

**Calendar No. 464**

111TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
{ 111-221

---

---

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG  
ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIA-  
TIONS BILL, 2011

---

JULY 15, 2010.—Ordered to be printed

---

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

**REPORT**

[To accompany S. 3606]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 3606) mak-  
ing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and  
Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal  
year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, reports fa-  
vorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

*Total obligational authority, fiscal year 2011*

Total of bill as reported to the Senate .....	\$132,053,999,000
Amount of 2010 appropriations .....	121,570,814,000
Amount of 2011 budget estimate .....	132,028,200,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2010 appropriations .....	+ 10,483,185,000
2011 budget estimate .....	+ 25,799,000

# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Breakdown by Title .....	4
Summary of the Bill:	
Overview and Summary of the Bill .....	5
Reports to Congress .....	5
Title I:	
Agricultural Programs:	
Production, Processing, and Marketing:	
Office of the Secretary .....	6
Office of Tribal Relations .....	7
Healthy Food Financing Initiative .....	7
Executive Operations .....	7
Office of the Chief Information Officer .....	9
Office of the Chief Financial Officer .....	10
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights .....	10
Office of Civil Rights .....	11
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration .....	11
Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments .....	12
Hazardous Materials Management .....	12
Departmental Administration .....	13
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	13
Office of Communications .....	14
Office of Inspector General .....	14
Office of the General Counsel .....	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 .....	31
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	32
Agricultural Marketing Service .....	37
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration .....	40
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	41
Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	41
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services .....	43
Farm Service Agency .....	44
Risk Management Agency .....	48
Corporations:	
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund .....	48
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund .....	49
Title II:	
Conservation Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	51
Office of Ecosystem Services and Markets .....	52
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	52
Title III:	
Rural Development Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	57
Rural Housing Service .....	58
Rural Business—Cooperative Service .....	66

	Page
Title III—Continued	
Rural Development Programs—Continued	
Rural Energy for America Program .....	70
Rural Utilities Service .....	71
Title IV:	
Domestic Food Programs:	
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services .....	77
Food and Nutrition Service .....	77
Title V: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs: Foreign Agricultural Serv- ice .....	85
Title VI:	
Related Agency and Food and Drug Administration:	
Food and Drug Administration .....	90
Independent Agency: Farm Credit Administration .....	98
Title VII: General Provisions .....	100
Program, Project, and Activity .....	103
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Sen- ate .....	103
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	104
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	104
Budgetary Impact of Bill .....	106
Disclosure of Congressionally Directed Spending Items .....	106
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority .....	117

## 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]

	2010	2011 Committee recommendation
Title I: Agricultural programs .....	30,191,573	30,259,695
Title II: Conservation programs .....	1,009,415	1,045,504
Title III: Rural economic and community development programs .....	2,934,309	2,767,584
Title IV: Domestic food programs .....	82,782,603	94,051,710
Title V: Foreign assistance and related programs .....	2,089,499	2,129,010
Title VI: Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....	2,357,089	2,516,282
Title VII: General provisions .....	- 193,674	- 715,786
Other appropriations (discretionary) .....	400,000	.....
Total, new budget (obligational) authority .....	121,570,814	132,053,999

## OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

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

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

Given the competing priorities that the Committee faces, the bill as reported provides the proper amount of emphasis on agricultural and rural development programs and on other programs and activities funded by the bill. It is within the subcommittee's allocation for fiscal year 2011.

All accounts in the bill have been closely examined to ensure that an appropriate level of funding is provided to carry out the programs of USDA, FDA, and FCA. Details on each of the accounts, the funding level, and the Committee's justifications for the funding levels are included in the report. The Committee provides full pay costs, as requested by the President, for agencies under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

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

## REPORTS TO CONGRESS

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

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

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$5,285,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	5,936,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,338,000

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,338,000 for the Office of the Secretary.

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

*Global Food Security.*—The Committee continues its strong support of work toward the goal of global food security. This bill includes a number of programs designed to assist in that effort including continuing last year’s increased level of spending for the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program and the flagship Public Law 480 program. In addition, the Committee includes \$10,000,000 in this bill to allow the Secretary to utilize the expertise of USDA and associated organizations such as land grant universities, to assist in the establishment and growth of sustainable food systems in developing countries. The Committee believes that progress such as this will contribute greatly to reducing the threat of chronic and acute hunger and to improve both national and international security and stability.

## OFFICE OF TRIBAL RELATIONS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	1,025,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,010,000

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,010,000 for the Office of Tribal Relations.

## HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 2010 .....	
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	\$35,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	15,000,000

The Healthy Food Financing Initiative will promote a range of interventions that expand access to nutritious foods, including developing and equipping grocery stores and other small businesses and retailers selling healthy food in communities that currently lack these options. This initiative will help reduce the number of food deserts over the next several years and will create new markets for farmers in an effort to revitalize distressed communities.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for the Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

The Committee recognizes the difficulty of obtaining nutritious food products in many communities, especially in rural communities where retail outlets may be located at a significant distance making access by rural residents problematic and expensive. The Committee provides a direct appropriation of \$15,000,000 and also allows a reserve of up to \$15,000,000 in available funds for a total amount of \$30,000,000 for the Healthy Food Financing Initiative in fiscal year 2011. Because of the need to assist rural populations in access to nutritious food, and because rural business and community development (which will serve as the catalyst for better food access) is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, these funds are to focus on improving product access in rural America. The Committee also expects this initiative to benefit farmers through the creation of new retail markets in rural and non-rural areas. The Secretary is directed to submit a report to the Committee by March 1, 2011 on the approach and status of implementing this activity.

## EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

Executive operations were established as a result of the reorganization of the Department to provide a support team for USDA policy officials and selected departmentwide services. Activities

under the executive operations include the Office of the Chief Economist, the National Appeals Division, the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, the Office of Homeland Security and the Office of Advocacy and Outreach.

#### CHIEF ECONOMIST

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$13,032,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	13,175,000
Committee recommendation .....	13,100,000

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,100,000 for the Office of the Chief Economist.

#### NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$15,254,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	15,424,000
Committee recommendation .....	15,424,000

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$15,424,000 for the National Appeals Division.

#### OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$9,436,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	9,547,000
Committee recommendation .....	9,547,000

The Office of Budget and Program Analysis provides direction and administration of the Department's budgetary functions including development, presentation, and execution of the budget; reviews program and legislative proposals for program, budget, and related implications; analyzes program and resource issues and alternatives, and prepares summaries of pertinent data to aid the Secretary and departmental policy officials and agency program managers in the decisionmaking process; and provides department-wide coordination for and participation in the presentation of budget-related matters to the committees of the Congress, the media, and interested public. The Office also provides departmentwide co-

ordination of the preparation and processing of regulations and legislative programs and reports.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,547,000 for the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,859,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	1,876,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,876,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,876,000 for the Office of Homeland Security.

OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,700,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	7,009,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,709,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,709,000 for the Office of Advocacy and Outreach.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$61,579,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	63,719,000
Committee recommendation .....	63,719,000

The Office of the Chief Information Officer was established in August 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), pursuant to the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, which required the establishment of a Chief Information Officer for major Federal agencies. This office provides policy guidance, leadership, coordination, and direction to the Department's information management and information technology

investment activities in support of USDA program delivery, and is the lead office in USDA e-gov efforts. The Office provides long-range planning guidance, implements measures to ensure that technology investments are economical and effective, coordinates interagency information resources management projects, and implements standards to promote information exchange and technical interoperability. In addition, the Office of the Chief Information Officer is responsible for certain activities financed under the Department's Working Capital Fund (7 U.S.C. 2235). The Office also provides telecommunication and automated data processing [ADP] services to USDA agencies through the National Information Technology Center with locations in Fort Collins, Colorado, and Kansas City, Missouri. Direct ADP operational services are also provided to the Office of the General Counsel, Office of Communications, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, and Executive Operations.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$63,719,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer. This amount includes an increase of \$2,000,000 for cyber security, as requested.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$6,566,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	6,632,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,632,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,632,000 for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$895,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	907,000
Committee recommendation .....	907,000

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 \$907,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$23,922,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	24,133,000
Committee recommendation .....	24,133,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$24,133,000 for the Office of Civil Rights.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$806,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	828,000
Committee recommendation .....	814,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$814,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$293,093,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	277,937,000
Committee recommendation .....	269,191,000

Department headquarters presently operates in a four-building Government-owned complex in downtown Washington, DC, and in leased buildings in the Metropolitan Washington, DC, area. Annual appropriations finance payments to the General Services Administration [GSA] for leased space and related services. Under this arrangement USDA operates, maintains, and repairs D.C. complex buildings, while GSA remains responsible for major nonrecurring repairs. GSA charges commercial rent rates pursuant to the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972, and agencies may review rate procedures and exercise rights to appeal. For the last several years the Department has implemented a strategic space plan to locate staff more efficiently, renovate its buildings, and eliminate safety hazards, particularly in the Agriculture South Building.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$269,191,000 for Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$300,000 for payments to the Department of Homeland Security, \$3,400,000 for repair and maintenance priorities, and \$5,600,000 for renovation of the South Building.

The following table reflects the Committee’s specific recommendations for this account as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

[In thousands of dollars]

	2010 enacted	2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
Rental Payments .....	184,812	178,470	178,470
Building Operations .....	94,781	85,667	76,921
DHS Building Security .....	13,500	13,800	13,800
Total .....	293,093	277,937	269,191

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$5,125,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	5,139,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,139,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,139,000 for Hazardous Materials Management.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$41,319,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	30,706,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,706,000

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$28,706,000 for Departmental Administration.

*Acquisition Workforce.*—The Committee recommends a general provision that provides \$1,000,000 to improve the capacity and capabilities of the Department’s acquisition workforce. If the Secretary intends to continue this effort in fiscal year 2012, the Committee strongly suggests that the budget request include information describing any evidence of deficiencies in the Department’s current acquisition activities and detail the manner in which a specific appropriations request is calculated.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$3,968,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	4,081,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,008,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,008,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

The Committee allows these funds to be transferred to support congressional relations’ activities at the agency level. Within 30

days from the enactment of this act, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the allocation of these funds by USDA agency, along with an explanation for the agency-by-agency distribution of the funds as well as the staff years funded by these transfers.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$9,722,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	9,839,000
Committee recommendation .....	9,839,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,839,000 for the Office of Communications.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$88,725,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	90,300,000
Committee recommendation .....	89,744,000

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$89,744,000 for the Office of Inspector General. In addition, the recommendation includes the fiscal year 2010 level for OIG to continue to address

violations of section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) and to coordinate with State and local law enforcement personnel in this effort.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$43,551,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	45,654,000
Committee recommendation .....	44,104,000

The Office of the General Counsel provides all legal advice, counsel, and services to the Secretary and to all agencies, offices, and corporations of the Department. The Office represents the Department in administrative proceedings; non-litigation debt collection proceedings; State water rights adjudications; proceedings before the Environmental Protection Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Maritime Administration, and International Trade Commission; and, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, in judicial proceedings and litigation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$44,104,000 for the Office of the General Counsel.

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

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$895,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	920,000
Committee recommendation .....	904,000

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 \$904,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.

*Herbicide Resistance.*—The Committee directs USDA to engage with farmers, land grant universities, State departments of agriculture, and the private sector to identify issues and to develop solutions related to herbicide resistance that are practicable, cost-effective, and minimize environmental impacts. The Chief Scientist shall provide the Committee with a report, which should include details on USDA’s research on herbicide resistance to date, a future research agenda, and outreach efforts undertaken in carrying out this directive.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$82,478,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	87,171,000
Committee recommendation .....	83,671,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$83,671,000 for the ERS. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$1,500,000 to improve user access to statistical data provided by ERS; \$1,000,000 for economic research on the access to affordable and nutritious food by low-income communities; \$990,000 for data integrity measures; and assumes all savings proposed in the budget request. The Committee recommendation also includes \$500,000 for continuation of the Organic Production and Market Data Initiative.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$161,830,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	164,721,000
Committee recommendation .....	163,721,000

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 \$163,721,000 for the National Agricultural Statistics Service. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$4,000,000 to enhance the annual county estimates program; \$500,000 to begin a comprehensive data series on organic production, handling and distribution; and \$800,000 to enhance remote sensing activities. Included in this amount is \$33,494,000 for the Census of Agriculture.

*Chemical Use Data Series.*—The Committee believes that the Chemical Use Data Series provides timely, valuable information on fertilizer and chemical user data on major field crops and selected specialty crops, and is pleased that NASS is continuing the collection and analysis of chemical use data, as well as practices such as integrated pest management.

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,179,639,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	1,199,669,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,216,825,000

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

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

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

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

##### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,216,825,000 for salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Research Service.

The Committee recognizes the successful history of ARS, the premier in-house USDA research agency, and strongly supports ongoing research activities vital to protecting this Nation's food supply,

environment, rural communities, and working toward energy independence. The Committee continues \$13,286,000, for this purpose.

The Committee recommendation does not include the President's budget proposal regarding laboratory closures, and expects research to continue at those locations. The Committee directs the Secretary to evaluate the agency's capital asset requirements for necessary coordination with ongoing and emerging research priorities. As part of this evaluation, ARS should provide opportunity for public comment in order to incorporate the priorities of all interested stakeholders, including ARS and other scientists, and users of ARS data.

The Committee recommends the following increases, as requested in the budget: \$6,130,000 for crop breeding and protection to enhance food production and security; \$2,438,000 for research on improved breeding strategies and germplasm, and animal protection to enhance food production and security; \$3,751,000 for increased food safety research; \$2,293,000 for research aimed at reducing world hunger, including \$793,000 to strengthen high priority grain disease research at St. Paul, Minnesota; \$675,000 for increased research on human nutrition; \$5,000,000 for Regional Biofuels Feedstocks Research and Demonstration Centers; \$1,625,000 for research on global climate change, including \$1,293,000 at Auburn, Alabama, to increase the resilience of crops and production systems to the stresses of climate change and weather extremes, and \$332,000 at Oxford, Mississippi, for research on mitigating the effects of climate change through improved water management; \$250,000 for research on colony collapse disorder; and \$500,000 on research regarding locally grown foods.

*Bioenergy and Sustainable Agriculture.*—The Committee recognizes the constraints placed upon the National Program Initiatives of Bioenergy/Biomass and Production Systems for Sustainable Agriculture especially the availability and cost of energy, water, feed, fertilizer, and technology to control invasive pest species. The Committee provides \$3,000,000 for research to mitigate these key constraints.

*Bioenergy Feedstock.*—The Committee provides \$500,000 to study new production practices and systems that can maximize yield of high quality feedstock.

*Cattle Production Systems.*—The Committee provides an increase of \$500,000 to develop management practices that improve the production efficiency of cattle grazing operations in temperate pastures.

*Childhood Health and Obesity.*—The Committee is concerned about the high rates of obesity in this country, and the medical issues obesity brings, and believes that prevention of childhood obesity is an important step in reducing overall obesity rates. Therefore, the Committee includes an increase of \$1,000,000 for research regarding what nutrients and dietary factors are needed to optimize infant and child development, and what infants should be fed to reduce childhood diseases and diseases they will experience later as adults.

*Diversified Rice Farming Techniques.*—The Committee includes an increase of \$400,000, as requested in the budget, for develop-

ment of diversified rice farming techniques, as part of the overall increase provided for crop breeding and protection to enhance food production and security.

*Human Nutrition Research.*—Of the funds provided to restore Human Nutrition Research, the Committee directs that \$350,000 go to Boston, MA; \$300,000 go to Houston, TX; and \$1,000,000 go to Kannapolis, NC.

*Infectious Livestock Diseases.*—The Committee recognizes the need to continue research on infectious livestock diseases. The Committee provides \$1,750,000 for expanded research on the emerging serotype of Bluetongue virus and zoonotic Rift Valley Fever virus to develop countermeasures and control insect vectors.

*Invasive Weeds Management.*—The Committee is aware of problems associated with invasive weeds and rangeland degradation in the Western Great Basin. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$500,000 to provide solutions and management practices for controlling invasive species and restoring ecosystem structure and function.

*Peanut Genome Mapping.*—The Committee provides \$750,000 to map and sequence the peanut genome and to develop molecular markers to aid in marker-assisted variety development.

*Pear Genetics and Genomics.*—The Committee directs the Agricultural Research Service to provide a report detailing specifically its year-by-year plans to locate and allocate resources including staff, facilities and equipment for pear genetics and genomics throughout the Agricultural Research Service. This report should also provide an estimate of how long it will take to meet the goals of the Pyrus plant improvement roadmap, including funding requirements necessary to meet the terms of that roadmap.

*Pulse Health Initiative.*—The Committee recognizes the need to investigate the ability of pulse crops—dry beans, dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas—to provide solutions to critical health issues including but not limited to obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer; and to increase the consumption of pulse crops by improving their functionality in baked goods and end use as a food and food ingredient through the study of milling, extrusion, extraction, and cooking properties. The Committee also recognizes the potential to improve the sustainability of agricultural rotations and reduce green house gas emissions by improving the nitrogen fixing abilities of pulse crops. The Committee recommends ARS provide adequate funding to establish the Pulse Health Initiative.

*Research Partnerships.*—The Committee is aware of ARS efforts to accelerate the adoption of Federal agricultural research and technology innovations through Federal/private sector partnerships with Agricultural Technology Innovation Partnership intermediaries. The Committee provides \$250,000 to establish one or more demonstration projects with the Mississippi Technology Alliance as a pilot for the commercialization of science-based agricultural technologies from Federal laboratories.

*Sugarcane.*—The Committee supports efforts to enhance the competitiveness of U.S. sugarcane producers through the expansion of valuable non-sugar byproducts and the development of pest and disease protection for viable diversified agricultural crops and encourages ARS to provide additional funding for this purpose.

*Sustainable Natural Resource and Crop Management Practices.*—The Committee recognizes the opportunity to improve the sustainability of farm operations through improvements in soil and water quality and diversification of farm products and income. Research is needed to develop natural resource and crop management practices to integrate trees and/or shrubs with crops/livestock at the interface of the urban and rural landscape. The Committee recommendation includes \$2,500,000 to accelerate efforts to develop land use systems and new conservation tools to support the long-term future of rural and urban working farms and landscapes.

*Upper Midwest Water Research.*—The Committee is supportive of the ongoing research collaboration between ARS and the Great Lakes Water Institute and the Milwaukee Water Council regarding the production of yellow perch, whose populations have decreased significantly in recent years. The Committee believes that aquaculture research, specifically as it relates to the Great Lakes, should be increased, and that ARS should expand the work it is doing in collaboration with the Great Lakes Water Institute and the Milwaukee Water Council.

The following is a list of congressionally designated projects:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS

	Committee recommendation
Aquaculture Fisheries Center; Stuttgart, AR .....	\$519,000
Biomass Crop Production; Brookings, SD .....	1,250,000
Bioremediation Research; Beltsville, MD .....	111,000
Biotechnology Research and Development Center; Headquarters .....	3,500,000
Computer Vision Engineer; Kearneysville, WV .....	400,000
Dairy Forage Research Center; Madison, WI .....	2,500,000
Dale Bumpers Small Farms Research Center; Booneville, AR .....	1,805,000
Diet Nutrition and Obesity Research; New Orleans, LA .....	623,000
Endophyte Research; Booneville, AR .....	994,000
Forage Crop Stress Tolerance and Virus Disease Management; Prosser, WA .....	200,000
Formosan Subterranean Termites; New Orleans, LA .....	3,490,000
Human Nutrition Research; Boston, MA; Houston, TX; Kannapolis, NC .....	1,650,000
National Center for Agricultural Law; Beltsville, MD .....	654,000
Northern Great Plains Research Laboratory; Mandan, ND .....	543,000
Northwest Center for Small Fruits; Corvallis, OR .....	275,000
Phytoestrogen Research; New Orleans, LA .....	1,750,000
Poultry Diseases; Beltsville, MD .....	408,000
Sorghum Research; Little Rock, AR .....	135,000
Technology Transfer; Headquarters .....	250,000
Water Management Research Laboratory; Brawley, CA .....	340,000
Water Use Reduction; Dawson, GA .....	1,200,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>22,597,000</b>

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$70,873,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	44,000,000

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$44,000,000 for buildings and facilities of the Agricultural Research Service.

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

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

## AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Agricultural Research Center; Beltsville, MD .....	3,000
Agricultural Research Center; Logan, UT .....	6,000
Agricultural Research Center; Pullman, WA .....	5,000
Animal Bioscience Facility; Bozeman, MT .....	3,000
Appalachian Fruit Laboratory; Kearneysville, WV .....	1,500
ARS Biotechnology Lab; Lorman, MS .....	2,000
ARS Research and Development Center; Auburn, AL .....	6,000
ARS Waste Management Research Facility; Bowling Green, KY .....	5,000
Dairy Forage Agricultural Research Center; Prairie du Sac, WI .....	1,000
National Cold Water Marine Aquaculture Center; Orono, ME .....	1,500
Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center; Hilo, HI .....	5,000
Sugarcane Research Laboratory; Houma, LA .....	1,000
Systems Biology Research Facility; Lincoln, NE .....	4,000
Total .....	44,000

*ARS Agroforestry Research Center.*—The Committee directs that funds appropriated to date for the National Plant and Genetics Security Center, Columbia, Missouri, be used to design and construct the ARS Agroforestry Research Center and a headhouse/greenhouse complex for plant physiology and genetics research. The Agroforestry Research Center shall be named the Dr. H.E. Gene Garrett Agroforestry Center.

*Bay Springs Research Facility Prospectus.*—The Committee directs the agency to provide a prospectus on the construction of a research facility at Bay Springs, Mississippi. The prospectus shall, at a minimum, include the following information: the feasibility, requirements, and scope of the proposed project; details on the building size, cost, associated facilities, scientific capacity, and other requirements; and details on the existing and planned research program and associated resource requirements.

*San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Science Center.*—The Committee is aware that there are funds remaining in the San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Science Center, Parlier, California, design and construction account and that the San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Science Center could benefit from the acquisition of additional land to support their research mission. The Committee directs ARS to use these remaining funds for site acquisition in support of the re-

search mission at the San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Science Center.

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 NIFA, effective October 1, 2009, any and all other authorities administered by the Administrator of the Cooperative State, Research, Education and Extension Service. The mission is to work with university partners and customers to advance research, extension, and higher education in the food and agricultural sciences and related environmental and human sciences to benefit people, communities, and the Nation.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$788,243,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	838,729,000
Committee recommendation .....	780,720,000

Research and Education programs administered by NIFA are USDA’s principal entrée to the university system of the United States for the purpose of conducting agricultural research and education programs as authorized by the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i); the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act of 1962, as amended (16 U.S.C. 582a et seq.); the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i); the National Agricultural, Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.); the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note); the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–185), as amended; the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–624); the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171); and the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246). Through these authorities, USDA participates with State and other cooperators to encourage and assist the State institutions in the conduct of agricultural research and education through the State Agricultural Experiment Stations of the 50 States and the territories; by approved Schools of Forestry; the 1890 Land-Grant Institutions and Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University; 1994 Land-Grant Institutions; by Colleges of Veterinary Medicine; and other eligible institutions. The appropriated funds provide Federal support for research and education programs at these institutions.

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$780,720,000 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 [NIFA]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

	Committee recommendation
Hatch Act .....	\$215,000,000
McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Research Program .....	29,000,000
Evans-Allen program (1890 Colleges, Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University) .....	48,500,000
Animal Health and Disease Research .....	2,950,000
Special Research Grants:	
Advanced Genetic Technologies (KY) .....	650,000
Advancing Biofuel Production (TX) .....	300,000
Aegilops Cylindrica (Jointed Goatgrass/Biomass) (WA) .....	200,000
Agricultural Diversification (HI) .....	153,000
Agricultural Science (OH) .....	450,000
Air quality (TX, KS) .....	300,000
Animal Science Food Safety Consortium (AR, IA, KS) .....	1,000,000
Aquaculture (LA) .....	150,000
Aquaculture (MS) .....	337,000
Avian Bioscience (DE) .....	150,000
Barley for Rural Development (ID, MT) .....	500,000
Biodesign and Bioprocessing (VA) .....	211,000
Bio Energy Production and Carbon Sequestration (TN) .....	500,000
Biomass-based Energy Research (OK, MS) .....	839,000
Bioresource Land Use Planning Project (KY) .....	671,000
Cataloging Genes Associated with Drought and Disease Resistance (NM) .....	168,000
Center for Food, Nutrition and Obesity (WV) .....	550,000
Center for One Medicine (IL) .....	500,000
Center for Multi-Functional Prairie Agriculture (SD) .....	700,000
Center for Rural Studies (VT) .....	350,000
Childhood Obesity and Nutrition (VT) .....	250,000
Cool season legume research (ID, ND, WA) .....	350,000
Cotton Insect Management and Fiber Quality (GA) .....	346,000
Cranberry/Blueberry (MA) .....	152,000
Cranberry/Blueberry Disease & Breeding (NJ) .....	522,000
Crop Diversification and Biofuel Research and Education (KY) .....	525,000
Dairy and Meat Goat Research (TX) .....	200,000
Dairy Farm Profitability (PA) .....	372,000
Delta Revitalization Project (MS) .....	176,000
Drought Mitigation (NE) .....	600,000
Efficient irrigation (NM, TX) .....	575,000
Emerald Ash Borer (OH) .....	522,000
Environmentally Safe Products (VT) .....	250,000
Floriculture (HI) .....	300,000
Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute (IA, MO, NV) .....	1,213,000
Food & Fuel Initiative (IA) .....	298,000
Forages for Advancing Livestock Production (KY) .....	473,000
Fresh Produce Food Safety (CA) .....	750,000
Genetically Enhanced Plants for Micro-nutrients and Genomics for Southern Crop Stress and Disease (MS) .....	797,000
Global Change, UV—Monitoring .....	1,750,000
Grain Sorghum (KS) .....	1,250,000
Grass Seed Cropping Systems for Sustainable Agriculture (OR, WA) .....	142,000
Human Nutrition (LA) .....	526,000
Illinois Plant Breeding Center (IL) .....	617,000
Inland Marine Aquaculture (VA) .....	380,000
Infectious Disease Research (CO) .....	617,000
Institute for Food Science and Engineering (AR) .....	500,000

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION  
ACTIVITIES—Continued

	Committee recommendation
Integrated Economic, Environmental and Technical Analysis of Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems (IN) .....	188,000
Leopold Center Hypoxia Project (IA) .....	100,000
Livestock & Dairy Policy (NY) .....	180,000
Maple Research (VT) .....	165,000
Midwest Center for Bioenergy Grasses (IN) .....	188,000
Midwest Poultry Consortium (IA) .....	250,000
Milk Safety (PA) .....	780,000
Minor Use Animal Drugs .....	429,000
National Beef Cattle Genetic Evaluation Consortium (CO, GA, NY) .....	655,000
National Center for Agricultural and Rural Sustainability (AR) .....	175,000
National Center for Soybean Technology (MO) .....	690,000
Native Grassland and Sustainability (KS) .....	1,000,000
Nematode Resistance Genetic Engineering (NM) .....	199,000
Nevada Arid Rangelands Initiative (NV) .....	500,000
New Century Farm (IA) .....	350,000
New Satellite and Computer-Based Technology for Agriculture (MS) .....	654,000
Organic Cropping (OR) .....	142,000
Organic Cropping (WA) .....	264,000
Pierce's Disease and Invasive Pest Research (CA) .....	2,000,000
Policy Analyses for a National Secure & Sustainable Food, Fiber, Forestry and Energy Program (TX) ..	200,000
Potato Research .....	1,436,000
Preharvest Food Safety (KS) .....	500,000
Protein Utilization (IA) .....	500,000
Rangeland Ecosystems Dynamics (ID) .....	300,000
Renewable Energy and Products (ND) .....	1,000,000
Rural Policies Research Institute (IA) .....	755,000
Russian Wheat Aphid (CO) .....	237,000
Small Fruit Research (ID, OR, WA) .....	285,000
Soil-Borne Disease Prevention in Irrigated Agriculture (NM) .....	178,000
Southern Great Plains Dairy Consortium (NM) .....	350,000
Soybean Cyst Nematode (MO) .....	556,000
Sustainable Engineered Materials from Renewable Resources (VA) .....	237,000
Sustainable Food and Bio-Energy Systems (MT) .....	305,000
Sustainable Production and Processing Research for Lowbush Specialty Crops (ME) .....	200,000
Sustainable Wheat Production and Food Security (SD) .....	600,000
Tillage, Silviculture, Waste Management (LA) .....	180,000
Tropical and Subtropical Research/T STAR (HI) .....	800,000
Virtual Plant Database Enhancement Project (MO) .....	588,000
Virus-free Wine Grape Cultivars (WA) .....	247,000
Viticulture Consortium (CA) .....	1,000,000
Water Conservation (KS) .....	600,000
Wetland Plants (LA) .....	200,000
Wheat Genetic Research (KS) .....	1,250,000
Wildlife/Livestock Disease Research Partnership (WY) .....	300,000
Wood Utilization (AK, ID, LA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC, OR, WV) .....	4,841,000
<b>Total, Special Research Grants .....</b>	<b>49,686,000</b>
<b>Improved Pest Control:</b>	
Expert IPM Decision Support System .....	156,000
Integrated Pest Management .....	2,415,000
Minor Crop Pest Management, IR-4 .....	12,180,000
Pest Management Alternatives .....	1,434,000
<b>Total, Improved Pest Control .....</b>	<b>16,185,000</b>
Critical Ag Materials Act of 1984 .....	1,083,000
Aquaculture Centers, Section 1475 .....	3,928,000
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education .....	15,000,000
1994 Institutions Research Program .....	1,805,000
Supplemental and Alternative Crops, Section 1473 D .....	835,000

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION  
ACTIVITIES—Continued

	Committee recommendation
AFRI .....	310,074,000
Joe Skeen Institute for Rangeland Restoration (NM, TX, MT) .....	983,000
New Era Rural Technology Program .....	875,000
Farm Business Management and Benchmarking Program .....	1,500,000
Sun Grant Program .....	2,250,000
Federal Administration:	
Ag-based Industrial Lubricants (IA) .....	405,000
Agriculture Development in the American Pacific (HI) .....	400,000
Agriculture Technology Innovation, MD .....	150,000
Agriculture Waste Utilization (WV) .....	500,000
Applied Agriculture and Environment Research (CA) .....	350,000
Biofuels Research (VT) .....	100,000
Biotechnology Research (MS) .....	480,000
Center for Dairy and Beef Excellence (PA) .....	340,000
Clemson University Veterinary Institute (SC) .....	1,000,000
Converting Agricultural Waste to Energy (KS) .....	2,000,000
Cotton Research (TX) .....	200,000
Council for Agriculture Science and Technology (IA) .....	110,000
Data Information System (REEIS) .....	2,704,000
Development of Biobased Chemicals and Materials from Agriculture Raw Materials (MI) .....	125,000
Electronic Grants Administration System .....	2,136,000
Ethnobotanicals (MD) .....	500,000
Farmland Preservation (OH) .....	152,000
Florida Biomass to Biofuels Conversion Program, University of Central Florida .....	285,000
International Center for Food Technology Development to Expand Markets (IL) .....	450,000
Kansas Advanced Biofuel Development .....	2,000,000
Kansas Center for Advanced Plant Design .....	2,000,000
Midwest Agribusiness Trade and Information Center MATRIC (IA) .....	95,000
Mississippi Valley State University .....	1,002,000
NE Center for Invasive Plants (CT, VT, ME) .....	295,000
Office of Extramural Programs .....	440,000
Pay Costs .....	5,826,000
Peer Panels .....	397,000
Polymer Research (KS) .....	2,350,000
Rural Systems (MS) .....	215,000
Shrimp Aquaculture (MS) .....	300,000
Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development Law Center (VT) .....	343,000
Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia (OH) .....	500,000
Water Pollutants (WV) .....	500,000
Total, Federal Administration .....	28,650,000
Higher Education:	
Graduate Fellowships Grants .....	3,859,000
Institution Challenge Grants .....	5,654,000
1890s Institution Capacity Building Grants .....	18,250,000
Multicultural Scholars .....	1,241,000
Hispanic-Serving Institutions Education Grants Program .....	9,237,000
Tribal Colleges Education Equity Grants Program .....	3,342,000
Secondary/2-Year Post Secondary .....	983,000
Veterinary Medical Services Act .....	5,000,000
Alaska Native-Serving and Native-Hawaiian-Serving Institutions .....	3,200,000
Resident Instruction Grants for Insular Areas .....	900,000
Distance Education Grants for Insular Areas .....	750,000
Total, Higher Education Grants .....	52,416,000
Total, Research and Education .....	780,720,000

*Agriculture and Food Research Initiative.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$310,074,000 for the Agriculture and Food

Research Initiative [AFRI]. The Committee notes that programs previously funded through the Integrated Activities account are eligible for funding under AFRI.

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

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

*Agriculture Policy Research.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,213,000 for the Food and Agriculture Policy Institute, of which \$340,000 shall be used to conduct analysis of rangeland, cattle, and hay with the University of Nevada-Reno. The Committee recommendation also includes \$755,000 for the Rural Policies Research Institute.

*Alaska Native-serving and Native Hawaiian-serving Institutions Education Grants.*—The Committee recommends \$3,200,000 for grants to individual eligible institutions or consortia of eligible institutions in Alaska and in Hawaii, with grant funds to be awarded equally between Alaska and Hawaii to carry out the programs authorized in 7 U.S.C. 3242. The Committee directs the agency to fully comply with the use of grant funds as authorized.

*Alternative Crops.*—The Committee recommends \$850,000 for alternative crop research to continue and strengthen research efforts on canola. The Committee understands that the United States does not produce enough canola to meet its consumption needs and encourages the Department to seek stakeholder input and to provide funds in a manner that reaches those areas most likely to see expansions in canola production.

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

*Floriculture and Tropical and Subtropical Research.*—The Committee provides funding to carry out floriculture research in Hawaii and expects priorities of this activity (as defined by industry stakeholders) to include the maintenance and improvement of

germplasm of orchid, anthurium, and protea to derive and release new commercial varieties and continue research on disease resistance and insect control. The Committee also provides funding for tropical and subtropical research and supports the current mechanism of solicitation, recommendation and distribution of funds through the Pacific Basin and Caribbean Basin Administration Groups.

*Forestry and Related Natural Resource Research.*—The Committee recognizes that forestry and related natural resource research were an integral part of the National Research Initiative, the predecessor program to the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative [AFRI]. As this program has grown, however, the allocation of AFRI funds by NIFA for research on forestry and related natural resource topics has fallen behind. In the future, the Committee directs the AFRI program administrator to put a greater emphasis on AFRI funding for forestry and natural resources topics with a goal of eventually providing at least 10 percent of the total funds provided for AFRI for forestry and natural resources related research on topics including: woody plant systems, including large scale efforts to sequence the genome for several economically important tree species, technologies for enhanced pest and disease resistance, and increased tree growth rates; management of complex forest ecosystems, including issues of forest health, productivity, economic sustainability, and restoration; assessing alternative management strategies, with emphasis on risk analysis, geospatial analysis including landscape implications, consideration of ecological services, providing decision support systems; and development of nanotechnology and biorefining technologies for the forest products sector as critical to enhancing global competitiveness and energy security.

*National Center for Agricultural and Rural Sustainability.*—The Committee provides \$175,000 for the National Center for Agricultural and Rural Sustainability and encourages the ERS, NRCS, RMA, and NIFA to cooperate with the Center in establishing national sustainability standards, measures, and protocols.

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

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

view and that the grantee submit an annual report to the Secretary describing the results of the research or related activity and the merits of the results.

Over the past few years, the Committee has made clear its intentions to employ a heightened level of scrutiny to grants awarded under 7 U.S.C. 450i(c). These indications have included requirements of detailed reports by grantees, in-depth explanations of prospective research objectives, and an understanding that grantees should not expect indefinite fiscal assistance from the Committee under this authority. In addition, the Committee has previously expressed concern that ongoing, long-term Federal commitments to specific research projects may reduce the opportunity to focus on emerging important research priorities and result in a less efficient Federal investment in agricultural and related research.

For fiscal year 2011, the Committee continues its responsibility of expressing congressional interest and intervention in setting research priorities through the investment of Federal funds. As the Committee has expressed in previous years, specific problems require specific objectives and specific attention. Therefore, the individual research activities described in this report are intended to accomplish the objectives set forth in this report and are not intended to extend into ongoing, long-term, indefinite research endeavors. The Secretary is encouraged to work with grantees to ensure that research conducted with these funds is set to achieve specific objectives and to refrain from undertaking research of an indefinite nature. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a report by March 1, 2011, regarding the status of grant awards for fiscal year 2011 and the specific objectives to be sought in each case.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$11,880,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	11,880,000
Committee recommendation .....	11,880,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

HISPANIC-SERVING AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
ENDOWMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2010 .....	
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	\$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.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$494,923,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	479,203,000
Committee recommendation .....	491,231,000

Cooperative extension work was established by the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended. The Department of Agriculture is authorized to provide, through the land-grant colleges, cooperative extension work that consists of the development of practical applications of research knowledge and the giving of instruction and practical demonstrations of existing or improved practices or technologies in agriculture, uses of solar energy with respect to agriculture, home economics, related subjects, and to encourage the application of such information by demonstrations, publications, through 4-H clubs, and other means to persons not in attendance or resident at the colleges.

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$491,231,000 for extension activities of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

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

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

	Committee recommendation
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(b) and (c) .....	\$297,500,000
Smith-Lever, Section 3d Programs:	
Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP) .....	68,070,000
Farm Safety .....	4,863,000
New Technologies for Ag Extension .....	1,750,000
Pest Management .....	9,938,000
Children, Youth, and Families at Risk .....	8,412,000
Youth Farm Safety Education and Certification .....	486,000
Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program .....	3,500,000
Sustainable Agriculture .....	5,000,000
Total, Section 3d Programs .....	102,019,000
1890 Colleges, Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University .....	42,677,000
Rural Health and Safety Education .....	1,738,000
1890 Facilities (Sec. 1447) .....	19,770,000
Grants to Youth Serving Institutions .....	1,000,000
Renewable Resources Extension Act (RREA) .....	4,068,000
Extension Services at the 1994 Institutions .....	5,321,000
Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database (FARAD) .....	1,000,000
Women and Minorities in STEM Fields .....	400,000
Federal Administration:	
Ag in the Classroom .....	553,000
Childhood Farm Safety (IA) .....	75,000
Conservation Technology Transfer (WI) .....	376,000
Dairy Education (IA) .....	175,000
E-commerce (MS) .....	231,000
Efficient irrigation (NM, TX) .....	475,000
Extension Specialist (MS) .....	173,000
Food Production Education (VT) .....	116,000
General Administration, Including Pay Costs .....	8,252,000
Health Education Leadership (KY) .....	300,000
Institute for Sustainable Agriculture (WI) .....	400,000
Invasive Phragmites Control and Outreach (MI) .....	147,000
Iowa Vitality Center .....	250,000
Maine Cattle Health Assurance Program .....	700,000
National Center for Farm Safety (IA) .....	150,000
Northeast Energy and Environmental Dairy System (PA) .....	305,000
Nutrition Enhancement (WI) .....	950,000
Ohio-Israel Agriculture Initiative .....	700,000
Pilot Technology Transfer (MS, OK) .....	209,000
Potato Integrated Pest Management—Late Blight (ME) .....	450,000
Range Improvement (NM) .....	200,000
Urban Horticulture (WI) .....	376,000
Urban Horticulture and Marketing (IL) .....	175,000
Total, Federal Administration .....	15,738,000
Total, Extension Activities .....	491,231,000

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$60,022,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	24,874,000
Committee recommendation .....	38,577,000

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 \$38,577,000 for integrated activities of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

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

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE [NIFA]—INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

	Committee recommendation
Section 406 Legislative Authority:	
Water Quality .....	\$12,649,000
Methyl Bromide Transition Program .....	3,054,000
Organic Transition Program .....	5,000,000
Total, Section 406 .....	20,703,000
International Science and Education Grants Program .....	3,000,000
Critical Issues Program .....	732,000
Regional Rural Development Centers Program .....	1,312,000
Homeland Security, Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative .....	9,830,000
Sustainable Agriculture Federal-State Matching Grant Program .....	3,000,000
Total, Integrated Activities .....	38,577,000

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$895,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	920,000
Committee recommendation .....	904,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$904,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$904,953,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	870,576,000
Committee recommendation .....	926,609,000

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

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

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

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

*Pest and Disease Management Programs.*—The agency carries out programs to control and eradicate pest infestations and animal diseases that threaten the United States; reduce agricultural losses caused by predatory animals, birds, and rodents; provide technical assistance to other cooperators such as States, counties, farmer or rancher groups, and foundations; and ensure compliance with interstate movement and other disease control regulations within the jurisdiction of the agency.

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$926,609,000 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 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
<b>PEST AND DISEASE EXCLUSION:</b>			
Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) .....	29,000	26,526	29,526
Cattle Fever Ticks .....	13,157	13,355	13,355
Foreign Animal Disease/Foot and Mouth Disease .....	4,004	4,007	4,007
Fruit Fly Exclusion and Detection .....	62,920	63,568	63,568
Import/Export .....	13,298	13,564	13,564
Overseas Technical and Trade Operations .....	16,172	17,195	17,195
Screwworm .....	27,714	20,243	20,243
Tropical Bont Tick .....	429	432	432
Subtotal, Pest and Disease Exclusion .....	166,694	158,890	161,890
<b>PLANT AND ANIMAL HEALTH MONITORING:</b>			
Animal Health Monitoring and Surveillance .....	121,667	128,659	130,175
Animal and Plant Health Reg. Enforcement .....	13,983	15,913	16,913
Avian Influenza .....	60,243	47,219	47,219
Emergency Management Systems .....	15,794	15,933	15,933
National Veterinary Stockpile .....	3,757	3,771	3,771
Pest Detection .....	28,113	26,957	28,314
Select Agents .....	5,176	5,214	5,214
Subtotal, Plant and Animal Health Monitoring .....	248,773	247,266	247,539
<b>PEST AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT:</b>			
Aquaculture .....	6,560	5,816	6,570
Biological Control .....	10,467	10,149	11,399
Brucellosis .....	9,707	9,154	9,804
Chronic Wasting Disease .....	16,875	14,208	16,929
Contingency Funds .....	2,058	2,085	2,085
Cotton Pests .....	23,390	9,041	22,254
<b>Emerging Plant Pests:</b>			
Asian Long-horned Beetle .....	33,021	49,200	42,130
Citrus Canker/Citrus Health Program .....	44,656	44,780	45,781
Emerald Ash Borer .....	37,205	13,160	22,000
Glassey-winged Sharpshooter .....	22,983	22,360	23,066
Sudden Oak Death .....	5,347	5,090	5,366
Potato Cyst Nematode .....	8,327	6,245	8,357
Karnal Bunt .....	2,151	2,160	2,160
Light Brown Apple Moth .....	1,008	11,010	10,010
Sirex Woodwasp .....	1,500	1,505	1,505
Varroa Mite .....	469	.....	469
Other Emerging Plant Pests .....	2,102	2,105	4,105
Total, Emerging Plant Pests .....	158,769	157,615	164,949
Golden Nematode .....	831	843	843
Grasshopper .....	5,578	4,637	5,637
Gypsy Moth .....	5,420	4,981	5,481
Imported Fire Ant .....	1,902	1,909	1,909
Johne's Disease .....	6,876	3,470	6,885
Noxious Weeds .....	1,990	1,174	1,993
Plum Pox .....	2,206	2,129	2,215
Pseudorabies .....	2,510	2,560	2,560
Scrapie .....	17,906	18,043	18,043
Tuberculosis .....	16,764	15,601	15,849
Wildlife Services Operations .....	77,780	71,015	80,701
Witchweed .....	1,517	1,522	1,522
Subtotal, Pest and Disease Management .....	369,106	335,952	377,628

## ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
<b>ANIMAL CARE:</b>			
Animal Welfare .....	21,979	25,933	25,933
Horse Protection .....	500	900	900
Subtotal, Animal Care .....	22,479	23,233	26,833
<b>SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SERVICES:</b>			
Biotechnology Regulatory Services .....	13,050	18,695	18,954
Environmental Compliance .....	2,715	2,750	2,750
Plant Methods Development Labs .....	9,949	10,137	10,637
Veterinary Biologics .....	17,325	17,645	20,645
Veterinary Diagnostics .....	26,073	29,745	30,633
Wildlife Services Methods Development .....	18,630	16,064	18,901
Subtotal, Scientific and Technical Services .....	87,742	95,036	102,520
<b>MANAGEMENT:</b>			
APHIS Information Technology Infrastructure .....	4,474	4,474	4,474
Physical/Operational Security .....	5,725	5,725	5,725
Subtotal, Management .....	10,199	10,199	10,199
<b>TOTAL, APHIS .....</b>	<b>904,953</b>	<b>870,576</b>	<b>926,609</b>

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

*Animal Disease Traceability (Formerly National Animal ID System).*—During fiscal year 2010 the Department gathered public comments and released a framework for a new Animal Disease Traceability initiative. The initiative will focus on State-specific concerns, and States and tribal governments will guide its development. Rather than taking the lead, the agency role is now facilitator and collaborator. At this stage it is premature to identify agency resource needs and the Committee provides no funding specifically for the initiative. However, once a comprehensive plan has been developed and funding needs identified, the Committee may consider this for further action during deliberations on the fiscal year 2011 bill.

*Biotechnology Regulatory Services.*—The Committee provides an increase of \$5,767,000 for biotechnology regulatory services and notes that while biotechnology holds promise for increased agricultural productivity, it is extremely important that adequate regulatory safeguards are in place to assure that only properly approved products are allowed entry to the market to avoid the possibility of any introduction of products with unintended traits which could have potentially devastating effects on the food supply and the economy.

*Center for Veterinary Biologics.*—The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$3,000,000 for the Center for Veterinary Biologics [CVB]. The leadership of Veterinary Services is commended for recently holding a stakeholder meeting and for committing to make timely improvements to the center's management,

transparency, and procedures. The Committee will closely monitor how the CVB implements these changes. The Deputy Administrator of Veterinary Services is directed to provide the Committee with semi-annual reports on the workload of the CVB and the number of days it takes for applications to complete the review process.

*Emerald Ash Borer.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$22,000,000 for emerald ash borer. These funds, coupled with the expected \$17,000,000 to be carried over from fiscal year 2010, will provide a \$39,000,000 program level in fiscal year 2011. The Committee recognizes this invasive species poses a significant threat to the Nation’s ash trees, has the potential to cause substantial economic and ecological damage, and that further efforts are required to manage its spread and develop techniques and technologies for eradication. To these ends, \$1,000,000 is included for a cooperative research agreement with the Agricultural Research Service to advance eradication efforts against this destructive infestation.

*Invasive Honey Bee Pests.*—The Committee is concerned with the national and global pollination impact associated with the varroa mite and Small Hive Beetle discoveries in Hawaii, and provides \$469,000 for the agency to work with other Federal agencies, State agencies, and community and industry leaders to suppress varroa mites and other invasive honey bee pests and eradicate and manage infestations where necessary.

COMMITTEE DIRECTIVES

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

The following is a list of congressionally designated projects:

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS

Project	Program	Amount
Agriculture Compliance Laboratory Equipment, Delaware Department of Agriculture.	Veterinary diagnostics .....	\$69,000
Arthropod damage control Nevada, APHIS Nevada .....	Grasshopper .....	1,000,000
Berryman Institute, Jack Berryman Institute Utah and Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station.	Wildlife services methods development.	1,500,000
Bio-safety and antibiotic resistance, University of Vermont .....	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	240,000
Blackbird management, APHIS Louisiana .....	Wildlife services operations .....	94,000
Bovine tuberculosis eradication Michigan, Michigan Department of Agriculture.	Tuberculosis .....	248,000
Brucellosis eradication in the Greater Yellowstone area states, Idaho Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Livestock, Wyoming Livestock Board.	Brucellosis .....	650,000
California county pest detection augmentation program, California Department of Food and Agriculture.	Pest detection .....	619,000

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

Project	Program	Amount
Cogongrass control, Mississippi Department of Agriculture .....	Noxious weeds .....	208,000
Cooperative livestock protection program, APHIS Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.	Wildlife services operations .....	223,000
Cormorant control, APHIS Michigan .....	Wildlife services operations .....	139,000
Cormorant control, APHIS Mississippi .....	Wildlife services operations .....	223,000
Cormorant control, APHIS Vermont and Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department.	Wildlife services operations .....	103,000
Database of North Carolina's agricultural industry for rapid response, NC Department of Agriculture.	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	208,000
Disease prevention, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.	Veterinary diagnostics .....	69,000
Genetically modified products, Iowa State University .....	Biotechnology regulatory services .....	259,000
Giant Salvinia control, Northwestern State University .....	Plant methods development .....	500,000
Hawaii interline, APHIS Hawaii .....	Agricultural quarantine inspection .....	3,000,000
Hawaii wildlife services activities, APHIS Hawaii .....	Wildlife services operations .....	2,230,000
Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, Tennessee, University of Tennessee .....	Biological control .....	1,250,000
Integrated predation management activities, APHIS West Virginia.	Wildlife services operations .....	280,000
Invasive aquatic species, Lake Champlain Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative, Vermont.	Aquaculture .....	94,000
National Agriculture Biosecurity Center, Kansas State University.	Veterinary diagnostics .....	750,000
New Mexico rapid syndrome validation program, New Mexico State University.	Animal health monitoring and surveillance.	404,000
Nez Perce Bio-control Center, Nez Perce Tribe .....	Noxious weeds .....	176,000
Noxious weed management, Nevada Department of Agriculture ..	Noxious weeds .....	235,000
Technology to combat asian long-horned beetles in New York forests, SUNY-College of Environmental Science and Forestry.	Emerging plant pests .....	500,000
Tri-State predator control, APHIS Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.	Wildlife services operations .....	926,000
Varroa mite suppression, APHIS Hawaii .....	Emerging plant pests .....	469,000
Wildlife management and control, APHIS Mississippi .....	Wildlife services operations .....	496,000
Wildlife Services South Dakota, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks.	Wildlife services operations .....	519,000
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	.....	17,681,000

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$4,712,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	4,712,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,712,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$4,712,000 for buildings and facilities of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. This funding is necessary to allow APHIS to maintain existing facilities, and perform critically needed repairs to and replacements of building components, such as heating, ventilation and air-conditioning on a prioritized basis at APHIS facilities. The Committee notes that due to the environmentally sensitive nature of many APHIS facilities, closure of a fa-

cility could result if APHIS is unable to complete the required repairs.

## AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

### MARKETING SERVICES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$91,148,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	97,255,000
Committee recommendation .....	96,955,000

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

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

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$96,955,000 for marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$891,000 for the Pesticide Data Program, \$250,000 for Microbiological Data Program sampling, \$3,111,000 for the National Organic Program, and \$920,000 for the Know Your Farmer Know Your Food initiative.

*Dairy Price Reporting.*—The Committee encourages the Secretary to consider the recommendations of the Dairy Industry Advisory Committee regarding implementation of section 1510 of Public Law 110–246.

*Organics.*—The Committee is greatly concerned by the inability of the Department to take immediate remedial actions upon strong evidence that products certified as organic may, in fact, not be eligible for such designation. A recent incident involving a third-party certification agent that approved imported products to carry a USDA organic label has proved most troubling. A departmental audit later resulted in a suspension of the party's certification, but such suspension occurred nearly 3 years after the initial audit. Further troubling is the fact that the Department lacked the ability to withdraw the certification due to lengthy appeals and other delays while products of questionable content continued to appear in U.S. markets. The Committee finds this type of delay unacceptable and fears that continued problems of this nature will erode the integrity of the entire USDA Organics Program.

The Committee has recommended an additional \$3,111,000 for operations of the National Organics Program [NOP], as requested. In addition, the Committee directs the Secretary to conduct a full review of the Department's authorities for enforcement of the NOP to identify proper actions for prompt responses to protect the integrity of the program whenever and wherever violations occur. The Secretary is directed to provide a written report to the Committee by March 1, 2011, on steps taken to improve enforcement of the Organic Standards Act.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2010 .....	\$64,583,000
Budget limitation, 2011 .....	60,947,000
Committee recommendation .....	60,947,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$60,947,000 on administrative expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY

(SECTION 32)

MARKETING AGREEMENTS AND ORDERS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$20,056,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	20,283,000
Committee recommendation .....	20,283,000

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 2009–2011:

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2009–2011

	Fiscal year 2009 actual	Fiscal year 2010 estimate	Fiscal year 2011 estimate
Appropriation (30 percent of Customs Receipts) .....	\$7,979,334,788	\$8,061,101,371	\$6,605,945,807
Rescission of Current Year Funds .....	-242,022,000		

## ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD—FISCAL YEARS 2009–2011—Continued

	Fiscal year 2009 actual	Fiscal year 2010 estimate	Fiscal year 2011 estimate
Less Transfers:			
Food and Nutrition Service .....	– 6,455,802,000	– 6,747,877,000	– 5,322,714,872
Commerce Department .....	– 108,510,788	– 114,224,371	– 68,230,935
Total, Transfers .....	– 6,564,312,788	– 6,862,101,371	– 5,390,945,807
Budget Authority .....	1,173,000,000	1,199,000,000	1,215,000,000
Unobligated Balance, Start of Year .....	293,529,985	375,373,561	76,000,000
Rescission of Prior Year Funds .....	– 51,507,985	– 133,351,561	.....
Proposed Rescission of Current Year Funds .....	.....	.....	– 50,000,000
Unavailable for Obligations .....	– 343,492,000	– 76,000,000	– 113,000,000
Transfer of Prior Year Funds to FNS .....	.....	– 242,022,000	.....
Available for Obligation .....	1,071,530,000	1,123,000,000	1,128,000,000
Less Obligations:			
Child Nutrition Programs (Entitlement Commodities) .....	467,880,887	465,000,000	465,000,000
12 Percent Commodity Floor Requirement .....	.....	152,200,000	120,000,000
State Option Contract .....	.....	.....	5,000,000
Removal of Defective Commodities .....	28,963	2,500,000	2,500,000
Emergency Surplus Removal .....	319,513,092	283,100,000	.....
Direct Payments .....	750,000	3,375,000	.....
Disaster Relief .....	.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases .....	119,418,398	24,639,114	203,000,000
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program .....	108,000,000	25,000,000	113,000,000
Whole Grain Products Study (FSA) .....	4,000,000	.....	.....
Accounting Adjustment .....	– 28,159,093	1,561,000	.....
Estimated Future Needs .....	.....	118,232,886	181,226,000
Total, Commodity Procurement .....	991,432,247	1,080,608,000	1,094,726,000
Administrative Funds:			
Commodity Purchase Support .....	31,092,419	22,336,000	20,283,000
Marketing Agreements and Orders .....	17,123,773	20,056,000	12,991,000
Total, Administrative Funds .....	48,216,192	42,392,000	33,274,000
Total Obligations .....	1,039,648,439	1,123,000,000	1,128,000,000
Unobligated Balance, End of Year .....	375,373,561	76,000,000	113,000,000

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a transfer from section 32 funds of \$20,283,000 for the formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders.

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

## PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,334,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	2,634,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,484,000

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,484,000 for payments to States and possessions for Federal-State marketing projects and activities.

## GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$41,964,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	44,192,000
Committee recommendation .....	44,192,000

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 \$44,192,000 for salaries and expenses of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$1,800,000 for enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

## LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Limitation, 2010 .....	\$42,463,000
Budget limitation, 2011 .....	45,041,000
Committee recommendation .....	50,000,000

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 \$50,000,000 on inspection and weighing services expenses.

## OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$813,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	836,000
Committee recommendation .....	821,000

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 \$821,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.

*Ombudsman.*—The Committee encourages the Secretary to consider the establishment of an ombudsman to provide FSIS inspectors and other personnel with an avenue to register their concerns and help ensure that they are able to carry out their responsibilities—ensuring compliance with all food safety and humane slaughter requirements—without undue interference. If deemed appropriate, the Committee recommends that this ombudsman be independent from FSIS, reporting directly to the Under Secretary for Food Safety.

## FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,018,520,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	1,036,900,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,047,200,000

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

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

The inspection program of the Food Safety and Inspection Service provides continuous in-plant inspection of all domestic plants preparing meat, poultry or egg products for sale or distribution; reviews foreign inspection systems and establishments that prepare meat or poultry products for export to the United States; and provides technical and financial assistance to States which maintain meat and poultry inspection programs.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,047,200,000 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

*Codex Alimentarius.*—Codex Alimentarius is critical for the protection of consumer health globally and facilitating international trade. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$3,903,000 exclusively for the activities of the U.S. Codex office including international outreach and education.

*Humane Slaughter.*—The Committee continues to include \$3,000,000, as requested in the budget, for maintenance of the Humane Animal Tracking System. Further, the Committee notes that the budget request will maintain no less than 148 full-time equivalent positions which have been provided solely for humane slaughter enforcement.

The Committee is pleased that USDA, during fiscal year 2010, acted upon the longstanding recommendations of this Committee regarding objective scoring methods to enforce the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act. The Committee encourages USDA to continue these efforts, and expand them as determined appropriate.

*Inspections.*—The Committee recommendation does not include the proposed reduction of \$10,300,000 for the implementation of section 11016 of Public Law 110-246, and expects USDA to meet its statutory obligation and promulgate regulations to implement this section. Further, USDA is directed to report on the progress of implementing this section within 30 days of the enactment of this act.

*Mobile Review Team.*—The Committee directs FSIS to consider the hiring and training of a mobile review team of FSIS employees to conduct unscheduled audits, including the potential for undercover surveillance, focused on assessing compliance with humane handling rules of live animals as they arrive and are offloaded and handled in pens, chutes and stunning areas. These teams could also, if deemed appropriate, be responsible for reporting on or acting on other food safety responsibilities, as outlined by FSIS. The Committee directs FSIS to report back to the Committee on the feasibility of such a team, including whether FSIS or another USDA agency would be the most appropriate to carry out this effort; and the potential responsibilities, challenges, costs, and benefits of having such a team. If FSIS deems this to be a worthwhile effort, the Committee encourages them to begin implementation.

*State Meat Inspection.*—The Committee is concerned that USDA has not yet promulgated regulations regarding interstate shipment of meat and poultry from eligible State-inspected plants, in accord-

ance with Public Law 110–246. The Committee encourages USDA to continue to collaborate with State agencies, as appropriate, on the swift publication and implementation of these regulations.

The following table represents the Committee’s specific recommendations for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
Food safety inspection:			
Federal .....	903,067	912,248	919,248
State .....	65,654	65,118	65,118
International .....	19,445	16,161	19,461
Codex Alimentarius .....	3,884	3,903	3,903
PHDCIS .....	26,470	39,470	39,470
Total .....	1,018,520	1,036,900	1,047,200

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN  
AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$895,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	920,000
Committee recommendation .....	904,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$904,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.

*Food Aid Quality.*—The Committee continues strong interest in maintaining high quality standards in food products used for international humanitarian assistance. The Department is encouraged further to develop adequate standardization of quality control mechanisms. In addition, the Committee expects that appropriate levels of funding from the Commodity Credit Corporation be directed to inspection of shipments in order to avoid breaks in food pipelines and to maintain an orderly conveyance of food to the world’s hungry populations.

*Geospatial Data.*—The Committee is aware of section 1619 of the Farm bill that requires geospatial data collected from farming operations to be portable and standardized. The Secretary is encouraged to work with the Nebraska Natural Resource Districts with their efforts in collecting geospatial data, as deemed appropriate.

## FARM SERVICE AGENCY

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

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(In thousands of dollars)

	Appropriations	Transfers from program accounts	Total, FSA, salaries, and expenses
Appropriations, 2010 .....	1,253,777	316,340	1,570,117
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	1,364,673	321,405	1,686,078
Committee recommendation .....	1,343,350	316,378	1,659,728

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 \$1,659,728,000 for salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency, including a direct appropriation of \$1,343,350,000.

*Information Technology.*—The Committee provides substantial funding for the information technology [IT] needs requested in the President's budget proposal. The Committee remains aware of the unstable status of the Farm Service Agency computer system which is responsible for the calculation and tracking of the agency's payments to agricultural producers, and which has resulted in disruption of services to U.S. farmers and ranchers.

*National Agriculture Imagery Program.*—The Committee recommends that no less than the fiscal year 2010 level shall be allocated to purchase imagery products to meet programmatic requirements.

## STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$4,369,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	4,369,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,369,000

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

## GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	6,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,000,000

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

## DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$930,000
Budget estimate, 2011 <sup>1</sup> .....	876,000
Committee recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	876,000

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

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated in fiscal year 2011 to be \$876,000, 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 fractionated land, and emergency loans to individuals, as well as the following types of loans to associations: irrigation and drainage, grazing, Indian tribe land acquisition, and boll weevil eradication.

FSA is also authorized to provide financial assistance to borrowers by guaranteeing loans made by private lenders having a contract of guarantee from FSA as approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and to establish Beginning Farmer and Rancher Individual Development grant accounts.

The following programs are financed through this fund:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a total loan level of \$5,423,940,000 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 2010 and the budget request levels:

#### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 budget	Committee recommendation
Farm ownership:			
Direct .....	650,000	475,000	650,000
Guaranteed .....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Farm Operating:			
Direct .....	1,000,000	900,000	1,190,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,650,000
Guaranteed subsidized .....	170,000	144,035	170,000
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition .....	3,940	2,000	3,940
Conservation Loans:			
Direct .....	75,000	75,000	75,000
Guaranteed .....	75,000	75,000	75,000
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Boll Weevil Eradication .....	100,000	60,000	100,000
<b>Total, Farm loans .....</b>	<b>5,083,940</b>	<b>4,741,035</b>	<b>5,423,940</b>

#### LOAN SUBSIDIES, GRANTS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Subsidies			Administrative expenses		Total ACIF
	Direct loan	Guaranteed loan	Total	Appropriations	Transfer to FSA	
Appropriations, 2010 .....	75,778	64,830	140,608	321,093	313,173	461,701
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	89,867	60,855	150,722	326,120	318,200	476,842
Committee recommendation .....	119,537	67,946	187,483	321,093	313,173	508,576

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]

	2010 enacted	2011 budget	Committee recommendation
Loan subsidies:			
Farm ownership:			
Direct .....	26,520	32,870	44,980
Guaranteed .....	5,550	5,700	5,700
Farm operating:			
Direct .....	47,400	54,540	72,100
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	35,100	34,950	38,450
Guaranteed subsidized .....	23,902	19,920	23,511
Conservation loans:			
Direct .....	1,065	2,243	2,243
Guaranteed .....	278	285	285
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans .....	793	214	214
Total, loan subsidies .....	140,608	150,722	187,483
ACIF expenses .....	321,093	326,120	321,093

#### RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$80,325,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	83,064,000
Committee recommendation .....	83,064,000

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

ARPA authorized significant changes in the crop insurance program. This act provides higher government subsidies for producer premiums to make coverage more affordable; expands research and development for new insurance products and under-served areas through contracts with the private sector; and tightens compliance. Functional areas of risk management are: research and development; insurance services; and compliance, whose functions include policy formulation and procedures and regulations development.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$83,064,000 for the Risk Management Agency.

#### CORPORATIONS

##### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2010 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$7,502,601,000
Budget estimate, 2011 <sup>1</sup> .....	7,613,232,000
Committee recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	7,613,232,000

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

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

projects, data processing improvements, public outreach, and related tasks and functions.

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

Producers of insurable crops are eligible to receive a basic level of protection against catastrophic losses, which cover 50 percent of the normal yield at 55 percent of the expected price. The only cost to the producer is an administrative fee of \$300 per crop per county.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated to be \$7,613,232,000 for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

The Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] is a wholly owned Government corporation created in 1933 to stabilize, support, and protect farm income and prices; to help maintain balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, including products, foods, feeds, and fibers; and to help in the orderly distribution of these commodities. CCC was originally incorporated under a Delaware charter and was reincorporated June 30, 1948, as a Federal corporation within the Department of Agriculture by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, approved June 29, 1948 (15 U.S.C. 714).

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

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

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

tion 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, 2010 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$13,878,054,000
Budget estimate, 2011 <sup>1</sup> .....	13,925,575,000
Committee recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	13,925,575,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, estimated in fiscal year 2011 to be \$13,925,575,000, for the payment to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

Limitation, 2010 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	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, 2010 .....	\$895,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	920,000
Committee recommendation .....	904,000

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 \$904,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.

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

*Maine Irrigation.*—The Committee commends the Department for its support of farmers with existing irrigation programs, through its Environmental Quality Incentives Program. However, funding for new irrigators, specifically potato farmers in Maine, has not been equitable in comparison to farmers in other areas of the country. The Committee directs the Department, through the Natural Resources Conservation Service and its Agricultural Management Assistance Program, to work to ensure that irrigation funding and assistance equitably addresses the needs of Maine potato farms that lack irrigation programs.

*Resources First Foundation.*—The Natural Resources Conservation Service entered to a Memorandum of Understanding [MOU] with the Resources First Foundation in January of 2008 to work cooperatively on outreach efforts to private landowners, conservationists, and others in order to further conservation efforts through better accessibility and sharing of information. The Committee supports the intent of this MOU and directs NRCS to work in good faith to carry out NRCS Agreement No. 693A758–38.

*Rhode Island Restoration.*—The Committee is aware of NRCS’s efforts in the State of Rhode Island to restore habitat for anadromous fish, including herring and American shad, through the construction of fish passages and dam removal. NRCS is encouraged to continue these efforts particularly in the Blackstone, Woonasquatucket, Moshassuck, and Pawtuxet river watersheds.

OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND MARKETS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	\$2,021,000
Committee recommendation .....	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for the Office of Ecosystem Services and Markets. The Committee expects these functions to be continued under the Office of the Chief Economist.

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, 2010 .....	\$887,629,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	923,729,000
Committee recommendation .....	928,979,000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$928,979,000 for Conservation Operations. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$13,000,000 for Strategic Watershed Action Teams, \$35,000,000 for Common Computing Environment refresh, \$1,500,000 for streamlining and integrating business model and information technology tools, \$1,095,000 for Snow Surveys, and \$500,000 for soil climate analysis network.

*Delta National Priority Area.*—The Committee directs the agency to maintain a national priority area program under the guidelines of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program [EQIP] in the Delta of the State of Mississippi.

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

For fiscal year 2011, the Committee recommends funding, as specified below, for new and ongoing conservation activities. Amounts recommended by the Committee for specific conservation measures shall be in addition to levels otherwise made available to States.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE—CONSERVATION OPERATIONS— CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Accelerated Soil Mapping Survey (WY) .....	200
Agricultural Development and Resource Conservation (HI) .....	1,400
Agricultural Wildlife Conservation Center (MS) .....	939
CEMSA with Iowa Soybean Association (IA) .....	288
Center for Invasive Species Eradication (TX) .....	1,000
Conservation Enhancements (PA) .....	200
Conservation Internships (WI) .....	120
Conservation Technical Assistance in New Jersey .....	236
Conservation Technical Assistance in Tennessee .....	1,000
Conservation Technology Transfer (WI) .....	516
Cover Crop Program (MD) .....	1,000
Delta Conservation Demonstration (MS) .....	376
Delta Water Study (MS) .....	235
Farm Viability Program (VT) .....	300
Grazing Land Conservation (WI) .....	732
Great Basin Plant Materials Center (NV) .....	269
Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control .....	404
Hungry Canyons Alliance (IA) .....	282

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE—CONSERVATION OPERATIONS—  
CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED PROJECTS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Illinois Conservation Initiative (IL) .....	1,126
Kentucky Soil Erosion Control .....	724
Mississippi Conservation Initiative .....	2,000
Native Plant Initiative (LA) .....	500
Operation Oak Program .....	100
Phosphorous Loading in Lake Champlain (VT) .....	179
Prairie Biomass (IA) .....	100
Quabbin to Cardigan Conservation Initiative (NH) .....	282
Riparian Restoration (NM) .....	200
Soil Survey (RI) .....	134
Technical Assistance Grants to Kentucky Soil Conservation Districts .....	545
Upper Cedar River Watershed Coalition (IA) .....	150
Watershed Demonstration Project (IA) .....	134
Watershed Planning Staff (HI) .....	500
West Virginia Conservation Initiative .....	1,000
Total, Conservation Operations .....	17,171

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$30,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	24,394,000

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

The following is a list of congressionally designated projects:

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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Committee recommendation
Cooper Mine Brook Watershed (CT) .....	330
Dunloup Creek (WV) .....	1,500
Lahaina Watershed (HI) .....	4,000
Lake County Watershed (IL) .....	350
Lower Hamakua (HI) .....	1,800
Missouri Watershed projects (MO) .....	2,000
North Fork of Elkhorn Creek (WV) .....	300
Pocasset River (RI) .....	2,000
Southeast Quadrant Drainage and Flood Prevention Project (AL) .....	350
Upcountry Maui (HI) .....	2,000
Wailuku-Alenaio (HI) .....	250
Total, Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations .....	14,880

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$40,161,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	40,497,000
Committee recommendation .....	40,497,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$40,497,000 for the Watershed Rehabilitation Program.

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

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$50,730,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	50,730,000
Committee recommendation .....	50,730,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

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

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$895,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	920,000
Committee recommendation .....	904,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$904,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.

*Regional Innovation Initiative.*—The Committee recognizes the potential for rural development synergies stemming from regional planning and coordination. Authority is provided to reserve up to 5 percent of selected Rural Development programs for projects in areas engaged in strategic regional planning. The Secretary is directed to develop and utilize empirical performance measures to gauge program success. Fiscal year 2011 accomplishments will impact deliberations on potential increases for fiscal year 2012.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	
Appropriation .....	201,987	232,257	237,507

## RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	
Transfer from:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Loan Program Account .....	468,593	454,383	454,383
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Program Account .....	39,959	38,374	38,374
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account .....	4,941	5,046	5,046
Total RD salaries and expenses .....	715,480	730,060	735,310

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 \$735,310,000 for salaries and expenses of Rural Development, which includes \$12,000,000 for the Common Computing Environment.

The Committee rejects the proposal to reduce efforts toward “maintaining portfolio compliance, safety and soundness.” In the face of expanding reliance on guaranteed lending, and recent exposure of private mortgage and financial industry weaknesses, the Committee directs the Secretary to ensure proper lender monitoring and underwriting standards are maintained. Now is not the time to relax Agency oversight responsibilities. Further, the Committee rejects the proposal to implement a “direct endorsement” model for the section 502 guaranteed single family housing loan program. If the Secretary wishes to pursue this option in the future, the Secretary should submit a report to the Committee detailing the costs and benefits of direct endorsement, and articulating procedures that would ensure portfolio quality would be protected while continuing to reach targeted rural households.

## RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

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

The mission of the Rural Housing Service is to improve the quality of life in rural America by assisting rural residents and communities in obtaining adequate and affordable housing and access to needed community facilities. The goals and objectives of the Service are: (1) facilitate the economic revitalization of rural areas by providing direct and indirect economic benefits to individual borrowers, families, and rural communities; (2) assure that benefits

are communicated to all program eligible customers with special outreach efforts to target resources to underserved, impoverished, or economically declining rural areas; (3) lower the cost of programs while retaining the benefits by redesigning more effective programs that work in partnership with State and local governments and the private sector; and (4) leverage the economic benefits through the use of low-cost credit programs.

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2010 (budget authority) .....	\$707,501,000
Budget estimate, 2011 (budget authority) .....	581,714,000
Committee recommendation (budget authority) .....	573,037,000

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, and rural housing sites. Rural housing loans are made to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and essential farm service buildings that are modest in size, design, and cost. Rental housing insured loans are made to individuals, corporations, associations, trusts, or partnerships to provide moderate-cost rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons in rural areas. These loans are repayable in terms up to 30 years. Loan programs are limited to rural areas, which include towns, villages, and other places of not more than 10,000 population, which are not part of an urban area. Loans may also be made in areas with a population in excess of 10,000, but less than 20,000, if the area is not included in a standard metropolitan statistical area and has a serious lack of mortgage credit for low- and moderate-income borrowers.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$573,037,000 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 2011, as well as for administrative expenses. The following table presents the loan subsidy levels as compared to the 2010 levels and the 2011 budget request:

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
Loan Levels:			
Single-Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct .....	1,121,488	1,200,000	1,200,000
Guaranteed .....	12,000,000	12,000,000	24,000,000
Housing Repair (sec. 504) .....	34,412	34,004	34,004
Direct rental housing (sec. 515) .....	69,512	95,236	69,512
Guaranteed rental housing (sec. 538) .....	129,090	129,133	129,133
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	5,045	5,052	5,052
Credit sales of acquired property .....	11,448	11,449	11,449

## RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
Self help land development loans (sec. 523) .....	4,970	4,966	4,966
Total, loan levels .....	13,375,965	13,479,840	25,454,116
Loan Subsidies:			
Single-Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct .....	40,710	75,120	75,120
Guaranteed .....	172,800		
Housing Repair (sec. 504) .....	4,422	6,437	6,437
Direct rental housing (sec. 515) .....	18,935	32,123	23,446
Guaranteed rental housing (sec. 538) .....	1,485	12,513	12,513
Site loans (sec. 524) .....		294	294
Credit sales of acquired property .....	556	556	556
Self help land development loans (sec. 523) .....		288	288
Total, loan subsidies .....	238,908	127,331	118,654
Administrative expenses .....	468,593	454,383	454,383
Total, loan subsidies and administrative expenses .....	707,501	581,714	573,037

## RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$980,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	965,635,000
Committee recommendation .....	971,593,000

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

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

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$971,593,000 for the Rental Assistance Program.

*Rental Assistance.*—The Committee provides funding to meet the needs of expiring and new rental assistance contracts for section

515 and 514/516 multi-family housing projects. The Committee includes statutory language requiring rental assistance to be held in 514/516 projects for a minimum period of time.

Rental assistance contracts are funded for 1 year durations. One year contract durations enable the Department to provide more accurate estimates of contract cost increases and the number of contracts expiring and requiring renewal.

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$43,191,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	18,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	44,055,000

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$44,055,000 for the Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program, including \$16,400,000 for vouchers, \$2,655,000 for revolving loan funds, and \$25,000,000 for a housing preservation demonstration program.

The Committee is aware of the large and growing demand for housing vouchers to protect multi-family housing residents from substantial rent increases if owners pre-pay their loans and leave the multi-family housing program. Sufficient funding is provided for expiring vouchers and new vouchers anticipated to be issued in fiscal year 2011.

The President’s budget states, “The rural development vouchers program is designed to provide a maximum of 36 monthly payments in rent assistance to eligible tenants, subject to annual appropriations.” The Secretary is directed to submit a report to the Committee detailing the number and amount of initial obligations and renewal history of all vouchers issued over the life of the pro-

gram, including identifying the number that have been terminated after 36 monthly payments. The report shall also indicate how recipients are advised of the 36 month term limit.

#### MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$41,864,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	37,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	41,864,000

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 \$41,864,000 for Mutual and Self-help Housing Grants.

The Committee is aware that in the decade prior to the recession, a period of high land value appreciation, self-help builders, and other nonprofits acquired land in order to provide future housing opportunities for low- and very low-income families. This effort was intended to keep land costs down, a key factor in providing affordable housing.

Now, in many communities, particularly in Western States, land values have plummeted. This has impacted self-help organizations to the degree that many are now producing at less than 50 percent of their capacity to provide affordable housing.

The Committee believes that self-help housing is an essential tool to improve homeownership opportunities in rural America. The Committee directs the Secretary to submit a report articulating options to assist self-help housing organizations encountering falling land values. These options should include a shared appreciation demonstration project.

#### RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$45,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	40,400,000
Committee recommendation .....	41,500,000

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

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

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

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

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

*Compensation for Construction Defects.*—Compensation for construction defects provides funds for grants to eligible section 502 borrowers to correct structural defects, or to pay claims of owners arising from such defects on a newly constructed dwelling purchased with RHS financial assistance. Claims are not paid until provisions under the builder’s warranty have been fully pursued. Requests for compensation for construction defects must be made by the owner of the property within 18 months after the date financial assistance was granted.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$41,500,000 for the Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program.

The following table compares the grant program levels recommended by the Committee to the fiscal year 2010 levels and the budget request:

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Very low-income housing repair grants .....	31,600	31,000	31,600
Compensation for construction defects .....	500	.....	500

## RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Housing preservation grants .....	9,400	9,400	9,400
Grants authorized by section 14204 of Public Law 110–246 .....	4,000	.....	.....
Total .....	45,500	40,400	41,500

## FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$19,746,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	20,346,000
Committee recommendation .....	20,346,000

The direct farm labor housing loan program is authorized under section 514 and the rural housing for domestic farm labor housing grant program is authorized under section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The loans, grants, and contracts are made to public and private nonprofit organizations for low-rent housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor. Grant assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of a project. Loans and grants may be used for construction of new structures, site acquisition and development, rehabilitation of existing structures, and purchase of furnishings and equipment for dwellings, dining halls, community rooms, and infirmaries.

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,346,000 for the cost of Direct Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants.

The following table compares the loan and grant levels recommended by the Committee to the fiscal year 2010 levels and the budget request:

## FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010	2011 request	Committee recommendation
Direct loan level .....	27,319	27,288	27,288
Direct loan subsidy .....	9,873	10,473	10,473
Grants .....	9,873	9,873	9,873

## RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$54,993,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	41,717,000
Committee recommendation .....	56,580,000

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 and fire and rescue facilities are the priorities of the program and receive the majority of available funds.

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$56,580,000 for the Rural Community Facilities Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

#### RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Loan levels and budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	Committee recommendations
<b>Loan levels:</b>			
Community facilities direct loans .....	294,962	295,038	295,038
Community facilities guaranteed loans .....	206,417	206,405	206,405
Total loan levels .....	501,379	501,443	501,443
<b>Budget authority:</b>			
Community facility direct loans .....	3,864	3,924	3,924
Community facility guaranteed loans .....	6,626	8,153	8,153
Community facility grants .....	20,373	29,640	20,373
Economic impact initiative grants .....	13,902	.....	13,902
Rural community development initiative .....	6,256	.....	6,256
Tribal college grants .....	3,972	.....	3,972
Total budget authority .....	54,993	41,717	56,580

*Consideration to Applications.*—Community Facilities loans and grants provide financial assistance to construct, enlarge, or otherwise improve essential community facilities for health care, public safety and other essential public services. The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications relating to essential community facilities for the following: Alaskan Native Green House Assisted Living Home (Alaska); Ashmun Bay Boat Access and Channel Dredging Project (Michigan); Bethel Police Station (Alaska); City of Belleview Municipal Complex Development Project (Florida); City of Helena-West Helena GIS Mapping System (Arkansas); Curry County Adult and

Juvenile Detention Center Renovations and Improvements (New Mexico); Dowling Park Library (Florida); Duncan Township Hall Improvements and Historic Preservation (Michigan); Duncan Township Office, Fire Hall Construction (Michigan); Gallup Regional Judicial Complex (New Mexico); Germfask Township Community/Senior Center (Michigan); Hagerman Town Hall Renovation (New Mexico); Ketchikan Gateway Borough Acquisition (Alaska); Les Cheneaux Emergency Response Vehicle (Michigan); Meadowview Subdivision Road Upgrade (Alaska); Miller County Conservation District Facility Renovation (Arkansas); Nome Public Safety Building (Alaska); Old Forge Arts & Science Center (New York); Quay County Courthouse (New Mexico); Rural Hawaii Community Facilities (Hawaii); San Miguel County Courthouse/Public Works Facility Project (New Mexico); Santaquin Agricultural and Equestrian Heritage Center (Utah); Seaside School District Relocation (Oregon); Shiawassee Performing Arts Center (Michigan); South County Community & Fitness Center Renovation (Michigan); Togiak Old School Rehabilitation into Community Center (Alaska); Waianae Intergenerational Community Service Center, the Hawaii Slaughter-Processing Network, and the Ka Mahi'ai'ahi O Wailea (the Sacred Farm of Wailea) (Hawaii); and, Wasilla Library Relocation (Alaska).

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

RURAL BUSINESS—COOPERATIVE SERVICE

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

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

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$97,116,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	81,526,000
Committee recommendation .....	86,689,000

The Rural Business and Industry Loan Program was created by the Rural Development Act of 1972, and finances a variety of rural industrial development loans. Loans are made for rural industrialization and rural community facilities under Rural Development

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

Rural business enterprise grants were authorized by the Rural Development Act of 1972. Grants are made to public bodies and nonprofit organizations to facilitate development of small and emerging business enterprises in rural areas, including the acquisition and development of land; the construction of buildings, plants, equipment, access streets and roads, parking areas, and utility extensions; refinancing fees; technical assistance; and startup operating costs and working capital.

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$86,689,000 for the Rural Business Program Account.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

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

	Fiscal year 2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	Committee recommendations
Loan levels:			
Business and Industry guaranteed loans loan levels .....	993,002	941,963	993,000
Budget authority:			
Business and industry guaranteed loans .....	52,927	40,316	42,500
Business enterprise grants .....	38,727	38,727	38,727
Business opportunity grants .....	2,483	2,483	2,483
Delta Regional Authority grants .....	2,979	.....	2,979
Total budget authority .....	97,116	81,526	86,689

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

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

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Estimated loan level .....	33,536	36,376	33,533
Direct loan subsidy .....	8,464	14,034	12,937
Administrative expenses .....	4,941	5,046	5,046
Total, loan subsidies and administrative expenses .....	13,405	19,080	17,983

The rural development (intermediary relending) loan program was originally authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452). The making of rural development loans by the Department of Agriculture was reauthorized by Public Law 99–425, the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986.

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

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 established the program account. Appropriations to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated in 2011, as well as for administrative expenses.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,983,000 for the Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account.

#### RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Estimated loan level .....	33,077	33,077	33,077

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

reasonable expenses for the purpose of fostering rural economic development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$34,854,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	40,054,000
Committee recommendation .....	35,560,000

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 \$35,560,000 for Rural Cooperative Development Grants.

Of the funds recommended, \$2,800,000 is for the Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas program through a cooperative agreement with the National Center for Appropriate Technology.

The Committee has included language in the bill that not more than \$3,463,000 shall be made available to cooperatives or associations of cooperatives whose primary focus is to provide assistance to small, minority producers.

*Value Added.*—The Committee recommends \$20,373,000 for value-added agricultural product market development grants.

## RURAL MICROENTERPRISE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	7,700,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,350,000

This program, authorized by section 379E of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1981 et seq.), provides micro-entrepreneurs with the skills necessary to establish new rural microenterprises, as well as support these types of businesses with technical and financial assistance. The program provides loans and grants to intermediaries that assist micro-entrepreneurs. The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 makes available \$4,000,000 of mandatory funding for fiscal year 2011.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,350,000 for the Rural Microenterprise Investment Program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendation as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

## RURAL MICROENTERPRISE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 level	2011 request	Committee recommendation
Estimated loan level .....	11,832	23,523	12,019
Loan subsidy .....	2,500	6,850	3,500
Grants .....	2,500	850	850

## BIOREFINERY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	\$17,300,000
Committee recommendation .....	

The Biorefinery Assistance program, authorized by section 9003 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, assists in the development of new and emerging technologies for the development of advanced biofuels. The program authorizes grants for development and construction of demonstration-scale biorefineries, and guaranteed loans for development, construction or retrofitting commercial-scale biorefineries.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation of discretionary funds for the Biorefinery Assistance Program. The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 provided \$75,000,000 in no year mandatory funding in fiscal year 2009, and \$245,000,000 in fiscal year 2010. Little of this funding has been obligated and the bulk will be carried over and remain available in fiscal year 2011.

## RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$39,340,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	39,340,000
Committee recommendation .....	39,340,000

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 \$39,340,000 for the Rural Energy for America Program.

The following table provides the Committee’s recommendation as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 level	2011 request	Committee recommendation
Estimated loan level .....	144,209	11,519	11,519
Guaranteed loan subsidy .....	19,670	5,340	5,340
Grants .....	19,670	34,000	34,000

*Consideration to Applications: Rural Business and Renewable Energy Programs.*—The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications for rural business and renewable energy programs for the following: Agricultural Processing and Product Development Center (Alaska); Biorefinery Development Using Multiple Feedstocks (Louisiana); Biotechnology Asset Inventory (North Carolina); Blue Mountain Station Product Development Market Center (Washington); Coffman Cove Marine Repair and Storage Project (Alaska); Cooperative Biofuel Supply Chain Development (Minnesota); Development of Fish Disease Laboratory and Bio-secure Fish Hatchery (Michigan); Economic Development Charette (Mississippi); Idaho Rural Partnership (Idaho); Integrated Bio-refinery for Multiple Biomass Feed Stocks (New Mexico); Mississippi Rural Economic Development Initiative (Mississippi); National Rural Development Fellows (Mississippi); Northeast Oregon Grown Meat Processing Development Plan (Oregon); Revitalizing the I-95 Corridor with Biotechnology, South Carolina Research Authority (South Carolina); San Joaquin County Agricultural Center Solar Energy Project (California); and, WNC Regional Livestock Center (North Carolina).

In addition, the Committee encourages the Department to consider applications for grants to rural public television broadcasting systems.

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

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

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

Rural Electrification Administration and the water and waste programs of the former Rural Development Administration.

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

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$568,730,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	534,414,000
Committee recommendation .....	582,851,000

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 \$582,851,000 for the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account.

The Committee recommends \$70,000,000 for water and waste disposal systems grants for Native Americans, including Native Alaskans, the Colonias, and residents of Hawaiian 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 \$15,000,000 available for the circuit rider program.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

## RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

[Loan levels and budget authority in thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2010 appropriation	2011 budget request	Committee recommendation
Loan levels:			
Water and waste disposal direct loans .....	1,022,162	1,036,294	1,022,156
Direct loans authorized by Public Law 83-566 .....			40,000
Water and waste disposal guaranteed loans .....	75,000	75,000	75,000
Total loan levels .....	1,097,162	1,111,294	1,137,156
Budget authority:			
Water and waste disposal direct loans .....	77,071	88,914	87,701
Direct loans authorized by Public Law 83-566 .....			3,432
Water and waste disposal grants .....	469,228	440,510	469,228
Solid waste management grants .....	3,441	3,500	3,500
Water well system grants .....	993	993	993
Water and waste water revolving funds .....	497	497	497
High energy cost grants .....	17,500		17,500
Total budget authority .....	568,730	534,414	582,851

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

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

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

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

The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) established the program account. An appropriation to this account will be used to cover the lifetime subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated and loan guarantees committed in fiscal year 2011, 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 2010 and budget request levels:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Loan authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct, 5 percent .....	100,000	100,000	100,000
Direct FFB .....	6,500,000	4,000,000	6,500,000
Guaranteed underwriting .....	500,000		500,000
Subtotal .....	7,100,000	4,100,000	7,100,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Telecommunications:			
Direct, 5 percent .....	145,000	145,000	145,000
Direct, Treasury rate .....	250,000	250,000	250,000
Direct, FFB .....	295,000	295,000	295,000
Subtotal .....	690,000	690,000	690,000
Total, loan authorizations .....	7,790,000	4,790,000	7,790,000
Administrative expenses .....	39,959	38,374	38,374

The Committee rejects the administration's proposal to place further restrictions on eligible projects under the electric program. Rural areas face ever increasing requirements for electricity while facilities are typically 20 to 30 years old. Substantial demands exist for comprehensive emissions control upgrades and increased peaking capacity. Diminishing rural electric cooperatives' access to Rural Utilities Service loan programs will further disadvantage rural residents by raising user rates and undermining service reliability. The Committee expects the Secretary to continue to fund program authorities, and not to attempt to implement the proposed program restrictions through the apportionment process.

The Committee recommendation includes a general provision authorizing a pilot program for the construction of not more than three facilities for the generation of electricity in rural America. The Committee is growing increasingly concerned that many current generation facilities in rural America are coming to the end of their operational capabilities while energy consumption is near capacity and expected to exceed current availability. This pilot program will help rural electric customers acquire an adequate supply of electricity at reasonable rates which will otherwise rise to unsustainable levels, particularly when compared to non-rural areas where investor owned utilities provide options not available in rural areas. Because it could take as long as 12 years to build an electric generation facility, the Committee believes that this issue should be dealt with during fiscal year 2011 to avoid rural area power shortages in the near and long term. The recommendation does not discriminate based on fuel input as long as emissions are no greater than emissions for natural gas facilities. While addressing the energy needs of rural America, the pilot project will also allow the Rural Utilities Service to establish program subsidy scores by giving the agency experience with the risks and benefits of financing contemporary baseload generation facilities.

## DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

## LOANS AND GRANTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 level	2011 request	
Loan and grant levels:			
Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program:			
Grants .....	37,755	30,000	37,755
Broadband program:			
Treasury rate loans .....	400,000	400,000	400,000
Treasury rate loans budget authority .....	28,960	22,320	22,320
Grants .....	17,976	17,976	17,976
Total DLT and Broadband program level .....	455,731	447,976	455,731
Total DLT and Broadband budget authority .....	84,691	70,296	78,051

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

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$78,051,000 for the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program. The Committee recommendation includes \$4,500,000 for public broadcasting systems grants to allow noncommercial educational television broadcast stations that serve rural areas to convert from analog to digital operations.

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

The Committee continues its support for extending high speed broadband service to the most remote, un-served areas of rural America. Substantial funds have been made available in annual appropriations bills, and an unprecedented investment of \$2,500,000,000 in budget authority was provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5). All Recovery Act funds, supporting both loans and grants, were to be obligated by October 2010.

The Secretary is directed to analyze and report to the Committees implications of the Recovery Act investments toward extending high speed broadband access to remote underserved and un-served

rural areas. This report should include lessons learned and suggestions on improving effectiveness of the regular broadband program, including the need for loan/grant combinations in developing successful projects with regular program funding. The Secretary is directed to utilize preliminary information provided under the National Broadband Map initiative mandated by the Recovery Act, and submit the report no later than 30 days after issuance of the map.

*Broadband Grants.*—In addition, of the funds recommended, \$17,976,000 in grants shall be made available to support broadband transmission and local dial-up Internet services for rural areas.

*Consideration to Applications: Rural Utilities Service Programs.*—The Committee has been made aware of and encourages the Department to give consideration to applications for: Batesville Water Storage Tank (Arkansas); Bayou Meto (Arkansas); Campbellton Wastewater Treatment and Bio-solids Recycling Project (Florida); Cattaraugus County Residential Wireless Broadband Internet Service (New York); Cedar Glades Park Municipal Water Supply (Arkansas); City of Barry Water Improvement Initiative (Illinois); City of Dundee Wastewater Project (Michigan); City of Lawtey Hydro-Pneumatic Potable Water Tank Replacement (Florida); City of Riddle Wastewater Plant Upgrade (Oregon); Crossroads Sewer/Water Project (New York); Ekwok Landfill Relocation (Alaska); Elk County Rural Water District #2 (Kansas); Estancia Valley Broadband Feasibility (New Mexico); Grand Prairie (Arkansas); Green Township Phase I Sanitary Sewer Improvements (Ohio); Gretna Wastewater System Improvements (Florida); GRWA Water System Improvements Lake Source (Michigan); Harrison County/Cadiz Village Wastewater Plant/Biodiesel Facility (Ohio); Hubbard Creek Impoundment Improvement (Oregon); Hubbard Creek Water Distribution Improvement Project (Oregon); JCJC Broadband Connect (Mississippi); Jemez Pueblo Drinking Water Project (New Mexico); Keystone Regional Water Reclamation Facility & Wastewater Collection System (California); Mammoth Community Water District Drinking and Wastewater Improvements (California); New Straitsville State Route 93/State Route 216 Waterline Replacement (Ohio); Northern New Mexico Solid Waste Automation Project (New Mexico); Partridge Creek Diversion Project (Michigan); Perry City Fiber Optic Network (Utah); Saline Watershed Alliance Water Supply (Arkansas); Sewer System Improvements, City of Georgiana (Alabama); Shoshone County Renewable Energy Project (Idaho); Spalding Avenue Sewage Pump Station (Oregon); Tremonton City Fiber-Optic Network (Utah); Tulare County Community Water System (California); Village of Dunkirk Combined Sewer Elimination Project (Ohio); and, Village of Richmond Sanitary Sewer Elimination Project (Ohio).

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

TITLE IV  
DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

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

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$813,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	836,000
Committee recommendation .....	821,000

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 \$821,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.

*Nutrition Services Incentive Program.*—The Committee is aware that the Nutrition Services Incentive Program [NSIP] is eligible to receive bonus commodities and has received such commodities in the past. Commodities from USDA are a significant component of Federal nutrition programs for the elderly, including Meals on Wheels that is provided through NSIP and administered by the Agency on Aging. However, the Department has determined that the Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP], the National School Lunch Program [NSLP], and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program [CSFP] will be given priority for bonus commodities and bonus commodities will not be provided to NSIP. The Department is directed to review and reconsider this decision and report back to the Committee within 120 days of the enactment of this act.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

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

*Child Nutrition Programs.*—The National School Lunch and School Breakfast, Summer Food Service, and Child and Adult Care Food programs provide funding to the States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam for use in serving nutritious lunches and breakfasts to children attending schools of high school grades and under, to children of preschool age in child care

centers, and to children in other institutions in order to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children, and broaden the markets for agricultural food commodities. Through the Special Milk Program, assistance is provided to the States for making reimbursement payments to eligible schools and child care institutions which institute or expand milk service in order to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation and transfer from section 32.

*Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC].*—This program safeguards the health of pregnant, post partum, and breast-feeding women, infants, and children up to age 5 who are at nutritional risk because of inadequate nutrition and income by providing supplemental foods. The delivery of supplemental foods may be done through health clinics, vouchers redeemable at retail food stores, or other approved methods which a cooperating State health agency may select. Funds for this program are provided by direct appropriation.

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

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

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, Public Law 110–246, provides that \$246,500,000 in fiscal year 2011 from funds appropriated in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program account be used to purchase commodities for The Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP].

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

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

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

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

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

## CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation	Section 32 transfers	Total
Appropriations, 2010 .....	9,865,930	6,989,899	16,855,829
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	18,158,393	.....	18,158,393
Committee recommendation .....	18,161,143	.....	18,161,143

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 \$18,161,143,000 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	2010 estimate	2011 budget	Committee recommendation
School Lunch Program .....	9,967,068	10,589,998	10,589,998
School Breakfast Program .....	2,920,391	3,117,863	3,117,863
Child and Adult Care Food Program .....	2,640,923	2,728,754	2,728,754
Summer Food Service Program .....	387,264	397,226	397,226
Special Milk Program .....	12,673	10,597	10,597
State administrative expenses .....	193,258	208,653	208,653
Commodity procurement and computer support .....	695,401	1,049,290	1,049,290
Team Nutrition .....	15,016	15,046	15,046
Food safety education .....	2,510	2,517	2,517
Coordinated review .....	5,751	5,833	5,833

## TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Child nutrition programs	2010 estimate	2011 budget	Committee recommendation
CACFP training and technical assistance .....	3,537	3,567	3,567
Child Nutrition Program Studies and Evaluations .....	3,000	19,711	19,711
Hunger-Free Community Grants .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Healthier U.S. School Challenge .....	699	.....	.....
School community garden pilot .....	1,000	.....	.....
Farm to school tactical team .....	.....	2,000	2,000
Payment Accuracy .....	2,338	2,338	2,338
Financial Management Systems Modernization .....	.....	3,500	1,750
IT Modernization and Support .....	.....	2,000	1,000

The Committee recommends \$15,046,000 for TEAM nutrition. Included in this amount is \$5,500,000 for food service training grants to States; \$3,000,000 for technical assistance materials; \$800,000 for National Food Service Management Institute cooperative agreements; \$1,000,000 for print and electronic food service resource systems; \$1,500,000 to assist USDA's Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion in development and maintenance of MyPyramid and Dietary Guidelines materials in support of nutrition education for program participants and their families; and \$3,246,000 for other activities including FNS' support of the McGovern Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program under section 3107 (g) of Public Law 107–171.

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

*Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.*—Section 4304 of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act provided \$150,000,000 for a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program to be made available on July 1, 2011. Of this amount, the Committee has included a general provision to delay availability of \$113,000,000 of these funds until October 1, 2011. The Committee notes that this general provision does not lower the funding amount provided in the Food, Conservation and Energy Act for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, but simply delays a portion of the funding until the beginning of fiscal year 2012. The full funding amount of \$150,000,000 will be available for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for the school year beginning July 1, 2011, as specified in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act.

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

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$7,252,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	7,603,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	7,252,000,000

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

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

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,252,000,000 for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. The Committee notes that \$125,000,000 in contingency funds will be available in fiscal year 2011.

The Committee recommendation fully funds estimated WIC participation in fiscal year 2011 and makes significant program improvements. The Committee recommendation includes \$80,000,000 for breastfeeding support initiatives, \$60,000,000 for State management information systems, and \$14,000,000 for infrastructure improvements. In addition, the Committee recommendation maintains funding for fruit and vegetable vouchers for all women as well as implements fruit and vegetable vouchers for children up to the Institute of Medicine recommendation, per the budget request.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(In thousands of dollars)

	Expenses	Amount in reserve	Puerto Rico and American Samoa	TEFAP commodity purchases	Total
Appropriations, 2010 .....	53,276,816	3,000,000	1,753,365	248,000	58,278,181
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	61,217,446	5,000,000	1,742,844	246,500	68,206,790
Committee recommendation .....	61,220,196	5,000,000	1,742,844	246,500	68,209,540

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

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

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

household benefit allotments to reflect changes in the cost of the thrifty food plan.

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

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

States are required to implement an employment and training program for the purpose of assisting members of households participating in SNAP in gaining skills, training, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment. The Department of Agriculture has implemented a grant program to States to assist them in providing employment and training services.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$68,209,540,000 for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,750,000 for financial management systems modernization and \$1,000,000 for information technology modernization and support. Of the amount recommended, \$5,000,000,000 is made available as a contingency reserve. The Committee recommendation includes language that permits the Food and Nutrition Service to conduct studies and evaluations consistent with the budget request.

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

#### COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$247,979,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	249,619,000
Committee recommendation .....	261,619,000

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

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

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

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

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

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 makes \$246,500,000 available for the purchase of TEFAP commodities in fiscal year 2011. In addition to the commodities purchased specifically for TEFAP, commodities obtained under agriculture support and surplus removal programs are donated to States for distribution through TEFAP.

*Pacific Island 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.

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

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$261,619,000 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 \$176,788,000 for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

*Farmers' Market Nutrition Program.*—The Committee is aware that the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program provides fresh fruits and vegetables to low-income mothers and children, benefiting not only WIC participants, but local farmers as well. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$20,000,000 for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and directs the Secretary to obligate these funds within 45 days.

*The Emergency Food Assistance Program.*—The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 provides \$246,500,000 for TEFAP commodities to be purchased with Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funds. The Committee recommendation includes \$56,000,000 for TEFAP administrative funding and \$6,000,000 for infrastructure grants. In addition, the Committee recommendation grants the Secretary authority to transfer up to an additional 10 percent from TEFAP commodities for this purpose.

#### NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$147,801,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	172,087,000
Committee recommendation .....	166,587,000

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 \$166,587,000 for Nutrition Programs Administration. The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$5,170,000 for improved program administration, and \$9,000,000 to develop and promote dietary guidelines.

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

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations	Transfers from loan accounts	Total
Appropriations, 2010 .....	180,367	6,465	186,832
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	258,780	6,525	265,305
Committee recommendation .....	219,780	6,525	226,305

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

The mission of FAS overseas is to represent U.S. agricultural interests, to promote export of domestic farm products, improve world trade conditions, and report on agricultural production and trade in foreign countries. FAS staff are stationed at 97 offices around the world where they provide expertise in agricultural economics and marketing, as well as provide attaché services.

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends \$226,305,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, including a direct appropriation of \$219,780,000.

The Committee recommendation includes increases of \$3,430,000 for International Cooperative Administrative Support Services, \$4,004,000 for overseas information technology support, \$4,500,000 for the National Export Initiative, \$1,500,000 for the Borlaug and Cochran Fellowship programs, \$14,600,000 for stabilization and reconstruction activities, and \$10,000,000 for international food security.

*Borlaug Fellows Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,000,000 for the Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Fellows Program. This program provides training for international scientists and policymakers from selected developing countries. The fellows work closely with U.S. specialists in their fields of expertise and apply that knowledge in their home countries. The Committee recognizes the importance of this program in helping developing countries strengthen their agricultural practices and food security.

*Cochran Fellowship Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,500,000 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 at no less than the fiscal year 2010 level.

*International Food Security.*—The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the Secretary to provide technical assistance in the establishment and growth of sustainable food production and marketing systems in developing countries. This appropriation should be considered to provide funding apart and different from funding provided for provincial reconstruction team activities in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While the Committee acknowledges the importance of emergency food assistance, there is an equally important role for the United States and the Department of Agriculture to play in assisting developing countries achieve higher levels of self-sufficiency in order to overcome chronic and acute hunger. Agricultural systems in many parts of the world face challenges that stand in stark contrast to those found in this country where advanced technologies, a network of extension and land grant services, an expansive transportation network, and other resources provide protection to American farmers from problems that bring risk of total failure to crop and livestock operations in much of the world.

The Secretary has available authorities under the Borlaug and Cochran fellowships, as well as other existing programs to provide meaningful leadership toward the goal of global food security. The Department is home to leading experts in the fields of crop and livestock production, conservation of land and water resources, market development, and other elements of a stable agricultural-based economy. In addition, the Department has working relationships with the Nation's land grant system and veterinary community that has fostered a vast pool of resources that could provide relief to many of the challenges facing developing countries. The Committee feels this expertise can provide substantial benefit to

help overcome world hunger and help support national and international security and stability.

In implementing this directive, the Secretary should give consideration to a range of activities including opportunities for individuals from developing countries to participate in educational and professional experiences in the United States and, conversely, for U.S. experts in the field of agricultural development to provide training and other assistance in developing countries. In addition, the Secretary should provide grants and cooperative agreements to land grant institutions, non-governmental organizations, and others with expertise in the field of agricultural development. The Secretary should also employ reimbursable agreements in order for USDA personnel to provide on-site assistance in developing countries. The Committee strongly feels these efforts should be focused on specific areas so that the actual establishment of sustainable systems can be a measurable outcome of this effort.

The Committee notes the historic role of the State Department and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in setting the priorities of international assistance. The Secretary is directed to coordinate any efforts under this specific appropriation with the Secretary of State for purposes of determining the specific locations where USDA assistance would be most beneficial. However, the Committee expects USDA, in consultation with USAID, to determine the best approaches to food system development in those locations. In addition, the Secretary is directed to provide a report to the Committee by March 1, 2011, on the approach and status of implementing these activities and a final report by September 30, 2011.

*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 PROGRAM ACCOUNT

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$2,812,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	2,846,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,846,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,846,000 for administrative expenses to continue servicing existing Food for Peace title I agreements.

FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$1,690,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	1,690,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,690,000,000

The Committee recognizes the important mission of the Food for Peace Program to combat hunger and malnutrition; promote broad-based equitable and sustainable development; expand international

trade; develop and expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities; and to foster and encourage the development of private enterprise and democratic participation in developing countries. The Committee strongly supports the continued efficient operation of this important program.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,690,000,000 for Food for Peace title II grants. The Committee does not support the President’s proposal to reduce the amount available for direct food assistance to cover administrative costs instead of providing for those costs through the Commodity Credit Corporation as is the current practice. Instead, the Committee believes it is more important to provide a higher level of direct humanitarian assistance to help meet the world’s growing hunger crisis.

The Committee notes that funds provided earlier in response to the earthquake that struck Haiti in 2010 were intended to provide reimbursement for food assistance diverted from other recipients in order to meet the immediate crisis in Haiti and were not intended to be limited only to prospective requirements on that island. Therefore, funds appropriated at that time may be used to reimburse obligations incurred for the purposes provided herein prior to enactment of this act.

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

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$209,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	209,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	209,500,000

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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$209,500,000 for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

## COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

## (EXPORT CREDIT PROGRAMS AND GSM-102)

(In thousands of dollars)

	Guaranteed loan levels <sup>1</sup>	Guaranteed loan subsidy <sup>1</sup>	Administrative expenses
Appropriations, 2010 .....	5,500,000	11,130	6,820
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	5,500,000	18,480	6,884
Committee recommendation .....	5,500,000	18,480	6,884

<sup>1</sup> No appropriation required since export credit authorizations are permanent authority.

In 1980, the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] instituted the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM-102) under its charter authority. With this program, CCC guarantees, for a fee, payments due U.S. exporters under deferred payment sales contracts (up to 36 months) for defaults due to commercial as well as 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 AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG  
ADMINISTRATION  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

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

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

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

prevention of diseases in animals and the improved production of food-producing animals, are approved for marketing.

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

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

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

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation	User fees	Total
Appropriations, 2010 .....	2,344,656	922,280	3,266,936
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	2,503,849	1,233,480	3,737,329
Committee recommendation .....	2,503,849	1,233,480	3,737,329

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,503,849,000 for FDA salaries and expenses. The Committee also recommends \$667,057,000 in Prescription Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$61,860,000 in Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act user fee collections; \$19,448,000 in Animal Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$5,397,000 in Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act user fee collections; \$450,000,000 in Tobacco Product User Fees; \$19,318,000 in Mammography Quality Standards Act fee collections; and \$10,400,000 in export and certification fees, as assumed in the President’s budget. The Committee recommendation includes bill language which prohibits FDA from developing, establishing, or operating any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

The Committee recommendation does not include proposed language regarding generic drug review user fees, reinspection user fees, export certification user fees, or food inspection and facility

registration user fees. None of these user fee proposals have been authorized by Congress. The Committee will continue to monitor any action by the Congress regarding these proposed user fees.

The following table reflects the Committee's recommendations, as compared to the fiscal year 2010 and budget request levels:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 request	
Centers and related field activities:			
Foods .....	782,915	856,383	856,383
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition [CFSAN] .....	236,418	261,510	261,510
Field Activities .....	546,497	594,873	594,873
Human Drugs .....	464,814	484,169	489,169
Center for Drug Evaluation and Research [CDER] .....	336,588	352,132	357,132
Field Activities .....	128,226	132,037	132,037
Biologics .....	206,438	215,026	215,026
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research [CBER] .....	166,182	173,875	173,875
Field Activities .....	40,256	41,151	41,151
Animal Drugs .....	135,475	140,673	140,673
Center for Veterinary Medicine [CVM] .....	82,452	86,538	86,538
Field Activities .....	53,023	54,135	54,135
Medical and radiological devices .....	315,377	325,726	325,726
Center for Devices and Radiological Health [CDRH] .....	234,974	243,255	243,255
Field Activities .....	80,403	82,471	82,471
National Center for Toxicological Research [NCTR] .....	58,745	60,975	60,975
Other Activities .....	143,712	161,659	156,659
Rent and related activities .....	91,158	105,239	105,239
Rental payments to GSA .....	146,022	153,999	153,999
Total, FDA salaries and expenses, new budget authority .....	2,344,656	2,503,849	2,503,849

The Committee recommendation includes the following increases in budget authority for FDA salaries and expenses activities, as requested in the budget: \$10,896,000 for cost-of-living adjustments; \$83,000,000 for food safety investments; \$43,323,000 for investments relating to safer drugs, biologics, and medical devices; and \$20,000,000 for regulatory science.

Of the increases provided, \$83,000,000 will be used for food safety investments. This includes funding for FDA to develop guidances and regulations to serve as a foundation for prevention-oriented food safety. FDA will also begin work on a modern import safety system, which will include standards for evaluating food safety systems in foreign countries, third-party certification, and an importer registry. This funding will also allow FDA to conduct additional audits of regulatory and public health partners, including foreign reg-

ulatory bodies. FDA will add State liaisons to facilitate timely communication, and will develop a national work plan for inspecting food manufacturing and distribution facilities. FDA will expand its capacity to identify products at highest risk for contamination, to better target and prioritize food safety efforts. Finally, FDA will hire nearly 100 new food safety inspectors, increase laboratory capacity, and undertake pilot programs using track and trace technology.

Of the increases provided, \$43,323,000 will be used for activities related to drug, device, and biologics safety. This includes funding to increase foreign and domestic inspections of the most critical and high-risk facilities and allow FDA to work more closely with regulatory authorities in foreign countries. FDA will also launch an electronic drug registration and listing system that will permit efficient screening of drug imports at the border, start to build a National Medical Device Registry to link unique identifiers for medical devices, and expand postmarket surveillance systems so the agency can better assess the safety of medical products. Further, FDA will more closely monitor the blood and human tissue supply and will improve the safety of vaccines through the development of biological markers to evaluate the safety of vaccine components.

Of the increases provided, \$20,000,000 will be used to advance regulatory science to help FDA build its scientific infrastructure, develop standards for new and emerging technologies, modernize standards for evaluating products, and accelerate the development of essential medical therapies. During recent decades, there have been revolutionary developments in biomedical sciences, and FDA's scientific expertise and infrastructure have not kept pace with these advances. These funds will address that gap. These funds will be used by FDA to strengthen its scientific leadership, including creating an Office of Science and Innovation. FDA will also increase and improve its scientific workforce, build core scientific capacity and expertise in revolutionary new fields such as nanotechnology, recruit additional scientists in areas where FDA expertise is lacking, address science issues for creating a National Medical Device Registry, and promote scientific collaboration and exchange. Finally, FDA plans to update and review standards and provide regulatory pathways for new technologies, including biosimilars.

The Committee expects FDA to continue all projects, activities, and programs as included in the fiscal year 2011 budget request, unless otherwise specified.

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

*Antibiotic Development.*—The Committee continues to be concerned about unresolved scientific issues regarding clinical development in the antibacterial drug arena, which has been identified as a serious impediment to new antibacterial development. In its report last year, the Committee directed FDA to issue clinical trial guidance for several serious indications. The Committee directs

FDA to report to by December 3, 2010, on its progress, including the status of FDA's work toward a final guidance on community-acquired bacterial pneumonia as well as how FDA plans to address guidance for multi-drug and pan-resistant organisms.

The Committee last year also encouraged FDA to identify ways to promote the development and/or appropriate use of priority antibacterial drugs for humans for which current market incentives are inadequate, by working with other governmental entities and interested parties to begin this work. The Committee directs FDA to address these issues in its December 2010 report, as well.

*Antimicrobial Resistance.*—Antimicrobial resistance, and the resulting failure of antimicrobial therapies in humans, is a mounting public health concern. To address this problem, the Committee recommends that FDA conduct, and make public, an overall review of the use of antibacterial drugs in food-producing animals and antimicrobial resistance. In addition, the Committee recommends that FDA examine the antibacterial drugs currently approved for use in food-producing animals and identify mechanisms for assuring that such products are aligned with current safety standards. FDA should conduct post market safety reviews to assure that current uses of animal drug products are used in a manner consistent with the standards currently used in premarket safety evaluations. The Committee directs the FDA to report on the progress of this effort within 1 year of the enactment of this act.

*Budget Justification.*—The Committee directs the agency to submit the fiscal year 2012 budget request in a format that follows the same account structure as the fiscal year 2011 budget request unless otherwise approved by the Committee.

*Critical Path and Modernizing Drug Safety.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$22,450,000 for the critical path initiative, including not less than \$6,000,000 for critical path partnerships as authorized by section 566 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act). The Committee expects that this funding will be used to further FDA's work on critical path opportunities and to promote collaborations with other Government agencies, academia, patient groups, and other interested parties such as the Critical Path Institute and the National Institute for Pharmaceutical Technology and Education. The Committee is also interested in Critical Path activities that advance safety testing, patient reported outcomes and accelerating therapies for serious diseases. Wherever possible, external awards should be competitive.

Worldwide, almost 2 million people die from tuberculosis [TB] and more than 9 million people develop active disease every year. The rise of drug resistant TB can result in a global, untreatable epidemic. The Committee believes that more effective combinations of treatment are needed. Of the \$6,000,000 provided for critical path partnerships, not less than \$2,000,000 shall be used to support a research partnership to advance the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of TB. The Committee directs FDA to report on critical path spending semi-annually.

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

*E-Pedigree.*—The Committee believes that a full electronic track and trace system for prescription drugs is critical to improve the security of the drug supply chain from counterfeit or other substandard products, and to protect consumers. A full electronic track and trace system would include the serialization, authentication, and recording the distribution history (also known as the pedigree) documenting all parties involved in the prior sale, purchase or trade of the prescription drug beginning with the manufacturer. The Committee directs FDA to provide a report to the Committee by March 1, 2011, that describes the status of developing standards for track and trace and authentication; the status of FDA's consideration of technologies for track and trace and authentication; efforts to harmonize, to the extent practical, with international standards and efforts; updates of international efforts for serialization, track and trace, and authentication; and all other activities planned or undertaken with the funding provided in fiscal year 2010 and 2011 for policy development related to the importation of prescription drugs.

*Food Labeling.*—The Committee is pleased that FDA recognizes that importance of accurate food labeling in helping consumers follow a healthy diet, and is working to ensure that nutritional claims by food manufacturers are accurate. The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$1,400,000, as requested, for FDA to use data from well-designed studies to support a modernized food label to encourage Americans to eat healthier diets and potentially reduce the prevalence of obesity and its associated health care costs in the United States. In undertaking this effort, the Committee encourages FDA to consider concerns addressed to the Committee regarding false or misleading structure/function claims, ingredient lists that are difficult to read or may not contain a declaration of the percentage of key ingredients, exaggerated representations regarding whole grain content, and a lack of information regarding caffeine and sugar.

*Generic Drugs.*—The Committee recommendation includes no less than \$96,966,000 for the generic drugs program at FDA, of which \$55,545,000 is for the Office of Generic Drugs. Total funding for the Office of Generic Drugs is an increase of \$4,000,000 above the fiscal year 2010 level, and \$2,000,000 above the budget request.

The President's budget proposal acknowledges that generic drugs now account for 70 percent of all prescriptions dispensed in the United States, an increase of 20 percent in 4 years. Further, annual generic drug application submissions have nearly tripled since 2001. Although the Committee has provided substantial funding increases for generic drug review, and remains firmly committed to supporting these activities, the demand continues to outpace staffing. The administration's proposals for user fees for generic drug applications have not yet been authorized by the Congress, but could provide a significant increase in funding levels for this important program. The Committee encourages FDA to continue to work with the generic drug industry and the Congress on this issue.

*H1N1 Emergency Use Authorizations.*—In response to the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic, the FDA issued several Emergency Use Authorizations (EUAs). The Committee directs FDA to submit a report to Congress by March 1, 2011, regarding the use of EUA au-

thorities over the past 24 months, the number of EUA declarations issued and whether they remain in effect, and FDA's assessment of whether the EUA authority is sufficient, including an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of using EUAs.

*Mammography.*—The Committee is aware that the Mammography Quality Standards Act [MQSA] has resulted in improved quality of mammography to make mammograms a more reliable tool to detect breast cancers. Appropriated funds pay for inspections in Government entities and in facilities where at least 50 percent of mammograms performed are funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, as well as other important activities. The Committee recommends no less than \$6,918,000 in appropriated funds, as well as \$19,318,000 in user fee collections, for activities related to MQSA.

*Nanotechnology.*—The Committee supports the budget increase of \$7,300,000 to expand upon current research in nanotechnology. The Committee is pleased that FDA has established a Nanotechnology Core Facility at the National Center for Toxicological Research, and encourages FDA to design this center to support nanotechnology toxicity studies, develop analytical tools to quantify nanomaterials in complex matrices, and develop procedures for characterizing nanomaterials in FDA regulated products.

*Orphan Product Development Grants.*—The Committee is interested in making every tool available to FDA to get new products to those who suffer from rare diseases, and the Committee has been encouraged by the success of the orphan product grant program. FDA has approved 44 products that received development support from orphan products grants. However, because the cost of clinical trials continues to increase far faster than the rate of inflation, FDA's funds are covering less and less of the true cost of conducting clinical trials. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes \$16,035,000 for orphan product development grants within the budget for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. This represents an increase of \$2,000,000 above the budget request and is the first substantial increase in funding for these grants since fiscal year 2005.

*Office of Women's Health.*—The Committee believes that it is imperative for FDA to pay sufficient attention to gender-based research, ensuring that products approved by the FDA are safe and effective for women as well as men. The Committee recommendation includes \$6,040,000 for the Office of Women's Health. The Committee encourages FDA to ensure that the Office of Women's Health is sufficiently funded to carry out its activities, and to enhance its funding if necessary.

*Rare Diseases.*—The Committee recommendation includes an increase of \$1,000,000 for the office of the Associate Director for Rare Diseases in the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research [CDER]. The Associate Director coordinates the development of policies and procedures for the review and approval of treatments for rare diseases throughout CDER, ensures appropriate training of staff, establishes consistent processes for providing advice to sponsors, and oversees the development of products for rare diseases across multiple scientific disciplines. In conjunction with the Office of Orphan

Products Development, the Associate Director supports collaboration among scientists and clinicians throughout FDA, promoting scientific and regulatory innovations to help facilitate timely development and approval of new treatments for patients with rare diseases. The Committee expects the Associate Director to use these funds to hire additional staff with specific expertise in facilitating the development of drugs to treat rare diseases.

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

*Seafood Safety.*—The Committee is supportive of the current MOU between NOAA and FDA and encourages both agencies, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of HHS to continue to work together to strengthen cooperation on seafood safety, seafood labeling, and seafood fraud. The agreements should focus on coordination of testing seafood imports, inspection of imported seafood at both domestic and international facilities, data standardization and collection, joint training and outreach for testing facilities, and information sharing. The Committee encourages an increase in the use of NOAA laboratory testing and the commissioning of NOAA officers by the Secretary of HHS as needed in order to increase capacity for seafood inspection and testing. In addition, the Secretaries are encouraged to share information with the Federal Trade Commission as appropriate on consumer protection issues with respect to fraud in seafood marketing and labeling.

*Standards of Identity.*—The Committee recognizes that honey is produced in the United States, traded internationally, and consumed as both a packaged food and as a food ingredient. However, there have been instances where manufacturers have been marketing products illegally as “honey” or “pure honey” that contain other ingredients. FDA has been in receipt of a citizen petition regarding a proposed standard of identity for honey for a significant and unacceptable length of time, and is directed to respond to this citizen petition within 6 months, and provide monthly status reports to the Committee on this effort until a response has been provided. Further, FDA is directed to work to find ways to protect consumers from misbranded honey and honey-derived products that are currently entering the U.S. market.

*Traceability.*—The Committee directs FDA to initiate one or more traceability projects on food products and/or ingredients known to be linked to foodborne disease outbreaks, or that have significant potential to cause serious adverse health consequences. When designing traceability projects, FDA should consider the challenges identified during previous outbreaks or build on previous efforts to improve product tracing along the supply chain. To prevent duplication of efforts and to more rapidly implement these pilot projects, the Committee encourages FDA to consider pilot projects already under way, either within the United States or the European Union, when implementing this directive. The Committee directs FDA to begin implementation of this project within

1 year, and to report back to the Committee upon the conclusion of the projects.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 2010 .....	\$12,433,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	12,433,000
Committee recommendation .....	12,433,000

FDA maintains offices and staff in 49 States and in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, including field laboratories and specialized facilities, as well as the National Center for Toxicological Research complex. Repairs, modifications, improvements, and construction to FDA headquarters and field facilities must be made to preserve the properties, ensure employee safety, meet changing program requirements, and permit the agency to keep its laboratory methods up to date.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,433,000 for FDA buildings and facilities. This funding shall be used to upgrade FDA facilities and laboratories which are currently below public safety standards and incapable of performing agency requirements.

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCY

##### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

##### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2010 .....	\$54,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011 .....	59,400,000
Committee recommendation .....	59,400,000

The Farm Credit Administration [FCA] is the independent agency in the executive branch of the Government responsible for the examination and regulation of the banks, associations, and other institutions of the Farm Credit System.

Activities of the Farm Credit Administration include the planning and execution of examinations of Farm Credit System institutions and the preparation of examination reports. FCA also establishes standards, enforces rules and regulations, and approves certain actions of the institutions.

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

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

The Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 authorized the formation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation [FAMC] to operate a secondary market for agricultural and rural housing mortgages.

The Farm Credit Administration, under section 8.11 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, is assigned the responsibility of regulating this entity and assuring its safe and sound operation.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$59,400,000 on administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration [FCA].

TITLE VII  
GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends the following provisions:

Section 701. This section makes funds available for the purchase, replacement, and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Section 702. This section gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to transfer unobligated balances to the Working Capital 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 makes funds available for the expenses and activities of certain advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces at the Department of Agriculture.

Section 707. This section prohibits the use of funds to establish an inspection panel at the Department of Agriculture.

Section 708. 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 709. 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 710. This section prohibits the purchase of new information technology equipment and equipment in excess of \$25,000 without the prior approval of the Chief Information Officer.

Section 711. This section prohibits the reprogramming of funds for programs, projects, or activities in excess of \$500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less without the prior notification of the Committee on Appropriations.

Section 712. This section prohibits the use of funds for user fee proposals that fail to provide sufficient budget impact information.

Section 713. This section places conditions on the closing or relocation of Rural Development State Offices.

Section 714. This section prohibits the closing of the Food and Drug Administration's St. Louis, Missouri laboratory.

Section 715. This section limits the amount of funding available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the release of commodities under the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust.

Section 716. This section provides funding for the National Center for Natural Products Research to construct and/or renovate facilities to enhance the research conducted on botanicals and dietary supplements at the National Center in conjunction with FDA's Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. This research aids FDA's regulatory mission in ensuring the safety and effectiveness of dietary supplements by identifying, isolating, and analyzing specific components of botanicals and dietary supplements.

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

Section 718. This section prohibits funds to carry out certain sections of Public Law 110-246.

Section 719. This section makes certain former Rural Utilities Service borrowers eligible for the Rural Economic Development loan and grant program.

Section 720. This section provides funding to continue development of a sterile fruit fly facility.

Section 721. This section makes selected communities eligible for certain Rural Development programs, pending receipt of the 2010 Census.

Section 722. This section provides funding for section 6402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, to support development and expansion of the specialty cheese industry.

Section 723. This section authorizes certain watershed projects.

Section 724. This section modifies matching requirements for certain research grants.

Section 725. This section provides funds for Rural Development and the Farm Service Agency information technology expenses.

Section 726. This section provides funding for the Geographically Disadvantaged Farmers Program and the Durum Wheat Quality Program as authorized in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008.

Section 727. This section provides funding to carry out a pilot program for hardwood trees.

Section 728. This section includes language regarding reconstituted infant formula.

Section 729. This section includes language regarding pandemic emergencies.

Section 730. This section includes language regarding school equipment.

Section 731. This section includes language regarding the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 732. This section includes language for the establishment of a fee under section 502(h)(8) of the Housing Act of 1949.

Section 733. This section includes language for the establishment of a fee under the business and industry loan program.

Section 734. This section includes language regarding the disbursement of obligations under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Section 735. This section rescinds funds for Agricultural Research Service Buildings and Facilities that are complete or have not received any appropriated funding in any of the previous 3 fiscal years.

Section 736. This section provides for the rescission of funds.

Section 737. This section includes language regarding acquisition workforce capacity.

Section 738. This section includes language regarding the Rural Innovation Initiative.

Section 739. This section includes language regarding the conveyance of land.

Section 740. This section includes language regarding baseload generation.

Section 741. This section includes language regarding rare and neglected diseases.

## PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2011, 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, 2011, 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 2011 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 2011 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as modified by congressional action, and in addition:

For the Agricultural Research Service the definition shall include specific research locations as identified in the explanatory notes and lines of research specifically identified in the reports of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

For the Natural Resources Conservation Service the definition shall include individual flood prevention projects as identified in the explanatory notes and individual operational watershed projects as summarized in the notes.

For the Farm Service Agency the definition shall include individual, regional, State, district, and county offices.

## COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports accompanying general appropriations bills identify each recommended amendment which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2011:

Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004:

- WIC Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program
- State Administrative Expenses
- Summer Food Service Program
- WIC Infrastructure, MIS, Special Nutrition Education

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for WIC  
 School Meals Program—Commodity Funding  
 State Mediation Grants

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 15, 2010, the Committee ordered reported en bloc an original bill (S. 3606) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; an original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011 and for other purposes; and an original bill making appropriations military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, with each subject to amendment and subject to the Committee Spending Guidance, and authorized the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate-reported bill as a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure, by a recorded vote of 17–12, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Inouye	Mr. Cochran
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Bond
Mr. Harkin	Mr. McConnell
Ms. Mikulski	Mr. Shelby
Mr. Kohl	Mr. Gregg
Mrs. Murray	Mr. Bennett
Mr. Dorgan	Mrs. Hutchison
Mrs. Feinstein	Mr. Brownback
Mr. Durbin	Mr. Alexander
Mr. Johnson	Ms. Collins
Ms. Landrieu	Mr. Voinovich
Mr. Reed	Ms. Murkowski
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Pryor	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Specter	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE  
 STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include “(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee.”

In compliance with this rule, the following changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italics; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

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

**CHAPTER 8A—SLUM CLEARANCE, URBAN RENEWAL, AND FARM HOUSING**

SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

**§ 1472. Loans for housing and buildings on adequate farms**

**(a) Terms of loan**

\* \* \* \* \*

**(h) Doug Bereuter section 502 single family housing loan guarantee program**

**(1) Short title**

\* \* \* \* \*

**(8) Guarantee fee**

With respect to a guaranteed loan under this subsection, the Secretary may collect from the lender at the time of issuance of the guarantee a fee equal to not more than **[1]** 3.5 percent of the principal obligation of the loan. *In addition, the Secretary may collect from the lender an annual fee not to exceed 0.5 percent of the outstanding principal balance of the loan for the life of the loan.*

---

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001, PUBLIC LAW 106-387**

**APPENDIX—H.R. 5426**

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

**[SEC. 739.** Hereafter, notwithstanding section 502(h)(7) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)(7)), the fee collected by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to a guaranteed loan under such section 502(h) at the time of the issuance of such guarantee may be in an amount equal to not more than 2 percent of the principal obligation of the loan.**]**

**FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT, 2008**

**TITLE XIV—MISCELLANEOUS**

**CHAPTER 2—OTHER PROVISIONS**

**Subtitle C—Other Miscellaneous Provisions**

**SEC. 14222. DOMESTIC FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.**

(a) DEFINITION OF SECTION 32.— \* \* \*

(b) TRANSFER TO FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available for a fiscal year to carry out section 32 in excess of the maximum amount calculated under paragraph (2) shall be transferred to the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, to be used to carry out the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) *except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21.*

**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 guidance <sup>1</sup>	Amount of bill	Committee guidance	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee spending guidance to its subcommittees for 2011: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies:				
Mandatory .....	NA	109,217	NA	<sup>2</sup> 101,226
Discretionary .....	22,838	22,838	NA	<sup>2</sup> 24,480
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2011 .....	.....	.....	.....	<sup>3</sup> 104,776
2012 .....	.....	.....	.....	4,393
2013 .....	.....	.....	.....	1,863
2014 .....	.....	.....	.....	298
2015 and future years .....	.....	.....	.....	209
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2011 .....	NA	33,914	NA	35,728

<sup>1</sup> There is no section 302(a) allocation to the Committee for fiscal year 2011.

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

<sup>3</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

**DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS**

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power of the purse. The Committee believes strongly that Congress should make the decisions on how to allocate the people's money.

As defined in Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the term "congressional directed spending item" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, pro-

viding, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative, formula-driven, or competitive award process.

For each item, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in such congressionally directed spending item. Such certifications are available to the public on the website of the Senate Committee on Appropriations ([www.appropriations.senate.gov/senators.cfm](http://www.appropriations.senate.gov/senators.cfm)).

Following is a list of congressionally directed spending items included in the Senate recommendation discussed in this report, along with the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the Committee of jurisdiction for each item so identified. Neither the Committee recommendation nor this report contains any limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in rule XLIV.

PRESIDENTIALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Requester(s)
National Institute of Food and Agriculture.	SRG .....	Global Change/UVB Radiation .....	\$1,750,000	The President
National Institute of Food and Agriculture.	SRG .....	Minor Use Animal Drugs .....	\$429,000	The President
Rural Development .....	Rural coop grants .....	Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas, National Center for Appropriate Technology, Butte, Montana.	\$2,800,000	Baucus, Feinstein, Harkin, Johnson, Lincoln, Pryor, Specter, The President, and Tester

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Agency	Account	Project	Funding	Member
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, MD .....	\$3,000,000	Mikulski
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Agricultural Research Center, Pullman, WA .....	\$5,000,000	Cantwell and Murray
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Agricultural Research Center, Logan, UT .....	\$6,000,000	Bennett and Hatch
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Animal Bioscience Facility, Bozeman, MT .....	\$3,000,000	Baucus and Tester
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Appalachian Fruit Laboratory, Kearneysville, WV .....	\$1,500,000	Rocketteller
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	ARS Biotechnology Lab, Lorman, MS .....	\$2,000,000	Cochran
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	ARS Research and Development Center, Auburn, AL .....	\$6,000,000	Shelby
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	ARS Waste Management Research Facility, Bowling Green, KY .....	\$5,000,000	McConnell
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Dairy Forage Agricultural Research Center, Prairie du Sac, WI .....	\$1,000,000	Kohl
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	National Cold Water Marine Aquaculture Center, Orono, ME .....	\$1,500,000	Collins and Snowe
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center, Hilo, HI .....	\$5,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Sugarcane Research Laboratory, Houma, LA .....	\$1,000,000	Landrieu and Vitter
Agricultural Research Service .....	Building and facilities .....	Systems Biology Research Facility, Lincoln, NE .....	\$4,000,000	Nelson, Ben
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Aquaculture Fisheries Center, ARS, Stuttgart, AR .....	\$519,000	Lincoln and Pryor
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Biomass Crop Production, ARS, Brookings, SD .....	\$1,250,000	Johnson and Thune
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Bioremediation Research, ARS, Beltsville, MD .....	\$111,000	Merkley and Wyden
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Biotechnology Research and Development Center, ARS, Washington, DC .....	\$3,500,000	Durbin
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Computer Vision Engineer, ARS, Kearneysville, WV .....	\$400,000	Rocketteller
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Dairy Forage Research Center, ARS, Marshfield, WI .....	\$2,500,000	Kohl
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Date Bumpers Small Farms Research Center, ARS, Booneville, AR .....	\$1,805,000	Lincoln and Pryor
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Diet Nutrition and Obesity Research, ARS, New Orleans, LA .....	\$623,000	Landrieu
Agricultural Research Service .....	Salaries and expenses .....	Endophyte Research, ARS, Booneville, AR .....	\$994,000	Lincoln, Merkley, Pryor, and Wyden

Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Forage Crop Stress Tolerance and Virus Disease Management, ARS, Prosser, WA	\$200,000	Cantwell
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Formosan Subterranean Termites Research, ARS, New Orleans, LA	\$3,490,000	Landrieu
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Human Nutrition Research, Boston, MA; Houston, TX; Kannapolis, NC	\$1,650,000	Burr, Hagan, Hutchison, and Kerry
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	National Center for Agricultural Law, ARS, Beltsville, MD	\$654,000	Harkin, Lincoln, and Pryor
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Northern Great Plains Research Laboratory, ARS, Mandan, ND	\$543,000	Conrad and Dorgan
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Northwest Center for Small Fruits Research, ARS, Corvallis, OR	\$275,000	Crapo, Merkley, Risch, and Wyden
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Phytohormone Research, ARS, New Orleans, LA	\$1,750,000	Landrieu
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Poultry Diseases, Beltsville, MD	\$408,000	Mikulski
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Sorghum Research, ARS, Little Rock, AR	\$135,000	Lincoln and Pryor
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Technology Transfer, ARS, Washington, DC	\$250,000	Cochran
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Water Management Research Laboratory, ARS, Brawley, CA	\$340,000	Boxer and Feinstein
Agricultural Research Service	Salaries and expenses	Water Use Reduction, ARS, Dawson, GA	\$1,200,000	Chambless and Isakson
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Agriculture Compliance Laboratory Equipment, Delaware Department of Agriculture	\$69,000	Carper and Kaufman
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Arthropod damage control Nevada, APHIS NV	\$1,000,000	Reid
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Berryman Institute, Jack Berryman Institute Utah and Mississippi Agriculture and Forestry Experiment Station	\$1,500,000	Bennett, Cochran, and Wicker
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Bio-safety and antibiotic resistance, University of Vermont	\$240,000	Leahy
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Blackbird management, APHIS LA	\$94,000	Landrieu
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Bovine tuberculosis eradication Michigan, Michigan Department of Agriculture	\$248,000	Levin and Stabenow
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Brucellosis eradication in the Greater Yellowstone area states, Idaho Department of Agriculture, Montana Department of Livestock, Wyoming Livestock Board	\$650,000	Barrasso, Baucus, Crapo, Enzi, Risch, and Tester
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	California county pest detection augmentation program, California Department of Food and Agriculture	\$619,000	Boxer and Feinstein
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Cogongrass control, Mississippi Department of Agriculture	\$208,000	Cochran
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Cooperative livestock protection program, APHIS Pennsylvania and Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture	\$223,000	Specter
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Cormorant control, APHIS MI	\$139,000	Levin and Stabenow
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Cormorant control, APHIS MS	\$223,000	Cochran
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Cormorant control, APHIS Vermont and Vermont Fish and Wildlife Department	\$103,000	Leahy
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Database of North Carolina's agricultural industry for rapid response, North Carolina Department of Agriculture	\$208,000	Burr and Hagan
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Disease prevention, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	\$69,000	Landrieu
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Genetically modified products, Iowa State University	\$259,000	Grassley and Harkin
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Giant Salvinia control, Northwestern State University	\$500,000	Landrieu
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Hawaii interline, APHIS HI	\$3,000,000	Akaka and Inouye

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Funding	Member
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Hawaii wildlife services activities, APHIS HI	\$2,230,000	Akaka and Inouye
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, Tennessee, University of Tennessee	\$1,250,000	Alexander
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Integrated predation management activities, APHIS WY	\$280,000	Rockefeller
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Invasive aquatic species, Lake Champlain Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative, Vermont	\$94,000	Leahy
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	National Agriculture Biosecurity Center, Kansas State University	\$750,000	Brownback and Roberts
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	New Mexico rapid syndrome validation program, New Mexico State University	\$404,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Nez Perce Bio-control Center, Nez Perce Tribe	\$176,000	Crapo and Risch
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Noxious weed management, Nevada Department of Agriculture	\$235,000	Reid
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Technology to combat asian long-horned beetles in New York forests, SUNY—College of Environmental Science and Forestry	\$500,000	Gillibrand and Schumer
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Tri-State predator control, APHIS Idaho, MT and WY	\$926,000	Barrasso, Baucus, Crapo, Enzi, and Risch
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Varrao mite suppression, APHIS HI	\$469,000	Akaka and Inouye
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Wildlife management and control, APHIS MS	\$496,000	Cochran
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	Salaries and expenses	Wildlife Services South Dakota, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks	\$519,000	Johnson
General Provision		Agricultural pest facility, APHIS HI	\$2,600,000	Akaka and Inouye
General Provision		Market Development, Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Foods, and Markets	\$1,000,000	Leahy
General Provision		Market Development, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	\$2,000,000	Kohl
General Provision		Phase II construction, National Center for Natural Products Research, Oxford, MS	\$8,000,000	Cochran and Wicker
General Provision		Specialty Markets, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	\$350,000	Kohl
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Childhood Farm Safety, Urbandale, IA	\$75,000	Grassley and Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Conservation Technology Transfer, University of Wisconsin Extension	\$376,000	Kohl
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Dairy Education, Iowa State University	\$175,000	Grassley and Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	E-commerce, Mississippi State University	\$231,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	\$475,000	Bingaman, Cornyn, and Hutchinson
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Extension Specialist, Mississippi State University	\$173,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Food Production Education, Vermont Community Foundation, Middlebury, VT	\$116,000	Sanders

National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Health Education Leadership, University of Kentucky Research Foundation.	\$300,000	McConnell
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Institute for Sustainable Agriculture, University of Wisconsin-Madison	\$400,000	Kohl
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Invasive Phragmites Control and Outreach, Ducks Unlimited	\$147,000	Levin and Stabenow
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Iowa Vitality Center, Iowa State University	\$250,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Maine Cattle Health Assurance Program, Maine Department of Agriculture.	\$700,000	Collins
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	National Center for Farm Safety, Northeast Iowa Community College	\$150,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Northeast Energy and Environmental Dairy System, PA	\$305,000	Specter
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Nutrition Enhancement, University of Wisconsin Extension and Wisconsin Department of Public Institutions.	\$950,000	Kohl
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Ohio-Israel Agriculture Initiative, The Negev Foundation, OH	\$700,000	Brown, Sherrod and Voinovich
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Pilot Technology Transfer, Mississippi State University, Oklahoma State University.	\$209,000	Cochran, Inhofe, and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Potato Integrated Pest Management—Late Blight, University of Maine.	\$450,000	Collins and Snowe
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Range Improvement, New Mexico State University	\$200,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Urban Horticulture, University of Wisconsin Extension and Growing Power.	\$376,000	Kohl
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	Extension	Urban Horticulture and Marketing, Chicago Botanic Garden, Glencoe, IL	\$175,000	Durbin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Ag-based Industrial Lubricants, University of Northern Iowa	\$405,000	Grassley and Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Agriculture Development in the American Pacific, University of Hawaii.	\$400,000	Akaka and Inouye
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Agriculture Technology Innovation, Maryland Technology Development Corporation, MD.	\$150,000	Cardin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Agriculture Waste Utilization, West Virginia State University	\$500,000	Rockefeller
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Applied Agriculture and Environment Research, California State University.	\$350,000	Boxer and Feinstein
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Biofuels Research, Vermont Technical College	\$100,000	Sanders
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Biotechnology Research, Alcorn State University, MS	\$480,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Center for Dairy and Beef Excellence, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.	\$340,000	Specter
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Clemson University Veterinary Institute, SC	\$1,000,000	Graham
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Converting Agricultural Waste to Energy, Kansas Livestock Foundation.	\$2,000,000	Brownback
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Cotton Research, Texas Tech University	\$200,000	Cornyn and Hutchinson
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Council for Agriculture Science and Technology, Ames, IA	\$110,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Development of Biobased Chemicals and Materials from Agriculture Raw Materials, Michigan Biotechnology Institute.	\$125,000	Levin and Stabenow

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Funding	Member
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Ethnobotanics, Frostburg State University, MD	\$500,000	Cardin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Farmland Preservation, The Ohio State University	\$152,000	Brown, Sherrod
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Florida Biomass to Biofuels Conversion Program, University of Central Florida	\$285,000	Nelson, Bill
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	International Center for Food Technology Development to Expand Markets, Purdue University	\$450,000	Lugar
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Kansas Advanced Biofield Development, Kansas Alliance for Bio-refining and Bioenergy	\$2,000,000	Brownback
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Kansas Center for Advanced Plant Design, Kansas Wheat Commission	\$2,000,000	Brownback
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Midwest Agribusiness Trade and Information Center MATRIC, Iowa State University	\$95,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Mississippi Valley State University	\$1,002,000	Cochran
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	NE Center for Invasive Plants, University of Connecticut, the University of Vermont, and the University of Maine	\$295,000	Collins and Snowe
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Polymer Research, Pittsburg State University, KS	\$2,350,000	Brownback
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Rural Systems, Jackson State University, MS	\$215,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Shrimp Aquaculture, University of Southern Mississippi	\$300,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development Law Center, Vermont Law School	\$343,000	Leahy
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Viral Hemorrhagic Septicemia, University of Toledo, OH	\$500,000	Brown, Sherrod and Voinovich
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	RE/FA	Water Pollutants, Marshall University, WV	\$500,000	Rockefeller
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Advanced Genetic Technologies, University of Kentucky Research Foundation	\$650,000	McConnell
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Advancing Biofuel Production, Baylor University, TX	\$300,000	Hutchison
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Aegilops Cylindrica (Jointed Goatgrass/Biomass), Washington State University	\$200,000	Cantwell and Murray
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Agricultural Diversification, University of Hawaii	\$153,000	Akaka and Inouye
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Agricultural Science, The Ohio State University	\$450,000	Brown, Sherrod and Voinovich
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Air quality, Kansas State University; Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX	\$300,000	Conyn and Roberts
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Animal Science Food Safety Consortium, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture, Iowa State University, Kansas State University	\$1,000,000	Grassley, Harkin, Lincoln, Pryor, and Roberts
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Aquaculture, Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	\$150,000	Landreiu and Vitter
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Aquaculture, Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station	\$337,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Avian Bioscience, University of Delaware	\$150,000	Carper and Kaufman

National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Barley for Rural Development, Montana State University, University of Idaho.	\$500,000	Baucus, Crapo, Risch, and Tester
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Biodesign and Bioprocessing, Virginia Tech University	\$211,000	Waner and Webb
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Bio Energy Production and Carbon Sequestration, University of Tennessee.	\$500,000	Alexander
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Biomass-based Energy Research, Oklahoma State University, Mississippi State University.	\$839,000	Cochran, Inhofe, and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Bioresource Land Use Planning Project, University of Kentucky	\$671,000	McConnell
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Cataloging Genes Associated with Drought and Disease Resistance, New Mexico State University.	\$168,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Center for Food, Nutrition, and Obesity, West Virginia University	\$550,000	Rockefeller
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Center for One Medicine, IL	\$500,000	Burris and Durbin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Center for Multi-Functional Prairie Agriculture, SD	\$700,000	Johnson and Thune
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Center for Rural Studies, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.	\$350,000	Leahy
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Childhood Obesity and Nutrition, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.	\$250,000	Leahy
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Cool season legume research, North Dakota State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University.	\$350,000	Cantwell, Conrad, Dorgan, and Murray
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Cotton Insect Management and Fiber Quality, University of Georgia	\$346,000	Chambliss and Isakson
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Cranberry/Blueberry, University of Massachusetts	\$152,000	Kerry
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Cranberry/Blueberry Disease & Breeding, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.	\$522,000	Lautenberg and Menendez
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Crop Diversification and Biofuel Research and Education, University of Kentucky.	\$525,000	McConnell
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Dairy and Meat Goat Research, Prairie View A&M University	\$200,000	Hutchison
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Dairy Farm Profitability, Pennsylvania State University	\$372,000	Casey and Specker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Delta Revitalization Project, Mississippi State University	\$176,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Drought Mitigation, University of Nebraska	\$600,000	Nelson, Ben
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Efficient irrigation, New Mexico State University, Texas AgriLife Extension Service and Texas AgriLife Research, College Station, TX.	\$575,000	Bingaman, Cornyn, Hutchison, and Udall, Tom
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Emerald Ash Borer, The Ohio State University	\$522,000	Brown, Sherrrod
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Environmentally Safe Products, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.	\$250,000	Leahy
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Floriculture, University of Hawaii	\$300,000	Akaka and Inouye
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute	\$1,213,000	Bond, Harkin, and Reid
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Food & Fuel Initiative, Iowa State University	\$298,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Forages for Advancing Livestock Production, University of Kentucky	\$473,000	McConnell
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Fresh Produce Food Safety, University of California	\$750,000	Boxer and Feinstein

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Funding	Member
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Genetically Enhanced Plants for Micro-nutrients and Genomics for Southern Crop Stress and Disease, Mississippi State University.	\$797,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Grain Sorghum, Kansas State University	\$1,250,000	Brownback and Roberts
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Grass Seed Cropping Systems for Sustainable Agriculture, Oregon State University, Washington State University.	\$142,000	Cantwell, Merkley, Murray, and Wyden
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Human Nutrition, Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA.	\$526,000	Landrieu
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Illinois Plant Breeding Center, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL.	\$617,000	Durbin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Inland Marine Aquaculture, Virginia Tech University	\$380,000	Warner and Webb
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Infectious Disease Research, Colorado State University	\$617,000	Bennet and Udall, Mark
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Institute for Food Science and Engineering, University of Arkansas	\$500,000	Lincoln and Pryor
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Integrated Economic, Environmental and Technical Analysis of Sustainable Biomass Energy Systems, Purdue University.	\$188,000	Lugar
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Leopold Center Hypoxia Project, Iowa State University	\$100,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Livestock & Dairy Policy, Cornell University, NY	\$180,000	Gillibrand and Schumer
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Maple Research, University of Vermont College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.	\$165,000	Leahy
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Midwest Center for Bioenergy Grasses, Purdue University	\$188,000	Lugar
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Midwest Poultry Consortium, Iowa State University	\$250,000	Franken, Harkin and Klobuchar
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Milk Safety, Pennsylvania State University	\$780,000	Casey and Specter
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	National Beef Cattle Genetic Evaluation Consortium, Colorado State University, Cornell University, University of Georgia.	\$655,000	Bennet and Chambliss
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	National Center for Agricultural and Rural Sustainability, University of Arkansas.	\$175,000	Lincoln and Pryor
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	National Center for Soybean Technology, University of Missouri-Columbia.	\$690,000	Bond
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Native Grassland and Sustainability, Kansas State University	\$1,000,000	Brownback
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Nematode Resistance Genetic Engineering, New Mexico State University.	\$199,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Nevada Arid Rangelands Initiative, University of Nevada Reno	\$500,000	Reid
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	New Century Farm, Iowa State University	\$350,000	Grassley and Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	New Satellite and Computer-Based Technology for Agriculture, Mississippi State University.	\$654,000	Cochran and Wicker
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Organic Cropping, Oregon State University	\$142,000	Merkley and Wyden
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	SRG	Organic Cropping, Washington State University	\$264,000	Cantwell and Murray

National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Pierce's Disease and Invasive Pest Research, University of California ..	\$2,000,000	Boxer and Feinstein
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Policy Analyses for a National Secure & Sustainable Food, Fiber, For- estry and Energy Program, Texas Agrilife Research, College Station, TX.	\$200,000	Hutchison
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Preharvest Food Safety, Kansas State University .....	\$500,000	Brownback and Roberts
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Protein Utilization, Iowa State University .....	\$500,000	Grassley and Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Rangeland Ecosystems Dynamics, University of Idaho .....	\$300,000	Crapo and Risch
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Renewable Energy and Products, North Dakota State University .....	\$1,000,000	Conrad and Dorgan
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Rural Policies Research Institute .....	\$755,000	Harkin
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Russian Wheat Aphid, Colorado State University .....	\$237,000	Bennet and Udall, Mark
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Small Fruit Research, Oregon State University, University of Idaho, Washington State University.	\$285,000	Cantwell, Crapo, Merkley, Murray, Risch, and Wyden
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Soil-Borne Disease Prevention in Irrigated Agriculture, New Mexico State University.	\$178,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Southern Great Plains Dairy Consortium, New Mexico State University ..	\$350,000	Bingaman and Udall, Tom
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Soybean Cyst Nematode, University of Missouri .....	\$556,000	Bond
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Sustainable Engineered Materials from Renewable Resources, Virginia Tech.	\$237,000	Warner and Webb
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Sustainable Food and Bio-Energy Systems, Montana State University ...	\$305,000	Tester
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Sustainable Production and Processing Research for Lowbush Specialty Crops, University of Maine.	\$200,000	Collins and Snowe
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Sustainable Wheat Production and Food Security, South Dakota State University.	\$600,000	Johnson and Thune
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Tillage, Silviculture, Waste Management, Louisiana State University .....	\$180,000	Landrieu
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Tropical and Subtropical Research/T STAR, University of Hawaii .....	\$800,000	Akaka and Inouye
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Virtual Plant Database Enhancement Project, Missouri Botanical Gar- den.	\$588,000	Bond
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Virus-free Wine Grape Cultivars, Wine Grape Foundation Block, Wash- ington State University.	\$247,000	Cantwell and Murray
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Viticulture Consortium, University of California .....	\$1,000,000	Boxer
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Water Conservation, Kansas State University .....	\$600,000	Brownback and Roberts
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Wetland Plants, Louisiana State University .....	\$200,000	Landrieu and Vitter
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Wheat Genetic Research, Kansas State University .....	\$1,250,000	Brownback and Roberts
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Wildlife/Livestock Disease Research Partnership, WY .....	\$300,000	Barrasso
National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	SRG .....	Wood Utilization (AK, ID, LA, ME, MI, MN, MS, NC, OR, WV) .....	\$4,841,000	Burr, Cochran, Collins, Crapo, Franken, Klobuchar, Landrieu, Levin, Merkley, Murkowski, Risch, Rockefeller, Snowe, Sta- benow, Wicker, and Wyden
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Accelerated Soil Mapping Survey, NRCS Wyoming .....	\$200,000	Barrasso

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Funding	Member
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Agricultural Development and Resource Conservation, Hawaii RC&D Councils.	\$1,400,000	Akaka and Inouye
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Agricultural Wildlife Conservation Center, MS	\$939,000	Cochran
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Center for Invasive Species Eradication, Texas Agrilife Research, College Station, TX.	\$1,000,000	Hutchison
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Certified Environmental Management Systems for Agriculture, Iowa Soybean Association.	\$288,000	Grassley and Harkin
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Conservation Enhancements, Lancaster County Conservation Districts, PA.	\$200,000	Specter
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Conservation Internships, Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association.	\$120,000	Kohl
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Conservation Technical Assistance, NRCS NJ	\$236,000	Lautenberg and Menendez
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Conservation Technical Assistance, NRCS TN	\$1,000,000	Alexander
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Conservation Technology Transfer, University of Wisconsin	\$516,000	Kohl
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Cover Crop Program, MD	\$1,000,000	Cardin and Mikulski
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Delta Conservation Demonstration, Washington County, MS	\$376,000	Cochran
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Delta Water Study, NRCS Mississippi	\$235,000	Cochran
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Farm Viability Program, Vermont Housing and Conservation Board	\$300,000	Leahy
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Grazing Land Conservation Initiative, NRCS WI	\$732,000	Kohl
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Great Basin Plant Materials Center, NV	\$269,000	Reid
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control, Great Lakes Commission.	\$404,000	Brown, Sherrod, Durbin, Levin, Schumer, Stabenow, and Voinovich
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Hungry Canyons Alliance, IA	\$282,000	Grassley and Harkin
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Illinois Conservation Initiative, Illinois Department of Natural Resources.	\$1,126,000	Durbin
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Kentucky Soil Erosion Control, NRCS KY	\$724,000	Bunning and McConnell
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Mississippi Conservation Initiative, NRCS MS	\$2,000,000	Cochran
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Native Plant Initiative, McNeese State University, IA	\$500,000	Landrieu
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Operation Oak Program, National Wild Turkey Federation	\$100,000	Chambliss, Cochran, and Graham
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Phosphorous Loading in Lake Champlain, Poultney Conservation District, VT.	\$179,000	Leahy
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Prairie Biomass, Central College, IA	\$100,000	Grassley and Harkin
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Conservation Operations	Quabbin to Cardigan Conservation Initiative, Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.	\$282,000	Shaheen

Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Riparian Restoration, New Mexico Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.	\$200,000	Bingaman
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Soil Surveys, NRCS RI .....	\$134,000	Reed
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Technical Assistance Grants to Kentucky Soil Conservation Districts, Kentucky Division of Conservation.	\$545,000	Bunning and McConnell
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Upper Cedar River Watershed Coalition, Trees Forever .....	\$150,000	Grassley and Harkin
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Watershed Demonstration Project, Iowa Soybean Association .....	\$134,000	Harkin
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	Watershed Planning Staff, NRCS Pacific Island Area .....	\$500,000	Akaka and Inouye
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Conservation Operations .....	West Virginia Conservation Initiative, NRCS WV .....	\$1,000,000	Rockefeller
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Copper Mine Brook Watershed, Bristol, CT .....	\$330,000	Dodd and Lieberman
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Dunloup Creek Watershed Project, NRCS WV .....	\$1,500,000	Rockefeller
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Lahaina Watershed, NRCS HI .....	\$4,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Lake County Watershed, IL .....	\$350,000	Durbin
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Lower Hamakua Ditch Watershed, NRCS HI .....	\$1,800,000	Akaka and Inouye
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Missouri Watershed Projects, NRCS MO .....	\$2,000,000	Bond
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	North Fork of the Elkhorn Creek, NRCS WV .....	\$300,000	Rockefeller
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Pocasset River, NRCS RI .....	\$2,000,000	Reed and Whitehouse
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Southeast Quadrant Drainage and Flood Prevention Project, Foley, AL ..	\$350,000	Sessions
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Upcountry Maui Watershed, NRCS HI .....	\$2,000,000	Akaka and Inouye
Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	Watershed/Flood Prevention Operations .....	Wailuku-Alenaio, NRCS HI .....	\$250,000	Akaka and Inouye

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011  
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
<b>TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary .....	5,285	5,936	5,338	+53	-598
Office of Tribal Relations .....	1,000	1,025	1,010	+10	-15
Healthy Food Financing Initiative .....	.....	35,000	15,000	+15,000	-20,000
Executive Operations:					
Office of Chief Economist .....	13,032	13,175	13,100	+68	-75
National Appeals Division .....	15,254	15,424	15,424	+170	.....
Office of Budget and Program Analysis .....	9,436	9,547	9,547	+111	.....
Office of Homeland Security .....	1,859	1,876	1,876	+17	.....
Office of Advocacy and Outreach .....	1,700	7,009	1,709	+9	-5,300
Office of the Chief Information Officer .....	61,579	63,719	63,719	+2,140	.....
Office of the Chief Financial Officer .....	6,566	6,632	6,632	+66	.....
Total, Executive Operations .....	109,426	117,382	112,007	+2,581	-5,375
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights .....	895	907	907	+12	.....
Office of Civil Rights .....	23,922	24,133	24,133	+211	.....
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration .....	806	828	814	+8	-14
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments .....	(293,093)	(277,937)	(269,191)	(-23,902)	(-8,746)
Payments to GSA .....	184,812	178,470	178,470	-6,342	.....
Department of Homeland Security .....	13,500	13,800	13,800	+300	.....
Building operations and maintenance .....	94,781	85,667	76,921	-17,860	-8,746
Hazardous materials management .....	5,125	5,139	5,139	+14	.....
Departmental Administration .....	41,319	30,706	28,706	-12,613	-2,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	3,968	4,081	4,008	+40	-73
Office of Communications .....	9,722	9,839	9,839	+117	.....
Office of the Inspector General .....	88,725	90,300	89,744	+1,019	-556
Office of the General Counsel .....	43,551	45,654	44,104	+553	-1,550
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics .....	895	920	904	+9	-16

Economic Research Service .....	82,478	87,171	83,671	+ 1,193	- 3,500
National Agricultural Statistics Service .....	161,830	164,721	163,721	+ 1,891	- 1,000
Census of Agriculture .....	(37,908)	(33,494)	(33,494)	(- 4,414)	.....
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses .....	1,179,639	1,199,669	1,216,825	+ 37,186	+ 17,156
Buildings and facilities .....	70,873	.....	44,000	- 26,873	+ 44,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service .....	1,250,512	1,199,669	1,260,825	+ 10,313	+ 61,156
National Institute of Food and Agriculture:					
Research and education activities .....	788,243	838,729	780,720	- 7,523	- 58,009
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund .....	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)	.....	.....
Extension activities .....	494,923	479,203	491,231	- 3,692	+ 12,028
Integrated activities .....	60,022	24,874	38,577	- 21,445	+ 13,703
Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities Endowment Fund .....	.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+ 10,000)	.....
Total, National Institute of Food and Agriculture .....	1,343,188	1,342,806	1,310,528	- 32,660	- 32,278
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs .....	895	920	904	+ 9	- 16
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses .....	904,953	870,576	926,609	+ 21,656	+ 56,033
Buildings and facilities .....	4,712	4,712	4,712	.....	.....
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service .....	909,665	875,288	931,321	+ 21,656	+ 56,033
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services .....	91,148	97,255	96,955	+ 5,807	- 300
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected) .....	(64,583)	(60,947)	(60,947)	(- 3,636)	.....
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (Section 32):					
Permanent, Section 32 .....	1,300,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	- 100,000	.....
Marketing agreements and orders (transfer from section 32) .....	20,056	20,283	20,283	+ 227	.....
Commodity purchases support system .....	(10,000)	.....	.....	(- 10,000)	.....
Payments to States and Possessions .....	1,334	2,634	2,484	+ 1,150	- 150
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service program .....	1,487,121	1,381,119	1,380,669	- 106,452	- 450
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses .....	41,964	44,192	44,192	+ 2,228	.....
Limitation on inspection and weighing services .....	(42,463)	(45,041)	(50,000)	(+ 7,537)	(+ 4,959)
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety .....	813	836	821	+ 8	- 15

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Food Safety and Inspection Service					
Lab accreditation fees	1,018,520 (1,000)	1,036,900 (1,000)	1,047,200 (1,000)	+28,680	+10,300
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	6,850,135	6,722,462	6,773,749	-76,386	+51,287
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	895	920	904	+9	-16
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	1,253,777	1,364,673	1,343,350	+89,573	-21,323
(Transfer from Food for Peace (Public Law 480))	(2,812)	(2,846)	(2,846)	(+34)	
(Transfer from export loans)	(355)	(359)	(359)	(+4)	
(Transfer from ACIF)	(313,173)	(318,200)	(313,173)		(-5,027)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts	(316,340)	(321,405)	(316,378)	(+38)	(-5,027)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,570,117)	(1,686,078)	(1,659,728)	(+89,611)	(-26,350)
State mediation grants	4,369	4,369	4,369		
Grassroot source water protection program	5,000		6,000	+1,000	+6,000
Dairy indemnity program	930	876	876	-54	
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	1,264,076	1,369,918	1,354,595	+90,519	-15,323
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (ACIF) Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(650,000)	(475,000)	(650,000)		(+175,000)
Guaranteed	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)		
Subtotal	(2,150,000)	(1,975,000)	(2,150,000)		(+175,000)

Farm operating loans:						
Direct	(1,000,000)	(900,000)	(1,190,000)	(+ 190,000)	(+ 290,000)	
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,650,000)	(+ 150,000)	(+ 150,000)	
Subsidized guaranteed	(170,000)	(144,035)	(170,000)		(+ 25,965)	
Subtotal	(2,670,000)	(2,544,035)	(3,010,000)	(+ 340,000)	(+ 465,965)	
Indian tribe land acquisition loans						
Conservation loans:	(3,940)	(2,000)	(3,940)		(+ 1,940)	
Direct	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)			
Guaranteed	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)			
Subtotal	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)			
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans						
Boll weevil eradication loans	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)			
	(100,000)	(60,000)	(100,000)			(+ 40,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(5,083,940)	(4,741,035)	(5,423,940)	(+ 340,000)	(+ 682,905)	
Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	26,520	32,870	44,980	+ 18,460	+ 12,110	
Guaranteed	5,550	5,700	5,700	+ 150		
Subtotal	32,070	38,570	50,680	+ 18,610	+ 12,110	
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	47,400	54,540	72,100	+ 24,700	+ 17,560	
Unsubsidized guaranteed	35,100	34,950	38,450	+ 3,350	+ 3,500	
Subsidized guaranteed	23,902	19,920	23,511	- 391	+ 3,591	
Subtotal	106,402	109,410	134,061	+ 27,659	+ 24,651	
Indian tribe land acquisition						
Conservation loans						
Direct	1,065	2,243	2,243	+ 1,178		
Guaranteed	278	285	285	+ 7		
Subtotal	1,343	2,528	2,528	+ 1,185		
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans						
	793	214	214	- 579		
Total, Loan subsidies	140,608	150,722	187,483	+ 46,875	+ 36,761	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
ACF administrative expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	313,173	318,200	313,173		- 5,027
Administrative expenses	7,920	7,920	7,920		
Total, ACF expenses	321,093	326,120	321,093		- 5,027
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (Loan authorization)	461,701 (5,083,940)	476,842 (4,741,035)	508,576 (5,423,940)	+ 46,875 (+ 340,000)	+ 31,734 (+ 682,905)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,725,777	1,846,760	1,863,171	+ 137,394	+ 16,411
Risk Management Agency, Administrative and operating expenses	80,325	83,064	83,064	+ 2,739	
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,806,997	1,930,744	1,947,139	+ 140,142	+ 16,395
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	6,455,278	7,613,232	7,613,232	+ 1,157,954	
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	15,079,163	13,925,575	13,925,575	- 1,153,588	
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)		
Total, Corporations	21,534,441	21,538,807	21,538,807	+ 4,366	
Total, Title I, Agricultural Programs (By transfer)	30,191,573 (316,340)	30,192,013 (321,405)	30,259,695 (316,378)	+ 68,122 (+ 38)	+ 67,682 (- 5,027)
(Loan authorization)	(5,083,940)	(4,741,035)	(5,423,940)	(+ 340,000)	(+ 682,905)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(112,046)	(110,988)	(115,947)	(+ 3,901)	(+ 4,959)

TITLE II— CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	895	920	904	+9	16
Office of Ecosystem Services Management .....		2,021			-2,021
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations .....	887,629	923,729	928,979	+41,350	+5,250
Watershed and flood prevention operations .....	30,000		24,394	-5,606	+24,394
Watershed rehabilitation program .....	40,161	40,497	40,497	+336	
Resource conservation and development .....	50,730		50,730		+50,730
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	1,008,520	964,226	1,044,600	+36,080	+80,374
Total, Title II, Conservation Programs .....	1,009,415	967,167	1,045,504	+36,089	+78,337

TITLE III—RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development .....	895	920	904	+9	-16
Rural Development:					
Rural development expenses:					
Salaries and expenses .....	201,987	232,257	237,507	+35,520	+5,250
(Transfer from RHF) .....	(468,593)	(454,383)	(454,383)	(-14,210)	
(Transfer from RDLFP) .....	(4,941)	(5,046)	(5,046)	(+105)	
(Transfer from RETLP) .....	(39,959)	(38,374)	(38,374)	(-1,585)	
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts .....	(513,493)	(497,803)	(497,803)	(-15,690)	
Total, Rural development expenses .....	(715,480)	(730,060)	(735,310)	(+19,830)	(+5,250)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502) .....	(1,121,488)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(+78,512)	
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(12,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(24,000,000)	(+12,000,000)	(+12,000,000)
Subtotal, Single family .....	(13,121,488)	(13,200,000)	(25,200,000)	(+12,078,512)	(+12,000,000)
Housing repair (Sec. 504) .....	(34,412)	(34,004)	(34,004)	(-408)	
Rental housing (Sec. 515) .....	(69,512)	(95,236)	(69,512)		(-25,724)
Site loans (Sec. 524) .....	(5,045)	(5,052)	(5,052)	(+7)	
Multifamily housing guarantees (Sec. 538) .....	(129,130)	(129,133)	(129,133)	(+3)	
Multifamily housing credit sales .....	(1,448)	(1,449)	(1,449)	(+1)	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Single family housing credit sales .....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
Self-help housing land develop (Sec. 523) .....	(4,970)	(4,966)	(4,966)	(-4)	
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(13,376,005)	(13,479,840)	(25,454,116)	(+12,078,111)	(+11,974,276)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502) .....	40,710	75,120	75,120	+34,410	
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	172,800			-172,800	
Subtotal, Single family .....	213,510	75,120	75,120	-138,390	
Housing repair (Sec. 504) .....	4,422	6,437	6,437	+2,015	
Rental housing (Sec. 515) .....	18,935	32,123	23,446	+4,511	-8,677
Multifamily housing guarantees (Sec. 538) .....	1,485	12,513	12,513	+11,028	
Site development loans (Sec. 524) .....		294	294	+294	
Multifamily housing credit sales .....	556	556	556		
Self-help land dev housing loans (Sec. 523) .....		288	288	+288	
Total, Loan subsidies .....	238,908	127,331	118,654	-120,254	-8,677
RHF administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	468,593	454,383	454,383	-14,210	
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program .....	707,501	581,714	573,037	-134,464	-8,677
(Loan authorization) .....	(13,376,005)	(13,479,840)	(25,454,116)	(+12,078,111)	(+11,974,276)
Rental assistance program:					
Rental assistance (Sec. 521) .....	968,612	959,635	959,635	-8,977	
Eligible households (Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)) .....	5,958		5,958		+5,958
New construction (Sec. 515) .....	2,030	3,000	3,000	+970	
New construction (Farm Labor Housing) .....	3,400	3,000	3,000	-400	
Total, Rental assistance program .....	980,000	965,635	971,593	-8,407	+5,958

Rural housing voucher program .....	16,400	18,000	16,400	.....	.....	-1,600
Multifamily housing revitalization program .....	25,000	.....	25,000	.....	.....	+25,000
Multifamily housing preservation revolving loans .....	1,791	.....	2,655	+864	.....	+2,655
<b>Total, Multifamily housing revitalization .....</b>	<b>43,191</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>44,055</b>	<b>+864</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>+26,055</b>
Mutual and self-help housing grants .....	41,864	37,000	41,864	.....	.....	+4,864
Rural housing assistance grants .....	45,500	40,400	41,500	-4,000	.....	+1,100
<b>Farm labor program account:</b>						
(Loan authorization) .....	(27,319)	(27,288)	(27,288)	(-31)	.....	.....
Loan subsidy .....	9,873	10,473	10,473	+600	.....	.....
Grants .....	9,873	9,873	9,873	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total, Farm Labor Program Account .....</b>	<b>19,746</b>	<b>20,346</b>	<b>20,346</b>	<b>+600</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>Rural community facilities program account:</b>						
Loan authorizations:						
Community facility:						
Direct .....	(294,962)	(295,038)	(295,038)	(+76)	.....	.....
Guaranteed .....	(206,417)	(206,405)	(206,405)	(-12)	.....	.....
<b>Total, Loan authorizations .....</b>	<b>(501,379)</b>	<b>(501,443)</b>	<b>(501,443)</b>	<b>(+64)</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>Loan subsidies and grants:</b>						
Community facility:						
Direct .....	3,864	3,924	3,924	+60	.....	.....
Guaranteed .....	6,626	8,153	8,153	+1,527	.....	.....
Grants .....	20,373	29,640	20,373	.....	.....	-9,267
Rural community development initiative .....	6,256	.....	6,256	.....	.....	+6,256
Economic impact initiative grants .....	13,902	.....	13,902	.....	.....	+13,902
Tribal college grants .....	3,972	.....	3,972	.....	.....	+3,972
<b>Total, RCFP Loan subsidies and grants .....</b>	<b>54,993</b>	<b>41,717</b>	<b>56,580</b>	<b>+1,587</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>+14,863</b>
<b>Subtotal, grants and payments .....</b>	<b>162,103</b>	<b>139,463</b>	<b>160,290</b>	<b>-1,813</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>+20,827</b>
<b>Total, Rural Housing Service .....</b>	<b>1,892,795</b>	<b>1,704,812</b>	<b>1,748,975</b>	<b>-143,820</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>+44,163</b>
(Loan authorization) .....	(13,904,703)	(14,008,571)	(25,982,847)	(+12,078,144)	.....	(+11,974,276)
<b>Rural Business-Cooperative Service:</b>						
Rural Business Program Account:						
(Guaranteed business and industry loans) .....	(993,002)	(941,963)	(993,000)	(-2)	.....	(+51,037)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy .....	52,927	40,316	42,500	-10,427	+2,184
Grants:					
Rural business enterprise .....	38,727	38,727	38,727		
Rural business opportunity .....	2,483	2,483	2,483		
Delta regional authority .....	2,979		2,979		+2,979
Total, RBP loan subsidies and grants .....	97,116	81,526	86,689	-10,427	+5,163
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) .....	(33,536)	(36,376)	(33,533)	(-3)	(-2,843)
Loan subsidy .....	8,464	14,034	12,937	+4,473	-1,097
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	4,941	5,046	5,046	+105	
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund .....	13,405	19,080	17,983	+4,578	-1,097
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) .....	(33,077)	(33,077)	(33,077)		
Limit cushion of credit interest spending .....	(44,463)	(103,000)	(103,000)	(+58,537)	
(Rescission) .....	-44,463	-103,000	-103,000	-58,537	
Rural cooperative development grants:					
Cooperative development .....	7,924	13,424	8,924	+1,000	-4,500
Appropriate technology transfer for rural areas .....	2,800	2,800	2,800		
Cooperative research agreement .....	300			-300	
Value-added agricultural product market development .....	20,367	20,367	20,373	+6	+6
Grants to assist minority producers .....	3,463	3,463	3,463		
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants .....	34,854	40,054	35,560	+706	-4,494
Rural Microenterprise Investment Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) .....	(11,832)	(23,523)	(12,019)	(+187)	(-11,504)
Loan subsidy .....	2,500	6,850	3,500	+1,000	-3,350

	2,500	850	850	850	-1,650	
Grants .....						
Total, Rural Microenterprise Investment .....	5,000	7,700	4,350	4,350	-650	-3,350
Renewable energy program (Rural Energy for America):						
(Loan authorization) .....	(144,209)	(11,519)	(11,519)	(11,519)	(-132,690)	
Loan subsidy .....	19,670	5,340	5,340	5,340	-14,330	
Grants .....	19,670	34,000	34,000	34,000	+14,330	
Total, Renewable energy program .....	39,340	39,340	39,340	39,340		
Biorefinery Assistance Program:						
(Loan authorization) .....		(49,856)				(-49,856)
Loan subsidy .....		17,300				-17,300
Total, Biorefinery Assistance Program .....		17,300				-17,300
Total, Rural Business Cooperative Service .....	145,252	102,000	80,922	80,922	-64,330	-21,078
(Loan authorization) .....	(1,215,656)	(1,096,314)	(1,083,148)	(1,083,148)	(-132,508)	(-13,166)
Rural Utilities Service:						
Rural water and waste disposal program account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Direct .....	(1,022,162)	(1,036,294)	(1,022,156)	(1,022,156)	(-6)	(-14,138)
Public Law 83-566 loans .....			(40,000)	(40,000)	(+40,000)	(+40,000)
Guaranteed .....	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)		
Total, Loan authorization .....	1,097,162	1,111,294	1,137,156	1,137,156	+39,994	+25,862
Loan subsidies and grants:						
Direct subsidy .....	77,071	88,914	87,701	87,701	+10,630	-1,213
Public Law 83-566 loans .....			3,432	3,432	+3,432	+3,432
Water and waste grants .....	469,228	440,510	469,228	469,228		+28,718
Solid waste management grants .....	3,441	3,500	3,500	3,500	+59	
Water and waste financing revolving fund .....	497	497	497	497		
Water well system grants .....	993	993	993	993		
High-energy cost grants .....	17,500		17,500	17,500		+17,500
Rural water and waste disposal .....						
Total, Water loan subsidies and grants .....	568,730	534,414	582,851	582,851	+14,121	+48,437

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5 percent .....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)		
Direct, FFB .....	(6,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(6,500,000)		(+ 2,500,000)
Guaranteed underwriting .....	(500,000)		(500,000)		(+ 500,000)
Subtotal, Electric .....	(7,100,000)	(4,100,000)	(7,100,000)		(+ 3,000,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5 percent .....	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)		
Direct, Treasury rate .....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)		
Direct, FFB .....	(295,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)		
Subtotal, Telecommunications .....	(690,000)	(690,000)	(690,000)		
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(7,790,000)	(4,790,000)	(7,790,000)		(+ 3,000,000)
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....	39,959	38,374	38,374	- 1,585	
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account .....	39,959	38,374	38,374	- 1,585	
(Loan authorization) .....	(7,790,000)	(4,790,000)	(7,790,000)		(+ 3,000,000)
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications .....	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)		
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)		
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants .....	37,755	30,000	37,755		+ 7,755

Broadband telecommunications:								
Direct .....	28,960	22,320	22,320	-6,640	22,320	-6,640	.....	.....
Grants .....	17,976	17,976	17,976	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Loan subsidies and grants .....	84,691	70,296	78,051	-6,640	78,051	-6,640	.....	+7,755
Total, Rural Utilities Service .....	693,380	643,084	699,276	+5,896	699,276	+5,896	.....	+56,192
(Loan authorization) .....	(9,287,162)	(6,301,294)	(9,327,156)	(+39,994)	(9,327,156)	(+39,994)	.....	(+3,025,862)
Total, Title III, Rural Development Programs .....	2,934,309	2,683,073	2,767,584	-166,725	2,767,584	-166,725	.....	+84,511
(By transfer) .....	(513,493)	(497,803)	(497,803)	(-15,690)	(497,803)	(-15,690)	.....	.....
(Loan authorization) .....	(24,407,521)	(21,406,179)	(36,393,151)	(+11,985,630)	(36,393,151)	(+11,985,630)	.....	(+14,986,972)
TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS								
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services .....	813	836	821	+8	821	+8	.....	-15
Food and Nutrition Service:								
Child nutrition programs .....	9,859,930	18,153,393	18,156,143	+8,296,213	18,156,143	+8,296,213	.....	+2,750
Competitive grants .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....
Nutrition education .....	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....	-1,000	.....	.....
Transfer from section 32 .....	6,989,899	.....	.....	-6,989,899	.....	-6,989,899	.....	.....
Total, Child nutrition programs .....	16,855,829	18,158,393	18,161,143	+1,305,314	18,161,143	+1,305,314	.....	+2,750
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children [WIC] .....	7,252,000	7,478,000	7,252,000	.....	7,252,000	.....	.....	-226,000
Reserve [WIC] .....	.....	125,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	-125,000
Total, WIC program .....	7,252,000	7,603,000	7,252,000	.....	7,252,000	.....	.....	-351,000
Supplemental nutrition assistance program:								
(Food stamp program) .....	58,278,181	68,206,790	68,209,540	+9,931,359	68,209,540	+9,931,359	.....	+2,750
Commodity assistance program:								
Commodity supplemental food program .....	171,409	176,788	176,788	+5,379	176,788	+5,379	.....	.....
Farmers market nutrition program .....	20,000	20,000	20,000	.....	20,000	.....	.....	.....
Emergency food assistance program .....	49,500	50,000	56,000	+6,500	56,000	+6,500	.....	+6,000
Emergency food program infrastructure grants .....	6,000	.....	6,000	.....	6,000	.....	.....	+6,000
Pacific island and disaster assistance .....	1,070	1,081	1,081	+11	1,081	+11	.....	.....
IT modernization and support .....	.....	1,750	1,750	+1,750	1,750	+1,750	.....	.....
Total, Commodity assistance program .....	247,979	249,619	261,619	+13,640	261,619	+13,640	.....	+12,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Nutrition programs administration .....	147,801	172,087	166,587	+ 18,786	- 5,500
Total, Food and Nutrition Service .....	82,781,790	94,389,889	94,050,889	+ 11,269,099	- 339,000
Total, Title IV, Domestic Food Programs .....	82,782,603	94,390,725	94,051,710	+ 11,269,107	- 339,015
TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Salaries and expenses .....	180,367	258,780	219,780	+ 39,413	- 39,000
(transfer from export loans) .....	(6,465)	(6,525)	(6,525)	(+ 60)	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses .....	186,832	265,305	226,305	+ 39,473	- 39,000
Food for Peace Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account, Administrative Expenses: Farm Service Agency, Salaries and expenses: (transfer to FSA) .....	2,812	2,846	2,846	+ 34	.....
Food for Peace Title II Grants: Expenses .....	1,690,000	1,690,000	1,690,000	.....	.....
Total, Food for Peace (Public Law 480) .....	1,692,812	1,692,846	1,692,846	+ 34	.....
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses): Salaries and expenses (Export Loans): General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS) .....	6,465	6,525	6,525	+ 60	.....
Farm Service Agency S&E (transfer to FSA) .....	355	359	359	+ 4	.....
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account .....	6,820	6,884	6,884	+ 64	.....
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants .....	209,500	209,500	209,500	.....	.....

	2,089,499 (6,465)	2,168,010 (6,525)	2,129,010 (6,525)	+ 39,511 (+ 60)	- 39,000
Total, Title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs (By transfer)					
TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	2,344,656	2,503,849	2,503,849	+ 159,193	
Prescription drug user fees	(578,162)	(667,057)	(667,057)	(+ 88,895)	
Medical device user fees	(57,014)	(61,860)	(61,860)	(+ 4,846)	
Animal drug user fees	(17,280)	(19,448)	(19,448)	(+ 2,168)	
Generic animal drug user fees	(5,106)	(5,397)	(5,397)	(+ 291)	
Tobacco product user fees	(235,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	(+ 215,000)	
Subtotal (including user fees)	(3,237,218)	(3,707,611)	(3,707,611)	(+ 470,393)	
Mammography user fees	(19,318)			(- 19,318)	
Export certification user fees	(10,400)			(- 10,400)	
FDA New User Fees (Leg proposals):					
Generic drug review user fees		(38,015)			(- 38,015)
Reinspection fees		(27,296)			(- 27,296)
Food and Feed Export Certification user fees		(4,385)			(- 4,385)
Food Facility Registration and Inspection fees		(220,200)			(- 220,200)
Subtotal, FDA New User fees		(289,896)			(- 289,896)
Buildings and facilities	12,433	12,433	12,433		
Total, FDA (w/user fees, including proposals)	(3,279,369)	(4,009,940)	(3,720,044)	(+ 440,675)	(- 289,896)
Total, FDA (w/enacted user fees only)	(3,279,369)	(3,720,044)	(3,720,044)	(+ 440,675)	
Total, FDA (excluding user fees)	2,357,089	2,516,282	2,516,282	+ 159,193	
INDEPENDENT AGENCY					
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(54,500)	(59,400)	(59,400)	(+ 4,900)	
Total, Title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	2,357,089	2,516,282	2,516,282	+ 159,193	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
<b>TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
Rural Community Out Migration (Sec. 716)	499	.....	.....	-499	.....
National Center for Natural Products Research (Sec. 718)	3,497	.....	8,000	+4,503	+8,000
Limit Wetlands reserve	.....	-142,000	-75,000	-75,000	+67,000
Limit Conservation stewardship	.....	-2,000	.....	.....	+2,000
Limit Grasslands reserve	.....	-14,000	-14,000	.....	.....
Limit Farmland protection	.....	-15,000	-15,000	.....	.....
Limit Agriculture management assistance (Sec. 1524)	.....	-5,000	-5,000	.....	.....
Limit Environmental Quality incentives program (Sec. 721)	-270,000	-380,000	-270,000	-5,000	+110,000
Limit Dam Rehab (Sec. 721)	-165,000	-165,000	-165,000	.....	.....
Limit Wildlife habitat incentives	.....	-12,000	.....	.....	.....
Limit fruit and vegetable program (Sec. 721)	-76,000	.....	-113,000	-37,000	+12,000
Section 32 (rescission) (Sec. 721)	-52,470	-50,000	-50,000	+2,470	-113,000
Hawaii APHIS facility (Sec. 723)	2,600	.....	2,600	.....	+2,600
Food Aid Products (Sec. 724)	4,000	.....	.....	-4,000	.....
Hunger Fellowships (Sec. 727)	3,000	.....	.....	-3,000	.....
Market development (WI, VT) (Sec. 728)	3,000	.....	3,000	.....	+3,000
Specialty market (Sec. 728)	350	.....	350	.....	+350
Carbon Inventory and Accounting System (Sec. 728)	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
International Food Protection Training Institute (Sec. 728)	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
Foodborne Illness Health Registry (Sec. 728)	200	.....	.....	-200	.....
At-risk supper program (Sec. 730)	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
Methamphetamine inhibitor grant program (Sec. 735)	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
Kansas Farm Bureau Foundation (Sec. 738)	250	.....	.....	-250	.....
Hardwood Trees (Sec. 739)	800	.....	800	.....	+800
Geographic Disadvantaged (Sec. 741)	2,600	.....	2,600	.....	+2,600
Durum Wheat (Sec. 741)	3,000	.....	3,000	.....	+3,000
Product Access (Sec. 745)	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
Rural Utilities Service baseload generation	.....	.....	15,000	.....	+15,000
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Employment and Training (rescission) (Sec. 742)	-11,000	.....	.....	+11,000	.....

Dairy (Sec. 748) .....	350,000					-350,000	
H1N1 program (Sec. 746) .....	2,000					-2,000	
Child Nutrition Reauthorization (Sec. 749) (outlays) .....							+65,434
Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and facilities (rescission) .....		-75,500				-10,066	
Rural Business program (rescission) .....		-20,070				-20,070	
Departmental Administration acquisition workforce .....		6,500				+1,000	
Broadband loan balances (rescission) .....		-15,000				-15,000	
<b>Total, Title VII, General provisions .....</b>	<b>-193,674</b>	<b>-889,070</b>	<b>-715,786</b>	<b>-522,112</b>	<b>+173,284</b>		
<b>OTHER APPROPRIATIONS</b>							
<b>DIVISION B—OTHER MATTERS (PUBLIC LAW 111-118)</b>							
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>							
<b>Food and Nutrition Service</b>							
Supplemental nutrition assistance program (Sec. 1001) (emergency) .....	400,000					-400,000	
<b>Total, Public Law 111-118 (emergency) .....</b>	<b>400,000</b>					<b>-400,000</b>	
<b>Total, Other appropriations .....</b>	<b>400,000</b>					<b>-400,000</b>	
<b>Grand total .....</b>	<b>121,570,814</b>	<b>132,028,200</b>	<b>132,053,999</b>	<b>+10,483,185</b>	<b>+25,799</b>		
Appropriations .....	(121,278,747)	(132,291,770)	(132,252,135)	(+10,973,388)	(-39,635)		
Emergency Appropriations .....	(400,000)			(-400,000)			
Rescissions .....	(-107,933)	(-263,570)	(-198,136)	(-90,203)	(+65,434)		
(By transfer) .....	(836,298)	(825,733)	(820,706)	(-15,592)	(-5,027)		
(Loan authorization) .....	(29,491,461)	(26,147,214)	(41,817,091)	(+12,325,630)	(+15,669,877)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(166,546)	(170,388)	(175,347)	(+8,801)	(+4,959)		
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>							
<b>Title I—Agricultural programs .....</b>	<b>30,191,573</b>	<b>30,192,013</b>	<b>30,259,695</b>	<b>+68,122</b>	<b>+67,682</b>		
Mandatory .....	(22,855,427)	(22,759,966)	(22,759,966)	(-95,461)			
Discretionary .....	(7,336,146)	(7,432,047)	(7,499,729)	(+163,583)	(+67,682)		
<b>Title II—Conservation programs (discretionary) .....</b>	<b>1,009,415</b>	<b>967,167</b>	<b>1,045,504</b>	<b>+36,089</b>	<b>+78,337</b>		
<b>Title III—Rural development programs (discretionary) .....</b>	<b>2,934,309</b>	<b>2,683,073</b>	<b>2,767,584</b>	<b>+166,725</b>	<b>+84,511</b>		
<b>Title IV—Domestic food programs .....</b>	<b>82,782,603</b>	<b>94,390,725</b>	<b>94,051,710</b>	<b>+11,269,107</b>	<b>-339,015</b>		
Mandatory .....	(75,128,010)	(86,360,183)	(86,365,683)	(+11,237,673)	(+5,500)		
Discretionary .....	(7,654,593)	(8,030,542)	(7,686,027)	(+31,434)	(-344,515)		
<b>Title V—Foreign assistance and related programs (discretionary) .....</b>	<b>2,089,499</b>	<b>2,168,010</b>	<b>2,129,010</b>	<b>+39,511</b>	<b>-39,000</b>		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Title VI—Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration (discretionary) .....	2,357,089	2,516,282	2,516,282	+ 159,193	.....
Title VII—General provisions (discretionary) .....	—193,674	—889,070	—715,786	—522,112	+ 173,284
Other appropriations (discretionary) .....	400,000	.....	.....	—400,000	.....
Total .....	121,570,814	132,028,200	132,053,999	+10,483,185	+ 25,799

○