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REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON
ACTIVITIES DURING THE 107TH CONGRESS

JANUARY 2, 2003.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. Combest, from the Committee on Agriculture,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

In accordance with rule XI, clause 1(d), of the Rules of the House
of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture reports herewith
on its activities during the 107th Congress.

I. SUMMARY OF ORGANIZATION, JURISDICTION, AND OVERSIGHT PLAN
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

A. ORGANIZATION

With the passage of House Resolution 19 on January 6, 2001 and
H. Res. 25 on January 31, 2001, the House of Representatives es-
established the total authorized membership of the Committee on Ag-
iculture for the 107th Congress at 51, with a party division of 27
Republicans and 24 Democrats. Among the committee members
were 10 Representatives who were serving their first terms (John-
son of Illinois, Osborne, Pence, Rehberg, Graves, Putnam, Kennedy,
Larsen, Ross, and Acevedo-Vilá.

The committee organized on February 14, 2001, into five sub-
committees, four of which were assigned jurisdiction over major ag-
icultural commodities and one which dealt with various related
agricultural operations. The five subcommittees were constituted as
follows:
### SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

(Ratio includes *ex officio* members. Larry Combest, chairman, and Charles W. Stenholm, ranking minority member, were *ex officio* members of all subcommittees)

#### COMMODITY SUBCOMMITTEES

**GENERAL FARM COMMODITIES AND RISK MANAGEMENT (Ratio 19–18)**

**SAXBY CHAMBLISS**, Georgia, Chairman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICK SMITH, Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY EVERETT, Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERRY MORAN, Kansas</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. THUNE, South Dakota</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM L. JENKINS, Tennessee</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RILEY, Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUG OSE, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL JENKINS, Tennessee</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RILEY, Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUG OSE, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROB HAYES, North Carolina</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES W. &quot;CHIP&quot; PICKERING, Mississippi</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON, Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE PENCE, Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS R. REHBERG, Montana</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM GRAVES, Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK R. KENNEDY, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RANKING MINORITY MEMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION BERRY, Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID D. PHELPS, Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN LUCAS, Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARON P. HILL, Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE BACA, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE ROSS, Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON KIND, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONNIE SHOWS, Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND HORTICULTURE (Ratio 10–9)**

**RICHARD W. POMBO**, California, Chairman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB RILEY, Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES W. &quot;CHIP&quot; PICKERING, Mississippi</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY OSBORNE, Nebraska</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE PENCE, Indiana</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RANKING MINORITY MEMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL F. HILLIARD, Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK LARSEN, Washington</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE ROSS, Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY A. CONDIT, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIALTY CROPS AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS (Ratio 10–9)**

**TERRY EVERETT**, Alabama, Chairman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB SCHAFFER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM L. JENKINS, Tennessee</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS R. REHBERG, Montana</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RANKING MINORITY MEMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GARY A. CONDIT, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN LUCAS, Kentucky</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONNIE SHOWS, Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE THOMPSON, California</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSERVATION, CREDIT, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RESEARCH (RATIO 9–8)

FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma, Chairman

JERRY MORAN, Kansas, Vice Chairman

JOHN R. THUNE, South Dakota

DOUG OSE, California

TOM OSBORNE, Nebraska

SAM GRAVES, Missouri

ADAM H. PUTMAN, Florida

MARK R. KENNEDY, Minnesota

TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania, Ranking Minority Member

JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI, Maine

DAVID D. PHELPS, Illinois

MIKE THOMPSON, California

JOE BACA, California

COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota

EVA M. CLAYTON, North Carolina

OPERATIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS, OVERSIGHT, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY (RATIO 8–7)

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia, Chairman

RICHARD W. POMBO, California, Vice Chairman

JERRY MORAN, Kansas

JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana

MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho

DENNIS R. REHBERG, Montana

ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida

EVA M. CLAYTON, North Carolina, Ranking Minority Member

MARION BERRY, Arkansas

ANIBAL ACEVEDO-VILA, Puerto Rico

TOM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania

JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI, Maine

RONNIE SHOWS, Mississippi

B. COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Under rules adopted by the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress, the Committee on Agriculture’s (hereinafter referred to as committee) jurisdiction (See rule X, clause 1 of the Rules of the House of Representatives) extended to——

(1) Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

(2) Agriculture generally.

(3) Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

(4) Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

(5) Agricultural economics and research.

(6) Agricultural education extension services.

(7) Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products, and commodities (not including distribution outside of the United States).

(8) Animal industry and diseases of animals.

(9) Commodity exchanges.

(10) Crop insurance and soil conservation.

(11) Dairy industry.

(12) Entomology and plant quarantine.

(13) Extension of farm credit and farm security.

(14) Inspection of livestock, poultry, meat products, and seafood and seafood products.

(15) Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

(16) Human nutrition and home economics.

(17) Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

(18) Rural electrification.

(19) Rural development.

(20) Water conservation related to activities of the Department of Agriculture.
The revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress (House Document No. 106–320) provides the following concerning the Committee on Agriculture: 1

“This committee was established in 1820 (IV, 4149). In 1880 the subject of forestry was added to its jurisdiction, and the committee was conferred authority to receive estimates of and to report appropriations (IV, 4149). However, on July 1, 1920, authority to report appropriations for the U.S. Department of Agriculture was transferred to the Committee on Appropriations (VII, 1860).

The basic form of the present jurisdictional statement was made effective January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812). Subparagraph (7) was altered by the 93d Congress, effective January 3, 1975, to include jurisdiction over agricultural commodities (including the Commodity Credit Corporation) while transferring jurisdiction over foreign distribution and nondomestic production of commodities to the Committee on International Relations (House Resolution 988, 93d Congress, October 8, 1974, p. 34470). Nevertheless, the committee has retained a limited jurisdiction over measures to release CCC stocks for such foreign distribution (September 14, 1989, p. 20428). Previously unstated jurisdictions over commodities exchanges and rural development were codified effective January 3, 1975.

The 104th Congress consolidated the committee’s jurisdiction over inspection of livestock and meat products to include inspection of poultry, seafood, and seafood products, and added subparagraph (20) relating to water conservation (section. 202(a), House Resolution 6, January 4, 1995, p.464). Clerical and stylistic changes were effected when the House recodified its rules in the 106th Congress (House Resolution 5. January 6, 1999, p. 111).

The committee has had jurisdiction of bills for establishing and regulating the Department of Agriculture (IV, 4150), for inspection of livestock and meat products, regulation of animal industry, diseases of animals (IV, 4154; VII, 1862), adulteration of seeds, insect pests, protection of birds and animals in forest reserves (IV, 4157; VII, 1870), the improvement of the breed of horses, even with the cavalry service in view (IV, 4158; VII, 1865).

The committee, having charge of the general subject of forestry, has reported bills relating to timber, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain (IV, 4160). It has also exercised jurisdiction of bills relating to agricultural colleges and experiment stations (IV, 4152), incorporation of agricultural societies (IV, 4159), and establishment of a highway commission (IV, 4153), to discourage fictitious and gambling transactions in farm products (IV, 4161; VII, 1861), to regulate the transportation, sale and handling of dogs and cats intended for use.

1 References are to the volume and section of Hinds’ (volumes I–V, e.g., IV, 500) and Cannon’s (volumes VI–VIII, e.g., VI, 400) Precedents of the House of Representatives, and to the Congressional Record by date and page (e.g., January 3, 1953, p. 500).
in research and the licensing of animal research facilities (July 29, 1965, p. 18691); and to designate an agricultural research center (May 14, 1995, p. ). The committee shares with the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over a bill comprehensively amending the Immigration and Nationality Act and including food stamp eligibility requirements for aliens (September 19, 1995, p. ).

The House referred the President's message dealing with the refinancing of farm-mortgage indebtedness to the committee, thus conferring jurisdiction (April 4, 1933, p. 1209). The committee has jurisdiction over a bill relating solely to executive level position in the Department of Agriculture (March 2, 1976, p. 4958) and has jurisdiction over bills to develop land and water conservation programs on private and non-Federal lands (June 7, 1976, p. 16768).

Some of the specific areas in which the Committee on Agriculture exercises its jurisdiction or that have been created for the committee by historical reference include:

1. Public Law 480, 83d Congress, the restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products; and the effect of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (and the North American Free Trade Agreement), bilateral free trade agreements, the European Community, and other regional economic agreements and commodity marketing and pricing systems on United States agriculture.

2. All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service.

3. Matters relating to rural development, including rural telephone companies, farm credit banks, farm rural housing loans, rural water supply, rural flood control and water pollution control programs, and loans for rural firehouses, community facilities, and businesses.

4. Production and use of energy from agricultural and forestry resources.

5. Matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the National Forests, including, but not limited to, development of a sound program for general public use of the National Forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies; Forest Service land exchanges; and wilderness and similar use designations applied to National Forest land.

6. Price spreads of agricultural commodities between producers and consumers.

7. The formulation and development of improved programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities, including seafood; and food safety generally.

8. Matters relating to trading in futures contracts for all commodities and similar instruments, including commodity options and commodity leverage contracts.

9. The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county committees and the adminis-
trative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

(10) The administration and development of small watershed programs under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended, and the development of resource conservation and development programs for rural areas.

(11) Programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds of the Department of Agriculture, including but not limited to the Food Stamp Program and the Commodity Distribution Program.

(12) Aquaculture programs of the Department of Agriculture.

(13) Sugar legislation, including import control programs that stabilize domestic prices.

(14) All matters relating to pesticides, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Amendments of 1988, and the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, including, but not limited to, the registration, marketing, and safe use of pesticides, groundwater contamination, and the coordination of the pesticide program under FIFRA with food safety programs.

(15) Agricultural research programs, including, but not limited to, the authorization of specific research projects and agricultural biotechnology development efforts.

(16) All matters relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

(17) Legislation relating to the control of the entry into the United States of temporary, nonresident aliens for employment in agricultural production.

(18) Legislation relating to the general operations and the Organic Act of the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, Farm Credit System, Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, and Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

(19) Producer-funded research, promotion, and consumer and industry information programs for agricultural commodities.

(20) Legislation regarding reclamation water projects where the pricing of water delivered by such projects is affected by whether the water will be used in the production of a crop for which an acreage reduction programs is in effect.

(21) Legislation regarding reclamation water projects for which the Secretary of Agriculture is required to make a determination regarding commodity availability prior to the determination of the price to be charged for the delivery of such project water.

(22) Legislation establishing the level of fees charged by the Federal Government for the grazing of livestock on Federal lands.

(23) Legislation governing the Federal regulation of transactions involving swaps contracts, hybrid financial instruments, and derivative securities and financial products.

(24) Legislation regarding the Federal Reserve Board with respect to its authority to regulate the establishment of appropriate levels of margin on stock index futures contracts.
The committee also reviews and studies, on a continuing basis, the current and prospective application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof. In addition, the committee, along with other standing committees of the House, has the function of reviewing and studying on a continuing basis the effect or probable effect of tax and other fiscal and monetary policies affecting subjects within their jurisdiction.

C. OVERSIGHT PLAN

The Committee on Agriculture met on February 14, 2001, to fulfill the General Oversight Responsibility reporting requirements of rule X 2(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The following outline was prepared in consultation with the ranking minority member and approved by the full committee which was forwarded to the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration on February 15, 1999.

OVERSIGHT PLAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 107TH CONGRESS

The committee expects to exercise appropriate oversight activity with regard to the following issues:

1996 FARM BILL AND CURRENT AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

- The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) implementation of the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996;
- Current status U.S. farm economy;
- Implementation of crop and market loss assistance provided in fiscal year 2001;
- USDA’s implementation of the Nonrecourse Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments provisions;
- The impact of the continuation of the milk price support program on U.S. dairy producers, and viability of current purchase price formulas;
- Operation of specialty crop programs; and
- Ways to improve the 1996 farm bill to strengthen the safety net for U.S. agricultural producers.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

- Administration of the Federal Crop Insurance Program, including implementation of crop insurance provisions contained in the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000;
- USDA implementation of statutory provisions designed to reduce crop insurance program waste and improve program integrity;
- Proposed policy options regarding insurance options for revenue and gross margin protection;
- Implementation of dairy forward contracting pilot project and expansion of dairy options pilot program; and
• Implementation of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000.

**Agricultural Trade**

• The administration’s plans for new trade agreements (Free Trade Area of the Americas and the FTA with Chile) and expansion of existing trade agreements affecting U.S. agriculture, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agricultural Agreement, and accession of countries, such as China, to the WTO;
• USDA’s implementation of trade agreements and related issues to ensure compliance of other countries trade obligations, including:
  • Organization for Economic and Cooperative Development (OECD) negotiations on USDA’s export credit guarantees;
  • WTO dispute settlement provisions, European Union (EU) issues such as the EU meat hormone ban, tariff rate quotas, EU crop subsidies, biotechnology, and state trading enterprises;
  • Issues relating to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), including Canada’s use of high tariffs for dairy, poultry, eggs, barley, and margarine products and Canadian exports of wheat, barley, and other agricultural commodities into the U.S.; and
  • Harmonization of sanitary and phytosanitary standards (SPS), including those provided by international organizations and incorporation of new technologies and products into SPS standards;
• Planning for the trade title of the 2002 farm bill and Public Law 480, including third country monetization, maximum administrative funding levels, the Farmer-to-Farmer Program, and expanded authority for sales on credit;
• Food assistance programs to ensure that program goals are being met in the most recent uses of the program, including the Global Food for Education Pilot Program;
• Extension of trade promotion negotiating authority;
• Implementation of agriculture sanctions reform and the expansion of sanctions reform;
• Examination of which markets offer the greatest opportunity to increase sales of U.S. agricultural product, such as Asia or Latin America, and what forums are best suited to open those markets, such as the FTAA, APEC, or the WTO;
• Impact of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 on U.S. agriculture (Africa, CBI, carousel);
• The current status of sugar and other sweeteners including stuffed molasses and high fructose corn syrup especially with regard to Mexico and Canada; and
• The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) as it relates to WTO guidelines.

**Agricultural Research and Promotion**

• USDA’s implementation of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, including
provisions regarding competitive and special grants and precision agriculture:
- The U.S. regulatory process and foreign government's process governing biotechnology relevant to production agriculture, as well as the Federal agencies responsible for such regulation and research, including but not limited to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA);
- Implementation of research provisions of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000;
- Administration of the Agricultural Research Service’s research stations and worksites;
- Administration of USDA’s agricultural marketing and promotion programs; and
- Federal efforts to facilitate research and development of aquacultural enterprises, specifically focusing on the activities of the Joint Committee on Aquaculture, chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture and including the Secretaries of Interior and Commerce.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT
- Budget and program activities of USDA’s Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS);
- NRCS administration of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program;
- The regulatory activities of the NRCS and the EPA regarding concentrated animal feeding operations (including safe harbor agreements, proposed rules, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits) and their impact on the livestock industry and other agricultural producers;
- EPA’s final rules on total maximum daily loads and their effects of agricultural producers;
- EPA's plan of action regarding hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico;
- Administration of the CRP and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Programs and related issues such as buffers, filterstrips and continuous signup;
- Implementation of the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Act;
- Potential impacts of the EPA’s National Ambient Air Quality for ozone and particulate matter on agricultural producers;
- Potential consequences for production agriculture in the United States should the mandates contained in the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations
- Framework Convention on Climate Change be implemented by treaty, law, or regulation;
- Impact of regulatory activities carried out pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, or any proposed legislative changes to such Act, on agricultural producers;
- Impact of laws or regulations relative to the rights of agricultural producers to use legally acquired property, ranging from actual Federal acquisition to regulatory ac-
tions that restrict or prohibit lawful activities that affect the value of private property;
• Impact of EPA’s regulatory activity relative to methyl bromide on production agriculture in the U.S.;
• EPA’s implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA); and
• Impact of U.S. Supreme Court’s recent decision regarding isolated wetlands and the migratory bird rule and the effects on inland wetlands.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATION
• United States Forest Service (USFS) management of the National Forest System, including the agency’s fiscal and financial accountability, strategic planning and performance measurement under the Government Performance and Results Act, efforts to address the nation’s declining forest health, and Federal laws and regulations affecting the management of private forest lands;
• USFS management of public lands under its jurisdiction, including a review of agency policy governing grazing and other uses of these lands which require users to secure a permit;
• Impacts of implementation delay in last-minute regulations affecting Federal lands, including the forest roadless policy, transportation policy, and planning regulations;
• Impact of the Southern Forests Assessment, an inter-agency study on the sustainability of southern forest practices;
• Review of programs that strengthen and support private forestland management; and
• Review of the USFS/Bureau of Land Management report on co-location and combination of services and operations.

USDA GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
• Implementation of the Freedom to E-File Act;
• Implementation and streamlining of USDA’s Common Computing Environment;
• Administration of USDA operations, including reorganization efforts, administrative convergence, management improvements, compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act, and the impact on client services;
• Implementation of USDA’s Civil Rights settlement; and
• Confidentiality of information provided to USDA by agricultural producers.

FARM CREDIT, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND THE RURAL ECONOMY
• Farm credit legislation expiring in 2002;
• Farm Credit Administration’s (FCA) regulatory responsibilities regarding the Farm Credit System, as well as their individual and collective efforts to ensure the System’s financial soundness;
• Availability of credit to agricultural producers in light of low commodity prices;
• Review of the FCA’s national charter proposal and its potential effects on the viability of the Farm Credit System;
• Review of a report from the Center for the Study of Rural America (“Beyond Agriculture New Policies for Rural America”, Kansas City Federal Reserve Bank);
• Impact of the rural equity investment legislative proposal;
• Status of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service’s Business and Industry loan program;
• Potential impact of electrical industry deregulation on agricultural producers and rural residents;
• Implementation of rural development policies and authorities provided in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996;
• Implementation of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000; and
• Implementation of rural satellite bill to ensure that implementation regulations are upholding the stated intent of Congress and there is sufficient local participation in the decision-making process.

WELFARE REFORM AND FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS

• Administration of the food stamp program and the replacement for cash welfare programs (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)), which expire 2002, including:
  • The simplified food stamp program and waiver authority provided to states to ensure that states have the necessary flexibility to simplify the program;
  • Food stamp program expansion done by regulation in November 2000 (such as non-citizen eligibility and transitional food stamp benefits);
  • Harmonization of TANF and food stamp programs by states, especially the application procedures and work requirements;
  • Implementation of work requirements and sanctions for able-bodied individuals and use of waivers by states to allow able-bodied persons, aged eighteen to fifty, to receive benefits;
  • Funding levels for work programs for able-bodied individuals versus other individuals;
  • Implementation of the state’s use of electronic benefits transfer (EBT) systems to improve the distribution of food benefits (all states must implement EBT by 2002);
  • Effectiveness of provisions designed to curb food stamp trafficking and fraud;
  • Effectiveness of the food stamp quality control system;
  • Implementation and funding levels for the Emergency Food Assistance program, formerly known as TEFAP and other commodity distribution programs; and
  • Nutrition monitoring oversight.
Food Safety, Marketing, and Miscellaneous Issues

- USDA's Food Safety Inspection Service's administration of the meat and poultry inspection laws and the Food and Drug Administration's food inspection activities, including seafood and seafood products to ensure that policies and resources are focused on developing scientifically sound systems for food safety assurance;
- USDA's efforts to educate consumers regarding safe food handling practices, the development of pre-exposure and post-exposure interventions to reduce the frequency and severity of food borne illnesses, expanded research and development of pathogen reduction technologies, as well as streamlined, science-based policies relative to assessment and approval of food safety technologies;
- USDA's implementation of new protocols for meat, poultry, eggs, or seafood safety inspection, including the implementation of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) for medium and small sized plants;
- Impact of lawsuits challenging aspects of food safety inspection modernization efforts including authority to establish and enforce microbiological performance standards and HACCP based inspection models;
- The issue of new drug development, approval, and availability for animal agriculture as well as the implementation of the Animal Drug Availability Act;
- USDA's proposed rule on organic standards;
- USDA's implementation of mandatory livestock price reporting;
- Effectiveness of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) in monitoring the potential for market manipulation in the livestock industry;
- Concentration of agribusiness and the potential impact on agricultural producers;
- Adequacy of agricultural labor and the agricultural guest worker program, H2A;
- Review implementation of Plant Protection Act of 2000;
- Current functioning of animal health protection programs and legislative proposals to consolidate and modernize legislative authorities;
- Current state of readiness to deal with emerging and exotic animal and plant diseases as well as threats of intentional introduction of animal and plant diseases and food borne pathogens;
- Federal efforts to reduce threats to human, animal, and plant health due to predatory and invasive species;
- Impact of judicial settlements to expand applicability of animal care programs to mice, rats, and birds used in research; and
- Proposals to expand applicability of animal care programs to gamebirds.
II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES DURING THE 107TH CONGRESS

A. MAIN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Agriculture reported or otherwise considered a variety of bills in the 107th Congress covering many of the diverse areas within its jurisdictional interest. However, its principal efforts in the first and second session of the 107th Congress were devoted to developing the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act (H.R. 2646), commonly referred to as the “farm bill.”

After holding more than 10 hearings across the country and five hearings in Washington, DC, during the 106th Congress, the committee began the process of building consensus on farm policy in the 107th Congress by convening January 31, 2001, to examine the final report of the Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture. This Commission was created in the 1996 farm bill to complete a comprehensive review regarding the current status of agriculture, taking into account economic risk, food security, trade, international competitiveness of U.S. production, farmland values, producer incomes, and regulatory and tax relief for farmers and ranchers.

Shortly after this forum, the committee began a series of hearings (14 in all) on the future of farm policy that challenged commodity and farm groups to provide detailed policy proposals, as well as how their proposals would affect related industries, impact America’s ability to move products in the world market, how it would comport with U.S. trade agreements and the impact on the Federal budget and overall spending on farm programs. (Note.—For further discussion on the hearings relating to the farm bill, see “D. Oversight” and committee hearing Serial No. 107–2.)

Over 15 commodity and farm groups met this challenge and helped give the committee the tools to shape a four-page concept paper that was based upon these specific proposals. Also instrumental to the concept paper were hearings (18 in all) before the committee and its subcommittees that focused on trade, forestry, conservation, nutrition, credit, research and rural development. (Note.—For further discussion on the hearings relating to the farm bill, see “D. Oversight” and Committee hearing Serial No. 107–10.)

H.R. 2646 was introduced on July 26, 2001 and enacted into Public Law 107–171 on May 13, 2002. (Note.—For a description of P.L. 107–171, see under “C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on Which Some Action Has Been Taken”.

Other major activities of the committee during the 107th Congress included the following:

Economic Assistance

Prior to enactment of the farm bill, the committee provided $5.5 billion in economic assistance to farm producers for the 2001 crop year. These producers were in their fourth year of economic hardship that ranked among the deepest in our Nation’s history along with the Great Depression, the post-World War I and II recessions and the financial ruin of the 1980s.

There were many factors that contributed to this dismal situation. Energy prices skyrocketed, pushing diesel fuel and fertilizer to more than twice of last year’s prices. The overseas markets con-
tinued the slump that started with the Asian financial crisis and tariffs charged on our agricultural exports remained high, averaging five times those levied by the U.S. (Note.—For further discussion see Public Law 107–25 under “C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on Which Some Action Has Been Taken”.)

Trade

On August 6, 2002, the President signed into law trade promotion authority (TPA), to negotiate future trade agreements. Many commodity and food industry groups favor TPA because it will give U.S. trade negotiators greater credibility and facilitate the passage of legislation to implement future trade agreements. These agreements include negotiations within World Trade Organization (WTO) that the committee is closely monitoring, to further liberalize trade in agriculture and other economic sectors; the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) which the committee held a hearing on May 23, 2001; and negotiations for potential trade agreements for Chile and Singapore.

The farm bill (P.L.107–171) also included a trade title that amended and extended export and food aid programs through fiscal year 2007. (Note.—For further discussion, see Public Law 107–171 and Public Law 107–210 under “C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on Which Some Action Has Been Taken”.)

Homeland Security

Pursuant to H.Res. 449, as passed by the House of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture met on July 11, 2002 and submitted its recommendations to the Select Committee on Homeland Security with regard to H.R. 5005, the Homeland Security Act of 2002. These recommendations included the means for using a specialized group of USDA inspectors for homeland security at U.S. ports of entry, maintaining protection for rural agriculture against imported animal and plant diseases. The responsibility for operation and maintenance of USDA facilities at Plum Island Animal Disease Center (PIADC) were also transferred to the new Department of Homeland Security. This transfer does not include transfer of personnel or program at PIADC which will remain a function of the USDA. (Note.—For further discussion, see P.L. 107–296 under “C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on Which Some Action Has Been Taken”.)

Bioterrorism

Since September 11, 2001, much attention has focused on assuring that food and the U.S. agricultural production system are adequately protected from bioterrorism. On June 12, 2002, the President signed into law the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act (Public Law 107–188).

This act authorizes such sums as may be necessary for enhanced Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) inspection activities in fiscal year 2003 and beyond that is responsible for inspecting most meat, poultry and processed egg products for safety, wholesomeness, and proper labeling.
The measure also authorizes $30 million to increase Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) border inspection activities, create closer working relations with State and private veterinarians, and to establish an integrated FSIS/APHIS computer tracking and record-keeping system for livestock and meat imports.

To help prevent bioterrorism and to establish a national database of dangerous pathogens, the act requires the HHS Secretary to impose new registration requirements on all possessors of the 36 biological agents and toxins most dangerous to humans and mandates tough new safety and security requirements. The act also grants authority to USDA to similarly regulate those agents that are most devastating to crops and livestock. Additionally, the act creates tough new criminal penalties to enforce both of these important new regulatory regimes. (Note. — For further discussion see Public Law 107–188 under “C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on Which Some Action Has Been Taken”.)

**The Food Stamp Program and Other Nutrition Programs**

The Food Stamp Program and other nutrition programs were last renewed as part of the 1996 farm bill, but with several program changes included in the 1996 welfare reform law (P.L. 104–193). However, food stamp reauthorization has more typically been part of the reauthorization cycle for the omnibus farm bill, and reauthorization and reform of the Food Stamp program are included in this year’s farm bill (P.L. 107–171). Action on food stamps as part of the farm bill has significant effects on welfare reform decisions because the Food Stamp program and its recipient population overlap TANF (and Medicaid) and because food stamps are an important source of continuing support for working families (including those leaving TANF).

Amendments that ease Federal controls over and add State options to food stamp rules formed a major part of this year’s farm bill. But States’ control over food stamps (and other assistance program) rules also has become part of the welfare reform reauthorization debate. The administration requested—and the welfare reform reauthorization bill approved by the House (H.R. 4737) includes—changes in law establishing new Federal waiver authority that would allow States to set aside or change Federal food stamp rules (and those of other assistance programs) in order to coordinate/integrate several major programs for the needy. (Note. — For further discussion, see P.L. 107–171 and H.R. 4737 under “C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture on Which Some Action Has Been Taken”.)

**B. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES**

(1) **Statistics on bills referred to the Committee on Agriculture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bill</th>
<th>Number of Bills Referred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House resolutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposition of bills containing items under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bills enacted into law</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bills acted on by the committee included in other bills that became law</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills vetoed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills acted on by both Houses, but not enacted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills passed by the House but not considered by the Senate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent resolutions passed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills reported to the House but not considered</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills defeated in the House</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Statistics on hearings and markups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open business meeting</th>
<th>Washington hearings</th>
<th>Field hearings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full committee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Commodities and Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Crops and Foreign Agriculture Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. DIGEST OF BILLS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WHICH ACTION HAS BEEN TAKEN

1. Bills enacted into law

Public Law 107–9 (S. 700)

To establish a Federal interagency task force for the purpose of coordinating actions to prevent the outbreak of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (commonly known as “mad cow disease”) and foot-and-mouth disease in the United States (approved May 24, 2001).

This Act known as the “Animal Disease Risk Assessment, Prevention, and Control Act of 2001” directs the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a preliminary report to specified congressional committees including the Committee on Agriculture, concerning: (1) interagency measures to assess, prevent, and control the spread of foot and mouth disease and bovine spongiform encephalopathy (mad cow disease) in the United States; (2) related Federal information sources available to the public; and (3) the need for any additional legislative authority or product bans.

Directs the Secretary, in consultation with governmental and private sector parties, to submit a final report to such committees that discusses such diseases: economic impacts, public and animal health risks, and related legislative, Federal agency, and product recommendations.

Public Law 107–19 (S. 657, H.R. 1388)

To authorize funding for the National 4–H Program Centennial Initiative (approved July 10, 2001).

This Act authorizes appropriations of $5 million to provide a grant to the National 4-H Council to pay the Federal share of the cost of conducting a program of Nation-wide discussions through meetings, seminars, and listening sessions on the national, State

---

2Note. “Similar or identical bills, and bills having reference to each other, are indicated by the number in parenthesis."
and local levels regarding strategies for youth development. The purpose of these meetings will be to prepare a report that summarizes suggestions and makes specific recommendations of strategies for youth development. The report will contain a detailed plan of action for carrying out these new strategies and will be provided to the President, Secretary of Agriculture, the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate.

Public Law 107–25 (H.R. 2213, S. 1246)

To respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers (approved August 13, 2001).

This Act known as the “Crop Year 2001 Agricultural Economic Assistance Act” provided a total of $5.5 billion in economic assistance to producers based on assistance provided for the 2000 crop year under the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–224) (ARPA).

Specifically, the measure provided $4.6 billion in Market Loss Assistance to producers of AMTA crops (wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, upland cotton, and rice); $424 million in economic assistance to producers of oilseeds (soybeans, sunflower seed, rapeseed, canola, safflower, flaxseed, mustard seed); $54 million in economic assistance to producers of peanuts; $129 million in economic assistance to producers of tobacco; $17 million in economic assistance to producers of wool and mohair; and $85 million in economic assistance to producers and first handlers of cottonseed.

Additionally, the measure provided $169 million in assistance for specialty crops. Of the $169 million, the Act provided $10 million in payments to States for the processing, transportation, and distribution of commodities purchased under the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983; $26 million in grants to States to promote agriculture with $500,000 for each State and $1 million for Puerto Rico; and $133 million in grants to States in amounts that represent the proportional value of specialty crops in each State relative to the national value of specialty crop production.

The Act also made a technical correction to the fiscal year 1999 Agricultural Appropriations Act to allow the State of Georgia to use the indemnity funds already provided for certain producers that suffered economic losses in 1998 and 1999; limited total payments to a person for contract commodities and oilseeds under AMTA to $150,000; and required that all expenditures under this Act be made by September 30, 2001.

Public Law 107–30 (H.R. 427, S. 254)

To provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon, and for other purposes (approved August 20, 2001).

This Act adds about 2,890 acres of Federal lands to the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit in Oregon and amends current law to prohibit timber harvesting within the area. The measure also requires the reclassification of other Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands within the Little Sandy Watershed. Finally, the Act also authorizes appropriations of $10 million for a grant to Clackamas County, Oregon, to support watershed restoration activities near the management unit.
To provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes (approved May 13, 2002). Major provisions of the “Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002” include:

Commodity Program—3-Piece Safety Net

Marketing Loan Provisions: This Act will continue the current marketing loan program at increased loan rates for all crops except soybeans. All production would be eligible for the marketing loan.

The $5.26/bu soybean loan rate was set deliberately high in the “1996 farm bill to compensate for the fact that soybean growers did not receive AMTA payments. The new farm bill brings soybeans into the 3-piece program with other commodities, and lowers the loan rate to $5/bushel, a level that is considered to be equitable to the loan rates for other commodities.

Sorghum is a feed grain that trades on the same market as corn, but has a lower loan rate that has resulted in decreased plantings of this crop. The new farm bill raises the sorghum loan rate to a level equivalent to corn.

Direct Decoupled Payments: Amount of the direct, decoupled payment will be equal to the product of the payment rate, the payment acres, and the payment yield. A producer could elect to receive up to 50 percent of the direct payment beginning December 1 of the year prior to the year the crop is harvested, and the balance of the direct payment in October of the year the crop is harvested.

Counter-Cyclical Payments: Counter-cyclical payments will be made whenever the effective price for a covered commodity is less than the target price. The effective price is equal to the sum of (1) the higher of the national average market price during the 12-month marketing year for the commodity or the national average loan rate, and (2) the payment rate for direct decoupled payments for the commodity. The payment rate for counter-cyclical payments is equal to the difference between the target price and the effective price for the commodity. The payment amount for counter-cyclical payments is the product of the payment rate, the payment acres, and the payment yield. If for example, market prices are above target prices (as they would have been in 1996), the producer would not receive a payment and there would be no Government expenditures.

For counter-cyclical payments, a producer can receive up to 35 percent of the projected payment in October of the year the crop is harvested; an additional 35 percent beginning in February of the following year; and the balance after the end of the 12-month marketing year for the specific crop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>$/Unit</th>
<th>Loan rates</th>
<th>Direct rates</th>
<th>Target prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002 Farm Bill</td>
<td>2002 Farm Bill</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat ......</td>
<td>Bu.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn ......</td>
<td>Bu.</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum .....</td>
<td>Bu.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley ......</td>
<td>Bu.</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Details

Base Update: Allows producers to retain their current AMTA base acres and add oilseed acres in a limited manner, or to update base acres using 1998–2001 acres planted and prevented planted to all covered commodities.

Updated Payment yield: Allows producers who choose to update base acreage to the average of 1998–2001 plantings, the option to update yields for counter-cyclical payments only. The producer may choose to update using 70 percent of the difference between current AMTA yields and a full yield update based on 1998–2001 yields on planted acreage or 93.5 percent of 1998–2001 yields on planted acreage. Provides a “plug” of 75 percent of the county average yield for years in which the actual farm yield is less than the county average yield. The yield choice is applicable to all covered commodities on the farm.

Soybeans and other Oilseeds Payment Yield before update: Payment yields for a farm are established by determining the average yield from 1998 through 2001, excluding years where the acreage planted to the crop was zero. Provides a “plug” of 75 percent of the county average yield for years in which the actual farm yield is less than the county average yield. The 4-year average is then reduced (approximately 22 percent) to reflect the yields between 1981–1985 and 1998–2001. The reduction is required to provide a yield equivalent to the other covered commodities for which their yield was established between 1981–85.

Payment limits: The new farm bill continues the limit on direct payments at $40,000; Adds a $65,000 limit on the newly formed counter-cyclical payments; Reduces limit on LDPs and MLGs from $150,000 to $75,000; Contains a separate payment limitation for the Peanut Program; Retains the use of generic certificates in the loan program. The total dollar limitation is reduced from $460,000 in current law to $360,000 in the new farm bill.

The Act also creates a new commission to study and make recommendations regarding farm program payment limitations and the impact of payment limit policy changes on farm income, land values and agribusiness infrastructure.

Other Commodities

Peanuts: The Act recognizes changes occurring in the peanut market and makes a historic market-oriented change to the Peanut
Program that will help protect our domestic peanut industry for the future. In addition to the increased political pressure, the program is now facing increased burdens from imports as tariff protections decline under NAFTA and GATT. The Act makes the Peanut Program similar to the program of other program crops.

The Act terminates the marketing quota program and compensates the quota holders for the loss of the quota asset value at $0.11 per pound per year for 5 years. This equates to a $220 per ton payment for each of the years 2002–06.

The Act provides a marketing loan at $355 per ton. In addition producers with peanut base would receive a direct decoupled payment at $36 per ton and counter cyclical program with a target price of $495 per ton.

Peanut acres and payment yields will be based upon actual production history along with actual planted and prevented planted acres for the period 1998 through 2001.

The Act protects quota owners as well as improving the safety net for other peanut producers. In addition, producers will no longer have to be out $200-$240 to lease quota. For example, a peanut producer with 50 acres producing 1 ton of quota peanuts per acre under the current program and having an identical base and yield under the new program would compare as follows:

**Current program:** Per ton ................................................................. $610

**New program:**

- Loan rate of $355 \times 50 \text{ acres} \times 1 \text{ ton per acre} \quad \ldots \quad \$17,750
- \$495 \text{ target} - \$355 \text{ marketing loan} = \$140
- \$140 \times 50 \text{ acres} \times 1 \text{ ton} \times 85\% \quad \ldots \quad \$5,950

Total ....................................................................................................... $23,700

$23,700 divided by 50 tons = $474 plus $220 per ton quota buyout ........... $694

**Dairy:** The Act balances interests of dairy producers from all regions of the country and has been endorsed by majority of organizations representing dairy producers and processors.

The Act establishes new 3½ year National Dairy Program to provide assistance to all U.S. producers. The program will provide a Federal payment each month equal to 45 percent of the difference between $16.94 and the Boston class I price. Payments are made on up to 2.4 million pounds of current monthly production for a producer annually.

The Act extends the milk price support program at $9.90 per cwt. through 2011 providing a continuation of the safety net program that has served dairy producers for more than 50 years.

The Act assists dairy exports through the Dairy Export Incentive Program (DEIP). This program is used to help U.S. dairy products meet competition from subsidizing countries, especially the European Union. Products eligible for DEIP are whole milk powder, nonfat dry milk, butterfat and cheese.

The Act continues the highly successful Fluid Milk Processor Promotion and Education Program and provides authority for the separate Dairy Promotion and Research Program to enable the Dairy Board to assess importers of dairy products in the same manner as domestic producers.

**Pulse Crops:** The Act, for the first time, establishes marketing loans and loan deficiency payments for small chickpeas, lentils and dry peas at the following loan rates:
Pulse Crops: The Act, for the first time, establishes marketing loans and loan deficiency payments for small chickpeas, lentils and dry peas at the following loan rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small chickpeas</th>
<th>Lentils</th>
<th>Dry peas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002–2003</td>
<td>$7.56$</td>
<td>$11.94$</td>
<td>$6.33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2007</td>
<td>$7.43$</td>
<td>$11.72$</td>
<td>$6.22$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sugar: Sugar producers have not been immune to the problem of low prices. Wholesale-refined sugar prices have been running at, or near, 22-year lows for most of the past 2 years. The main culprit for these low prices is oversupply, caused by increased imports from Canada and Mexico and increased domestic production. The new farm bill addresses these problems in two ways:

The Act reduces the burden on producers by lowering CCC interest rates on price support loans and eliminates the marketing assessment on sugar.

The Act reestablishes the no-net-cost feature of the program by authorizing a Payment-in-Kind Program and marketing allotments and eliminates the one-cent a pound loan forfeiture penalty and gives authority to the Secretary to establish quota allotments.

Honey: To aid honey producers and provide them with a safety net in times of poor market conditions, the Act creates a marketing assistance loan program similar to that of other program commodities. The Act also provides producers with price support loans or loan deficiency payments with a loan rate of $0.60 per pound.

Wool and Mohair: The wool and mohair industry has suffered from a depressed fiber market. The Act establishes a marketing assistance loan program for wool and mohair similar to that traditionally provided for program commodities.

The Act also provides marketing loans or loan deficiency payments based on a loan rate of $1 per pound for graded wool, $.40 per pound for non-graded wool, $4.20 per pound for mohair and $.40 per pound for unshorn pelts.

Fruits and Vegetables: The Act helps ensure economic stability within the specialty crop sector by retaining the prohibition on planting fruits and vegetables on contract acres, helping with international trade via providing technical assistance to combat trade barriers as well as increasing funding for the Market Access Program, and significantly increasing funding for conservation programs utilized by the fruit and vegetable industry, including targeted spending for water conservation assistance. It also helps provide greater protection to our farmers by streamlining the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service's ability to respond to plant and animal pest and disease emergencies.

Apples: The Act provides assistance for apple producers who have suffered low market prices.

Protection from Domestic Competition: The Act retains the planting restriction on fruits and vegetables on program crop acres.

Specialty Crop Purchases: The Act increases carryover-spending authority for section 32 commodity purchases. Directs commodity purchases by requiring not less than $200 million of section 32 funds per year to be used to purchase fruits and vegetables and
other specialty food crops. At least $50 million of that amount is to be used for fresh fruits and vegetables for schools through the DoD Fresh Program.

**Market Access Program:** The Act increases the Market Access Program (MAP) from $90 million to $200 million per year by 2006. This program aids in the creation, expansion, and maintenance of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products and is very important to the fruit and vegetable industry.

**Technical Assistance Specialty Crop (TASC):** The Act creates a Technical Assistance Specialty Crop (TASC) fund ($19 million over 10 years) to address the barriers to exports that U.S. producers of specialty crops face. The purpose of TASC is to provide direct assistance through public and private sector projects to facilitate increased exports of U.S. specialty crops within the global marketplace.

**Conservation Programs:** The Act increases conservation funding by 80 percent overall with significant increases going to EQIP, the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) and the Farmland Protection Program (FPP). In addition, the new farm bill includes increased funding in EQIP to address ground water conservation issues, including cost share for more efficient irrigation systems.

**Seniors Farmers’ Farmers Market Nutrition Program:** The Act provided $5 million in 2002 and $15 million per year thereafter for the Seniors Farmers’ Market Program—a program administered through States that provides vouchers, or coupons to seniors to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables at farmers markets.

**Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program:** The Secretary of Agriculture is required to establish a 1-year pilot program to make fresh and dried fruits and vegetables available in 25 schools in four States. Funding is authorized up to $6 million for the purchase of fresh and dried fruits and vegetables.

**Nutrition Information and Awareness Pilot Program:** The Secretary is authorized to set up a cost-share pilot program aimed at increasing the domestic consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables and conveying related health promotion messages.

**Conservation**

The Act not only brings predictability to Federal farm policy but also greatly expands and improves our soil and water conservation programs. As conservation programs have become popular with farmers, they also have become important to taxpayers. The Act responds to the demand for increased protection of our soil, air, water, and wildlife. While the 2002 farm bill builds on the current voluntary incentive programs that have proven to work, farmers and ranchers will have the opportunity to participate in new conservation programs.

The Federal investment in soil and water conservation programs is increased by more than 80 percent above current program levels. This will provide producers with more options to implement progressive conservation practices on their land, with the backing of increased technical assistance to producers using government or private contractors.
The Act makes needed changes to the CRP and EQIP programs to make them more usable and accessible to all producers in all regions of the country. Current conservation programs were enhanced to ensure they meet the needs of producers of livestock, row crops, and fruits and vegetables. Additionally, the Act responds to producers who expressed a great desire for a Grasslands Reserve Program to provide producers with incentive payments for managed grazing. Producers also have the option of participating in the new Conservation Security Program.

The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) would be reauthorized through 2007. This program has proven popular with producers wishing to voluntarily set aside environmentally sensitive land. The CRP has saved soil and, thus, has helped improve water quality by keeping sediment out of our streams and waterways. It has been a boon to wildlife, especially upland game birds, by retiring large blocks of land in the Great Plains States.

The Act increases the enrollment cap from 36.4 million acres to 39.2 million acres and permits harvesting of biomass for energy on CRP acreage with a reduction in rental rate. The Act also retains priority areas and expands wetlands pilot to 1 million acres with all States eligible. The measure makes land on which surface or groundwater is conserved eligible for enrollment and makes land currently enrolled in the CRP eligible for re-enrollment. The Act also requires the Secretary to conduct a rulemaking to achieve a balance of conservation interests in soil erosion, water quality and wildlife habitat in determining the acceptability of contract offers.

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) is reauthorized through 2007. This program has been a popular program among producers and has been tremendously over-subscribed by a ratio of 5 to 1, lacking sufficient funding to meet producer needs. Many producers expressed great interest in expanding this program that will provide them with cost-share and incentive payments to perform multiple land management practices and promote the enhancement of soil, water, air and other resources. Priority areas that have arbitrarily directed funding to producers in one region and excluded producers in another have been eliminated, as EQIP is a national program intended for all producers. Furthermore, this program will assist producers in complying with Government regulations.

The program level is phased up from $200 million annually to reach $1.3 billion annually, an increase of more than 6-fold, with livestock producers receiving 60 percent of annual funding, and crop producers receiving the other 40 percent.

The water conservation program provides a total of $600 million for cost-share incentives and assistance for efforts to conserve ground and surface water. Of this amount, $50 million is reserved specifically to assist producers in the Klamath Basin.

The measure provides explicit authority for the Secretary to implement an incentives payment program for producers of annual and perennial crops, such as tree nuts or fruits.

The Act also places an emphasis on residue, nutrient, pest, invasive species, and air quality management.

The Act addresses the concerns of smaller producers and socially disadvantaged producers, and allows EQIP contracts to be from 1
to 10 years in length with producers receiving payment the same year in which they sign the contract.

The Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) is reauthorized through 2007 and provides producers with payments for wetland easements as well as with cost-share payments to implement plans to restore an area to the original wetland condition.

The Act also increases the enrollment cap from a total of 1,075,000 million acres to 2.275 million acres.

The Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) is reauthorized through 2007. WHIP is the primary mechanism to provide technical assistance and cost-share payments to establish and improve fish and wildlife habitat primarily found on private lands. Since 1996, approximately $62.5 million has been spent through this program to provide cost-share payments on 1.6 million acres. The Act provided WHIP with a much needed funding increase as the previous funds were exhausted after the first few years of the 1996 farm bill.

The Farmland Protection Program (FPP) is reauthorized through 2007. This program has been popular as it protects valuable agricultural lands and green space from the threat of urban sprawl. Since 1996, this program has provided $53.4 million to protect 108,000 acres. The new funding total of $985 million is nearly a 20-fold increase over the amount committed to this program since the last farm bill. The measure also makes agricultural land that contains historic or archeological resources eligible.

The Grassland Reserve Program authorizes up to 2 million acres of virgin and improved pastureland to be enrolled. The program encourages common grazing practices done in various regions of the country or for a particular type of livestock operation which may include rotational grazing. The program will also help to enhance wildlife habitat and prevent tracts of land from being subdivided for development. This Act provides $254 million in total funding for this program and provides 1 million acres to native grass and 1 million acres devoted to restored grasslands. The program would be divided 40/60 between agreements of 10, 15, or 20 years and agreements and easements for 30-years and permanent easements.

The Small Watershed Dam Restoration is funded at $275 million. More than 10,000 small flood prevention dams have provided conservation and economic benefits to much of rural America and are in need of rehabilitation. The Act provides essential funding for the rehabilitation of aging small watershed impoundments that have been constructed over the past 50 years.

The Conservation Security Program is a new national incentive payment program that rewards producers for maintaining and increasing farm and ranch stewardship practices. The farm bill estimates $2 billion for this program over a 10-year period.

Underserved States: This program was started in the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 and is continued with a total funding level of $50 million.

Desert Terminal Lakes: The Act provides $200 million in funding to help conserve desert terminal lakes. These funds cannot be used for the purchase or lease of water rights.

Protection of Private Information: Provides producers participating in conservation programs with protection against the release of confidential information by the agency.
Rural Development and Value-Added Agriculture

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 makes significant investments in, and improvements to our rural development programs. These programs are important to sustaining rural communities by investing in programs that will aid in the development of rural infrastructure and create jobs in rural areas.

Broadband service for rural areas has been a great concern to many individuals living in rural America. This Act includes a total of $100 million to provide loans and loan guarantees to allow rural consumers to receive high-speed, high-quality broadband services.

The farm bill provides $80 million for rural residents in unserved or underserved areas to access their local television stations.

Value Added Market Development Grants have been expanded to meet producers' interests in start-up farmer-owned value added processing facilities while establishing resource centers to assist producers in value-added endeavors. Knowing the importance of enabling producers to capture more of the value of their commodities, the farm bill significantly increases this program by: (1) increasing value-added funding from a total of $15 million to $40 million per fiscal year through 2007; (2) increasing participation in the program by allowing broader standards of eligibility so agricultural producer groups and business ventures largely owned by producers can compete for grants designed to develop value-added products or markets; and (3) encouraging grants to be used to assist in the development of agricultural-based renewable energy sources.

Drinking Water Assistance Grants—Of annual appropriations made for the water and waste disposal grant program, 3 to 5 percent will be directed to address the ongoing needs of rural communities that may have difficulty providing safe and adequate quantities of drinking water to their residents.

The farm bill provides $360 million to fund pending applications for water and waste disposal system grants and loans, with priority to water systems.

The Act increases the current loan limit from $25 million to $40 million for the Business and Industry Lending Program for projects in rural areas. Over the years, the needs for debt capital in small cities and rural communities have expanded, and inflation has eroded the purchasing power of the current loan limit of $25 million, thus the need to increase this amount to $40 million.

The Rural Strategic Investment Program provides planning and innovation grants of up to $3 million to assist certified Regional Investment Boards, develop and implement a rural strategic and economic development plan for a particular rural area. Regional Boards will be certified and regional plans will be approved by the National Board on Rural America. The Act provides $100 million, which will be used for planning and innovation grants.

The Rural Business Investment Program provides $280 million in guarantees for rural business investment companies to provide equity investments for businesses in rural areas.

The Rural Firefighters and Emergency Personnel Grant Program will provide $50 million in grants to train rural firefighters and emergency personnel and improve training facilities.
Trade and Export Promotion

The farm bill recognizes how critically important international trade is to U.S. producers. Forty percent of U.S. commodities go into the export market, and in order to sustain profitability for U.S. producers, this market must be expanded.

The entire Act is designed to comport with U.S. international trade obligations under the WTO, and thereby to promote more free and fair trade for the future.

Title III of the Act makes substantial investments in programs designed to aid in the creation, expansion, and maintenance of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products and to share America’s bounty with the needy in developing countries.

The Market Access Program funding is increased by $650 million over ten years for the promotion of value added agricultural products in international markets. Currently funded at $90 million, MAP will be increased to $100 million in fiscal year 2002, $110 million in fiscal year 2003, $125 million in fiscal year 2004, $140 million in fiscal year 2005 and $200 million for fiscal years fiscal year 2006–07.

The Act provides $308 million over 10 years on the Food for Progress Program. Funding caps for transportation and administrative caps are increased and a minimum level of commodities to be purchased for food aid programs is established.

The Act also reauthorizes the Food for Peace Program (P.L. 480) and makes program improvements relating to transportation, shipping and handling of U.S. agricultural commodities to developing countries and to streamlined program management. The minimum amount of commodities to be purchased for this food aid program is increased and program for stockpiling and distribution of shelf-stable pre-packaged foods for food aid is reauthorized. The farmer-to-farmer program, with an additional focus on African and Caribbean countries, is reauthorized.

The Act funds the Foreign Market Development Program (FMD) at $67 million over 10 years. FMD funding is increased from $27.5 million per year to $34.5 million per year. A continued significant emphasis on the promotion of value added agricultural products into emerging markets is also included in the substitute.

The Act provides $100 million to continue the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Nutrition Pilot Program through fiscal year 2003. After 2003, the program is reauthorized through fiscal year 2007 with funding subject to appropriations. The substitute vests authority in the President to determine which agency (USDA or USAID) administers and runs the program.

Research

Research is the key to keeping U.S. producers competitive in the world market. Through technology, producers can realize new production efficiencies, minimize their production risks, and ensure a safer, higher quality, and more affordable final product. The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 recognizes the critical need for research and makes a significant new investment in research programs that will help reaps rewards for producers and society for many years to come.

The Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems (IFAPS) established in the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education
Reauthorization Act of 1997 was funded at $120 million per year through 2003 as a mandatory program. The initiative is designed to promote on-the-ground solutions for American producers and consumers. Further, it addresses critical issues, such as, plant and animal genomics, food safety, biobased products, and natural resources management.

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 extends the Initiative beyond its current sunset date of 2003 and incrementally increases mandatory funding for the Initiative to $200 million annually by fiscal year 2007. Permanent budgetary baseline is established for this program at the $200 million per year for each fiscal year 2007, and beyond.

**Forestry**

The Act establishes and acknowledges forestry as a viable mainstay of communities across the United States. As our Nation's public lands become more and more difficult to access for their products as well as recreational values, there is a growing dependence on private, non-industrial forest landowners to provide these necessary commodities demanded by a growing population.

In 1996, timber products were the second highest valued agricultural crop in the United States. The forestry title strengthens the commitment of Congress to sustainable forest management practices.

The farm bill creates a new Forest Land Enhancement Program (FLEP) by combining the existing Forestry Incentives Program and Stewardship Incentives Program.

Funding for the FLEP provides $100 million for the establishment, management, maintenance, enhancement, and restoration of forests on non-industrial private forest lands in the United States.

The forestry title reauthorizes the Renewable Resources Extension Act through 2007 at $30 million annually and creates a Sustainable Forestry Outreach Initiative within the RREA to educate landowners on the value and benefits of practicing sustainable forestry practices, and to educate landowners about the variety of programs available to them. The farm bill also reauthorizes the International Forestry Program through 2007 and reaffirms the importance of the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying out programs of forestry research. The Act also establishes a competitive forestry, natural resources and environmental grant program for research into a variety of forest-related concerns, including biodiversity.

The forestry title provides enhanced community fire protection by directing the Secretary to coordinate with local communities in implementing rural fire protection and control strategies. This section also creates a Community and Private Land Fire Assistance Program enabling the Secretary to undertake a variety of activities aimed at preventing fires on both Federal and non-Federal lands.

**Energy**

Recognizing that agricultural producers are both contributors and stakeholders in the energy security debate, The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 is the first farm bill containing a separate title devoted to Energy. The bill also includes provisions
to promote renewable energy in the Research, Rural Development and Conservation titles.

The Act provides $204 million to carry on the Bioenergy Program during fiscal years 2003–06, which will enable the Secretary to continue making payments to bioenergy producers who purchase agricultural commodities for the purpose of expanding production of biodiesel and fuel grade ethanol.

The Act authorizes the Secretary to operate a grant program to assist biorefineries in demonstrating the commercial viability of new and emerging processes for converting biomass into fuels, chemicals, or energy.

The Act provides $1 million annually in each fiscal year 2003–06 to carry on the Bioenergy Program during fiscal years 2003–06, which will enable the Secretary to continue making payments to bioenergy producers who purchase agricultural commodities for the purpose of expanding production of biodiesel and fuel grade ethanol.

The Act authorizes the Secretary to operate a grant program to assist biorefineries in demonstrating the commercial viability of new and emerging processes for converting biomass into fuels, chemicals, or energy.

The Act provides $1 million annually in each fiscal year 2003–07 to carry out a new competitive grant program for the purpose of educating governmental and private entities, as well as the public in general, about the benefits of using biodiesel.

The Act reauthorizes the Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000 through fiscal year 2007 and provides $5 million for fiscal year 2002, and 14,000,000 annually for each of fiscal years 2003–07 for such research.

The Act creates a new program whereby Federal agencies give preference to purchasing biobased products, which should help energize emerging markets for these products. The section also includes a voluntary biobased-labeling program and provides $1 million annually for each of fiscal years 2002–07 for testing biobased products.

The Act authorizes the Secretary to operate a grant program to assist entities in conducting energy audits that provide farmers and ranchers with recommendations on how to improve energy efficiency.

The Act provides $23 million annually in each of fiscal years 2003–07, to carry out a loan, loan guarantee and grant program to assist individual farmers, ranchers and rural small businesses in purchasing renewable energy systems and making energy efficiency improvements.

The Act expands the Secretary’s existing authority to make loans and loan guarantees for the purpose of reducing reliance on non-renewable energy resources by specifically encouraging the development and construction of wind energy systems and anaerobic digesters.

The Act expands the definition of value added agricultural products to enable the Secretary to consider grant applications for projects focusing on renewable energy, such as wind power.

Many of the areas identified by the Department of Energy to have the greatest wind energy potential have significant acreage enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program. The Act authorizes the Secretary to permit wind turbines to be placed on Conservation Reserve Program lands for the purpose of generating energy.

The Act authorizes the Secretary to expand the allowance for harvesting biomass from Conservation Reserve Program lands for use in energy production.

The Act directs the Secretaries of Agriculture and Energy to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding hydrogen and fuel cell technology applications for agricultural producers and rural communities.
The Act reauthorizes the Carbon Cycle Research Program through fiscal year 2007. Additionally, the bill amends the existing program by adding new sections on cooperative research and extension projects for measuring and monitoring changes in carbon content in soils and plants and the exchange of other greenhouse gases.

Nutrition

The Act provides total additional spending for nutrition programs of $6.4 billion; maintains the critical link between agriculture and nutrition programs; and makes important structural improvements to the food stamp program.

The food stamp program seeks to ensure access to an adequate diet and the fruits of a productive agricultural economy to all eligible Americans. The new farm bill includes a number of changes to simplify the program, give States greater flexibility, remove unnecessary barriers to participation, and increase assistance to working families. In addition, it commits funds to private community-based assistance programs.

The standard deduction is increased to establish standard deductions based on household size. The new standard deduction equals 8.35 percent of each year’s poverty guidelines and is adjusted each year.

The Act permits States to provide “transitional food stamp benefits” to households who cease to receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) cash assistance as part of welfare. Households could receive transitional benefits for up to 5 months after termination of cash assistance. Currently, transitional benefits are only provided, by regulation, for 3 months after leaving TANF cash assistance.

The Act reinstates benefits for legal immigrants who have lived in the United States for at least 5 years. Also restores benefits for legal immigrant children (under 18 years of age) and disabled individuals without minimum residency requirements.

The Act allows States to require households to report changes in household circumstances not less often than once every 6 months in lieu of reporting changes as they occur.

The Act allows at State option, to exclude rather than deduct child support payment and allows the use of Child Support Enforcement agency data to determine the amount of support paid. A State option allows States to elect to disregard changes in household circumstances that affect the amount of deductions households may claim until the next determination of eligibility and allows States to make standard utility allowances mandatory.

The Act extends the requirement for unmatched Federal funding for employment and training programs and sets the basic amount of unmatched Federal funding at $90 million per year. Current law is $165 million per year. The requirement to use at least 80 percent of unmatched Federal spending on Able Bodied Adults without Dependents (ABAWDS) is eliminated.

The Act allows grants to eligible entities to simplify the food stamp application and eligibility determination system and to improve access to food stamp benefits for eligible individuals and families. New income exclusions such as education assistance, State complementary assistance program payments and at State option,
any types of income that a State does not consider when determining eligibility for the amount of cash assistance under its TANF program or eligibility for medical assistance under its Medicaid program are added.

The Act requires the Secretary to promulgate regulations under which a State also may exclude any types of financial resources that it does not consider when determining eligibility for cash assistance under its TANF program or medical assistance under its Medicaid program, with the goal of adopting similar rules for major welfare programs.

Commodity Programs

The Emergency Food Assistance Program: $40 million per year is added to TEFAP. This program provides food to food banks and soup kitchens across the United States.

Community Food Projects: Grants to community food projects are increased to $5 million per year. This program provides one-time funding for projects aimed at innovative ways to link sectors of the food system, such as community markets.

Commodity Supplemental Food Program: The Commodity Supplemental Food Program and the program to distribute commodities to special nutrition projects are reauthorized.

Commodities for the School Lunch Program: The Act provides $100 million for additional commodities for school lunch programs.

Grants for Encouragement of the Purchase of Locally Produced Food: The Secretary is required to provide grants to States administering the school lunch and breakfast programs to purchase locally produced foods, to the maximum extent possible.

Nutrition Information and Awareness Pilot Program: The Secretary is authorized to set up a cost-share pilot program aimed at increasing the domestic consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables.

Miscellaneous

Country of Origin Labeling: For meat, fruits and vegetables, fish and peanuts. Requires the Secretary to provide guidelines for voluntary labeling by September 30, 2002. This program would become mandatory in two years. For a commodity to be labeled USA product, it must be born, raised and processed in the United States. Commodities that are ingredients in processed products would not fall under the labeling requirement.

Animal Health Protection Act: Current authority for animal health is scattered throughout several statutes, some dating back to the 1880’s, and contain outdated descriptors and definitions that no longer apply due to scientific advances and industry changes. The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 consolidates animal health programs under a new Animal Health Protection Act in order to fill gaps in existing laws, clarify the areas of uncertainty, standardize USDA’s responsibility and authority, and enhance the Secretary of Agriculture’s ability to carry out the mission of the USDA-Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). This would allow APHIS to deal expeditiously with critical and emerging animal disease outbreaks that may threaten the health and economic viability of the $107 billion U.S. animal agriculture industry.
Animal Health provisions in the new farm bill will protect animal agriculture by clarifying the Secretary of Agriculture’s authority to deal with potential outbreaks and allow her to deal with them in the most expeditious manner possible.

The Animal Health Protection Act designates the Department of Agriculture as the lead Federal agency when responding to pests and diseases of livestock, poultry and aquaculture.

Civil and criminal penalties under the Animal Health Protection Act, as well as the Plant Protection Act of 2000 are augmented to strengthen the ability of the USDA to deter commercial scale violations, as well as provide the flexibility to deal with repeat violators.

Animal Welfare: The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 addresses animal welfare issues such as the handling of non-ambulatory livestock, humane slaughter and interstate shipment of fighting birds. The Act further clarifies Congressional intent regarding regulation of certain animals used in biomedical research under the Animal Welfare Act.

Pasteurization: The FSRIA of 2002 clarifies the Food and Drug Administration approval process for claims of pasteurization. The FDA is directed to revise as appropriate its existing regulation covering the labeling of foods. For products that are irradiated in order to improve the food safety and food quality, the Act authorizes individuals to seek FDA approval of an alternative-labeling claim. Likewise, the Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to develop educational programs to inform consumers about the availability and safety of irradiated food products. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for hearing Serial No. 107–1, hearing Serial No. 107–2 and hearing Serial No. 107–50”.)

Public Law 107–188 (H.R. 3448)

To improve the ability of the United States to prevent, prepare for, and respond to bioterrorism and other public health emergencies (approved June 12, 2002).

H.R. 3448 considered under the suspension of the rules and passed in the House with a vote of 418–2 on December 12, 2001. Provisions of the Senate bill were incorporated into the House bill as a substitute amendment and agreed to in the Senate by unanimous consent on December 20, 2001. The Senate insisted on its amendment and named conferees on December 20, 2001. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment and named conferees from the Energy and Commerce committee, the Committee on Agriculture for consideration of title II of the house bill and sections 216 and 401 of the Senate amendment, and the Judiciary committee. The conference report, H. Report 107–481 filed and passed the House on May 22, 2002 with 425 yeas and 1 nay. The Senate passed the conference report on May 23, 2002 with 98 yeas and no nays. The President signed Public Law 107–188 on June 12, 2002. The major provisions included in P.L. 107–188 that affect the Committee on Agriculture are as follows:

• The Act authorizes more than $1.5 billion in grants to States, local governments and other public and private health care facilities and other entities to improve planning and preparedness activities, enhance laboratory capacity, educate and train health care personnel, and to develop new drugs, therapies and vaccines.
The Act authorizes $300 million for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to upgrade and renovate their facilities to deal with public health threats and additional sums, as needed, to improve CDC capabilities.

The Act authorizes more than $1.15 billion for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand our current national stockpiles of medicines and other supplies, including the purchase of additional smallpox vaccines.

To help prevent bioterrorism and to establish a national database of dangerous pathogens, the Act requires the HHS Secretary to impose new registration requirements on all possessors of the 36 biological agents and toxins most dangerous to humans and mandates tough new safety and security requirements. The Act also grants authority to USDA to similarly regulate those agents that are most devastating to crops and livestock. Additionally, the Act creates tough new criminal penalties to enforce both of these important new regulatory regimes.

To further protect America’s food and drug supply, as well as to enhance agricultural security, the Act authorizes $545 million for FDA and USDA to hire hundreds of new inspectors at our borders, develop new methods to detect contaminated foods, work with State food safety regulators and to protect crops and livestock. The Act also provides new regulatory powers to FDA to detain suspicious foods for inspection, to require prior notice of all food imports, to improve access to records to investigate the source of contamination and to require foreign and domestic food facilities to register with the FDA. These new resources and authorities will substantially improve the Secretary’s ability to ensure the safety of America’s food supply.

To help bring safer, more-effective medicines to market, the Act reauthorizes the Prescription Drug User Fees Act (PDUFA) through fiscal year 2007, authorizes additional funding for FDA’s Office of Drug Safety, the Office of Generic Drugs and the Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising and Communications. Additionally, the Act provides FDA the authority to notify physicians when clinical studies of new drugs have not been completed.

And finally, in order to better protect against chemical, biological or radiological attacks on America’s drinking water supplies, the Act authorizes over $100 million for the development of vulnerability analyses and emergency response plans for drinking water systems.

(Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summary’s for hearing Serial No. 107–1, hearing Serial No. 107–2 and hearing Serial No. 107–50”.)

Public Law 107–203 (H.R. 3971)

To provide for an independent investigation of Forest Service firefighter deaths that are caused by wildfire entrapment or burnover (approved July 24, 2002).

This Act provides for an independent investigation in each fatality of an officer or employee of the Forest Service that occurs due to wildfire entrapment or burnover. The Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture will conduct an investigation of each fatality. The investigation will not rely on, and will be completely independent of, any investigation of the fatality that is conducted
by the Forest Service. The Act also calls for the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture to submit the results of the investigation as soon as possible after the investigation is complete to Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Public Law 107–296 (H.R. 5005)

To establish the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (approved November 25, 2002).

The administration’s proposal to create a Department of Homeland Security was transmitted to the Congress on June 18, 2002. A select committee on Homeland Security was established on June 19. Each standing committee with jurisdictional interest in the bill was given until July 12, 2002 to forward their recommendations to the Select Committee on Homeland Security. The House Committee on Agriculture held a public hearing to review the proposal regarding the transfer of the Animal, Plant, and Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and Plum Island Animal Disease Center to the proposed Department away from USDA on June 26, 2002. On July 11, 2002 the Committee on Agriculture held a business meeting to recommend legislative language to the Select Committee on Homeland Security.

The Committee on Agriculture’s recommendation modified the administration’s original proposal by transferring only those APHIS personnel actually conducting import and entry inspections while the rest of the agency would remain at the USDA and would continue to operate largely as it does today. Additionally, USDA will set the policy for the border inspections to be conducted by the Department of Homeland Security and will supervise the training of those inspectors. The Plum Island Animal Disease Center would still be transferred to the new Department, but access would be provided for USDA to continue research, diagnostic, and other necessary activities.

The select committee made changes to the bill with input from the committees of jurisdiction. During the select committee markup, a total of 22 provisions were accepted. Eight, in addition to the chairman’s changes, were offered by Republicans and 14 by Democrats. The measures added by the select committee clarify roles and responsibilities of the Department, help create a world-class workforce within the civil service framework, enhance research and development opportunities, and protect civil liberties.

H.R. 5005 was passed by the House on July 26, 2002 with 295 yeas and 132 nays. The bill was then passed by the Senate on November 19, 2002, amended by a vote of 90 yeas to 9 nays. On November 22, 2002, the House agreed to the Senate Amendment by unanimous consent. (Note.— See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summary for hearing Serial No. 107–18”.)

Other Laws

Several bills acted on by other authorizing committees, but not acted on by the Committee on Agriculture, were enacted with provisions relating to matters within the committee’s jurisdiction. Following are abbreviated summaries of these bills, including some of the relevant provisions:
Legislative matters

Public Law 107–8 (H.R 256)

To extend for 11 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (approved May 11, 2001)

Chapter 12 is a specialized form of bankruptcy relief available only to a family farmer with regular annual income. This form of bankruptcy relief permits eligible family farmers, under the supervision of a bankruptcy trustee to reorganize their debts pursuant to a repayment plan. The special attributes of chapter 12 make it better suited to meet the particularized needs of family farmers in financial distress than other forms of bankruptcy relief, such as chapter 11 (business reorganization) and chapter 13 (individual reorganization).

Statistically, chapter 12 is not extensively used. According to the most recent date released by the Administrative Office, only 551 family farmer bankruptcy cases were filed for the 12-month period ending September 30, 2000. For the same 12-month period in 1999, 811 chapter 12 cases were filed.

Chapter 12 was enacted on a temporary 7-year basis as part of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 in response to the farm financial crisis of the early 1980s. It has been subsequently extended.

Public Law 107–17 (H.R. 1914)

To extend for 4 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (approved June 26, 2001).

Chapter 12 is a specialized form of bankruptcy relief available only to a family farmer with regular annual income. It permits eligible family farmers to reorganize their debts pursuant to a repayment plan. In the 105th Congress chapter 12 was extended until April 1, 1999 as part of an Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. Public Law 107–17 reenacted chapter 12 for the period beginning June 1, 2001 and ending October 1, 2001. It also specifies that all cases commenced or pending under chapter 12 shall be conducted and determined under such chapter as if such chapter were continued in effect after October 1, 2001.

Public Law 107–110 (H.R. 1)

To close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind (approved January 8, 2002).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to revise, reauthorize, and consolidate various programs and extends authorizations of appropriations for ESEA programs through fiscal year 2007.

Major provisions are summarized in the following titles:

I. Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged.
II. Preparing, training, and recruiting high quality teachers and principles.
III. Language instructions for limited English proficient and immigrant students.
IV. Promoting informed parental choice and innovative programs.
V. Improving flexibility and accountability.
VI. Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaskan Native Education.
VII. Impact Aid Program.

Senate amendment 805, agreed to by unanimous consent, following the passage of H.R. 1 in the Senate, would amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) by requiring local educational agencies and schools to implement school pest management plans and to provide parents, guardians, and staff members with notice of the use of pesticides in schools. Chairman Combest requested the Committee on Agriculture be named as conferees to the conference on H.R. 1 since under House rule X, the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over bills relating to FIFRA. No conferees were named from the Committee on Agriculture, however, the provision was removed in the final conference report.

On July 18, 2001, the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry held a hearing on Senate Amendment 805. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summary for July 18, 2001, hearing Serial No. 107–12.”)

Public Law 107–123 (H.R. 1088)
To amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce fees collected by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes (approved January 3, 2002)

This Act provides cost savings to investors and market participants by reducing or eliminating all of the user fees imposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). These include transaction fees, registration fees, merger/tender offer fees, single stock future transaction assessments, and Trust Indenture Act fees.

Public Law 107–170 (H.R. 4167)
To extend for 8 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (approved May 7, 2002).

This Act extends Public Law 107–17 for an additional 8 months for which family farmers can reorganize their debts. (Note.—See the description of Public Law 107–17 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law; Other Laws”.)

Public Law 107–210 (H.R. 3009)
To extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes (approved August 6, 2002).

H.R. 3009 was enacted as the Trade Act of 2002, covering trade adjustment assistance (TAA), trade promotion authority (fast-track procedures), Andean trade preferences, and other trade provisions on August 6, 2002. As passed House on November 16, 2001, H.R. 3009 covered Andean trade provisions. The Senate agreed to S.Amdt. 3401, a broader trade legislation package, as a substitute amendment to H.R. 3009 on May 23, 2002. On June 26, 2002, the House agreed to the Senate amendment with an amendment pursuant to H. Res. 450. Differences were resolved at the conference level. As enacted, H.R. 3009 incorporated provisions from H.R. 3005, H.R. 3008, H.R. 3010, and H.R. 3129.
Public Law 107-377 (H.R. 5472)

To extend for 6 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted (cleared for the President on November 20, 2002).

Amends the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 to extend from January 1, 2003, until July 1, 2002, the reenactment of chapter 12 of the Federal Bankruptcy Code (Adjustment of Debts of a Family Farmer with Regular Annual Income), thereby extending family farmer bankruptcy relief.

Appropriations

Public Law 107–20 (H.R. 2216)

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (approved July 24, 2001).

This Act provided $65.5 million in various forms of assistance, including $35.5 million for Watershed and Flood Prevention programs in Florida, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas and Wisconsin; $20 million for farmers in the Klamath Basin region affected by the unavailability of irrigation water; $5 million for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to guard against the threat of foot and mouth disease, mad cow disease and other foreign animal diseases; $3 million to enforce the Animal Welfare Act and humane slaughter practices; and $2 million to assist Yakima Basin farmers in Washington State.

Public Law 107–38 (H.R. 2888, S. 1426)

Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 2001 for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, and for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes (approved September 18, 2001).

This Act authorized a total of $40 billion in emergency supplemental funding government-wide to recover from the September 11th terrorist attacks and to combat terrorism. Of the first $20 billion that was made available, $95 million was allocated by the President to USDA’s Foreign Agricultural Service for P.L. 480 title II grants to provide food aid to Afghanistan to mitigate the impact of the ongoing conflict and drought. The other $20 billion was allocated in P. L. 107–117.

Public Law 107–76 (H.R. 2330)

Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (approved November 28, 2001).

This Act appropriated $75.9 billion in fiscal year 2002 budget authority for agriculture programs, through the United States Department of Agriculture and other agencies. This figure is $700 million less than last year’s appropriation, but $2 billion more than the President’s request.

Specifically the Act provides $75 million in market loss assistance to apple farmers.
Funding for the food stamp program included $2 billion in reserves to be available in the event economic projections are not met.

**Public Law 107–117 (H.R. 3338)**

Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States (approved January 10, 2002).

Public Law 107–38, required enactment of a subsequent act defining the use of an additional $20 billion. Public Law 107–117 authorizes $367 million of the funds for USDA programs primarily to enhance security at the Department of Agriculture and its research facilities, including $119.1 million to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; $113 million to Agricultural Research Service; $80.9 million to the Secretary’s office; and $15 million to the Food Safety Inspection Service. Also included was $39 million for the WIC program in response to the downturn in the national economy.

**Public Law 107–206 (H.R. 4775, S. 2551)**

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (approved August 2, 2002).

The supplemental provisions in this act provided government-wide funds to combat terrorism. For USDA programs, the Act provided $212 million in non-contingent funding, including: $94 million for Watershed and Flood and Flood Prevention Operations; $75 million for the WIC program; $25 million for security at the Ames, Iowa animal disease research facility; $10 million in agricultural assistance to producers along the Rio Grande River due to failure of Mexico to deliver water under a current treaty; and $8 million to fund local television loan guarantees in rural areas.

2. Bills acted on by the committee included in other laws enacted

None

3. Bills Vetoed

None

4. Bills acted on by both Houses but not enacted

H.R. 4, to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Ways and Means, Resources, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, and Financial Services on July 27, 2001. H.R. 4 passed the House on August 1, 2001. On April 25, 2002 the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and substituted the language of S.517 as amended and passed H.R. 4. On June 12, 2002, the Committee on Agriculture was named as conferees to the Conference Committee. Eight conference meetings between the Senate and House were held from June 27, 2002 to October 3, 2002. Since no agreement has been reached in the conference, we can expect
the development of comprehensive energy policy legislation during the 108th Congress.

The following explains the two sections for which the Committee on Agriculture had jurisdictional interest in which there was agreement in conference.

Senate Sec. 265—Renewable Energy on Federal Land: This section, as passed by the Senate, provides for renewable energy demonstration programs on public lands. As a result of conference staff discussions, the Senate proposed a substitute provision requiring a report to Congress from the Secretary of Interior regarding the obstacles, feasibility and necessary regulatory changes to developing renewable energy on Federal lands. This substitute language was adopted by the conference.

Senate Sec. 941—948 and 950—Rural and Remote Communities: sections 941–948 and 950 are similar in objective to items contained in the Rural Development title of the new farm bill. The conference therefore, agreed to minor changes to section 19 of the Rural Electrification Act in lieu of section 941–948. In lieu of section 950, the conference adopted language that amends the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to provide out migration assistance grants to the Northern Great Plains Development Authority.

While conferees and staff discussed other items referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, there were no formal conference resolutions pertaining to House Sec. 401/Senate Sec. 301—Alternative Conditions and Fishways; Senate Sec. 604—Orphaned and abandoned wells on Federal land; Senate Sec. 1103 Establishment of memorandum of agreement (National Greenhouse Gas Database); Senate Sec. 1221 Enhanced Renewable Energy Research and Development; Senate Sec. 1311–1313 Department of Agriculture Programs (Climate Change Science and Technology); Senate Sec. 2008 Incentives For Biodiesel (tax credits).

5. Bills acted on by the House but not the Senate

H. Con. Res. 352. Expressing the Sense of Congress that Federal land management agencies should fully support the “Collaborative 10-year Strategy for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment” as prepared by the Western Governors’ Association, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and other stakeholders, to reduce the overabundance of forest fuels that place national resources at high risk of catastrophic wildfire, and prepare an National assessment of prescribed burning practices to minimize risks of escape.

H. Con. Res. 352 was passed by the House under suspension of the rules on July 22, 2002. It was then referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. No further action has been taken.

7H. Con. Res. 408. Honoring the American Zoo and Aquarium Association and its accredited member institutions for their continued service to animal welfare, conservation education, conservation research, and wildlife conservation programs.
H. Con. Res. 408 passed the House under the suspension of the rules on July 15, 2002. The measure was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works on July 16, 2002. No further action has been taken.

_H.R. 1408, to safeguard the public from fraud in the financial services industry, to streamline and facilitate the antifraud information-sharing efforts of Federal and State regulators, and for other purposes._

H.R. 1408 was introduced on April 4, 2001, and referred to the Committee on Financial Services and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Agriculture. The bill was reported by the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on the Judiciary, H.Rept. 107–192, part. 1 and 2. On August 2, 2001, the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from further consideration. On November 6, 2001, the bill passed the House, by a vote of 392 yeas to 4, amended, under suspension of the rules. On November 7, 2001, H.R. 1408 was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs with no further action being taken.

H.R. 1408, improves protections for consumers and businesses by coordinating the antifraud efforts of Federal and State financial regulators. The financial regulators are directed, to the extent practicable and appropriate, to develop procedures to provide for a network for the sharing of antifraud information. In addition to coordinating the different regulators’ computer systems, H.R. 1408 establishes the first industry-wide comprehensive protections for confidentiality, privacy, and security, of Government information shared through the network on regulated entities. It also directs the regulators to provide certain minimum due process rights where adverse actions are taken against a person.

_H.R. 4737, to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes._

Provisions of H.R. 4090, as ordered reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, and provisions of the H.R. 4092, as reported from the Committee on Education and Workforce, were previously incorporated in H.R. 4700. Subsequently action moved to H.R. 4735 and then to H.R. 4737, the Personal Responsibility, Work and Family Promotion Act which was referred to the Committees on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Agriculture and Financial Services. On May 15, 2002, H.R. 4737 passed the House, amended, by a vote of 229 yeas to 197 nays. On July 25, 2002, the Senate Committee on Finance reported the bill with a substitute, S. Rept. 107–221, and was placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar. No further action has been taken.

Under current law, at least 50 percent of TANF families are required to participate in work and other activities designed to help them achieve self-sufficiency, but in many States far fewer actually work. H.R. 4737 increased the work requirement by 5 percent per year, so that States are required to have 70 percent of welfare families working and participating in other job-preparation activities.
40 hours per week by fiscal year 2007. The bill also offered new authority to enable States to conduct “State Flex” demonstration projects to improve program effectiveness or coordinate a range of programs in order to improve service delivery. Eligible programs included TANF, Food Stamps, Public House, Workforce Investment Act, and Child Care, among others.

**H.R. 5017, to amend the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act to facilitate the ability of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign countries for the sharing of personnel to fight wildfires.**

H.R. 5017 was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, International Relations, and the Judiciary. H.R. 5017 was agreed to by voice vote under the suspension of the rules on July 9, 2002. No further action has been taken by the Senate.

H.R. 5017 amends the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act, as amended by the Wildfire Suppression Assistance Act, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, as part of any reciprocal agreement with a foreign country for sharing personnel to fight wildfires, to include a provision that personnel furnished under the agreement to provide wildfire pre-suppression or suppression services will be considered, for tort liability purposes, employees of the country receiving such services when the personnel provide them under the agreement.

The legislation prohibits the Secretaries from entering into any such agreement unless the foreign country (either directly or through the fire organization that is a party to the agreement) agrees to assume any and all liability for the acts or omissions of American firefighters engaged in providing such services under the agreement in the foreign country. It also makes remedies provided under the laws of the host country the exclusive remedies for acts or omissions committed while providing services under the agreement.

Neither the firefighter, the sending country, nor any organization associated with the firefighter shall be subject to any action whatsoever pertaining to or arising out of providing wildfire pre-suppression or suppression services under such a reciprocal agreement.

**H.R. 5316, to establish a user fee system that provides for an equitable return to the Federal Government for the occupancy and use of National Forest System lands and facilities by organizational camps that serve the youth and disabled adults of America, and for other purposes.**

H.R. 5316 was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources. H.R. 5316 was considered and passed by unanimous consent on October 10, 2002. No further action has been taken by the Senate.

The National Forest Organizational Camp Fee Improvement Act of 2002 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to charge an annual acreage and market value-based fee for the occupancy and use of National Forest System lands and facilities by organizational
camps (nonprofit or governmental entity-run camps for youth or persons with disabilities).

The bill reduces the land-use fee, but not below a minimum amount to be determined by the Secretary, for: (1) use by persons with disabilities and at-risk children; and (2) youth programs through organized social, citizenship, character-building, or faith-based activities oriented to outdoor recreation. Facility use fee reductions are prohibited in the legislation as well.

Other bills
Several bills acted on by other authorizing committees of the House that passed the House of Representatives, but were not acted on by the Committee on Agriculture, contained provisions relating to matters within the committee’s jurisdiction. Following are abbreviated summaries of these bills.

**H.R. 7, to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Government program delivery to individuals and families in need, and to enhance the ability of low-income Americans to gain financial security by building assets.**

On March 29, 2001 H.R. 7 was referred to the House Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary. It was reported out of both committees (H.Rept. 107–138 pt. 1 and 2) and passed by the House of Representatives on July 19, 2001. On July 16, 2002, the Senate Committee on Finance reported the bill, S.Rept. 107–211, and the bill was placed on the Senate legislative calendar. No further action has been taken.

Title I of the bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to expand charitable contributions. Title II of H.R. 7 contained provisions that would expand the Charitable Choice Act of 2001 and specifically contained a provision affecting the committee’s jurisdictional interest in hunger relief activities. Chairman Combest waived jurisdiction and did not seek a sequential referral. Title III created individual development accounts (IDA) for low-income families.

6. Concurrent resolutions approved

None

7. Bills reported to the House but not considered

**H.R. 701, to use royalties from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas production to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes.**

H.R. 701 was referred to the House Committee on Resources on February 14, 2001. After a hearing and markup H.R. 701 (H. Rept. 107–758) was reported on October 16, 2002. The bill was then referred sequentially to the House Committees on the Budget and Agriculture on the same date. Further consideration of H.R. 701 was extended to November 22, 2002 for both committees.

The Conservation and Reinvestment Act establishes the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund (CRAF). Requires the Sec-
retary of the Treasury to deposit into the CRAF certain Outer Con-
tinental Shelf revenues, undisbursed impact assistance and coastal
conservation amounts, and interest earned on CRAF investments.
CRAF funds shall be allocated among coastal States for impact
assistance and coastal conservation, the Land and Water Conserva-
tion Fund, and Federal aid to a certain wildlife restoration fund.
The bill provides for CRAF funding of the Urban Park and Recre-
ation Recovery Act of 1978, the National Historic Preservation Act,
the National Maritime Heritage Act of 1994, Endangered and
Threatened Species Recovery Agreements, and a specified program
for payments in lieu of taxes and refuge revenue sharing.
H.R. 701 expresses the intent of Congress that amounts made
available under this Act are to supplement, and not to detract
from, annual appropriations for the National Park Service.
The expenditure of funds are prohibited under this Act if such
an expenditure diminishes benefit obligations of the Federal Old-
Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability
Insurance Trust Fund, the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, or the
Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

H.R. 1462, to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish
a program to provide assistance through States to eligible
weed management entities to control or eradicate harm-
ful, nonnative weeds on public and private land.

H.R. 1462 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Re-
sources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On May
9, 2002, the Committee on Resources reported the bill, H.Rept.
107–451. On July 19, 2002, the Committee on Agriculture was dis-
charged from further consideration. No further action was taken.
H.R. 1462 directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish a pro-
gram to provide financial assistance through States to eligible weed
management entities to control or eradicate harmful, nonnative
weeks on public and private land. The legislation authorizes the al-
locations of funds to States and Indian tribes to carry out project
approved by States and Indian tribes for such purposes. Of the
funds made available, five percent would be reserved for allocation
to Indian tribes. If the funds allocated to Indian tribes were not
sufficient to provide assistance to each weed management entity of
a tribe, the legislation would permit the tribe to seek additional
funding by participating as a local stakeholder in the establish-
ment of such an entity.

H.R. 2386, to establish terms and conditions for use of certain
Federal lands by outfitters and to facilitate public opportunities for
the recreational use and enjoyment of such lands.

H.R. 2386 was referred to the House Committee on Resources
and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture on June 28, 2001.
The Resources Committee reported H.R. 2386 as amended on Octo-
was discharged of the bill on October 15, 2002.
H.R. 2386 sets forth procedures for granting permits and de-
scribes permit requirements. Some of the terms and conditions out-
lined in the bill include:
• Requiring fees for outfitter authorizations.
• Requiring authorized outfitters to defend and indemnify the
United States for costs or expenses associated with injury, death,
or damage to any person or property caused by negligence or wanton disregard for persons or property arising out of an outfitter's activities.

- Requiring outfitter permits to include a principal allocation of outfitter use and authorizes temporary permits to include such allocation.
- Authorizing the Secretary to adjust an allocation of use.
- Permitting temporary allocations of use for up to two years and the renewal, transfer, or extension of such allocations.
- Requiring the Secretary to: (1) develop a process for annual evaluation of the performance of authorized outfitters; and (2) renew an authorization at the outfitter's request, under appropriate conditions.
- Making outfitter permits transferable to qualified transferees under specified conditions.
- Setting forth recordkeeping requirements for authorized outfitters.
- Requiring the Secretary to: (1) grant authorized outfitters full access to administrative remedies; and (2) establish an expedited procedure for consideration of appeals.
- Entitling outfitters that hold existing permits, contracts, or other authorizations to issuance of permits under this Act if their recent performance was determined good, satisfactory, or acceptable, or the equivalent.

_H.R. 2581, to provide authority to control exports and for other purposes._

H.R. 2581 was referred to the House Committee on International Relations and in addition to the Committee on Rules. After the Committee on International Relations reported H.R. 2581 (H. Rept. 107–297, part 1) on November 16, 2001, the measure was sequentially referred to the following additional House committees: Agriculture, Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Intelligence (Permanent Select). The Committee on Armed Services reported H.R. 2581 (H. Rept. 107–297, part 2) on March 8, 2002; all remaining committees were discharged of the bill on the same day. No further action has been taken.

Section 313 of the bill gives the President authority to control the exportation of pesticides that he determines to be a risk to the public health, safety, or environment of the United States or other countries. These provisions conflict with existing authority under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under House rule X, the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over bill relating to FIFRA and pesticide use.

_H.R. 3208, to authorize funding through the Secretary of the Interior for the implementation of a comprehensive program in California to achieve increased water yield and environmental benefits, as well as improved water system reliability, water quality, water use efficiency, watershed management, water transfers, and levee protection._

H.R. 3208 was referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on November 1, 2001. The Committee on Resources reported H.R.
3208, as amended, (H. Rept. 107–360) on February 14, 2002 and no further action has been taken.

Section 103 of the legislation directs all involved Federal agencies to use their existing programs to implement the CALFED record of decision. Since this part of the measure will potentially override or be inconsistent with the statutory priorities of the conservation programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture the Committee on Agriculture asked to be named as conferees to any eventual conference on the bill between the Senate and House.

H.R. 4622, to require Federal land managers to support, and to communicate, coordinate, and cooperate with, designated gateway communities, to improve the ability of gateway communities to participate in Federal land management planning conducted by the Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior, and to respond to the impacts of the public use of the Federal lands administered by these agencies, and for other purposes.

The bill was referred to the House Committee on Resources in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. Under clause 1(a) of rule X, the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over bills relating to forestry in general and forest reserves other than those created from public domain. On September 11, 2002 the Committee on Resources reported H.R. 4622 (H. Rept. 107–653) and the Committee on Agriculture agreed to be discharged. After being placed on the House Calendar, no further action has been taken.

Gateway Communities Cooperation Act of 2002—Requires the National Park Service, United States Forest Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management to: (1) provide for public involvement by Government officials of local gateway communities (communities adjacent to or near public lands) in the development of land use plans, programs, regulations, and decisions, transportation plans, general management plans, and any other public land plans, decisions, projects, or policies that will have a significant impact; (2) provide such communities with early public notice of such proposed decisions; (3) offer training sessions for officials for understanding and participating in agency planning processes; (4) assign an employee or contractor to work with such a community to develop data and analysis relevant in the preparation of agency plans, decisions, and policies; and (5) assist in conducting a review of plans likely to affect such community.

H.R. 4622 would allow a Federal land manager to enter into a cooperative agreement with gateway communities to provide for coordination between Federal, State, local, and tribal governments in land use inventory, planning, and management activities.

The legislation would also require, to the extent practicable, the consolidation and coordination of the plans and planning processes of two or more Federal agencies to facilitate an affected gateway community’s participation.

The bill would require the Federal land agencies to, as soon as practicable (but not later than the scoping process), actively solicit the participation of gateway communities as cooperating agencies
when a proposed action is determined to require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

H.R. 4622 allows a Federal land manager to make grants to enable an eligible gateway community (population 10,000 or less) to: (1) participate in Federal land planning or management processes; (2) obtain professional land use or transportation planning assistance necessary as a result of Federal action; (3) address and resolve public infrastructure impacts that are a likely result of the Federal land management decisions and for which sufficient funds are not otherwise available; and (4) provide information and interpretive services.

Last, the bill would provide for funding for grants from the following sources: (1) general land agency funds; (2) funds available to a Federal land manager for planning, construction, or project development; and (3) funds combined by Federal land managers from different Federal land agencies.

_H.R. 4912, to increase the penalties to be imposed for a violation of fire regulations applicable to the public lands, National Park System lands, or National Forest System lands when the violation results in damage to public or private property, to specify the purpose for which collected fines may be used, and for other purposes._

H.R. 4912 was referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture on June 11, 2002. The Committee on Resources reported H.R. 4912 (H. Rept. 107–763) on October 21, 2002 and the Committee on Agriculture was discharged. No further action was taken on the measure.

H.R. 4912 revises penalties for violations of the rules regulating the use of fire by visitors of public lands if such violation results in damage to public or private property. The bill also changes the maximum $1,000 fine to a minimum $1,000 fine with respect to public lands under the Bureau of Land Management. The legislation would change penalties with respect to National Park and National Forest Systems from a maximum $500 fine and six months imprisonment to a minimum $1,000 and maximum 12 months imprisonment.

Money collected from fines imposed for violation of fire rules under this Act would be available for the purposes of: (1) covering costs to the United States of any improvement, protection, or rehabilitation rendered necessary by the action that resulted in the fine; (2) reimbursing the affected agency for the cost of the response to such action, including investigations, damage assessments, and legal actions; and (3) increasing public awareness of rules, regulations, and other requirements regarding the use of fire on public lands.

_H.R. 5319, to improve the capacity of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expeditiously address wildfire prone conditions on National Forest System lands and other public lands that threaten communities, watersheds, and other at-risk landscapes through the establishment of expedited environmental analysis procedures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, to establish a predecisional administrative review process for the Forest Service, to expand fire manage-
ment contracting authorities, to authorize appropriations for hazardous fuels reduction projects.

H.R. 5319 was referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture on September 4, 2002. The Committee on Resources reported H.R. 5319 (H. Rept. 107–770) on October 31, 2002. No further action has been taken.

The Healthy Forests Reform Act of 2002 directs the Council on Environmental Quality to: (1) treat the threat of catastrophic wildfire on Federal lands as an emergency circumstance; and (2) establish an expedited environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 for fire reduction and forest health measures on certain Federal lands.

The bill also directs the Secretary of Agriculture and the Interior (Secretary) to jointly establish an independent panel to assess agency actions concerning wildfire reduction, forest health and biodiversity promotion, and watershed protection.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to establish a predecisional review process for the Forest Service. Repeals, 90 days after enactment of this Act, Forest Service decision-making and appeal provisions under the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993.

H.R. 5319 directs that emergency response activities proceed immediately due to extraordinary circumstances affecting Federal lands, including actions to reduce bark beetle infestation and attendant catastrophic wildfire threat in the Routt National Forest, Colorado. All such activities would be exempt from judicial review and certain notice, comment, and appeal requirements.

The Secretary is authorized to enter into stewardship contracts for land management activities on Federal lands.

Last, the legislation authorizes appropriations for fuel reduction activities.

8. Bills defeated in the House

None

D. OVERSIGHT

The Committee on Agriculture and its subcommittees were active in their oversight functions, holding a number of oversight hearings both in the field and in Washington, DC, during the course of the 107th Congress. The hearings related to the application, administration, and effectiveness of laws that lie within the committee’s jurisdiction as well as the organization and operation of the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies having responsibility for the administration of such laws. The hearings often resulted in recommendations for improvements in the administration of the laws, regulations and policies in effect in the Executive Branch as they related to the committee’s jurisdiction. Information gathered at these hearings was later useful in preparing legislation for consideration in the House of Representatives.

As part of its hearings, the committee and its subcommittees reviewed the way the particular Federal agency or department (usually the Department of Agriculture) administered existing laws related to the subject matter of the legislation before, or to be considered by, the committee. In some cases, legislation favorably reported to the House carries a termination date (a sunset) to ensure
that in the future Congress will again review the effectiveness and the methods with which the executive branch of Government has carried out the letter and the spirit of that statute.

In keeping with the objective of the Oversight Plan as submitted to the Committee on Government Reform and House Administration, the committee and its subcommittees conducted the following chronological oversight hearings during the 107th Congress:

**Oversight hearings**


This first meeting of the committee was held as a public forum because the total authorized Committee membership had not fully been established. This meeting gave Members the opportunity to review the final report as prepared by the Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture as the committee began to prepare to embark upon the process of building consensus in future farm policy.

As directed by the 1996 farm bill, the Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture was required to do a comprehensive review regarding the current status of agriculture, taking into account economic risks, food security, trade, international competitiveness of United States production, farmland values, producer incomes, and regulatory and tax relief for farmers and ranchers. This final report also contained suggestions and recommendations regarding the appropriate future role of the Federal Government in support of production agriculture. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”)*


This hearing was the opening of a series of hearings to acquire recommendations from farm economists, agricultural experts, and producer organizations on the needs of the fragile farm economy. Three witnesses testified before the committee and outlined the financial conditions in agriculture and the implications of certain farm policies. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”)*


This hearing was the first in a series of hearings that challenges commodity and farm groups to provide detailed policy proposals, as well as how their proposals would affect related industries, impact America’s ability to move products in the world market, how it would comport with U.S. trade agreements, and the impact on the Federal budget and overall spending on farm programs. The first to appear before the committee was the National Cotton Council who represented seven segments of the U.S. cotton industry, including producers, ginners, seed crushers, and warehousemen, shippers, cooperatives and textile manufacturers. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”)*

This hearing was the second in the series of hearings of what promises to be an intense and interesting set of hearings on specifics for the future of national farm policy. The President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Bob Stallman, who represents more than five million member families in all 50 States including Puerto Rico testified before the committee that the next farm bill must provide “an expanded public investment in agriculture” that includes increased income support for producers, much of it “counter-cyclical,” and increased expenditures for conservation, research and export promotion to help the industry grow and prosper. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)

March 7, 2001: Review of the Farm Credit Administration’s proposed rule providing for the issuance of national charters for the Farm Credit System. Hearing serial No. 107–3.

The purpose of this hearing was to review the proposed rule providing for the issuance of national charters for the Farm Credit System prior to the close of the public comment period. Five witnesses testified before the committee representing both the public and private sector or groups who are charged with providing credit to this Nation’s farmers and ranchers.


This was the third in the series of hearings on the future of American farm policy. Responding to the committee’s challenge to present specific proposals on their own commodity programs was the barley industry. Testifying on behalf of the U.S. barley industry was the President of the National Barley Growers Association who focused on three key areas: the Marketing Loan Program, fixed and decoupled AMTA payments, and a counter-cyclical income safety net program. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This was the fourth hearing in the series of hearings on the future of American farm policy. The American Farm Bureau responded to the committee’s challenge to present specific proposals on their own that will help the committee in creating farm policy that will strengthen the economic conditions of American agriculture. The National Farmers Union testified before the committee that the primary goal of commodity programs should be to provide economic stability and opportunity for producers over time consistent with a responsible view of market realities, resources sustainability and food security and safety issues. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)

Testimony was presented on behalf of the wheat industry by the President of the National Wheat Growers Association in the response to the committee's challenge to offer specific recommendation about the future of farm policy. The wheat producers testified that farm policy should encompass four elements. Policy should be equitable, fiscally responsible, counter-cyclical, and WTO compliant and recommended continued support of the market-oriented approach implemented in the 1996 FAIR Act. While the wheat industry plan does not support any form of mandatory set asides, an expansion of CRP, the establishment of a Farmer Owned Reserve, or other proposals that would limit farmer flexibility, its plan does call for securing a guaranteed fixed payment, similar to the current AMTA system in order to safeguard the wheat producer's ability to security operating capital. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This was the sixth in the series of hearings that the committee challenged witnesses to provide detailed proposals of where they would go on farm policy in the future. Testifying before the committee was the U.S. Rice Producers Association who along with other farm and commodity organizations urged Congress to increase spending. The rice industry also called a substantial increase in the agriculture budget baseline for 2001 and beyond to assure that annual spending be no lower than the total $20-billion-per-year average of the past threes years. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


Testifying before the committee in what was the seventh in a series of hearings on the future of the farm economy were four segments of the livestock industry. Representatives from the poultry, beef, pork, and sheep and goat industries all offered their recommendations. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to hear from various forestry agencies on the implementation of the National Fire Plan and the process of the five primary goals of the Plan, which are firefighting readiness, rehabilitation and restoration, hazardous fuel reduction, community assistance and accountability. Seven witnesses appeared before the subcommittee who are directly charged with carrying out the National Fire Plan.


Testifying before the committee in what was the eighth in a series of hearings on the future of the farm economy was the American Soybean Association who represented American's soybean and oilseed farmers. The program recommended by the soybean producers would included oilseeds in an expanded PFC program, set current market loan rates as floors rather than ceiling, and replace ad hoc emergency assistance with a counter-cyclical income support

The purpose of this hearing was to receive testimony and written statements from food distribution organizations on the benefits of USDA domestic food distribution programs. Seven witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and described the ability of the programs to meet the needs of the individuals they were designed to assist while at the same time providing support to the agriculture community.


This was the ninth in a series of hearings to be held on the future of our Nation’s farm policy. Grain sorghum producers presented specific farm policy recommendations and emphasized the need for a loan rate equal to that of corn, the need for a countercyclical safety net, and for the continuation of AMTA payments. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This was the tenth in a series of hearings designed to examine recommendations for future farm policy. Representatives of the Nation’s dairy industry appeared before the committee and emphasized the need for an economic safety net for dairy producers. According to the industry, this safety net should accomplish four goals: protect viable dairy farm operations from short-term disaster; maintain a level of income sufficient to satisfy demand for milk; not discriminate among regions or between farm operations of different sizes; and enable supply to adjust to demand. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


Testifying at what was the eleventh in a series of hearings designed to examine recommendations for future farm policy was corn producers from Battle Creek, Michigan; the Texas Panhandle; and Central Ohio who presented a detailed farm income proposal that replaced the non-recourse Marketing Loan Program and Loan Deficiency Payment with a 9 month recourse loan. The National Corn Growers Association farm proposal that was presented to the committee maintains Production Flexibility Contract payments, and sets a National Target Income, producer payment units, and an income shortfall calculation, establishing income shortfall-based producer payments to help American farmers remain globally competitive, market responsive and environmentally responsible, with access to world markets, capital, and advances in technology and risk management. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)

April 25, 2001: Review of the energy supply and demand issues affecting the agricultural sector of the U.S economy. Subcommittee

This was the first of two hearings to examine the energy issues affecting the agricultural sector of the U.S. economy. Eight witnesses testified before the subcommittee and discussed the energy crisis hitting farmers and ranchers at every stage of production.


Testifying before the committee at what was the twelfth hearing on the future of farm policy was the sugar industry who cited economic, domestic and trade policy as a crisis that was threatening the existence of growers and refiners. American sugar industry representatives proposed that sugar policy include a domestic allotment program needing import quota and access concerns to be addressed by other congressional committees. Acknowledging that the Committee on Agriculture does not have jurisdiction regarding Canadian import of “stuffed molasses” and import access on sweeteners from Mexico, sugar growers and refiners asked the Committee on Agriculture to consider establishing several other short-term and long-term proposals, notably an inventory management to control domestic production relative to domestic demand and import requirements. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


As the committee neared the end of the series of hearings on the future of Federal farm policy, two industries which have not been participants in traditional farm programs presented their recommendations for increased support for their operations. Representatives of the fruit and vegetable industry, as well as the honey industry, explained how the economic crisis that is facing American agriculture has affected their industries. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This was the second in a series of hearings conducted by the subcommittee to review energy issues that are affecting the agricultural sector of the American economy. In particular, testimony was presented on behalf of USDA regarding the impact of energy prices on production decisions, and the Energy Information Administration that provided a forecast of future energy prices. In all, a total of eight witnesses testified.


This was the committee’s last hearing in the series of hearings designed to examine the current state of our Nation’s agricultural economy. The National Farmers Organization (NFO) was the last of 15 organizations that have taken up the committee’s challenge to present detailed policy proposals regarding the future of Amer-
ican farm policy. In doing so, NFO proposed that the current marketing loan provision of the current farm bill be changed to a “price support loan”, thus eliminating LPD’s and marketing gain payments, in support of a flexible fallow program, which was introduced by Rep. Bereuter as H.R. 32, and for the implementation of a Strategic Food Security System that was combined with a price support commodity loan program. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to review national dairy policy. Dairy industry representatives testified before the subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture to facilitate discussion on the reform of the dairy industry and the upcoming farm bill. Topics discussed included the dairy price support program, purchase price relationship between butter and nonfat dry milk under the DPSP, and the Dairy Export Incentive Program. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This hearing covered the FTAA proposals by the Bush administration and the effect of the proposals on the Nation’s agriculture. Views were also expressed toward strengthening the U.S. negotiating position and resolving issues with current trading partners before expanding beyond Canada and Mexico.


This was the first hearing in a series of three to discuss conservation issues to be addressed in the next farm bill. The Conservation Reserve Program, Wetlands Reserve Program, Environmental Quality Incentives Program and the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program statuses were all reported. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the mandatory livestock price reporting as well as to examine problems associated with misreported data. A review team was appointed with the task of examining the mandatory reporting system process and procedures, review the performance of the system, assess the consequences of misreporting, and recommend actions to be taken to enhance the system.


This was the second of three hearings to discuss conservation issues. The main interest of this hearing was how current conservation programs were operating, what changes needed to be made, and whether new programs were needed. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)

This is the third in the series of three hearings to discuss conservation issues. Current programs and supports were discussed including the Conservation Reserve Program, Wetlands Reserve Program, Farmland Protection Program, Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program among others. New initiatives were also presented and discussed. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to review Federal farm policy. Testimonies were heard by wheat, corn, soybean and barley producers from Minnesota and issues such as the FAIR Act, Marketing Loan Program, AMTA Payments, income support and loan deficiency payments were discussed. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to review forestry programs. Many of the Nation’s forestry organizations presented testimony, and common proposals were made such as the creation of a new programs called the Sustainable Forestry Incentives Program and the Sustainable Forestry Outreach Initiative. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was review the peanut program. Producers, shellers, manufacturers and two Members of Congress testified before the subcommittee to discuss changes in the current peanut program. Issues included the impact on the peanut industry by NAFTA, GATT and the potential effects of the Free Trade Area of the Americas agreement. Phasing-out the current quota program, establishing transition payments based on the historic quota and a marketing loan program, and short-term and long-term solutions were presented. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


Testimonies for this hearing were heard from rice, cotton and wheat producers who discussed the U.S. Dollar Index, market access, trade programs, the FAIR Act, and Loan Deficiency Payments among others. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)

The purpose of this hearing was to review agricultural policies affecting the fruit and vegetable industries. Witnesses discussed threats to the industry by exotic plant pests and diseases and recommended enactment of legislation that will authorize APHIS to develop an emergency pest eradication. Trade promotions programs and Market Loss Assistance topics were also addressed. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to discuss current and future agricultural credit conditions with witnesses from the agricultural lending industry. Witnesses testified that, although the state of agricultural lending institutions is sound, low commodity prices and future Federal assistance uncertainty exemplifies the need for predictability in economic assistance for producers. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This is the third in a series of hearings to discuss farm policy. Witnesses were asked to discuss issues on cotton, wheat, corn, rice, soybeans, oilseeds, barley, and grain sorghum. Other topics discussed included Loan Deficiency Payments, Agriculture Market Transition Assistance, and Counter Cyclical Payments. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to gain insight on agricultural research programs. Benefits, including lower production costs, higher profits and safer food supplies, of agricultural research programs were discussed. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


This is the fifth hearing designated for reviewing the Research title of the upcoming farm bill. Agricultural research investments produce higher returns for both farmer and consumer Americans. This hearing aided in guiding the committee on working to determine how increased funding can be best directed. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry took a comprehensive look at the Food Stamp Program and heard various witnesses testify on the recent drop in participation, Electronic Benefit Transfer system, and State control
over the program. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”).*


Witnesses representing beef, poultry, sheep, pork, dairy and vegetable producers testified on behalf of the Draft Farm Bill Concept Paper. Proposals were presented regarding the marketing loan programs, FAIR Act, conservation, rural development, and trade. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”).*


This was the first in a series of full committee hearings to discuss the Draft Farm Bill Concept Paper and receive testimony from witnesses across the Nation. Concerns were heard from producers representing the wheat, cotton, corn, soybean, rice, sorghum, peanut and sugar industries. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”).*


Another in the series of hearings to discuss the Draft Farm Bill Concept Paper, this hearing brought in representatives from Ducks Unlimited, Inc., Wildlife Management Institute, National Association of Conservation Districts, Society of American Foresters, The Nature Conservancy and National Hardwood Lumber Association to provide their input on the Draft Farm Bill Concept Paper. *(Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–171 (H.R. 2646) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”).*


The purpose of this hearing was to review the Buena Vista Watershed Proposal. Witnesses testified regarding the Small Watershed Programs authorized by P.L. 78–534 and P.L. 83–566 that have served America well for over 50 years and how these programs have reduced threats from floods, improved the environment, increased economic development, and helped develop the infrastructure on which many rural communities depend on. It was determined that Buena Vista is in need of flood protection to provide safety and stabilization for the citizens, business and industry. *(Note.—For further action, see the discussion under “E. Watershed Projects—Hearings and Action Taken”).*


The purpose of this hearing was to review the biosecurity programs and authorities of the United States Department of Agriculture. The September 11th attacks reinforced the committee’s desire to ensure that the Nation’s food supply is protected from potential terrorist attacks and caused the agencies of the Department to increase their vigilance. Deputy Secretary James Mosley of the United States Department of Agriculture testified before the committee and noted that the Department has been in the food safety business for almost 100 years since the passage of the original Federal meat inspection legislation in 1906. However, over the course of time, responsibilities have been expanded and systems improved.
(Note.—For further action see the discussion of P.L. 107–188 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


A year and a half after the enactment of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (ARPA), the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management met to assess the progress of the implementation of the Act. Two witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and testified that the reforms in ARPA have strengthened the Federal crop insurance program which has become a successful risk management tool for producers.


The purpose of this hearing was to review areas within the Black Hills National Forest that are experiencing a severe mountain pine beetle outbreak which has developed into a threat of catastrophic wildfire to the forest and surrounding properties and communities. Two areas of particular concern due to the fact that the Forest Service is unable to conduct management to reduce the threat and prevent a catastrophe, are the Beaver Park area and the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve. These two areas are currently being litigated. This litigation has tied the Forest Service’s hands and stopped them from conducting necessary management to reduce the threat. Three witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and testified in favor of declaring the areas a disaster area on the National Forest, so as to allow the Forest Service to undertake management actions to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the National Fire Plan and the outlook for the 2002 fire season. Three witnesses testified before the subcommittee and expressed concern over the 2002 fire season that has produced fires that are burning earlier, growing faster and spreading with greater intensity than expected due to the combination of drought, fuel loads, and the increasing size of the wildlife-urban interface.


The purpose of this hearing was to hear from forestry officials about the status of the Roadless Area Conservation rule that was announced by President Clinton in 1999 and finalized in January 2001. Five Witnesses testified before the subcommittee and highlighted the need to reopen a meaningful dialogue between Forestry officials and State and local governments and communities in order to bring about a workable forest management plan.

The purpose of this hearing was to review the issue of stewardship contracting in the national forests. Seven witnesses presented testimony, while the subcommittee again pushed for a reasoned approach to fulfill stewardship contracts that will not only clear away years of dead underbrush now fueling wildfires throughout the national lands but help strengthen local communities economies through the diversification of available jobs and the development of new and expanded markets.

**September 18, 2002:** Review of the implementation of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act and the effectiveness of the Federal Crop Insurance Program. Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management. Hearing serial No. 107–22.

This was the second oversight hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management to review USDA’s implementation of crop insurance reforms enacted by the “Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000,” as well as the overall effectiveness of the Federal Crop Insurance Program as a risk management tool for producers. Risk Management Agency Administrator, Mr. Ross Davidson, Jr., testified before the subcommittee and assured the Members that the Agency is working diligently to extend much needed protection to American ranchers.


Responding to the continued concerns raised by subcommittee ranking member Eva Clayton, subcommittee chairman Bob Goodlatte convened this hearing for a detailed accounting of allegations against USDA, as well as how the Agriculture Department is addressing continued allegations and improving participant service. Nine witnesses testified before the subcommittee that represented the U.S. Department of Agriculture and farm groups.

**September 26, 2002:** Review Tobacco Buyout Proposals. Subcommittee on Specialty Crops and Foreign Agriculture Programs. Hearing serial No. 107–24.

The purpose of this hearing was to receive testimony on the potential for a buyout of tobacco quota. Growers from seven tobacco growing States and from Flue-cured and Burley regions appeared before the subcommittee, as well as two economists, and four congressmen who have introduced buyout measures and tobacco manufacturers. Much of the discussion was on what the tobacco producers want the program to look like in the future.


The subcommittee convened this hearing to discuss the issues concerning species that are invasive, harmful and alien to the United States. Ten witnesses testified before the subcommittee that represented USDA’s Animal and Plant Health and Inspection Service, the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, The Smithsonian, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, The Nature Conservancy, National Weed Science Society, American Seed Trade Association, and the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association.
2. Legislative oversight


This hearing’s purpose was to hear testimony relating to the effects of the Emergency Food Assistance Enhancement Act pertaining to The Emergency Food Assistance Program. Witnesses testified that the bill would be of great help in feeding the hungry and aiding in storage, transportation and distribution of commodities.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the Senate amendment that was added to the H.R. 1 that would require local education agencies and schools to implement pest management plans and provide parents and guardians with notice of the use of pesticides. Witnesses testified on the topic saying that they were concerned about having to shut down schools periodically or place our children’s health in danger. (Note.—See the discussion of Public Law 107–110 (H.R. 1) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to hear from representatives of the agricultural community who are concerned about the proposal to move the Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to the new Department of Homeland Security.

The proposed Department of Homeland Security (DHS) would move two elements of USDA to the DHS. The first element is the Plum Island research facility in New York. This lab has the highest of biocontainment and is used for quarantine as well as research relating to the most contagious of animal diseases. The second, and larger element to be transferred is the APHIS that employs approximately 3,900 people in Agricultural Quarantine Inspection at 186 ports of entry, who work every day to prevent the importation of materials and disease that pose a threat to livestock and plants.

Ten witnesses appeared before the committee and expressed support for increasing homeland security but also opposed the wholesale movement of APHIS.

H.R. 5005, the “Homeland Security Act of 2002” was introduced and passed by the House of Representatives on July 26, 2002. (Note.—For further discussion, see P.L. 107–296 (H.R. 5005) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law”.)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the administration’s proposed legislation on “Healthy Forests Initiative” to reduce catastrophic wildfire threats to communities and the environment. USDA Under Secretary of National Resources and the Environment and U.S. Interior Department Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management testified before the subcommittee that
the initiative has a timely treatment for forest at risk of catastrophic fires which pose the greatest risk to people, communities, and the environment.

(Note.—On September 12, 2002, H.R. 5376 was introduced by Chairman Combest and co-sponsored by Mr. Steholtm, Mr. Goodlatte, Mr. Hansen, Mr. McInnis, and Mr. Berry.)

E. WATERSHED PROJECTS—HEARINGS AND ACTION TAKEN

On June 2, 2000, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), in concurrence with the Office of Management and Budget, submitted to the Committee the Buena Vista Watershed Project Information Sheet.

On November 14, 2001, the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research held a hearing to review the Buena Vista Watershed Proposal under P.L. 83–566.

On November 15, 2001, the full committee met in an open business meeting and approved the project by a voice vote.

(Note.—For further discussion see “D. Oversight 1. Oversight Hearings, November 14, 2001: Review of the Buena Vista Watershed Proposal”.)

F. PRINTED HEARINGS (BY SUBJECT)


PRINTED HEARINGS (BY SERIAL NO.)


107–24 TOBACCO BUYOUT PROPOSALS. Subcommittee on Specialty Crops and Foreign Agriculture Programs. September 26, 2002.


G. HEARINGS NOT PRINTED

Full committee. Open business meeting. Organizational meeting and approval by voice vote of committee Oversight Plan for 107th Congress. February 14, 2001.

Full committee. Open business meeting. Organizational meeting and approval by voice vote budget views and estimates letter for fiscal year 2001 to be forwarded to Committee on the Budget. March 15, 2001.


Full committee. Open business meeting. Approval by voice vote of budget views and estimates letter for fiscal year 2002 to be forwarded to Committee on the Budget. February 25, 2002.


H. COMMITTEE PRINTS


III. APPENDIX

A. EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS


20—January 6, 2001; Letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, De-

21—January 6, 2001; Letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV00–989–5 FIR Received January 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


89—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Extension of Time To File Annual Reports for Commodity Pools—Received December 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


92—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of Low-Documentation Di-

93—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Associate Chief for Natural Resources, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Special Areas: Roadless Area Conservation (RIN: 0596-AB77) Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


96—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—West Indian Fruit Fly Docket No. 00–110–1 Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

97—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Policy on Audits of RUS Borrowers; Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) (RIN: 0572-AB62) Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

98—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Price Support Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Farm Storage Facility Loan Program (RIN: 0560-AG00) Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


103—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301093; FRL–6760–9 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

104—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301087; FRL–6758–1 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

105—January 20, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Clomazone; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301095; FRL–6761–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


321—January 30, 2001; Letter from the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Administration of the Forest Development Transportation System; Prohibitions; Use of Motor Vehicles Off Forest Service Roads (RIN: 0596-AB67) Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

322—January 30, 2001; Letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Stamp Program: Revisions to the Retail Food Store Definition and Program Authorization Guidance (RIN: 0584-AB90) Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

323—January 30, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Republic of South Africa Because of Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 00–122–1 Received January 22, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


452—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the

453—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Delegation of Authority to Disclose and Request Information—Received January 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

454—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Clarification of Inspection Requirements Docket No. FV99–905–5 FR Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


456—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Tobacco and Peanuts Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Cleaning and Reinspection of Farmers Stock Peanuts (RIN: 0560-AF56) Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


459—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Interim Amendment of Orders Docket No. AO–14-A69, et al; DA–00–03 Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

460—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV00–989–5 FIR Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
461—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Reduction in Production Cap for 2001 Diversion Program Docket No. FV01–989–1 IFRA Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

525—January 31, 2001; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the USDA 1997–99 activities report on environmental assessment, restoration, and cleanup activities required by Section 120(e)(5) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.


528—February 6, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Post-loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guaranteed and Insured Loans (RIN: 0572-AB53) Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

529—February 6, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Policy on Audits of RUS Borrowers; Management Letter (RIN: 0572-AB66) Received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

706—February 8, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Farm Loan Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Loan Limitations and Cash Flow Requirements for Farm Service Agency Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0560-AG15) Received January 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

707—February 8, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—District of Columbia; Movement of Plants and Plant Products Docket No. 00–085–1 Received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

809—February 12, 2001; Letter from the Secretaries, Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a Joint Order Interchanging Administrative Jurisdiction of Department of the Army Lands and National Forest Lands.

812—February 13, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dimethylpolysiloxane; Tolerance Exemption OPP–301096; FRL–6762–1 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

823—February 14, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Flutolanil, N-(3-(1-methylethoxy) phenyl)-2-(trifluoromethyl)benzamide; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301094; FRL–6761–1 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
69

824—February 14, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Clomazone; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301101; FRL–6764–2 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1036—March 1, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Specifically Approved States Authorized To Receive Mares and Stallions Imported from Regions where CEM Exists Docket No. 00–115–3 Received February 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1059—March 5, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Transportation and Marketing, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—National Organic Program Docket No. TMD–00–02-FR (RIN: 0581-AA40) Received February 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1144—March 8, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–932–1 IFR Received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1145—March 8, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Change in Size Designation Docket No. FV00–966–1 FIR Received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1146—March 8, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Docket No. FV00–956–1 FIR Received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1147—March 8, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment

1160—March 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Research and Promotion Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan; Redistricting and Adding Two Importer Members to the National Watermelon Promotion Board FV–00–703-FR Received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1161—March 12, 2001; Letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Disclosure to Shareholders; Annual Report (RIN: 3052-AB94) Received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1276—March 20, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pyriproxyfen; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301103; FRL–6766–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1279—March 20, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Butene, Homopolymer; Tolerance Exemption OPP–301104; FRL–6769–8 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1284—March 20, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Request For Grant Proposals Making Smart Growth Work: Community Innovations And Responses To Barriers—Received March 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1374—March 28, 2001; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization; Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Stock Issuances (RIN: 3052-AB91) Received March 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1405—March 30, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–959–1 IFR Received March 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1406—March 30, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Reduction in Production Cap for 2001 Diversion Program Docket No. FV01–989–1 FIRA Received March 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1407—March 30, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–955–1 FR Received March 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1408—March 30, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Coniothyrium mimitans Strain CON 91–08; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–301107; FRL–6772–1 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1415—April 3, 2001; Letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fees for Commodity and Rice Inspection Services (RIN: 0580-AA74) Received March 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1527—April 24, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV01–916–1 IFR Received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1529—April 24, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301114; FRL–6777–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1530—April 24, 2001; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Zoxamide 3, 5-dichloro-N- (3-chloro–1-ethyl–1-methyl–2-oxopropyl) –4-methylbenzamide; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301110; FRL–6774–8 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1531—April 24, 2001; Letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; Risk-Based Capital Requirements (RIN: 3052-AB56) Received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1591—April 25, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Farm Services Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Diary Price Support, Diary Recourse Loan, Livestock Assistance, American Indian Livestock Feed, and Pasture Recovery Programs (RIN: 0560-AG32) Received April 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1592—April 25, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Farm Services Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—2000 Crop Disaster Program (RIN: 0560-AG36) Received April 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1593—April 25, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dairy and Cranberry Market Loss Assistance Programs, Honey Marketing Assistance Loan and LDP Program, Sugar Nonrecourse Loan Program, and Payment Limitations for Marketing Loan Gains and Loan Deficiency Payments (RIN: 0560-AG34) Received April 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1723—May 7, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 00–076–2 Received April 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1724—May 7, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis Testing for Imported Cattle Docket No. 00–102–1 Received April 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1725—May 7, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; South Dakota Docket No. 00–103–2 Received April 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1726—May 7, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington: Exemption From Handling and Assessment Regulations for Potatoes Shipped for Experimental Purposes Docket No. FV00–946–1 FIR Received April 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1793—May 8, 2001; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed fiscal year 2002 budget.

1796—May 9, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Wool and Mohair Market Loss Assistance Program and Apple Market Loss Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AG35) Received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1797—May 9, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Oklahoma Docket No. 01–016–1 Received April 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1798—May 9, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Plant Protection Act; Revisions to Authority Citations Docket No. 00–063–2 Received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1845—May 10, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Germany, Italy, and Spain
Because of BSE Docket No. 01–008–1 Received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1846—May 10, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Honey Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Order; Amendments FV–00–701 FR (RIN: 0581-AB84) Received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2082—May 23, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Minimum Financial Requirements for Futures Commission Merchants and Introducing Brokers; Amendment to the Capital Charge on Unsecured Receivables Due From Foreign Brokers (RIN: 3038-AB54) Received May 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2083—May 23, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions—Received May 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
2084—May 23, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus thuringiensis Cry3Bb1 and Cry2Ab2 Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for its Production in Corn and Cotton; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP—301123; FRL—6781–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received May 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2105—May 24, 2001; Letter from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Rural Business Enterprise Grants and Television Demonstration Grants (RIN: 0570-AA32) Received May 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2106—May 24, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerance OPP—301132; FRL—6784–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received May 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2107—May 24, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Aspergillus flavus AF36; Extension of Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP—301124; FRL—6781–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received May 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2108—May 24, 2001; Letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Eligibility and Scope of Financing (RIN: 3052-AB90) Received May 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2216—May 25, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Fees and Charges for Permissive Inspection and Certification; Fee Revisions Docket No. TB—00–04 (RIN: 0581-AB86) Received May 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2308—June 5, 2001; Letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled, “The Operation of the Enterprise for the Americas Facility and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act”.

2312—June 6, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department
of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of France, Ireland, and The Netherlands Because of Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 01–031–1 Received May 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2313—June 6, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clethodim; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301133; FRL–6783–5 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2314—June 6, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Prohexadione Calcium; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301128; FRL–6781–5 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2315—June 6, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyriproxyfen; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301131; FRL–6782–5 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2344—June 7, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition of Beef from Argentina Docket No. 01–032–1 Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2345—June 7, 2001; Letter from the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning; Extension of Compliance Deadline—Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2346—June 7, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Republic of San Marino and the Independent Principalities of Andorra and Monaco Docket No. 01–029–1 Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2347—June 7, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1F Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for its Production in Corn; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–301130; FRL–6783–3 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2413—June 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Papayas Grown in Hawaii; Suspension of Grade, Inspection, and Related Reporting Requirements Docket No. FV01–928–1 IFR Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2414—June 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmit-
ting the Department’s final rule—Revision of User Fees for 2001 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers CN–00–010 (RIN: 0581-AB57) Received June 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2415—June 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2001–2002 Marketing Year Docket No. FV–01–985–1 FR Received June 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2416—June 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–932–1 FIR Received June 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2417—June 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2001 Tariff-Rate Quota Year—Received June 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2494—June 14, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Regulated Areas Docket No. 01–058–1 Received June 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2495—June 14, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Mangoes from the Philippines Docket No. 93–131–2 Received June 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2524—June 18, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Payments for Recovery of Lost Production Income Docket No. 00–037–4 (RIN: 0579-AB15) Received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2525—June 18, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Undersized Regulation for the 2001–02 Crop Year Docket No. FV01–993–1 FR Received June 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
2526—June 18, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Florida Docket No. 01–020–1 Received June 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2632—June 25, 2001; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled, “Assessment of the Cattle and Hog Industries, Calendar Year 2000”.


2636—June 25, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final—Pyridaben; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction OPP–301136; FRL–6786–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2637—June 25, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—L-Glutamic Acid and Gamma Aminobutyric Acid; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–301138; FRL–6786–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2638—June 25, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301139; FRL–6787–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2669—June 26, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—West Indian Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area Docket No. 00–110–3 Received June 22, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2689—June 27, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances for Emer-


2817—July 11, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Aminoethoxyvinylglycine (AVG); Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances OPP–301147; FRL–6790–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2818—July 11, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Aminoethoxyvinylglycine; Temporary Tolerance OPP–301144; FRL–6788–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2893—July 12, 2001; Letter from the Secretaries, Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture, transmitting notification of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and Forest Service lands at the Fort Leonard Wood Military Reservation in the State of Missouri, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 505a.

2925—July 17, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas Docket No. 01–049–1 Received July 16, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2951—July 18, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Uruguay Because of Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 00–111–2 Received July 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3053—July 25, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order;
Amendment No. 1 FV–00–706-FR Received July 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3134—July 27, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Regulated Areas Docket No. 01–063–1 Received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3137—July 27, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–048–1 Received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3193—July 31, 2001; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, “To au-
authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe, adjust, and collect fees to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary for activities related to the review and maintenance of licenses and registrations under the Animal Welfare Act”.


3195—July 31, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Lysophosphatidylethanolamine (LPE); Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–301145; FRL–6788–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3246—August 1, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Policy on Audits of RUS Borrowers; Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) (RIN: 0572-AB62) Received July 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3247—August 1, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mexican Fruit Fly Regulations; Regulated Areas, Regulated Articles, and Treatments Docket No. 99–075–5 Received July 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3248—August 1, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tepraloxydim; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301148; FRL–6791–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3249—August 1, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Isoxadifen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction OPP–301156; FRL–6794–3 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received July 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3301—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Export Sales Reporting Requirements (RIN: 0551-AA51) Received July 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3302—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–959–1 FIR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3303—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV01–916–1 FIR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3305—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 2000–01 Crop Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless and Zante Currant Raisins Docket No. FV01–989–3 IFR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3306—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Reporting on Organic Raisins Docket No. FV01–989–2 FR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3307—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, De-
partment of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Revision of Requirements Regarding Quality Control Program Docket No. FV01–981–1 FR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3309—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwi fruit Grown in California; Removal of Certain Inspection and Pack Requirements Docket No. FV01–920–1 FR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3310—August 2, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Reporting Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV01–916–3 IFR Received August 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3333—September 5, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 00–077–2 Received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3334—September 5, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Fees for Permit Applications Docket No. 99–060–2 Received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3336—September 5, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2-Propenoic Acid, Polymer with 2-Propanamide, Sodium Salt; Tolerance Exemption OPP–301157; FRL–6794–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3487—September 6, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the

3488—September 6, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Treatment of Customer Funds—Received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3489—September 6, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Delegation of Authority to Disclose and Request Information—Received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3490—September 6, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Contract Markets and Registered Futures Association—Received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3491—September 6, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Recordkeeping Amendments to the Daily Computation of the Amount of Customer Funds Required To Be Segregated (RIN: 3038-AB52) Received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3518—September 10, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Commuted Traveltime Periods: Overtime Services Relating to Imports and Exports Docket No. 00–017–1 Received September 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3519—September 10, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Designation of Quarantined Area Docket No. 01–080–1 Received September 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3522—September 10, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Buprofezin; Pesticide Tolerances
3525—September 10, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions OPP–301153; FRL–6793–3 Received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
3527—September 10, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2-Propenoic Acid, Sodium Salt, Polymer with 2-Propenamide; Tolerance Exemption OPP–301158; FRL–6794–8 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
3621—September 14, 2001; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 2000, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2155.
3675—September 17, 2001; Letter from the Secretaries, Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled, “Initial Report to Congress Required by the Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000”.
3679—September 19, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Performance of Notice Registration Processing Functions by National Futures Association With Respect to Certain Securities Brokers and Dealers—Received August 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
3681—September 19, 2001; Letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Notice Registration as a Futures Commission Merchant or Introducing Broker for Certain Securities Brokers or Dealers—Received August 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3682—September 19, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and Umatilla County, OR; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–924–1 IFR Received August 16, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3713—September 20, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Payments for Commercial Citrus Tree Replacement Docket No. 00–037–3 Received August 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3770—September 24, 2001; Letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Labeling of Natural or Regenerated Collagen Sausage Casings Docket No. 94–030F (RIN: 0583-AC80) Received August 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3968—October 2, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Oklahoma Docket No. 01–016–2 Received September 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4056—October 3, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—RUS Standard for Service Installations at Customer Access Locations—Received September 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4057—October 3, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Telecommunications System Construction Contract and Specifications (RIN: 0572-AB41) Received September 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4096—October 4, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bispyribac-Sodium; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301175; FRL–6803–2 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4097—October 4, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301172; FRL–6803–2 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4098—October 4, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Mefenoxam; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301170; FRL–6801–4 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4100—October 4, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Zeta-cypermethrin and its Inactive R-isomers; Pesticide Tolerances OPP–301171; FRL–6801–1 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received September 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4102—October 4, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sulfosate; Pesticide Tolerances OPP–


4108—October 4, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions OPP–301169; FRL–6801–5 (RIN: 2070–

4228—October 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit Docket No. FV01–905–1 IFR Received October 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4229—October 12, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Suspension of Continuing Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–948–2 IFR Received October 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4230—October 12, 2001; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle, Bison, and Captive Cervids; State and Zone Designations Docket No. 99–092–2 Received October 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4263—October 16, 2001; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of Area No. 3 Handling Regulation Docket No. FV01–948–1 FR Received October 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4385—October 25, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fenthion, Methidathion, Naled, Phorate, and Profenofos; Tolerance Revocations OPP–300985A;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2001</td>
<td>4396—November 1, 2001; Letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s annual reports in the March 2000, March 2001, and June 2001 Treasury Bulletin, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2001</td>
<td>4723—December 5, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Amino–6–1(1,1-dimethyl)–3–(methylthio)–1, 2, 4–triazin–5 (4H)–one Metribuzin, Dichlobenil, Diphenylamine, Sulprofos, Pendimethalin, and Terbacil; Tolerance Actions OPP–300734A; FRL–6804–4 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4857—December 17, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; Multiple Chemicals OPP–301194; FRL–6814–2 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4929—December 19, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sodium thiosulfate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–301196; FRL–6811–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4931—December 19, 2001; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fluthiacet-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301184; FRL–6806–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5040—January 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Ethalfluralin; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301208; FRL–6818–6 (RIN 2070-AB78) Received January 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5041—January 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-


5044—January 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pesticide Chemicals Not Requiring a Tolerance or an Exemption from a Tolerance; Rhodamine B; Revocation of Unlimited Tolerance; Rhodamine B; Revocation of Unlimited Tolerance Exemption OPP–301026A; FRL–6813–6 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received December 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5048—January 23, 2002; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Loan Policies and Operations; Definitions; Loan Purchases and Sales (RIN: 3052-AB93) Received January 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5280—January 29, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the FY 2000 activities report on environmental assessment, restoration, and cleanup activities required by Section 120(e)(5) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.


5433—February 8, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

5434—February 8, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301206; FRL–6818–3 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received January 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5457—February 12, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—1,2-Ethanediamine, Polymer with Methyl Oxirane and Oxirane; Tolerance Exemption OPP–301214; FRL–6821–9 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received February 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5458—February 12, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tetraethoxysilane Polymer with Hexamethyldisiloxane; Tolerance Exemption OPP–301216; FRL–6822–4 (RIN 2070-AB78) Received February 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5549—February 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sulfuryl Floride; Temporary Pesticide Tolerances OPP–301166A; FRL–6823–4 (RIN 2070-AC18) Received February 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5550—February 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301215; FRL–6820–9 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received February 05, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5646—February 26, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s report entitled, “Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act Pilot Project FY 2000”.

5647—February 27, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Slovakia and Slovenia Because of BSE Docket No. 01–122–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5648—February 27, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Japan With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth

5649—February 27, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Greece Because of BSE Docket No. 01–065–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5650—February 27, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Czech Republic Because of BSE Docket No. 01–062–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5665—February 28, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Regulated Areas Docket No. 01–058–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5666—February 28, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Regulated Areas Docket No. 00–088–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5667—February 28, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Regulated Areas Docket No. 01–063–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5670—February 28, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–093–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5671—February 28, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Designation of Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–102–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5672—February 28, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Diflubenzuron; Pesticide Tolerance

5748—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Florida Docket No. 01–020–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5752—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—States Approved To Receive Stallions and Mares From CEM-Affected Regions; Rhode Island Docket No. 01–055–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5753—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Prohibition of Beef From Argentina Docket No. 01–032–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5756—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Horses From Iceland; Quarantine Requirements Docket No. 00–010–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–081–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Citrus Canker; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 00–036–3 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–092–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Phytophthora Ramorum; Quarantine and Regulations Docket No. 01–054–1 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Animals Destroyed Because of Tuberculosis; Payment of Indemnity Docket No. 00–106–1 (RIN: 0579-AB29) Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Export Certification; Canadian Solid Wood Packing Materials Exported From the United States to China Docket No. 99–100–4 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Chronic Wasting Disease in Cervids; Payment of Indemnity Docket No. 00–108–1 (RIN: 0579-AB35) Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of Germany, Italy, and Spain Because of BSE Docket No. 01–008–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Depart-
ment of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Republic of San Marino and the Independent Principalities of Andorra and Monaco Docket No. 01–008–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5767—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—District of Columbia; Movement of Plants and Plant Products Docket No. 00–085–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5768—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of The Netherlands and Northern Ireland With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 01–031–3 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5769—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of France and Ireland With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 01–031–2 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5770—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—States Approved To Received Stallions and Mares From CEM-Affected Regions; Rhode Island Docket No. 01–055–01 Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5771—March 6, 2002; Letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Termination of the Designation of Argentina as a Participant Under the Visa Waiver Program INS No. 2188–02; AG ORDER No. 2561–2002 (RIN: 1115-AB93) Received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5812—March 11, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Treasury Rate Direct Loan Program (RIN: 0572-AB71) Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5889—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olivas Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–932–1 IFR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5890—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—
West Indian Fruit Fly Docket No. 00–110–4 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5891—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and Umatilla County, OR; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–924–1 FIR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5892—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Elimination of Requirements for Partial Quality Control Programs; Certification of Scales Docket No. 97–001TF (RIN: 0583-AC35) Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5893—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–984–1 FIR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5894—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–966–2 IFR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5895—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–905–3 IFR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5896—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–079–2 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5897—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–092–2 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5898—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Greece Because of BSE Docket No. 01–065–2 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5899—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions Docket No. 00–075–2 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
5900—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Steam Treatment of Golden Nematode-Infested Farm Equipment, Construction Equipment, and Containers Docket No. 01–050–1 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5901—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Black Stem Rust; Identification Requirements and Addition of Rust Resistant Varieties Docket No. 97–053–3 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5902—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of Japan Because of BSE Docket No. 01–094–2 Received March 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5903—March 14, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—2, 4-D; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301219; FRL–6827–1 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5914—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al.; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–929–3 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5915—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–993–3 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5916—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–916–2 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5917—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–948–3 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5918—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–987–1 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5919—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–931–1 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5920—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Modifica-

5921—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan; Subpart D—Referendum Procedures FV–01–701 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5922—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwi Fruit Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack Requirements Docket No. FV02–920–1 IFR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5923—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve percentages for 2000–01 Crop Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless and Zante Currant Raisins Docket No. FV01–989–3 FIR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5924—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Producer Referenda on Mandatory Grading Docket No. TB–02–03 Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5925—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Growers’ Referendum Results Docket No. TB–00–23 Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5926—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Referendum Procedures FV–01–706–FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5927—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Limes Grown in Florida and Imported Limes; Suspension of Regulations Docket No. FV01–911–2 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5928—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Winter Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; the Establishment of a Supplemental Rate of Assessment for the Beurre d’Anjou Variety of Pears and of a Definition for Organically Produced Pears Docket No. FV01–927–1 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5929—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Reporting Requirements for Imported Hazelnuts Docket No. FV01–982–3 FR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5930—March 18, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Extensions of Payments of Principal and In-
terest (RIN: 0572-AB60) Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5943—March 19, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Distance Learning and Telemedicine Loan and Grant Program (RIN: 0572-AB70) Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5944—March 19, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Extension of Redemption Date for Unsold 2001 Diversion Certificates Docket No. FV02–989–3 IPR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5945—March 19, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Suspension of Continuing Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–948–2 FIR Received March 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6018—March 20, 2002; Letter from the Secretary (DOT) and Chairmans, Federal Reserve System, Department of Treasury, Commodity Futures Trading Comm., Securities and Exchange Comm., transmitting a report entitled, “Joint Report on Retail Swaps” as required by Section 105(c) of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000.

6019—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulations Governing the California Prune Plum (Tree Removal) Diversion Program Docket No. FV01–81–01 FR (RIN: 0581 -AC03) Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6020—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–925–1 FR Received March 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6021—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–959–1 FR Received March 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6022—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–979–1 FR Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
6023—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Reporting Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV01–916–3 FIR Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6024—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack Requirements Docket No. FV02–920–1 FIR Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6025—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Interim Final and Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2001–2002 Marketing Year Docket No. FV02–982–1 IFR Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6026—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Reduction in Production Cap for 2002 Diversion Program Docket No. FV02–989–2 IFR Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6027—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment Docket No. LS–01–05 Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6029—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Interim and Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2000–2001 Marketing Year Docket No. FV01–982–1 FIR Received March 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6030—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Rules of Practice AMS–02–001 Received March 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6031—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–966–2 FIR Received March 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6032—April 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Streamlining of the Emergency Farm Loan Pro-

6121—April 10, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Increase in Fees for Voluntary Federal Seed Testing and Certification Services and Establishment of a Fee for Preliminary Test Reports Docket Number LS–01–07 Received March 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6163—April 15, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Acetamiprid; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301225; FRL–6829–3 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received March 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6214—April 17, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Austria Because of BSE Docket No. 02–004–1 Received March 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6215—April 17, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Finland Because of BSE Docket No. 01–131–1 Received March 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6216—April 17, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Horses, Ruminants, Swine, and Dogs; Inspection and Treatment for Screwworm Docket No. 00–028–2 Received March 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6217—April 17, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Removal of Quarantined Area Docket No. 02–018–1 Received March 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6218—April 17, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Committed Traveltime Periods: Overtime Services Relating to Imports and Exports Docket No. 01–125–1 Received March 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6243—April 18, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the

6244—April 18, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Furilazole; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301223; FRL–6828–4 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6245—April 18, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Propiconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions OPP–301221; FRL–6828–3 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6275—April 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Order Amending Marketing Agreement and Order No. 923 Docket Nos. 99AMS-FV–923-A1; FV00–923–1 Received April 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6278—April 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV01–894–1 FIR Received April 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6279—April 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 2001–02 Crop Natural (sun-dried) Seedless and Other Seedless Raisins Docket No. FV02–989–4 IFR Received April 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6280—April 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Extension of Redemption Date for Unsold 2001 Diversion Certificates Docket No. FV02–989–3 FIR Received April 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6330—April 23, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-
partment’s final rule—Guaranteed Rural Rental Housing Program (RIN: 0575-AC26) Received April 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6331—April 23, 2002; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s rule—Organization; Loan Policies and Operations; Termination of Farm Credit Status (RIN: 3052-AB86) Received April 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6361—April 24, 2002; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s rule—Organization; Loan Policies and Operations; Termination of Farm Credit Status (RIN: 3052-AB86) Received April 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6362—April 24, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV02–916–1 IFR Received April 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6363—April 24, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV02–916–1 IFR Received April 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6364—April 24, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order—Increase in Importer Assessments No. LS–01–02 Received April 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6365—April 24, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Increase in Fees and Charges for Egg, Poultry, and Rabbit Grading Docket No. PY–01–005 Received April 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6366—April 24, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Infectious Salmon Anemia; Payment of Indemnity Docket No. 01–126–1 Received April 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6367—April 30, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Infectious Salmon Anemia; Payment of Indemnity Docket No. 01–126–1 Received April 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6368—April 30, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Farm Loan Programs Account Servicing Policies—Reduction of Amortized Shared Appreciation Recapture Amortization Rate (RIN: 0560-AG43) Received April 18, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6369—April 30, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Lamb Promotion, Research, and Information Order No. LS–01–12 (RIN: 0581-AC06) Received April 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6486—April 30, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–
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6490—April 30, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fenhexamid; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–301228; FRL–6829–9 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6525—May 1, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Viruses, Serums, and Toxins and Analogous Products; Autogenous Biologics Docket No. 95–066–2 Received April 10, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6526—May 1, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Czech Republic Because of BSE Docket No. 01–062–2 Received April 10, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6571—May 2, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Steam Treatment of Golden Nematode-Infested Farm Equipment, Construction Equipment, and Containers Docket No. 01–050–2 Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6572—May 2, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker Quarantined Areas; Technical Amendment Docket No. 01–079–3 Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6573—May 2, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas Docket No. 01–049–2 Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6574—May 2, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Texas (Splenic) Fever in Cattle; Incorporation by Reference Docket No. 01–110–1 Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6575—May 2, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Upper Midwest Marketing Area; Interim Order Amending the Order Docket No. AO–361-A35; DA–01–03 Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6704—May 9, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, “To prescribe, adjust, and collect fees to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary to produce national and international reagents and references and make them available to the industry on a fee basis”.

6705—May 9, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Lysophosphatidylethanolamine (LPE); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–301212; FRL–6821–4 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received April 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6779—May 14, 2002; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Electronic Commerce; Disclosure to Shareholders (RIN: 3052-AC02) Received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6829—May 15, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Limited Ports of Entry for Pet Birds, Performing or Theatrical Birds, and Poultry and Poultry Products Docket No. 01–121–2 Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6901—May 20, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Revision to Container and Pack Requirements Docket No. FV02–925–2 IFR Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6903—May 20, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–932–1 FIR Received April 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6904—May 20, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2002–2003 Marketing Year Docket No. FV–02–985–1 FR Received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6981—May 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2002 Tariff-Rate Quota Year—Received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6982—May 22, 2002; Letter from the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—National Forest System Land and Resource Management

6983—May 22, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Portugal Because of African Swine Fever Docket No. 01–026–2 Received May 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6984—May 22, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Restrictions on the Use of Grain Originating in a Regulated Area Docket No. 01–118–1 Received May 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6985—May 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2002 Tariff-Rate Quota Year—Received May 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6988—June 2, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report required by the Grain Standards and Warehouse Improvement Act of 2000, Public Law 106–472.


6991—June 4, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report required by the Grain Standards and Warehouse Improvement Act of 2000, Public Law 106–472.


6993—June 6, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco...

7339—June 12, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Silica, Amorphous, Fumed (Crystalline Free); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–2002–0031; FRL–6835–5 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7340—June 12, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pesticides; Removal of Duplicative or Expired Time-limited Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions OPP–2002–0037; FRL–6835–7 (RIN: 2070-AB78) Received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7366—June 13, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Reduction in Production Cap for 2002 Diversion Program Docket No. FV02–989–2 FIR Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7367—June 13, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker; Quarantined Areas Docket No. 02–029–1 Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7368—June 13, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Used Farm Equipment From Regions Affected with Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 01–037–1 Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7369—June 13, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Addition to Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–081–2 Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7370—June 13, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Areas Docket No. 01–080–2 Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7371—June 13, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Slovakia and Slovenia Because of BSE Docket No. 01–122–2 Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7394—June 17, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–915–2 FR Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7395—June 17, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Undersized Regulation for the 2002–03 Crop Year Docket No. FV02–993–1 FR Received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
7396—June 17, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pink Bollworm Regulated Areas; Removal of Oklahoma Docket No. 02–031–1 Received May 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7494—June 19, 2002; Letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund annual report and the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund annual report, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a).

7495—June 20, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Post-Loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guaranteed and Insured Loans (RIN: 0572-AB48) Received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7496—June 20, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fludioxonil; Re-establishment of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions OPP–2002–0061; FRL–7176–8 Received May 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7609—June 25, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the


7731—July 8, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s draft bill entitled, “To amend sections 3, 7D, 16(i)(2), and 19 of the United States Grain Standards Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to recover through user fees the costs of standardization activities”.


7765—July 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Lamb Promotion, Research, and Information Program: Rules and Regulations No. LS–02–05 Received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7827—July 11, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increase in the Minimum Size Requirement for Area No. 2 Docket No. FV02–948–1 FR Received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7828—July 11, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–916–2 IFR Received June 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7829—July 11, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Pro-
duced From Grapes Grown in California; Addition of a New Varietal Type and Quality Requirements for Other Seedless-Sulfured Raisins Docket No. FV02–989–1 IFR Received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7830—July 11, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Cotton Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Revision of User Fees for 2002 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers Docket No. CN–02–001 (RIN: 0581-AC04) Received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7902—July 15, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Modifying Procedures and Establishing Regulations To Limit the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit Docket Nos. FV01–905–1 FIR; FV01–905–2 FIR Received June 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7903—July 15, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Farm Loan Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Streamlining of the Emergency Farm Loan Program Loan Regulations; Correction (RIN: 0560-AF72) Received June 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7904—July 15, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Additional Opportunity for Participation in 2002 Raisin Diversion Program Docket No. FV02–989–5 IFR Received June 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7905—July 15, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Revision of Reporting and Assessment Requirements Docket No. FV02–955–1 IFR Received June 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7978—July 16, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; Texas Docket No. 02–021–1 Received June 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8077—July 18, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Clarified Hydrophobic Extract of Neem Oil; Pesticide Tolerance; Technical Correction OPP–2002–0073; FRL–6835–1 Received June 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8079—July 18, 2002; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting notification of the 2002 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency’s current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix.

8105—July 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Interim Final and Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2001–2002 Marketing Year Docket No. FV02–982–1 FIR Received July 9, 2002.

8106—July 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Proceedings Under Research, Promotion, and Education Programs FV–02–709 Received July 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8230—July 25, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Aspergillus flavus AF36; Amendment, Temp-


8276—July 26, 2002; Letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft bill entitled, “To amend section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and for other purposes”.

8277—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area Docket No. 01–093–2 Received July 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8278—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Austria Because of BSE Docket No. 02–004–2 Received July 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8279—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Lamb Meat Adjustment Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AG17) Received July 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8280—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Executive Vice President, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dairy Recourse Loan Program for Commercial Dairy Processors (RIN: 0560-AF41) Received July 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
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8281—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Executive Vice President, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Livestock Indemnity Program (RIN: 0560-AG33) Received July 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8282—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Greece With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease Docket No. 01–059–2 Received July 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8283—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Poland Because of BSE Docket No. 02–068–1 Received July 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8284—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Finland Because of BSE Docket No. 01–131–2 Received July 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8375—July 26, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a legislative proposal to implement three important international environmental agreements that represent critical steps forward to protecting environmental and human health in the United States and around the globe.


8386—September 4, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-


8390—September 4, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2-Propenoic acid, 2-methyl-, polymer with ethyl 2-propenoate and methyl 2-methyl–2-propenoate, ammonium salt; Tolerance Exemption OPP–2002–0148; FRL–7188–3 Received August 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8395—September 4, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Thiophanate-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0140; FRL–7192–1 Received August 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8890—September 5, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin; Order Amending Marketing Agreement and Order No. 930 Docket Nos. AO–370–A7; FV00–930–1 Received September 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8891—September 5, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Undersized Regulation for the 2002–03 Crop Year Docket No. FV02–993–1 FR Received September 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8892—September 5, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Artificially Dwarfed Plants Docket No. 00–042–2 Received August 28, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
8893—September 5, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the Agency’s draft bill entitled, “Packers and Stockyards Licensing Fee Act of 2002”.

8916—September 9, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s report entitled, “Assessment of the Cattle and Hog Industries” for Calendar Year 2001, pursuant to Public Law 106–472, Section 312(e).

8917—September 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Decrease in Desirable Carryout Used to Compute Trade Demand Docket No. FV02–989–6 IFR Received August 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8918—September 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Papayas Grown in Hawaii; Suspension of Regulations Docket No. FV02–928–3 FR Received August 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8920—September 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Midwest Marketing Area; Interim Order Amending the Order Docket No. AO–361–A35; DA–01–04 Received August 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8921—September 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Removing Dancy and Robinson Tangerine Varieties from the Rules and Regulations Docket No. FV02–905–3 IFR Received August 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8922—September 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruits Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack and Container Requirements Docket No. FV02–920–3 IFR Received August 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8992—September 10, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Revision to Container and Pack Requirements Docket No. FV02–925–2 FIR Received August 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8993—September 10, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; In-

8994—September 10, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–993–4 IFR Received August 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9081—September 11, 2002; Letter from the Secretaries, Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, transmitting the Departments’ four legislative proposals to implement the President’s Healthy Forests Initiative.

9082—September 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin; Order Amending Marketing Agreement and Order No. 930 Docket Nos. AO–370-A7; FV00–930–1 Received September 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9083—September 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–987–1 FR Received August 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9084—September 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Celery Grown in Florida; Termination of Marketing Order No. 967 Docket No. FV98–967–1 FR Received August 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9085—September 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches Docket No. FV02–916–1 FIR Received August 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9086—September 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Order FV–01–705–PR (RIN: 0581–AB92) Received September 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9087—September 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Change in the Minimum Maturity Requirements for Fresh Grapefruit Docket No. FV02–905–2 IFR Received September 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9111—September 13, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Iodosulfuron-Methyl-Sodium; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0141 FRL–7187–2 Received September 6, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9175—September 17, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Thiophanate-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions OPP–2002–0226; FRL–7196–5 Received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9176—September 17, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Objections to Tolerances Established for Certain Pesticide Chemicals; Additional Extension of Comment Period OPP—2002–0057; FRL–7275–3 Received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9206—September 18, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Lactic acid, ethyl ester and Lactic acid, n-butyl ester; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–2002–0217; FRL–7196–6 Received September 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9262—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—AQI User Fees: Extension of Current Fees Beyond Fiscal Year 2002 Docket No. 02–085–1 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9263—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Azoxystrobins; Pesticide Tolerances OPP–2002–0238; FRL–7198–9 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9264—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Diflubenzuron; Pesticide Tolerances OPP–2002–0224; FRL–7200–4 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9267—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Halosulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0243; FRL–7200–8 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9268—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Indoxacarb; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemption OPP–2002–0256; FRL–7274–9 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9269—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0219; FRL–7198–5 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9270—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Tolylfluanimid; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0216; FRL–7200–5 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9271—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Triclopyr; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0190; FRL–7196–7 Received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9322—September 23, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s report entitled, “Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act Pilot Project Status Report to Congress FY 2001”.

9323—September 24, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mergers and Consolidations of Electric Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AB63) Received September 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9345—September 24, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s draft bill entitled, “Omnibus Marketing Enforcement Act of 2002”.

9368—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Fenamidone; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0229; FRL–7196–8 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9369—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Glyphosate; Pesticide Tolerances OPP–2002–0232; FRL–7200–2 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9370—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Lambda-cyhalothrin; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0204; FRL–7200–1 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9371—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Cycluthrin; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0193; FRL–7199–8 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9372—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances OPP–2002–0221; FRL–7199–2 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9373—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Clopyralid; Pesticide Tolerance OPP—
9375—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosad; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0195; FRL–7199–5 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9376—September 26, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyraclostrobin; Pesticide Tolerance OPP–2002–0225; FRL–7200–7 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9437—October 1, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Minimum Quality and Handling Standards for Domestic and Imported Peanuts Marketed in the United States and Termination of the Peanut Marketing Agreement and Associated Rules and Regulations Docket No. FV02–996–1 IFR Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9438—October 1, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit Docket No. FV02–905–5 IFR Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9439—October 1, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Revision of Reporting and Assessment Requirements Docket No. FV02–955–1 FIR Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9440—October 1, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–916–2 FIR Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9441—October 1, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sucrose Octanoate Esters; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–2002–0016; FRL–7199–1 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9442—October 1, 2002; Letter from the Principal Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pseudozyma flocculosa strain PF-A22 UL; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP–2002–0233; FRL–7198–8 Received September 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9469—October 2, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Order: Rules and Regulations—Decrease in Assessment Rate and Decrease of Im-

9470—October 2, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Regulatory Contact, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—United States Standards for Milled Rice—Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9573—October 9, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops Program (RIN: 0551-AA63) Received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9633—October 11, 2002; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 2001, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2155.

9639—October 15, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—United States Standards for Milled Rice—Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9645—October 16, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—United States Standards for Milled Rice—Received September 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9650—October 16, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—2002 Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 Sugar Programs and Farm Facility Storage Loan Program (RIN: 0560-AG73) Received October 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9753—October 28, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Codification of Poultry Substitution and Modification of Commodity Inventory Controls for Recipient Agencies (RIN: 0584-AD08) Received October 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9754—October 28, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Cold Treatment of Fruits Docket No. 02–071–1 Received October 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9775—October 31, 2002; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Clopyralid; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction OPP—2002–0235; FRL—7276–9 Received October 18, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9845—November 7, 2002; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review and Foreign Investment Disclosure Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program (RIN: 0560-AG71) Received November 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9882—November 8, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Tobacco Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Flue-Cured Tobacco Advisory Committee; Amendment of regulations Docket No. TB–02–14 (RIN: 0581-AC11) Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9896—November 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendment to the Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations No. LS–99–20 Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9897—November 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Exemption for Shipments of Tree Run Citrus Docket No. FV02–905–4 IFR Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9898—November 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–906–1 IFR Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9899—November 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–920–4 FR Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9900—November 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon, and Irish Potatoes Imported Into the United States; Modification of Handling and Import Regulations Docket No. FV00–945–2 FR Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9901—November 12, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon, and Irish Potatoes Imported Into the United States; Modification of Handling and Import Regulations Docket No. FV00–945–2 FR Received November 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9926—November 13, 2002; Letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Diflubenzuron; Pesticide Tolerances Correction OPP—2002–0224; FRL—7277–9 Received October 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
9927—November 13, 2002; Letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerance OPP—2002–02 98; FRL—7279–6 Received October 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9928—November 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Canadian Border Ports; Blaine and Lynden, WA Docket No. 02–064–1 Received November 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9929—November 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area Docket No. 01–093–3 Received November 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9930—November 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas Docket No. 02–053–2 Received November 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9931—November 14, 2002; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Low Pathogenic Avian Influenza; Payment of Indemnity Docket No. 02–048–1 (RIN: 0579-AB46) Received November 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10032—November 19, 2002; Letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus Cereus Strain BPO1; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance OPP—2002–0291; FRL—7277–3 Received November 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10033—November 19, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Reduction of Membership on the Area No. 3 Colorado Potato Administrative Committee Docket No. FV02–948–2 FR Received November 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10034—November 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Tobacco Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Mandatory Grading

10165—November 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Limiting the Volume of Small Red Seedless Grapefruit Docket No. FV02–905–5 FIR Received November 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10166—November 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–984–1 IFR Received November 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10167—November 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Decreased Assessment Rate Docket No. FV02–993–4 FIR Received November 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

10168—November 22, 2002; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack and Container Requirements Received November 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

B. PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

72 February 13, 2002; Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the administration’s 2002 National Drug Control Strategy, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 1705.

89 June 13, 2002; Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 714(k).

C. PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS AND OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST


Intent to nominate Lou Gallegos to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. March 14, 2001.


Intent to nominate Bill Hawks to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulatory Programs. April 3, 2001.


Remarks to the Cattle Industry Annual Convention and Trade Show, Denver, CO. February 8, 2002.


Intent to nominate Phyllis K. Kong to be Inspector General, Department of Agriculture. March 14, 2002.
Remarks at the World Pork Expo in Des Moines, IA. June 7, 2002.
Remarks on the Healthy Forests Initiative in Ruch, OR. August 22, 2002.
Radio address regarding wildfire season. August 24, 2002.

D. STATUTORY REPORTS


USDA: Letter regarding the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program. Submitted by the USDA, March 1, 2001


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule, required by the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, that amends regulations to allow Farm Credit System service corporations to sell stock to non-Sys-tem entities, provide adequate disclosures to investors in service

GAO: Month in Review: April, 2001, Reports Testimony, Correspondence, and Other Publications, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April, 2001.


Letter from the Acting Chairman of the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission to the Chairman of Financial Services regarding the Commission’s position on H.R. 1408, as amended by the Manager’s Amendment on May 6, 2001.


USDA: Letter from Secretary Veneman to Speaker Hastert requesting consideration of a draft bill to amend sections 3, 7D, 16(i)(2) and 19 of the United States Grain Standards Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to recover through user fees the costs of standardization activities. Submitted by USDA, May 30, 2001.


Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: Notification of delayed preliminary report concerning coordinated interagency activities to assess, prevent, and control foot-and-mouth disease and bovine spongiform encephalopathy in the U.S., required by the Ani-


Office of the Inspector General: Audit Reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, including, Farm Service Agency Payment Limitations; Forest Service, Audit of Fiscal Year 2000; Security Over Information Technology Resources at the National Agricultural Statistics Service; Farm Service Agency, Risk Management Agency, Resolution of Production Differences for Crop Insurance and Disaster Assistance and/or Loan Deficiency Payments; and Privacy Considerations with USDA Agency Internet Sites, pursuant to agreed upon oversight procedures. Submitted by USDA, July 13, 2001.


Farm Credit Administration: Proposed amendments to the Code of Federal Regulations, title 12, chapter VI, as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, July 18, 2001.


Letter from Chairman Oxley to Securities and Exchange Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and Internal


GAO: Farm Credit Administration, Analysis of Administrative Expenses and Funding Through Assessments, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, August, 2001.


GAO: Month in Review, August, 2001, Reports, Testimony, Correspondence, and Other Publications, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, August, 2001.


Office of the Inspector General: Audit Reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, including, Rural Housing Service, Guaranteed Multi-Family Loans, June, 2001; Commodity Credit Corporation’s Financial Statements for fiscal year 2000, June, 2001; Forest Service, Challenge Cost Share Program June 3, 2001; Review of Forest


Farm Credit Administration: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI, of the Code of Federal Regulations, as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, August 15, 2001.

USTR: Letter from Ambassador Bob Zoellick to Chairman Combest acknowledging the chairman’s intent to lead a delegation of Agriculture Committee members to the WTO Ministerial in Doha, Qatar in November 2001. Submitted by USTR, August 16, 2001.


Department of Commerce: Letter from Secretary Donald Evans to Chairman Combest regarding the President’s trade agenda. Submitted by Department of Commerce, August 21, 2001.


GAO: Summary of Reinsurance Activities and Rating Actions Tied to Selected Insurers Involved in the Failed “Unicover” Venture, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, August 24, 2001.

Agricultural Marketing Service: Notice of request under the Freedom of Information Act for a list of peach growers and nectarine growers in the State of California covered by Federal mar-


Farm Credit Administration: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI, of the Code of Federal Regulations. Submitted by Farm Credit Administration, September 18, 2001.


USDA: Letter from Secretary Veneman to Chairman Combest indicating the need for additional funding to fully implement Public Law 107–25 and provide assistance to all eligible producers. Submitted by USDA, September 24, 2001.


USDA: Letter from Bill Hawks, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, USDA, regarding study to be submitted to Congress on milk prices paid to producers in the U.S., as mandated by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000. Submitted by USDA, December 3, 2001.


Farm Credit Administration: Financial Condition of the Farm Credit Administration, required by the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, December 20, 2001.


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, as required by 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1). Submitted by Farm Credit Administration, January 7, 2002.


GAO: Food Stamp Program, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, January 16, 2002.


GAO: Foreign Assistance, pursuant to request. Submitted by USDA, January 22, 2002.


GAO: Mad Cow Disease, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, January 25, 2002.


GAO: Farm Credit Administration: Safety and Soundness Oversight of the Farm Credit System, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, February 28, 2002.
GAO: Farm Credit Administration, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, March 8, 2002.


USDA: China’s Food and Agriculture. Submitted by USDA, April, 2002.


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, as required by 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1). Rule amends title 12, chapter VI, of the Code of Federal Regulations. Submitted by FCA, April 1, 2002.


USDA: Report to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the activities of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Food Safety and Inspection Service, and agen-
cies under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics regarding reported cases of inhumane animal treatment, the response of USDA regulatory agencies, and the research, development, and promotion of technologies to help reduce the incidence of such treatment. Pursuant to S. Rept. 107–33, accompanying the Fiscal Year 2001 Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 107–20). Submitted by USDA, April 4, 2002.


Farm Credit Administration: Semiannual Report to Congress on Farmer Mac, pursuant to request. Submitted by FCA, April 18, 2002.


GAO: Analysis of a major rule issued by the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, entitled, “Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program,” pursuant to section 801(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code. Submitted by GAO, May 6, 2002.


GAO: Month in Review: June 2002, Reports, Testimony, Correspondence, and Other Publications, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, June, 2002.


Charter: Establishing the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Department of Agriculture Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition (CARAT), required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Submitted by EPA, June 18, 2002.


GAO: Letter from Emi N. Brook, Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, acknowledging request to provide information pertaining to the participation of minority-serving institutions in competitive research grants programs at the Department of Agriculture. Submitted by GAO, June 27, 2002.


USDA: Letter from Mary Waters, Assistant Secretary, Congressional Relations, regarding the Commission on the Application of Payment Limitations. Submitted by USDA, July, 2002.


USDA: Acknowledgement of letter from Chairman Combest to Secretary Veneman regarding the effects of low pathogenic avian influenza (AI) on the poultry industry. Submitted by USDA, July 10, 2002.


Department of the Treasury: Report of Licensing Activities, pursuant to the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act

GAO: Month in Review: August, 2002, Reports, Testimony, Correspondence, and Other Publications, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, August, 2002.


GAO: Month in Review: September, 2002, Reports, Testimony, Correspondence and Other Publications, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, September, 2002.


GAO: Report on a major rule promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, entitled “Peanut


Farm Credit Administration: Final ruled adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, November 8, 2002.


GAO: Report on major rule promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, entitled “2002 Farm Bill Regulations—Cooperative Marketing Associations; Cotton; Dairy; Honey,” pursuant to section 801(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code. Submitted by GAO, December 4, 2002.

E. MEMORIALS

2—February 7, 2001; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 101 memorializing the U.S. Congress to provide diversion funds that have been earmarked by Congress for potato producers to help ease the economic crisis they face in 2001.

30—May 1, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 103 memorializing the U.S. Congress to request the President to impose a moratorium on the roadless regulations pending careful review and study.

31—May 1, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 107 memorializing the U.S. Congress to support a moratorium on all imports of live cattle, precooked beef, all beef products, and potentially contaminated feed ingredients for a period of 3 years or until importers can prove that the meat, live animals and feed ingredients are free of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy for the protection of the U.S. cattle industry.

32—May 1, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 108 memorializing the U.S. Congress to enact legislation that mandates country of origin labeling for meat, and to require that products labeled “U.S. Produced” be born, raised and processed completely in the United States.

33—May 1, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 109 memorializing the U.S. Congress to support safeguards to prevent movement of Foot and Mouth Disease on persons, on other animals not directly susceptible to the virus but which could be passive carriers, and on inanimate objects; and we support a moratorium on all imports of cloven-hoofed animals and products thereof, for a period of 3 years or until importers can prove that cloven-hoofed animals and prod-
ucts thereof are free of Foot and Mouth Disease for the protection of the American livestock owners.

38—May 1, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 105 memorializing the U.S. Congress to enact legislation enacting pilot projects such as those recommended in the report submitted to the Idaho Board of Land Commissioners entitled, “Breaking the GridLock: Federal Lands Pilot Projects in Idaho”.

39—May 1, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 104 memorializing the U.S. Congress in the interest of protecting the integrity and posterity of our forest and wild lands, wildlife habitat, watershed, air quality, human health and safety, and private property, the U.S. Forest Service and other Federal land management agencies must immediately implement a cohesive strategy to reduce the overabundance of forest fuels that place these resources at high risk of catastrophic wildfire.

41—May 2, 2001; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress to take all reasonable action necessary to provide adequate and timely funding to the Federal agencies responsible for the treatment and restoration work on damaged forestlands in Arkansas.

53—May 14, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 8019 memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to review the Department’s policies regarding the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program and alter those policies to allow the inclusion in the program of lands that are currently used to produce perennial horticultural crops.

54—May 14, 2001; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Resolution 126 memorializing the U.S. Congress to reintroduce and pass the New Markets for State-Inspected Meat Act as a means of assisting small meat-packing operations and to restore fairness to the meat industry in this country.

72—May 16, 2001; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Resolution No. 126 memorializing the U.S. Congress to reintroduce and pass the New Markets for State-Inspected Meat Act as a means of assisting small meat-packing operations and to restore fairness to the meat industry in this country.

77—May 23, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 87 memorializing the U.S. Congress to establish and fund a U.S. Department of Agriculture-Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center-managed cacao germplasm center in Hawaii.

109—June 14, 2001; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, relative to a Resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress to and the Department of Agriculture to grant a waiver for Agramarke Quality Grains, Inc. for development in St. Joseph, Missouri, to allow Agramarke to qualify for rural development economic incentive programs.

110—June 14, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 64 memo-
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rializing the U.S. Congress to increase Federal aid to Louisiana farmers.

114—June 19, 2001; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 134 memorializing the U.S. Congress to expand and fund Federal agricultural conservation programs, including the Conservation Reserve, Wetlands Reserve, Environmental Quality Incentives, Wildlife Habitat Improvement, and Forestry Incentives Programs.

123—July 10, 2001; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 403 memorializing the U.S. Congress to pass legislation reforming the Federal Freedom to Farm law and the sugar support program to correct the current inequities.

252—May 16, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20 memorializing the U.S. Congress to support the Act to Leave No Child Behind.

253—May 20, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5014 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact revisions to the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to allow interstate shipment and marketing of meat products by state inspected meat processing facilities.

303—July 10, 2002; Memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Resolution No. 25 memorializing the U.S. Congress to increase the minimum monthly allotment for one-person and two-person households under the Federal Food Stamp Program from $10 to $25 and require that the minimum be adjusted annually in accordance with changes in the Federal cost-of-living.

335—July 18, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 16 memorializing the U.S. Congress to impose a quota on certain imported seafood such as shrimp.

339—July 18, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 127 memorializing the U.S. Congress to appropriate adequate financial impact assistance for health, education, and other social services for Hawaii's Freely Associated States citizens.

347—July 24, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 53 memorializing the Congress of the United States to turn over the management of Federal forest lands to the States through a block grant program.

348—July 24, 2002; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 91 memorializing the Congress of the United States to express full support to the efforts of the Louisiana congressional delegation for the creation of a Center of Excellence in Biological and Chemical Warfare Medicine in Louisiana.

368—October 2, 2002; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina, relative to House Resolution No. 1786 memorializing the U.S. Congress and the President to support and enact legislation to establish a tobacco quota buyout program.
443—November. 14, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 25 memorializing the Congress of the United States that the Legislature of the State of California recognizes the important role that sustainably managed forests and products from those forests will continue to play in meeting the needs of the citizens of California.

450—November. 19, 2002; Memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Resolution No. 36 memorializing the Congress of the United States that the legislature urges the U.S. Department of Agriculture to allocate additional resources to address problems associated with the resident Canada goose population in New Jersey.

451—November. 19, 2002; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 48 memorializing the Congress of the United States that the legislature hereby requests the Alaska congressional delegation, as well as the congressional delegations of the several States, to introduce and adopt legislation that would amend the laws of the United States regarding land managing agencies.

F. PETITIONS

25—June 5, 2001; Petition of the Council on Administrative Rights, relative to a resolution petitioning the U.S. Congress to seek redress from ineffective environmental and energy policies.

27—June 6, 2001; Petition of the city of Hoonah, Alaska, relative to a resolution petitioning the U.S. Congress to support the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999.

61—June 20, 2002; Petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to resolution No. 197 petitioning the U.S. Congress that the legislature of Rockland County hereby supports the Resource Conservation and Development Council’s application for the establishment of a Resource Conservation and Development area that would encompass Rockland County and several surrounding counties and the accompanying funding administered by the Natural Resource Service.