

This wasn't his first attempt at starting a brewery, but it was the first time he was able to obtain financial backing. "Ten years ago or even still five years ago," he says, "it was very difficult to find private investment or to convince banks to loan money to a start-up."

In the past decade, craft beer production has thrived, attracting investors with deep pockets. In 2012, national retail sales for craft beer were \$11.9 billion, according to the most recent figures from the Brewers Association.

While Mr. Hill was in Denmark, where American craft beer was starting to become popular, he was able to borrow \$80,000 from a small group of European and American lenders who he felt respected his vision and abilities.

From the start, his philosophy has been to make the best beer possible without pursuing what he calls "infinite, boundless growth." He operates under the belief that beer is a perishable item, "just like lettuce or broccoli," he says, and should be consumed locally, not shipped long distances.

Mr. Hill has a staff of six, including two assistant brewers who harvest yeast and transfer beer into kegs, but he personally makes all of the brewery's offerings—pale ales, stouts and porters—using modern stainless steel tanks and traditional wooden barrels, like those used in winemaking.

The beers are known for having "a sense of balance that isn't common in a lot of new breweries," says Jeff Baker, the bar manager of the Farmhouse Tap and Grill in Burlington, which serves the beers. "They're hoppy, but they're not super-bitter and they don't exhaust your palate."

For entrepreneurs who measure success in more than just financial terms, it's still crucial to have a viable business, says Bo Burlingham, author of "Small Giants: Companies That Choose to Be Great Instead of Big." "The challenge for a lot of small companies who have nonfinancial goals is that you can't let that get in the way of having a very financially solid business," Mr. Burlingham says. "You'd better have a sound business model, steady gross margins, a healthy balance sheet and margins you protect."

For Mr. Hill, financial stability came quickly. He says the brewery began turning a profit after just one year.

Demand surged last February when users of the beer-review site Ratebeer.com deemed Hill Farmstead the best brewery in the world—after having anointed Mr. Hill as the best new brewer in 2010.

Now Mr. Hill says he fields questions like the one from the Fresno caller every day. He estimates that thousands of people have made long-distance beer runs to Hill Farmstead Brewery, some traveling from as far as New Zealand, Norway and Japan.

Customers wait in line for one to four hours to buy bottles and two-liter growlers of the beers, many of which are named for Mr. Hill's ancestors (Edward, Abner, Florence). The brewery once sold an entire batch of beer—500 gallons—in one day.

As his beer's popularity has risen, he has sometimes worked 18-hour days. Some small-business owners who have achieved financial stability choose to delegate a significant portion of their work to employees, but Mr. Hill says he won't be doing that.

And the notion of moving production to an industrial park, where craft breweries are commonly found, holds no appeal for him. He has decided to invest in infrastructure and better equipment that will make his current operation more efficient.

"I didn't start this brewery so I could keep growing and move it away from here; that wasn't the point," he says. "It wouldn't be

fun anymore. It wouldn't have purpose or meaning."

FAIRNESS IN DISASTER DECLARATIONS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this week, Senator KIRK and I introduced the Fairness in Federal Disaster Declarations Act. It is designed to ensure fairness in FEMA's consideration of whether a community will be granted Federal assistance after a disaster.

This legislation is necessary because the way FEMA evaluates whether to declare an area a Federal disaster is not working. It works against States with large populations.

From 2002 to 2012, Illinois was denied Federal disaster assistance six times. Texas was denied 11 times—for damage caused by everything from wildfires to tropical storms. Florida was denied Federal disaster assistance six times during that 10 year period, and California, New Jersey, and New York were each denied four times. FEMA's formula does not work for large, populous States, particularly those with a concentrated urban area, like Illinois.

It is not enough just to talk about the numbers, though. Each one of these disasters devastated communities. In each one of these disasters, people saw their homes and their towns destroyed.

This past November, tornadoes swept through Illinois, killing six people and destroying whole towns in my State. The cities of Washington, Gifford, and New Minden, IL, experienced some of the worst tornado damage I have ever seen. Power lines were down and public infrastructure was decimated, but because Illinois did not meet one of FEMA's criteria, we were denied Federal public assistance.

Governor Pat Quinn is going to appeal that denial, and he has Senator KIRK's and my full support for that appeal.

Illinois also was denied Federal disaster assistance after tornadoes destroyed the towns of Harrisburg and Ridgway in 2012. Eight people died after tornadoes with winds up to 200 miles per hour splintered homes, businesses, churches, and public infrastructure in those two towns. Nevertheless, the State was denied public assistance. FEMA said because Illinois has a large population, we should be able to absorb those recovery costs. When similar tornado damage happened in neighboring Joplin, MO—which has a smaller population—Federal assistance was granted.

It is not just tornado damage in Illinois that has resulted in denials from FEMA for Federal assistance, and it is not just the State's per capita that has been used as FEMA's justification for the denials. Counties with a high population also have been denied. Last April, Illinois experienced major flooding both along the Mississippi River and resulting from flash flooding due to major storms.

Many communities in Cook County, including Chicago and its suburbs, ex-

perienced unprecedented flooding. But because the damage in Cook County did not meet FEMA's per capita requirement, Cook County was denied individual assistance. All of the neighboring counties were approved. Cook County was denied.

When questioned about these decisions, FEMA pointed to the factors it considers when determining if a Federal declaration is warranted. One of these factors has to do with the population of the State. If a State has a large population—more than 10 million people—it is analyzed differently than if it were smaller. The thinking is that large States have the resources necessary to absorb the recovery costs. Well, I can tell you—Illinois does not have the resources to absorb the costs of these tornadoes and flooding. Whole towns were devastated in these disasters.

The bill Senator KIRK and I introduced assigns a value to each of the six factors considered in the disaster declaration analysis. When FEMA considers individual assistance—help for people to rebuild their homes and pay for temporary housing—it will use the same, consistent factors, no matter where the disaster strikes.

The population of the State will constitute 5 percent of the analysis. Consideration of the concentration of damages will be 20 percent. The amount of trauma to the disaster area will be 20 percent. The number of special populations—such as elderly or unemployed people—will be 20 percent of the analysis. The amount of voluntary assistance in the area will be 10 percent. And the amount of insurance coverage for the type of damage incurred will be 20 percent of the analysis.

Our bill also adds a seventh consideration to FEMA's metrics—the economics of the area, which will receive 5 percent consideration. This includes factors such as the local assessable tax base, the median income as it compares to that of the State, and the poverty rate as it compares to that of the State. It is reasonable that FEMA should take into consideration the size of the State, but as the regulations stand, large States are being penalized. Assigning values to the factors will ensure that the damage to the specific community weighs more than the State's population.

After the tornadoes hit Harrisburg and Ridgway, the head of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, Jonathon Monken, worked with locals and people from the FEMA regional office to determine if the State could apply for public assistance—money to help Mayor Gregg and others pay for the overtime accrued by all the people working around the clock to help the community dig out of the destruction. What Director Monken and the others discovered was that it would have been a waste of the State's time and resources to even apply for Federal public assistance. We did not meet FEMA's threshold.

Currently, FEMA multiplies the number of people in the State by \$1.35 to determine a threshold of the amount of damage a state would have to have incurred to be considered for public assistance. In Illinois, that figure is about \$17 million. Well, Harrisburg, Ridgway, and the surrounding communities had about \$5.5 million in public assistance damages, and \$5.5 million is a lot of loss, particularly in a rural area, but not enough to qualify for Federal assistance under FEMA's rules.

In the same way this bill assigns values to the factors FEMA considers for individual assistance, it assigns values to the six factors the agency considers for public assistance. The per capita consideration will be 10 percent of the analysis. Localized impacts of the disaster will make up 40 percent of the analysis. The estimated cost of the assistance needed will constitute 10 percent of the analysis. The insurance coverage in force will be 10 percent. The number of recent multiple disasters will be 10 percent. And an analysis of the other Federal assistance for the area will make up 10 percent of the evaluation.

The bill also would add a seventh consideration for public assistance—the economic circumstances of the affected area—which would be considered

at 10 percent of the analysis. This would include the same information as it would for individual assistance—the local assessable tax base, the median income of the area as it compares to that of the State, and the poverty rate as it compares to that of the State.

Illinois is a relatively large State, geographically, and has a concentrated urban area. The State—particularly downstate—is being punished for this fact. If the cities of Washington and Gifford—and Harrisburg and Ridgway—do not qualify under FEMA's current criteria for federal assistance, something is wrong.

These towns were struck by category 4 and category 3 tornadoes, respectively, and the damage is devastating. The people of these communities are being punished for living within a populous State. Let's fix the metrics FEMA uses to make this analysis so that they are fair to every state.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, section 114(d) of H.J. Res. 59, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, allows the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and levels filed on January 14, 2014, pursuant to section 111 of H.J.

Res. 59, for a number of deficit-neutral reserve funds. These reserve funds were incorporated into the Bipartisan Budget Act by reference to sections of S. Con. Res. 8, the Senate-passed budget resolution for 2014. Among these sections is a reference to section 313 of S. Con. Res. 8, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a farm bill. The authority to adjust enforceable levels in the Senate for a farm bill is contingent on that legislation not increasing the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

I find that the conference agreement on H.R. 2642, the Agricultural Act of 2014, as reported on January 27, 2014, fulfills the conditions of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for a farm bill. Therefore, pursuant to section 114(d) of H.J. Res. 59, I am adjusting the budgetary aggregates, as well as the allocation to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

I ask unanimous consent that the following tables detailing the revisions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 111 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	\$s in millions	2014	2014–18	2014–23
Current Budgetary Aggregates:				
Spending:				
Budget Authority		2,924,837	n/a	n/a
Outlays		2,937,094	n/a	n/a
Revenue		2,311,026	13,699,478	31,095,742
Adjustments Made Pursuant to Section 114(d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act:*				
Spending:				
Budget Authority		3,243	n/a	n/a
Outlays		2,124	n/a	n/a
Revenue		5	51	104
Revised Budgetary Aggregates:				
Spending:				
Budget Authority		2,928,080	n/a	n/a
Outlays		2,939,218	n/a	n/a
Revenue		2,311,031	13,699,529	31,095,846

n/a = Not applicable. Appropriations for fiscal years 2015–2023 will be determined by future sessions of Congress and enforced through future Congressional budget resolutions.
* Adjustments made pursuant to section 114(d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporates by reference section 313 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 313 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a farm bill.

REVISIONS TO THE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY PURSUANT TO SECTION 111 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 AND SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

	\$s in millions	Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry		
		Current Allocation	Adjustments*	Revised Allocation
Fiscal Year 2014:				
Budget Authority		12,852	3,243	16,095
Outlays		11,862	2,124	13,986
Fiscal Years 2014–2018:				
Budget Authority		68,964	– 3,906	65,058
Outlays		66,695	– 5,310	61,385
Fiscal Years 2014–2023:				
Budget Authority		141,305	– 15,034	126,271
Outlays		137,659	– 16,504	121,155

* Adjustments made pursuant to section 114(d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which incorporates by reference section 313 of S. Con. Res. 8, as passed by the Senate. Section 313 establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a farm bill.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007, the act, calls for the Select Committee on Ethics of the United States Senate to issue an annual report not later than January 31 of each year providing information in certain categories describing its activities for the preceding year. Reported

below is the information describing the committee's activities in 2013 in the categories set forth in the act:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, including the number raised by a Senator or staff of the Committee: 26. (In addition, two alleged violations from the previous year were carried into 2013.)

(2) The number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) For lack of subject matter jurisdiction or in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist: 19.

(B) Because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion: 7.