots source water protection program .....	5,526				6,000	+ 474	+ 6,000
Dairy indemnity program .....	500			500	500		
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency .....	1,209,610		1,189,155		1,190,295	- 19,315	+ 1,140
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (ACIF) Program Account:							
Loan authorizations:							
Farm ownership loans:							
Direct .....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)			(1,500,000)		
Guaranteed .....	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)			(2,000,000)		
Subtotal .....	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)			(3,500,000)		
Farm operating loans:							
Direct .....	(1,252,004)	(1,252,004)			(1,252,004)		
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(1,393,443)	(1,393,443)			(1,393,443)		
Subtotal .....	(2,645,447)	(2,645,447)			(2,645,447)		
Emergency loans .....	(34,667)	(34,667)			(34,667)		
Indian tribe land acquisition loans .....	(2,000)	(2,000)			(2,000)		
Conservation loans:							
Guaranteed .....	(150,000)	(150,000)			(150,000)		
Indian highly fractionated land loans .....	(10,000)	(10,000)			(10,000)		
Boll weevil eradication loans .....	(60,000)	(60,000)			(60,000)		
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)			(6,402,114)		
Loan subsidies:							
Farm operating loans:							
Direct .....	63,101	53,961			53,961	- 9,140	
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	14,770	14,352			14,352	- 418	
Subtotal .....	77,871	68,313			68,313	- 9,558	
Emergency Loans .....	856	1,262			1,262	+ 406	
Indian highly fractionated land loans .....							
Individual development account grants .....		2,500					- 2,500
Total, Loan subsidies and grants .....	78,727	72,075			69,575	- 9,152	- 2,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
ACIF administrative expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	306,998	309,991	306,998		-2,993
Administrative expenses	7,920	7,920	7,920		
Total, ACIF expenses	314,918	317,911	314,918		-2,993
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (Loan authorization)	393,645 (6,402,114)	389,986 (6,402,114)	384,493 (6,402,114)	-9,152	-5,493
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,603,255	1,579,141	1,574,788	-28,467	-4,353
Risk Management Agency:					
RMA Salaries and expenses	74,829	76,946	74,829		-2,117
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,678,982	1,656,994	1,650,515	-28,467	-6,479
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund	8,930,502	8,175,224	8,175,224	-755,278	
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	13,444,728	10,519,933	10,519,933	-2,924,795	
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)		
Total, Corporations	22,375,230	18,695,157	18,695,157	-3,680,073	
Total, Title I, Agricultural Programs (By transfer)	30,446,595 (330,066)	27,401,704 (333,362)	26,838,162 (330,369)	-3,608,433 (+ 303)	-563,542 (- 2,993)
Total (Loan authorization)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)		

	(115,709)	(120,982)	(120,982)	(120,982)	(+ 5,273)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....					
<b>TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	898	907	898		-9
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Private lands conservation operations .....	846,428	831,231	855,209	+ 8,781	+ 23,978
Farm Security and Rural Investment program (transfer authority) .....		(774,612)			(- 774,612)
Total, Public Lands Conservation operations .....	846,428	1,605,843	855,209	+ 8,781	- 750,634
Watershed Flood and Prevention operations (Leg. proposal) .....		200,000			- 200,000
Watershed rehabilitation program .....	12,000			- 12,000	
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	858,428	1,031,231	855,209	- 3,219	- 176,022
Total, Title II, Conservation Programs .....	859,326	1,032,138	856,107	- 3,219	- 176,031
<b>TITLE III—RURAL DEVELOPMENT</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	898	907	898		-9
Rural Development:					
Rural development expenses:					
Salaries and expenses .....	224,201	226,717	228,701	+ 4,500	+ 1,984
(Transfer from RHF) .....	(415,100)	(419,530)	(415,100)		(- 4,430)
(Transfer from RD(LFP) .....	(4,439)	(4,488)	(4,439)		(- 49)
(Transfer from RETLP) .....	(34,478)	(34,864)	(34,478)		(- 386)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts .....	(454,017)	(458,882)	(454,017)		(- 4,865)
Total, Rural development expenses .....	(678,218)	(685,599)	(682,718)	(+ 4,500)	(- 2,881)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502) .....	(900,000)	(900,000)	(900,000)		
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)		
Subtotal, Single family .....	(24,900,000)	(24,900,000)	(24,900,000)		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
Housing repair (Sec. 504) .....	(26,279)	(26,278)	(26,278)	(-1)	(-13,873)
Rental housing (Sec. 515) .....	(28,398)	(42,271)	(28,398)		
Multi-family housing guarantees (Sec. 538) .....	(150,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(+50,000)	
Site development loans (Sec. 524) .....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)		
Single family housing credit sales .....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
Self-help housing land develop. (Sec. 523) .....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)		(+5,000)
Farm Labor Housing (Sec.514) .....	(23,602)	(23,855)	(23,602)		(-253)
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(25,148,279)	(25,207,404)	(25,198,278)	(+49,999)	(-9,126)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502) .....	66,420	60,750	60,750	-5,670	
Housing repair (Sec. 504) .....	3,687	3,424	3,424	-263	
Rental housing (Sec. 515) .....	9,800	12,525	8,414	-1,386	-4,111
Farm labor housing (Sec. 514) .....	7,600	6,789	6,717	-883	-72
Total, Loan subsidies .....	87,507	83,488	79,305	-8,202	-4,183
Farm labor housing grants .....	8,336	8,336	8,336		
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	415,100	419,530	415,100		-4,430
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program (Loan authorization) .....	510,943 (25,148,279)	511,354 (25,207,404)	502,741 (25,198,278)	-8,202 (+49,999)	-8,613 (-9,126)
Rental assistance program:					
Rental assistance (Sec. 521) .....	1,088,500	1,171,900	1,167,000	+78,500	-4,900
Multi-Family Housing Revitalization Program Account:					
Rural housing voucher program .....	7,000	15,000	7,000		-8,000
Multi-family housing revitalization program .....	17,000	19,000	17,000		-2,000



Total, Multi-family housing revitalization .....	24,000	34,000	24,000	.....	-10,000
Mutual and self-help housing grants .....	27,500	10,000	27,500	.....	+17,500
Rural housing assistance grants .....	32,239	25,000	32,239	.....	+7,239
Rural Community Facilities Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct .....	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(+11,524)	(+84,746)
Guaranteed .....	(73,222)	.....	(84,746)	.....	.....
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(2,273,222)	(2,200,000)	(2,284,746)	(+11,524)	(+84,746)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Community facility:					
Guaranteed .....	3,500	.....	2,000	-1,500	+2,000
Grants .....	13,000	50,000	13,000	.....	-37,000
Rural community development initiative .....	4,000	4,000	4,000	.....	.....
Economic impact initiative grants .....	5,778	.....	5,778	.....	+5,778
Tribal college grants .....	4,000	8,000	4,000	.....	-4,000
Total, RCFP Loan subsidies and grants .....	30,278	62,000	28,778	-1,500	-33,222
Subtotal, grants and payments .....	90,017	97,000	88,517	-1,500	-8,483
Total, Rural Housing Service .....	1,713,460	1,814,254	1,782,258	+68,798	-31,996
(Loan authorization) .....	(27,421,501)	(27,407,404)	(27,483,024)	(+61,523)	(+75,620)
Rural Business—Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business Program Account:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans) .....	(919,765)	(758,222)	(919,765)	.....	(+161,543)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy .....	47,000	31,444	35,687	-11,313	+4,243
Rural business development grants .....	24,000	30,000	24,000	.....	-6,000
Demonstration Projects (rural child poverty) (Leg. proposal) .....	.....	20,000	.....	.....	-20,000
Delta regional authority .....	3,000	.....	3,000	.....	+3,000
Total, RBP loan subsidies and grants .....	74,000	81,444	62,687	-11,313	-18,757
Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account:					
(Loan authorization) .....	(18,889)	(10,014)	(18,889)	.....	(+8,875)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
Loan subsidy .....	5,818	2,766	5,217	-601	+2,451
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	4,439	4,488	4,439		-49
Total, Rural Business Program Fund .....	10,257	7,254	9,656	-601	+2,402
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) .....	(33,077)	(85,000)	(48,013)	(+ 14,936)	(- 36,987)
Limit cushion of credit interest spending .....	(179,000)	(154,000)	(182,000)	(+ 3,000)	(+ 28,000)
(Rescission) .....	-179,000	-154,000	-182,000	-3,000	-28,000
Rural Cooperative Development Grants:					
Cooperative development .....	5,800	6,000	5,800		-200
Appropriate technology transfer for rural areas .....	2,500	2,087	2,500		+413
Grants to assist minority producers .....	3,000	3,000	3,000		
Value-added agricultural product market development .....	10,750	10,000	10,750		+750
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants .....	22,050	21,087	22,050		+963
Rural Microenterprise Investment Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) .....		(23,416)			(- 23,416)
Loan subsidies and grants .....		4,653			-4,653
Total, Rural Microenterprise Investment .....		4,653			-4,653
Rural Energy for America Program (Loan authorization) .....	(12,760)	(75,758)	(7,576)	(- 5,184)	(- 68,182)
Loan subsidy and grants .....	1,350	5,000	500	-850	-4,500
Grants .....		5,000			-5,000
Total, Rural Energy for America Program .....	1,350	10,000	500	-850	-9,500
Rural Business Investment Program Account (Loan authorization) .....		(41,195)			(- 41,195)



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
Guaranteed underwriting .....	(500,000)	.....	(750,000)	(+ 250,000)	(+ 750,000)
Subtotal, Electric .....	(5,500,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,750,000)	(+ 1,250,000)	(+ 750,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, Treasury rate .....	(690,000)	(345,000)	(345,000)	(- 345,000)	.....
Direct, FFB .....	.....	(345,000)	(345,000)	(+ 345,000)	.....
Subtotal, Telecommunications .....	(690,000)	(690,000)	(690,000)	.....	.....
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(6,190,000)	(6,690,000)	(7,440,000)	(+ 1,250,000)	(+ 750,000)
Loan Subsidy:					
Telecommunications Direct, Treasury Rate .....	.....	104	104	+ 104	.....
Total, Loan subsidies .....	.....	104	104	+ 104	.....
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	34,478	34,864	34,478	.....	- 386
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account .....	34,478	34,968	34,582	+ 104	- 386
(Loan authorization) .....	(6,190,000)	(6,690,000)	(7,440,000)	(+ 1,250,000)	(+ 750,000)
Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications .....	(24,077)	(44,239)	(20,576)	(- 3,501)	(- 23,663)
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(24,077)	(44,239)	(20,576)	(- 3,501)	(- 23,663)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants .....	22,000	24,950	22,000	.....	- 2,950

Broadband telecommunications:									
Direct	4,500	9,675	4,500					-5,175	
Grants	10,372	20,372	10,372					-10,000	
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	36,872	54,997	36,872					-18,125	
Total, Rural Utilities Service (Loan authorization)	536,207 (7,464,077)	573,285 (7,934,239)	568,192 (8,710,576)				+ 31,985 (+ 1,246,499)	-5,093 (+ 776,337)	
Total, Title III, Rural Development Programs (By transfer) (Loan authorization)	2,403,423 (454,017) (35,870,069)	2,604,351 (458,882) (36,335,248)	2,493,942 (454,017) (37,187,843)				+ 90,519 (+ 1,317,774)	-110,409 (- 4,865) (+ 852,595)	
TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS									
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	816	824	816					- 8	
Food and Nutrition Service:									
Child nutrition programs	21,259,170	21,483,377	21,483,377				+ 224,207		
School breakfast program equipment grants	25,000	35,000	25,000					-10,000	
Demonstration projects (Summer EBT)	16,000	66,900	16,000					-50,900	
Child Nutrition State Exchange Activities (Leg. proposal)		2,000						-2,000	
Total, Child nutrition programs	21,300,170	21,587,277	21,524,377				+ 224,207	- 62,900	
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC) Supplemental nutrition assistance program: (Food stamp program)	6,623,000	6,623,000	6,513,000				- 110,000	-110,000	
Reserve	78,836,572	78,661,071	78,661,071				- 175,501		
FDPIR nutrition education services	3,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000					-2,000,000	
National food consumption survey (Leg. proposal)	998	998	998						
State Transition Grants (Leg. proposal)		5,000						-5,000	
Fiscal Year 2017 (first quarter)		25,000						-25,000	
Total, Food stamp program	81,837,570	104,599,069	81,662,069				- 175,501	-22,937,000	
Fiscal year 2016	(81,837,570)	(83,692,069)	(81,662,069)				(- 175,501)	(- 2,030,000)	
Commodity Assistance Program:									
Commodity supplemental food program	211,482	221,298	221,298				+ 9,816		
Farmers market nutrition program	16,548	16,548	16,548						

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
Emergency food assistance program .....	49,401	49,401	49,401		
Pacific Island and disaster assistance .....	1,070	1,070	1,070		
Total, Commodity assistance program .....	278,501	288,317	288,317	+ 9,816	
Nutrition programs administration .....	150,824	155,564	151,824	+ 1,000	- 3,740
Total, Food and Nutrition Service .....	110,190,065	133,253,227	110,139,587	- 50,478	- 23,113,640
Fiscal Year 2016 .....	(110,190,065)	(112,346,227)	(110,139,587)	( - 50,478)	( - 2,206,640)
Total, Title IV, Domestic Food Programs .....	110,190,881	133,254,051	110,140,403	- 50,478	- 23,113,648
Fiscal Year 2016 .....	(110,190,065)	(112,346,227)	(110,139,587)	( - 50,478)	( - 2,206,640)
TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Salaries and expenses .....	181,423	191,631	187,225	+ 5,802	- 4,406
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(6,394)	(6,394)	(6,394)		
Total, Salaries and expenses .....	187,817	198,025	193,619	+ 5,802	- 4,406
Food for Peace Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account, Administrative expenses: Farm Service Agency, Salaries and expenses (transfer to FSA) .....	2,528	2,528	2,528		
Unobligated balances (rescission) .....	- 13,000			+ 13,000	
Food for Peace Title II Grants: Expenses .....	1,466,000	1,400,000	1,466,000		+ 66,000
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses): Salaries and expenses (Export Loans): General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS) .....	6,394	6,394	6,394		

	354	354	354	354
Farm Service Agency S&E (transfer to FSA) .....				
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account .....	6,748	6,748	6,748	
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program grants .....	191,626	191,626	201,626	+ 10,000
Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program (Leg. proposal) .....		20,000		- 20,000
Total, Title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs .....	1,835,325	1,812,533	1,864,127	+ 51,594
(By transfer) .....	(6,394)	(6,394)	(6,394)	
TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION				
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES				
Food and Drug Administration				
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation .....				
Prescription drug user fees .....	2,588,536	2,734,715	2,628,978	+ 40,442
Medical device user fees .....	(798,000)	(826,072)	(826,072)	(+ 28,072)
Human generic drug user fees .....	(128,282)	(134,475)	(134,475)	(+ 6,193)
Biosimilar biological products user fees .....	(312,116)	(320,029)	(320,029)	(+ 7,913)
Animal drug user fees .....	(21,014)	(21,540)	(21,540)	(+ 526)
Animal generic drug user fees .....	(22,464)	(22,140)	(22,140)	(- 324)
Tobacco product user fees .....	(6,944)	(7,429)	(7,429)	(+ 485)
	(566,000)	(599,000)	(599,000)	(+ 33,000)
Subtotal (including user fees) .....	(4,443,356)	(4,665,400)	(4,559,663)	(+ 116,307)
Mammography user fees .....	(19,705)	(20,109)	(20,109)	(+ 404)
Export and color certification user fees .....	(13,651)	(13,835)	(13,835)	(+ 184)
Food and Feed Recall user fees .....	(1,434)	(1,434)	(1,434)	
Food Reinspection fees .....	(6,414)	(6,414)	(6,414)	
Voluntary qualified importer program fees .....	(5,300)	(5,300)	(5,300)	
Pharmacy compounding fees (CBO estimate) .....	(1,000)			(- 1,000)
Subtotal, FDA (with user fees) .....	(4,490,860)	(4,712,492)	(4,606,755)	(+ 115,895)
FDA New User Fees (Leg. proposals): .....				
Export and color certification user fees cap increase (Leg. proposal) .....		(4,280)		(- 4,280)
Food Inspection and Facility Registration user fees .....		(60,120)		(- 60,120)
Food import user fees .....		(103,343)		(- 103,343)
International courier user fees .....		(5,926)		(- 5,926)
Cosmetic user fees .....		(19,856)		(- 19,856)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2015 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2015 appropriation	Budget estimate
Food contact substance notification user fees .....		(5,098)			(-5,098)
Subtotal, FDA new user fees (Leg. Proposals) .....		(198,623)			(-198,623)
Buildings and facilities .....	8,788	8,788	8,788		
Total, FDA (w/user fees, including proposals) .....	(4,499,648)	(4,919,903)	(4,615,543)	(+115,895)	(-304,360)
Total, FDA (w/enacted user fees only) .....	(4,499,648)	(4,725,560)	(4,615,543)	(+115,895)	(-110,017)
Total, FDA (excluding user fees) .....	2,597,324	2,743,503	2,637,766	+40,442	-105,737
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>					
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(60,500)	(69,400)	(65,600)	(+5,100)	(-3,800)
Total, Title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....	2,597,324	2,743,503	2,637,766	+40,442	-105,737
<b>TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
Emergency livestock assistance program (rescission) (Sec. 709) .....	-125,000			+125,000	-68,000
Limit Dam Rehab (Sec. 714(1)) .....	-69,000		-68,000	+1,000	+69,000
(rescission) .....		-69,000		-55,000	-191,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives Program (Sec. 716(2)) .....	-136,000		-191,000		+300,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives Program fiscal year 2015 (Sec. 1241(a)(5)(C))(Sec. 714(2)) (rescission) .....		-300,000		-73,000	
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives Program fiscal year 2016 (Sec. 1241 (a)(5)(B)) (Sec. 714(2)) (rescission) .....		-73,000			
Limit Conservation Stewardship Program (Sec. 713(3)) .....	-7,000	-3,000	-73,000		+3,000
Limit fruit and vegetable program (Sec. 714) .....	-122,000	-125,000	-125,000	+7,000	
Section 32 (rescission) (Sec. 715) .....	-121,000	-292,000	-125,000	-3,000	
Limit Biomass Crop Assistance Program (Sec. 714(3)) .....	-2,000	-20,000	-20,000	-18,000	-20,000
Watershed Flood and Prevention Program (rescission) (Sec. 737f) .....		-20,000	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Water and waste cancellation (rescission ) (Sec. 738) .....		-20,000	-20,000	-20,000	-13,000
Limit Biorefinery Assistance (Sec. 717(7)) .....	-16,000		-13,000	+16,000	
Geographic Disadvantaged farmers .....	1,996		1,996		+1,996



Hardwood Trees (Reforestation Pilot Program) .....	600		600			+ 600
Water Bank program .....	4,000		4,000			+ 4,000
Repowering Assistance (rescission) .....	- 8,000				+ 8,000	
ARS Building and Facilities (rescission) .....	- 2,000				+ 2,000	
Freight Reimbursement (rescission) .....	- 2,000				+ 2,000	
Emergency Watershed Protection (disaster relief category) .....	78,581				- 78,581	
Emergency Forestry Restoration Program (disaster relief category) .....	3,203				- 3,203	
Emergency Conservation Program (disaster relief category) .....	9,216				- 9,216	
Total, Title VII, General Provisions .....	- 512,404	- 882,000	- 719,404	- 207,000		+ 162,596
TITLE VIII—EBOLA RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation (emergency) .....	25,000				- 25,000	
Total, Title VIII, Ebola Response and Preparedness (emergency) .....	25,000			- 25,000		
Grand total .....	147,845,470	167,966,280	144,111,103	- 3,734,367		- 23,855,177
Appropriations fiscal year 2015 .....	(148,179,470)	(147,594,280)	(144,542,103)	(- 3,637,367)		(- 3,052,177)
Emergency Appropriations .....	(25,000)			(- 25,000)		
Emergency appropriations .....	(25,000)			(- 25,000)		
Disaster relief .....	(91,000)			(- 91,000)		
Rescissions .....	(- 450,000)			(- 431,000)		(+ 104,000)
Advance appropriations, Fiscal Year 2016 .....		(20,907,000)				(- 20,907,000)
(By transfer) .....	(790,477)	(798,638)	(790,780)	(+ 303)		(- 7,858)
(Loan authorization) .....	(42,272,183)	(42,737,362)	(43,589,957)	(+ 1,317,774)		(+ 852,595)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(176,209)	(190,382)	(186,582)	(+ 10,373)		(- 3,800)