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REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON 
ACTIVITIES DURING THE 109th CONGRESS

JANUARY 2, 2007.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State 
of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

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 109th Congress.

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

A. ORGANIZATION

The House of Representatives established the total authorized membership of the Committee on Agriculture for the 109th Congress at 46, with a party division of 25 Republicans and 21 Democrats. Among the committee members were 13 Representatives who were serving their first terms (Foxx, Conaway, Fortenberry, Boustany, Schwarz, Schmidt, Sodrel, Kuhl, Cuellar, Salazar, Melancon, Costa, and Barrow of GA).

The committee organized on February 16, 2005, into five subcommittees, four of which were assigned jurisdiction over major agricultural commodities and one that dealt with various related agricultural operations. The five subcommittees were constituted as follows:
SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

(Ratio includes ex officio members. Bob Goodlatte, chairman, and Collin C. Peterson, ranking minority member, were ex officio members of all subcommittees)

COMMODITY SUBCOMMITTEES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL FARM COMMODITIES AND RISK MANAGEMENT (Ratio 16–14)

JERRY MORAN, Kansas, Chairman

TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma
WILLIAM L. JENKINS, Tennessee
TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON, Illinois
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
JO BONNER, Alabama
STEVE KING, Iowa
MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE, Colorado
RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas
CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, Jr., Louisiana
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina,
JOHN T. SALAZAR, Colorado
JOHN B. BONNER, Alabama
STEVE KING, Iowa
MARILYN N. MUSGRAVE, Colorado
MIKE M. CINTYRE, North Carolina
ED CASE, Hawaii,

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND HORTICULTURE (Ratio 13–11)

ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina, Chairman

RICHARD W. POMBO, California
TOM OSBORNE, Nebraska
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
STEVE KING, Iowa
JOHN R. “RANDY” KUHL, Jr., New York
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
MICHAEL E. SODREL, Indiana
ED CASE, Hawaii,

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIALTY CROPS AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS (Ratio 9–8)

WILLIAM L. JENKINS, Tennessee, Chairman

TERRY EVERETT, Alabama,
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
STEVE KING, Iowa
JOHN J.H. “JOE” SCHWARZ, Michigan
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina,
CHARLIE MELANCON, Louisiana
JIM COSTA, California
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas

CONSERVATION, CREDIT, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RESEARCH (Ratio 10–9)

FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma, Chairman

JERRY MORAN, Kansas
TOM OSBORNE, Nebraska,
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
JOHN J.H. “JOE” SCHWARZ, Michigan
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania,
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
ED CASE, Hawaii,
LINCOLN DAVIS, Tennessee
STEANIE HERSETH, South Dakota
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
OPERATIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE

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

GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota, Chairman
RICHARD W. POMBO, California
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
JO BONNER, Alabama
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina
JEFF FORTEMBERY, Nebraska
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio

RICHARD W. POMBO, California, Ranking Minority Member
JOE BACA, California
DENNIS A. CARDOZA, California
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
JIM COSTA, California

B. COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Under rules adopted by the House of Representatives for the 109th Congress, the Committee on Agriculture's (hereinafter also 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

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).
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 (H. Res. 988, 93d Cong., Oct 8, 1974, p. 34470). Nevertheless, the committee has retained a limited jurisdiction over measures to release CCC stocks for such foreign distribution (Sept. 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 (sec. 202(a), H. Res. 6, Jan. 4, 1995, p.464). Clerical and stylistic changes were effected when the House recodified its rules in the 106th Congress (H. Res. 5. Jan. 6, 1999, p.———).

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 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.11070). 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 (Sept. 19, 1995, p.25533).

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 Agri-
culture (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, Eighty-third Congress, the restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for United States 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 administrative 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, Eighty-third 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 program 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 16, 2005 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 16, 2005:

OVERSIGHT PLAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS

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

2002 FARM BILL AND CURRENT AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

- The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) implementation of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002;
- Current status of U.S. farm economy;
- Oversight of implementation of new peanut program, including marketing loan program, direct payments, countercyclical payments, and quota compensation payments;
- USDA’s implementation of the Fair and Equitable Tobacco Reform Act of 2004;
- Impact of 2003 and 2004 calendar year weather conditions on 2004 crop production;
- USDA’s implementation of agricultural disaster assistance contained in the fiscal 2005 Military Construction Appropriations conference report;
- Oversight of USDA’s activities regarding the implementation of the U.S. Warehouse Act;
- Reauthorization of the United States Grain Standards Act; and

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

- Administration of the Federal Crop Insurance Program, including implementation of the insurance provisions contained in the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 in light of 2003 and 2004 crop and livestock disasters and continued drought conditions into the 2005 crop year;
- Risk Management Agency implementation of Premium Reduction Plans;
- Review of private sector risk management tools available to producers;
- USDA implementation of statutory provisions designed to reduce crop insurance program waste and improve program integrity;
• Proposed policy options regarding crop insurance options for revenue and gross income protection and multi-year disasters;
• Reauthorization of the CFTC; and
• Oversight of electricity market investigations by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE

• The administration is negotiating the World Trade Organization (WTO) multilateral trade agreement affecting U.S. agriculture. Negotiations continue on the Agricultural Agreement under the Doha Development Agenda;
• Bilateral and regional FTAs are being negotiated (CAFTA-DR, Panama, Bahrain, et cetera) and the impact on U.S. agriculture will be assessed;
• Countries that are under consideration for accession to the WTO, such as Russia will be evaluated on the impact on U.S. agriculture;
• USDA’s implementation of the trade title of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 will be reviewed in preparation for the new farm bill;
• USDA and USTR’s implementation of trade agreements already adopted and related issues to ensure compliance of other countries’ trade obligations, including:
  • WTO dispute settlement provisions (cotton, biotechnology, geographical indications);
  • European Union (EU) issues such as the EU meat hormone ban;
  • use of the U.S. carousel legislation;
  • tariff rate quotas (TRQ);
  • biotechnology;
  • EU non-trade concerns, including animal welfare;
  • import and export State trading enterprises;
  • Issues relating to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA):
    • Canada’s use of high tariffs for dairy, poultry, eggs, barley, and margarine products;
    • Canadian exports of wheat, barley, and other agricultural commodities into the U.S.;
    • Mexico’s actions that can impair NAFTA trade on U.S. pork, apples, beef, and rice;
    • Mexico’s sanitary and phytosanitary barriers on grains and meat;
    • Mexico’s tax on soft drinks using high fructose corn syrup;
    • U.S. sugar;
    • International food assistance programs to ensure that program goals are being met in the most recent uses of the program reauthorized in the 2002 farm bill, including the Global Food for Education Program, Food for Progress Program, and P.L. 480; and
  • Congressional oversight of trade negotiations that affects U.S. food assistance programs.
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND PROMOTION

• Review implementation of biosecurity protocols at USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) laboratories;
• USDA’s implementation of research, education and extension programs authorized in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, and the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000;
• Administration of the Agricultural Research Service’s research stations and worksites;
• Review USDA’s continuing ability to conduct foreign animal disease research, training and diagnostic programs at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center following the transfer of the center to the Department of Homeland Security;
• 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;
• Implementation of USDA’s regulation on organic standards;
• Review coordination between ARS, Economic Research Service (ERS), Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) and action agencies in USDA such as Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and Farm Service Agency (FSA) in order to prevent duplicative research;
• Review operation of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board;
• Evaluate the current mix of research funding mechanisms to insure maximum benefits from these investments to food and fiber producers, processors and consumers; and
• administration of USDA’s agricultural marketing and promotion programs and to assess what, if any, legislation may be needed to carry out these programs.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

• Comparing conservation payments to commodity program payments and their effect of keeping producers profitable;
• Impact of regulatory activities carried out pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, or any proposed legislative changes to such Act, on agricultural producers;
• Oversight of regulatory initiatives undertaken by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concerning Endangered Species Act consultations regarding pesticide products regulated under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act;
• Impact of EPA’s regulatory activity relative to methyl bromide on production of agriculture in the U.S.;
Review of the resource needs of the EPA as they pertain to the collection of pesticide registration, re-registration and tolerance fees;
Budget and program activities of USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS);
NRCS implementation of the technical service provider assistance provisions of Farm Security and Rural Investment Act 2002;
Review of the initial implementation of the Conservation Security Program;
Review of USDA’s Conservation Reserve and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program;
Review of implementation of the EPA’s rule on animal feeding operations and its impact on the U.S. livestock industry and the practical uses of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) to ease implementation of the rule;
Review of EPA’s rule on permit trading under the Clean Water Act and its effect on and potential benefits to U.S. agriculture;
Review of potential impacts of EPA’s Clean Air Act regulatory program on U.S. agriculture;
Potential consequences for production agriculture in the U.S. 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 the ESA, on agricultural producers;
Impact of EPA’s regulatory activity relative to methyl bromide on production agriculture in the U.S;
Review EPA’s implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA);
Review the impact of litigation on producers who are complying with FIFRA, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act;
Review the EPA’s regulatory actions in regard to pesticide evaluations; and
Review of EPA’s Air Quality Compliance Agreement for Animal Feeding Operations and its impact on U.S. livestock producers.
BIOTECHNOLOGY

• Review issues related to trade barriers and possible promotion or increase of trade regarding products helpful to third world countries (pharma/nutraceuticals);
• Review current regulatory framework for products of agricultural biotechnology;
• Specifically, review current regulations and research regarding animal biotechnology; and
• Promote education, outreach and research for increased consumer acceptance of products of biotechnology.

U.S. FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

• Review Forest Service budget, focusing on proposed land acquisition and easement programs;
• Review Forest Service financial management and accounting, including progress towards clean financial statements and review of GAO’s assessment of Forest Service’s fiscal health;
• Continue oversight of Healthy Forests Restoration Act implementation, particularly title IV projects;
• Continue oversight of Forest Service fire management program, focusing on reducing costs, achieving efficiencies in aviation management, and addressing other procurement problems;
• Conduct oversight on implementation of PL 106–393, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act, in preparation for eventual reauthorization;
• Review and assess effectiveness and appropriateness of programs authorized in Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act, particularly those providing technical assistance and financial assistance to private forest landowners, in preparation for the 2006 farm bill;
• Assess effectiveness of Forest Service’s commodity programs, including forest products and grazing management;
• Review administration efforts to reform the National Forest Planning process;
• Review status and implementation of Forest Service’s Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) policy, with particular attention to the extent to which the Forest Service uses local input to guide implementation; and
• Assess Forest Service research program to ensure it focuses on enhancing the competitiveness of the domestic forestry sector, including forest products industry and non-Federal forest landowners.

DAIRY

• Review structure of domestic dairy industry and how it facilitates or impedes development of new products;
• Review opportunities to improve competitiveness in export markets for U.S.-produced dairy products; and
• Review options to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of dairy programs in light of current budgetary realities.
USDA General Administration

- 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 Administration’s (FCA) regulatory program and activities regarding the Farm Credit System (FCS) to assure the FCS’ safety and soundness;
- Review of Farmer Mac activities and programs;
- Implementation of rural development policies and authorities contained in FSRIA 2002 and the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act;
- Review the status of the Rural Telephone Bank;
- Oversight of the USDA’s Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program;
- Oversight of the implementation of the USDA’s Telecommunications Programs;
- Review of rural telecommunications issues;
- Review of agriculture technology issues.

USDA Food and Nutrition Programs

- Hearings will be held in preparation of the farm bill and related to reauthorization of the food and nutrition programs under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee, including the food stamp program, the emergency food assistance program and other commodity distribution programs;
- Review of the 2005 Dietary Guidelines for Americans and any changes to the USDA Pyramid;
- USDA food assistance programs and obesity;
- Oversight of the provisions of the food stamp program, including those related to:
  - Food stamp benefits for non-citizens;
  - Transitional food stamp benefits for persons leaving welfare programs;
  - Simplification of the food stamp program by States;
  - Employment and training programs for food stamp participants who are 18 to 50; years old, able-bodied and with no dependents;
- Monitor and hold hearings on the reauthorization of the program of block grants for States for temporary assistance for needy families (TANF), including waiver authority for the food stamp program and initiation of the State food assistance block grant demonstration project, as introduced in H.R. 240 on January 4, 2005;
- Assess States’ use of electronic benefits transfer (EBT) systems to improve the distribution of food benefits;
- Review of the reformed food stamp quality control system on reducing overpayments, payments to ineligible participants and underpayments to assess States’ administration of the food stamp program; and
- Oversight of commodity distribution programs, including the emergency food assistance program (TEFAP).
FOOD SAFETY

• USDA’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 microbial 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;
• Review implementation of new protocols for meat, poultry, eggs, or seafood safety inspection, including the implementation of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) pathogen reduction regulation; and
• 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.

PLANT AND ANIMAL HEALTH

• Review implementation of the Plant Protection Act of 2000;
• Review implementation of the Animal Health Protection Act of 2002;
• Review enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act;
• Federal efforts to reduce threats to human, animal, and plant health due to predatory and invasive species;
• USDA’s management of domestic pest and disease surveillance and eradication programs;
• Oversight of USDA’s expanded BSE surveillance program;
• Review implementation of USDA’s final rule recognizing Canada as a BSE Minimal Risk Country;
• Oversight of a national animal identification system that is being developed and implemented by USDA and to assess what, if any, legislation may be needed to carry out this program;
• Department of Homeland Security-Customs and Border Patrol (HS-CBP) administration of the Animal Health Protection Act and Plant Protection Act border inspections;
• Review of DHS-CBP expenditures of Agricultural Quarantine Inspection funds transferred from USDA-APHIS;
• Review of DHS operation of Plum Island Animal Disease Center; and
• The issue of new drug development, approval, and availability for animal agriculture as well as the implementation of the Animal Drug Availability Act.
LIVESTOCK MARKETING

• Review potential changes and implementation of mandatory livestock price reporting and to assess what, if any, legislation may be needed to carry out this program;
• USDA’s implementation of voluntary Country of Origin Labeling in preparation for mandatory Country of Origin Labeling;
• Effectiveness of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) in monitoring the potential for market manipulation in the livestock industry; and
• Structural changes in agribusiness and the potential costs and benefits for agricultural producers.

HOMELAND SECURITY AND BIOTERRORISM

• Review the implementation of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 including USDA and HHS joint regulation of select biological agents and toxins; also, protection against adulteration of food, debarment for repeated or serious food import violations, registration of food facilities and other activities;
• USDA’s ability to protect, prevent and effectively deal with an attack on agriculture and its infrastructure;
• Oversight of the transfer of the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection responsibility from the USDA to the Department of Homeland Security;
• USDA’s management of domestic pest and disease surveillance and eradication programs in light of the transfer of resources to the Department of Homeland Security; and
• USDA’s continuing ability to conduct foreign animal disease research, training and diagnostic programs at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center following the transfer of the center to the Department of Homeland Security.

MISCELLANEOUS

• Adequacy of agricultural labor and the agricultural guest worker program, H2A; and
• Review implementation of the Specialty Crop Competitiveness Act.

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES TO REDUCE DUPLICATION

• With Resources Committee on forestry issues and other public land issues;
• With Science Committee on Research;
• With Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce on nutrition programs;
• With Homeland Security on importation of animal and plant material;
• With Judiciary on immigrant agricultural labor;
• With Energy and Commerce on biomass energy programs both existing and new; and
• With any other committee as appropriate.
II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES DURING THE 109TH CONGRESS
A. MAIN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Agriculture reported or otherwise considered a variety of bills in the 109th Congress covering many of the diverse areas within its jurisdictional interest.

Some of the major activities of the committee during the 109th Congress included the following:

Farm Bill

The provisions of the 2002 farm bill begin expiring September 30, 2007. Farm bills are written every 5 years and authorize many programs, including the following areas: commodities; conservation; nutrition; trade; forestry; credit; rural development; research; and energy.

In 2006, the Committee on Agriculture held 11 full committee field hearings and two public hearings in Washington, DC to review farm policy. The field hearings were held in: Fayetteville, NC; Auburn, AL; Stockton, CA; Nebraska City, NE; Greeley, CO; San Angelo, TX; Yakima, WA; Canandaigua, NY; Staunton, VA; Marshall, MN; and Scottsburg, IN.

In addition to the full committee hearings, there were two subcommittee hearings held in Washington, DC and eight subcommittee field hearings held in: Valdosta, Georgia; Coolidge, Arizona; Wall, South Dakota; Sioux City, Iowa; Springfield, Missouri; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Miles City, Montana; and El Reno, Oklahoma.

The commodity programs authorized under the 2002 farm bill include the Direct Payment Program, the Counter-Cyclical Program and the Marketing Assistance Loan.

The Direct Payment Program authorizes a base level of support to help producers meet their cash flow and production financing needs.

The Counter-Cyclical Program provides additional support to producers when crop prices are low. When market prices are above statutorily-set levels, no payment is made.

Marketing Assistance Loans provide producers interim financing at harvest time to meet cash flow needs without having to sell their commodities when market prices are typically at harvest-time lows. This allows for orderly marketing of commodities throughout the year. In some instances, producers elect to forgo the Marketing Assistance Loan and instead receive a Loan Deficiency Payment.

Trade

Trade continues to be a primary interest and the committee continues to monitor the Doha Round of WTO Negotiations.

At the completion of the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations, member States agreed to begin a new round of talks at the end of the implementation period in 1999 to further advance trade openings. The current round of negotiations formally began with a meeting in Doha, Qatar where member nations pledged to focus on expanded trade for economic development. Subsequent ministerial meetings were held in Seattle in 2001, Cancun in 2003 and Hong Kong in 2005.

At the July 21–23, 2006 meeting of the trade and agriculture ministers from the U.S., the EU, Japan, Brazil, India and Argentina in Geneva, the talks broke down with WTO Director General Lamy announcing that the talks would be suspended.

The farm bill will proceed on its previously announced schedule as a largely domestic program reauthorization. (Note.— See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for November 2, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–19.)

Brazilian Case against the U.S. Cotton Program at the WTO

After over 2 years of litigation and appeals, the WTO panel considering the Brazilian complaint against the U.S. cotton program handed down its final ruling. While Brazil did not prevail in every area, on three important points the panel ruled against the United States.

This was the first adjudication of a commodity support program since the expiration of the “peace clause” established in the Uruguay Round agreement. Under the peace clause, any nation was deemed to be in compliance if it kept its farm support spending established by the Uruguay agreement. After the peace clause expired, any spending could be a violation if the complaining country could establish that they had suffered “serious harm” from the defending country’s agricultural subsidies, regardless of the amount or type of subsidy.

The three points found in Brazil’s favor were: 1) the cotton step 2 program was ruled to be an illegal export subsidy; 2) the GSM export loan guarantee contained elements of subsidy that were illegal; and 3) the fruit and vegetable planting restriction modified the direct payment program in such a way that dictated planting decisions.

Since then, Congress repealed the step 2 program last year and USDA has modified the export loan guarantee program to address WTO questions. The Brazilians held off pressing on the remaining issues while the current WTO negotiations were underway. In mid-July, Brazil again asked to reopen discussions on settling the cotton case.

The 2002 farm bill was written with the clear understanding that it was compliant with WTO rules.

The questionable analysis done by the WTO panel to reach its conclusions brought forward some unusual interpretations of the rules. For example, the fruit and vegetable planting restriction was designed to prevent certain activity on program acres. The panel found that it forced production of program commodities, despite the
fact that to receive direct payments a producer doesn’t have to plant anything at all.

This type of creative interpretation brings into question just how the Congress can predict which program policies would be protected and which would not in formulating policy.

This case also highlights the importance of operating in a world without a “peace clause” to give certainty to farm programs.

With the suspension of the Doha Round of talks in late July, there may be more cases brought against U.S. farm programs using some of the same approaches seen in the U.S.-Brazil cotton case.

National Animal Identification System

The Committee on Agriculture has conducted five hearings on this topic and continues to work with the animal agriculture community in the development of animal ID public policy.

The National Animal Identification System (NAIS) is currently a voluntary program to encourage identification of the nation’s flock and herd by 2009. Animal identification has been a topic of discussion in the livestock community for many years, and gained new interest since the discovery of BSE in a Canadian-born cow in Washington State in 2003. USDA is presently working with State animal health officials to register premises, the first phase step toward implementing a comprehensive system.

Livestock interest groups express a range of views on animal ID — from mandatory to voluntary, government-based to private sector systems, and questions about which types of animal movements would have to be recorded or reported. Concerns have also been raised about costs, regulatory burdens and confidentiality of the data. Other elements of the meat & poultry sector, such as retailers, processors and small scale or casual livestock owners also have a range of ideas about what animal ID should entail.

Constituents have raised many questions about the USDA’s approach, which has received $84.8 million in Federal funding to date, and criticized USDA for providing insufficient detail about its plans. The House-passed fiscal year 2007 Agriculture appropriations includes a requirement that USDA describe, in detail, how they intend to implement an NAIS. Specifically, this language stops all spending on NAIS unless and until USDA publishes an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking outlining, the costs, regulatory requirements, participants, processes, and legislative changes necessary to make their plan succeed. (Note.— See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for September 15, 28 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–16.”)

Country of Origin Labeling

The final 2002 farm bill contained a provision that required retail establishments to provide country-of-origin labeling (COOL) for muscle cuts of meat, seafood, fruits and vegetables. In writing the farm bill, the House Agriculture Committee had rejected mandatory labeling after extensive hearings and mark-up. Fruit & vegetable labeling was ultimately adopted on the House floor; the Senate added meat and seafood labeling.

Subsequently, implementation of mandatory COOL for meat and fruit & vegetables was delayed from 2004 to 2006, and then again
until 2008. In the meantime, there have been efforts to create a rigorous voluntary labeling program.

Proponents of mandatory COOL argue that it is a consumer-right-to-know issue and believe it will improve the competitiveness of domestic producers. Opponents of mandatory labeling see it as a thinly-disguised attempt at a non-tariff trade barrier and believe the costs far outweigh the benefits.

Opponents changed its policy and now favors a voluntary labeling program over a mandatory approach. It remains a contentious issue within the fruit and vegetable community.

The debate about the future of country-of-origin labeling will continue through the consideration of the next farm bill next year.

A USDA cost-benefit analysis of mandatory COOL, published in the October 30, 2003, Federal Register, estimates total direct costs will likely range between $582 million to $3.9 billion in the first year. Recurring costs are projected to add between $140 and $600 million annually.

Nothing currently limits labeling at the retail level. The fact is that firms label qualities that they find help sell product. Examples of USDA-certified, voluntary marketing programs for beef are numerous and include “Ohio Signature Beef” “Oregon Trail Supreme Beef” and “Washington Beef: St Helen’s Premium Angus Beef.”

Eminent Domain

The Constitution’s fifth amendment states, in part, that the Government shall not take private property unless the taking is for a “public use” and the owner receives “just compensation. In the summer of 2005 the Supreme Court decided the case of Kelo v. New London. The Court, in Kelo, ruled that States may use eminent domain to take private property from one person and convey it to second person even though the property would not be used as a public use. Instead, the Court said that a person’s land could be taken for economic development or increased tax revenue. This expansive interpretation effectively removes protection of property rights and was not what the Framers of the Constitution intended by “public use.”

In the wake of Kelo, the Committee on Agriculture began work on H.R. 3405, which the committee favorably reported. No further action was taken on H.R. 3405 because the concepts and ideas from the Agriculture Committee’s work were later incorporated in H.R. 4128, the Property Rights Act of 2005. The Property Rights Act passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 376–38.

H.R. 4128 prohibits a State or local government from exercising its power of eminent domain for the purpose of economic development if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during the fiscal year. The definition of economic development is the key to the bill and is defined to mean the taking of private property and conveying or leasing it to a private entity for commercial enterprise carried on for profit or to increase tax revenue, the tax base, employment, or general economic health.

It is important to note that there are exceptions to this prohibition. These include conveyances to common carriers such as railroads; for use as a road that is open to public use; for use as an
aqueduct or pipeline; removal of an immediate threat to public safety; and for use by a public utility.

If a State or local government exercises its power of eminent domain in this manner, it is not eligible to receive Federal economic funding for 2 years, unless the State or local government returns the property.

In June, 2006, President Bush issued an executive order that outlines a similar regime for the Federal Government. The order directs the Attorney General to issue instructions to Federal agencies to prevent the use of eminent domain for the benefit of private parties or for economic development. The order recognizes exceptions similar to those found in the Property Rights Act.


H.R. 4128, if it becomes law would give States and local governments an incentive to limit their expansive use of the power of eminent domain.

Several States have enacted statutes or amended their constitutions in response to the public outcry over *Kelo*. Analysis of this legislation, however, shows that there are loopholes that would allow continued abuse of the eminent domain power in many of these State laws. (Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 4128 under “5. Bills Act on by the House But Not the Senate”, and H.R. 3405 under “7. Bill Reported to the House But Not Considered.” See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for September 7, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–15.”)

**Forestry Issues**

The Emergency Forestry Conservation Reserve Program (EFCRP) was created to help reforest and restore the millions of acres of forest land damaged or destroyed by 2005 hurricanes Dennis, Katrina, Ophelia, Rita and Wilma in 2005. Hurricanes Rita and Katrina damaged over 5.7 million acres of timberland alone, destroying over 15 billion board feet of timber and millions of tons of pulpwood.

The initial Hurricane Supplemental (Public Law 109–148, signed December 30, 2005) provided $404 million for the program. The Emergency Supplemental for 2006 increased the program to $504.1 million to help landowners in the 261 hurricane-impacted counties in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina and Texas. Rules for the program were published in June, 2006, and sign-ups began on July 17th. Enrollment for the program ended on October 20, 2006.

Eligible Loss: To be eligible for EFCRP, a forest landowner must be located in one of the effected counties and experienced at least a 35 percent loss to merchantable timber on private non-industrial forestland. The loss must be directly related to one of the five 2005 hurricanes.

Criteria for Enrolling Forest Land: A forester will collect eligibility and other data. Continuous enrollment will be determined by an environmental benefit index. The Farm Service Agency (FSA) will evaluate and rank offers based on their potential to prevent soil erosion; improve water quality; enhance wildlife habitat; and mitigate economic losses caused by the 2005 hurricanes.
The ranking of offers will accord equal weight to softwoods and hardwoods, with additional points awarded for tree species and planting densities that benefit wildlife. FSA will prioritize offers that are suitable for the site.

Conservation Plans: After offer evaluation and acceptance, a forester will work with the landowner to develop a forestry conservation plan, including provisions to conserve soil and water, restore wildlife habitat, and re-establish appropriate tree species on the Hurricane-damaged site. The plan will also include maintenance requirements such as weed control, tree thinning and prescribed burns, as appropriate.

Contracts: 10-year contracts will all be approved by December 31, 2006, and will prohibit timber harvest during the duration of the contract except when FSA allows it as part of normal forest management.

Payments: EFCRP participants will receive up to 50 percent cost-share to prepare and replant sites or restore tree stands. Participants will also receive either 10 years of annual rental payments or a lump sum rental payment.

Annual rental rates are: based on the average rental rate for CRP contracts in the county where the land is physically located; or, where a county has no CRP contracts, the CRP rate applicable to a nearby similar-situated county. Participants selecting a lump sum will receive the payment within 30 days after the contract becomes effective. Lump sum payments will equal the present value of 10 years of rental payments based on a five-percent discount rate. Producers cannot receive EFCRP cost-share funding for land on which they have or will receive funding from any other Federal program that covers the same expenses. Acreage enrolled in EFCRP does not count toward either the per-county number of acres eligible for CRP; or CRP's maximum acreage enrollment authority. (Note.— See also the discussion for P.L. 109–148 (H.R. 2863) under "1. Bills Enacted Into Law.")

Canadian Softwood Lumber Trade Dispute Update

The trade dispute between the United States and Canada, which dates at least as far back as 1982, has apparently been resolved by a bi-lateral agreement signed on July 1st in Geneva by US Trade Representative Susan Schwab and Canadian Trade Minister David Emerson.

Chairman Goodlatte led a delegation of Agriculture Committee members to Canada in July 2005 to meet with Canadian officials, calling for a negotiated settlement to the dispute. The issue has come up in Agriculture Committee executive sessions and briefings with Commerce Department and USTR officials as well.

Canadian softwood lumber is produced by private companies who purchase subsidized timber from the provinces. The Canadian provinces own almost 90 percent of the timberland in Canada, and they sell timber to mills in seeming disregard for market conditions. US lumber producers, in contrast, purchase timber from millions of small family ownerships, State lands, and national forests, in competitive markets.

While a bilateral agreement briefly reduced conflict from 1996 to 2001, it has mostly been an exercise in litigation in both WTO and NAFTA forums. While U.S. agencies (Commerce Department and
the International Trade Commission) and the WTO have repeatedly ruled that Canadian exports are both subsidized and dumped into U.S. markets, NAFTA panels have repeatedly ruled against the U.S. The state of litigation is almost impossible to neatly summarize. By December 2005, Canadian interests were, by one count, pursuing 18 separate trade actions, including seeking compensation for an unfair taking to recover duty deposits in the U.S. Court of Claims. The U.S. Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports had filed a constitutional challenge to the NAFTA dispute resolution process.

The July agreement calls for the U.S. to revoke softwood duties, and for Canada to implement border measures in the form of either taxes or quotas. A border tax, ranging from 5–15 percent, and/or quotas on Canadian shipments to the U.S. would kick in when the price of framing lumber is at $355 per thousand or lower (as of July 14, the price stood at $317, down from $381 this time last year). Each province is allowed to choose whether they will pay taxes only, or a lower tax combined with a quota. Of the estimated $5 billion collected since the duties were implemented in May 2002, $4 billion would be refunded to Canadian shippers and $1 billion would stay in the U.S., with half of that going to members of the Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports. The agreement also: 1) provides for the development of a dispute resolution system; 2) creates “exit ramps” by which provinces could be exempt from the border measures if their lumber pricing systems achieve market-based reforms; and 3) provides for a “surge mechanism” to prevent sudden surges in imports.

The Canadian Government must submit legislation enabling the collection of the border tax, and the Harper government has said this will be a vote of confidence. Certain elements of the Canadian industry continue to agitate opposition to the agreement, but the political situation is not in their favor. The effective date of the July 1 agreement is based on suspension of all active cases, which has not yet taken place. U.S. lumber producers express support for the agreement, saying it is the “next best thing” to truly open markets for timber and lumber, while providing minimal protections for U.S. producers in down markets. U.S. lumber consumers (i.e. — the building industry) have expressed opposition to the agreement, fearing it will lead to unpredictable supplies from Canada. However, they have made no efforts to fundamentally derail the process.

Healthy Forests Restoration Act Implementation

The President signed the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA), Public Law 108–148 on December 3, 2003. The Agriculture Committee had primary jurisdiction over this bill, and Chairman Goodlatte chaired the Conference Committee. Since enactment, the HFRA has been used to treat 8.5 million acres of forests and other wildlands, reducing fuel loads and helping to protect communities from wildfire.

The HFRA established a set of alternative processes for Federal land managers to propose and implement hazardous fuels reduction treatments on public lands, and established pilot authorities to demonstrate innovative pest and forest health treatments on all ownerships. The centerpiece of the bill created a set of expedited processes and public involvement tools to allow forest health treat-
ments to proceed quickly, before a forest is damaged by fire or other catastrophic events.

The Forest Service has been able to use HFRA authorities to reduce hazardous fuels on 6 million acres, and has conducted landscape restoration on 2.5 million acres using HFRA authorities. 65 percent of the acres treated have been in the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI), the area immediately adjacent to communities. When HFRA authorities are combined with administrative tools developed as part of the President’s Healthy Forests Initiative (HFI), the Forest Service has conducted hazardous fuels reduction treatments on over 1.2 million acres this fiscal year. Since the HFI administrative measures were adopted in 2001, over 15 million acres have been treated for fuels reduction or landscape restoration.

The HFRA gives additional flexibility to conduct fuels reduction treatments to communities that prepare Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs). To date, there have been 654 completed CWPPs, covering almost 2,700 communities. An additional 600 CWPPs are in progress.

In spite of the progress made, the HFRA and the related administrative authorities must be kept in context. The year HFRA was signed into law, approximately 191 million acres of forests and rangeland were classified as being at high or extreme risk of catastrophic wildfires or insect outbreaks. Wildfires this year have burned 82 percent more acres than the 10-year average. Many of these fires are brush and range fires, and reflect severe drought conditions or result from proliferation of annual brush growth following wet winters.

Because millions of acres of forest continue to be damaged by fires and other catastrophes, the committee has reported and the House has approved HR 4200, the Forest Emergency Recovery and Research Act (FERRA). Building upon the expedited authorities of HFRA, the FERRA allows the Forest Service to move ahead quickly after fires to implement reforestation and recovery treatments. The bill also gives the agency clear direction to work with adjacent landowners to develop recovery plans after disaster strikes.

(Note.—See the discussion for H.R. 4200 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate”. See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for May 25, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–9; November 15, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–20; and December 7, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–23.”)

B. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

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

Number of bills referred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bill</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House resolutions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate joint resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposition of bills containing items under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture

Bills enacted into law ................................................................. 12
Bills acted on by the committee included in other bills that became law .... 0
Bills vetoed .................................................................................. 0
Bills acted on by both Houses, but not enacted ....................... 0
Bills acted on by the House but not the Senate ...................... 12
Concurrent Resolutions approved ............................................. 0
Bills reported to the House but not considered ..................... 9
Bills ordered reported, but not reported ................................. 0
Bills defeated in the House ...................................................... 2

(2) Statistics on hearings and markups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Commodities and Risk Management ..........</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and Horticulture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Crops and Foreign Agriculture Programs ....</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research ...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</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 109–17 (S.643)

To amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987 to reauthorize State mediation programs (approved June 29, 2005).
This Act authorizes the USDA Certified State Mediation Programs through the fiscal year 2010.
Agricultural mediation is a way of settling disputes within a producer’s own means while providing a neutral mediator who can help resolve the problematic issues. Mediation helps resolve many different areas of agricultural disputes, including farm loans, wetland determinations, conservation compliance and pesticide use.
Legislative History: S. 643 was introduced by Senator Pat Roberts on March 16, 2005. The bill was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry. On April 21, 2005, the bill passed Senate without amendment by unanimous consent and was received in the House on April 25, 2005. On June 13, 2003, the bill passed House by a vote of 371 yeas to 2 nays. On June 17, 2005, the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 109–17.

Public Law 109–58 (H.R. 6)

To ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy (approved, August 8, 2005).
The Energy Policy Act extends the renewable electricity production credit through December 31, 2007 for qualified facilities, including small irrigation power facilities. The Act provides a 30 percent credit for investments in alternative fuel refueling stations,

Note. Similar or identical bills, and bills having reference to each other, are indicated by the number in parenthesis.
expands the small ethanol producer credit to producers with annual production capacity of more than 60 million gallons, and creates an equivalent credit for producers of agri-biodiesel through December 31, 2008. H.R. 6 extends the excise tax credits for biodiesel through December 31, 2008 and allows “renewable diesel” to claim similar income and excise tax credits at the rate applicable to agri-biodiesel.

H.R. 6 also includes a measure concerning renewable fuels. Under the measure the annual average volume of renewable fuel additives would increase incrementally, tripling the current requirement over 7 years. In 2013 and thereafter, the amount of fuel additives would be determined by the EPA, the USDA and the Department of Energy, and would be based on the experience of increasing fuel additives in the previous 7 years. Provisions are included to prevent anti-competitive behavior.

In addition, the Act includes two sections dealing with natural gas and electricity market transparency. Sections 316 and 1281 direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) to complete a memorandum of understanding regarding information sharing between the commissions. This requirement does not affect the exclusive jurisdiction of the CFTC with respect to markets under its authority, but rather seeks to avoid duplication of information reporting, ensure appropriate protection of proprietary business information, and acknowledge the respective jurisdictions of both agencies in order to avoid any jurisdiction overlap. This memorandum is a formal statement of an already well-established information sharing relationship between the two commissions.

Legislative History: H.R. 6 was introduced by Representative Joe Barton on April 18, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Workforce, Financial Services, Agriculture, Resources, Science, Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure. It was passed in the House by a recorded vote of 249–183. It was first read in the Senate on June 9, 2005 and passed the Senate, as amended by Yea-Nay Vote, 85–12. The Senate then requested a conference and appointed conferees and a message on Senate action was sent to the House on July 11, 2005. On July 14, 2005, the House disagreed to the Senate amendment and agreed to a conference. The Speaker then appointed conferees from the Committee on Agriculture and other committees. On July 17–24, 2005 a conference was held and a Conference Report, H.Rept. 109–190, was filed in the House on July 27, 2005. The Conference report passed the House on July 28, 2005 by a vote of 275 yeas to 156 nays. On July 29, 2005, the Conference Report was agreed to by the Senate by a 74 yeas to 26 nays. On August 8, 2005 the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 109–58. (Note: See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for July 21, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–12.”)

Public Law 109–83 (S. 1752, H.R. 3421)

To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to reauthorize the Act (approved September 30, 2005).

This Act reauthorizes and extends the United States Grain Standards Act to facilitate the official inspection at export port lo-
cations of grain required or authorized to be inspected under such Act, and for other purposes through September 30, 2015.

Legislative History: H.R. 3421 was introduced by Congressman Jerry Moran and it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture on July 25, 2005. On July 27, 2005, House Committee on Agriculture held a full committee business meeting and ordered it reported. S. 1752 was introduced by Senator Saxby Chambliss on September 22, 2005. The bill was read twice, considered, read the third time and passed without amendment by unanimous consent. On September 26, 2005, the bill was received in the House. On September 28, 2005, the House passed the bill by a voice vote. On September 30, 2005, the bill was signed by the President into law as Public Law 109–83. (*Note.*—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for May 24, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–8.”)

**Public Law 109–154 (H.R. 2875, S. 1238)**

To amend the Public Lands Crop Act of 1993 to provide for the conduct of projects that protect forests, and for other purposes (approved December 30, 2005).

The Act permits the Secretary of Agriculture, in the case of National Forest System land, or the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of Indian lands, Hawaiian home lands, or lands administered by the Department of the Interior to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements in order to give favor to qualified youth or conservation groups located in certain areas with a sizeable number of members who are economically, physically, or educationally disadvantaged to perform the project. The Act also gives the Secretary the authority to approve suitable conservation and other projects to be completed on Federal, State, local, or private land as part of a Federal disaster prevention or relief effort. The Act alters the conditions for the establishment and use of conservation centers as well, and the Act authorizes the Secretary to provide any appropriate services, facilities, equipment, supplies, technical assistance, oversight, monitoring, or evaluations to carry out the Act. It authorizes the Secretary provide each participant of the Public Lands Corps with a living allowance and for the time served can be used toward future Federal hiring.

Legislative History: On June 14, 2005, H.R. 2875 was introduced by Representative Walden and referred to the House Committee on Resources and additionally to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce. S. 1238 was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. On July 20, 2005, Senate Hearing held for S. 1238, S. Hrg. 109–157. On October 19, 2005, S. 1238 was reported with amendments, report No. 109–152, and is placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar, Calendar No. 244. On November 7, 2005, H.R. 2875 was reported and amended, H. Rept. 109–273 Part 1, and placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar no. 149. On November 16, 2005, S. 1238 was considered, amended, and passed by the Senate by Unanimous Consent. On November 19, 2005, S. 1238 was received in the House. On December 19, 2005, S. 1238 was considered by the House and passed by Unanimous Consent. On December 30, 2005, S. 1238 was signed by the President and became Public Law No: 109–154.
Public Law 109–171, (S. 1932, H.R. 4241)

To provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 202(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006 (H.Con.Res. 95) (approved February 8, 2006).

Title I of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 amends the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to revise the national dairy market loss payment formula by decreasing the multiplier for the periods beginning on (1) October 1, 2005, and ending on August 31, 2007; and (2) September 1, 2007. Extends the sign-up and contract periods through September 30, 2007. Reduces advance payments for peanuts and for covered commodities to: (1) 40 percent for crop year 2006; and (2) 22 percent for crop year 2007. Repeals authority to issue upland cotton user marketing certificates.

This title amends the Food Security Act of 1985 to (1) extend the Conservation Security Program authority through fiscal year 2011; and (2) extend and increase Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) funding for such program. It further amends the Environmental quality incentives program to (1) extend program authority through fiscal year 2010; (2) apply the aggregate payment limitation to any 6-year period. (Currently, such limitation applies to fiscal year 2002–07); and (3) set forth specified funding provisions for fiscal year 2007–09, and for fiscal year 2010.

Title I also amends the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to reduce fiscal year 2007 funding for the renewable energy systems and energy efficiency improvements program. It cancels authority to obligate funds previously made available for expanded access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas unobligated as of October 1, 2006, as of that date. The Deficit Reduction Act also cancels authority to obligate funds previously made available for value-added agricultural product market development grants unobligated as of October 1, 2006, as of that date. Furthermore, title I terminates rural business investment program funding, cancels authority to obligate funds previously made available for such program unobligated as of October 1, 2006, cancels authority to obligate funds previously made available for rural business strategic investment grants unobligated as of October 1, 2006, as of that date, terminates rural firefighters and emergency personnel grant authority after fiscal year 2006, and cancels authority to obligate funds previously made available for such program unobligated as of October 1, 2006, as of that date.

The measure also amends the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to eliminate fiscal year 2007–09 CCC transfer funding for the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems, while providing funds available for a 2-year period from the date of transfer, except for fiscal year 2006 funds which shall be available for a 1-year period beginning on October 1, 2005.

Legislative History: Pursuant to the instructions contained in H.Con.Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget—fiscal year 2006, the Committee on Agriculture submitted its recommendations to the Committee on the Budget on November 1, 2005. These recommendations were included in H.R. 4241 as reported by the Committee on the Budget, H.Rept. 109–281. On November 18, 2005, H.R. 4241 passed the House by a vote of 217 yeas to 215 nays. The House, also on this same date, took from the
Speaker's desk the companion bill, S. 1932, which had passed the Senate by a vote of 52 yeas to 47 nays, on November 3, 2005, struck all after the enacting clause and inserted the text of H.R. 4241 as passed by the House. On December 14, 2005, the Senate disagreed to the House amendment, requested a conference and appointed conferences. On December 16, 2005, the House appointed conferences. On December 19, 2006, Conference Report 109–362 was filed in the House and passed by a vote of 212 yeas to 206 nays. On December 21, 2005, two points of order was sustained against the Conference Report in the Senate, therefore by operation of the Budget Act, the Conference Report was defeated. However, the Senate then concurred in the House amendment with an amendment to S. 1932, by a vote of 51 yeas to 50 nays. On February 1, 2006, the House agreed to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 1932. On February 8, 2006, the President signed S. 1932 into Public Law 109–171.

Public Law 109–215 (S. 2120)
To ensure regulatory equity between and among all dairy farmers and handlers for sales of packaged fluid milk in federally regulated milk marketing areas and into certain non-federally regulated milk marketing areas from federally regulated areas, and for other purposes. (approved March 28, 2005).

The Act provides that minimum milk price and exemption provisions under this Act shall not be construed as affecting, expanding, or contracting the treatment of producer-handlers except as provided for by such provisions.

Legislative History: S. 2120 was introduced by Senator Kyl on December 16, 2005, and passed without amendment, by unanimous consent. In the House, the bill was referred to the Agriculture Committee. On March 28, 2005, the House considered it under suspension of the rules. The bill passed by a vote of 285 yeas and 128 nays. On April 11, 2005, the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 109–215.

Public Law 109–296 (H.R. 3408/S. 1613)
To reauthorize the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 and to amend the swine reporting provisions of that Act (approved October 5, 2006).

Livestock Mandatory Price Reporting was first passed in 1999 to address producers' concerns about low livestock prices, industry concentration, and the availability of accurate market information. The program expired on September 30, 2005 and was operating on a voluntary basis. The House bill (H.R. 3408) extends the program for 5 years and amends hog reporting provisions, while the Senate bill (S. 1613) was a 1-year extension.

Legislative History: H.R. 3408 was introduced by Chairman Bob Goodlatte on July 22, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On July 27, 2005, the Committee on Agriculture ordered reported H.R. 3408, as amended, by a voice vote. On September 14, 2005, H.R. 3408 passed the House, amended, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On September 15, 2005, H.R. 3408 was received in the Senate, but was not referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry until October 7, 2005. S. 1613 was introduced by Senator Chuck Grassley and re-
ferred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry on September 6, 2005. On September 13, 2005, S. 1613 was discharged by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the bill was then passed by Senate by unanimous consent without amendment. On September 14, 2005, S. 1613 was received by the House and held at the desk. On September 20, 2006, H.R. 3408 was discharged from further consideration of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and passed by the Senate by unanimous consent. On October 5, 2006, the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 109–296.

**Public Law 109–320 (H.R. 2720/S. 177)**

To further the purposes of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 by directing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to carry out an assessment and demonstration program to control salt cedar and Russian olive, and for other purposes (approved October 11, 2006).

The Act directs the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, to carry out a salt cedar and Russian olive assessment and demonstration program to (1) assess the extent of the infestation by salt cedar and Russian olive trees in the western United States; (2) demonstrate strategic solutions for the long-term management of such trees and the reestablishment of native vegetation; and (3) assess economic means to dispose of biomass created as a result of removal of those trees. This measure also directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a memorandum of understanding for the administration of such a program.

Legislative History: S. 177 was introduced by Senator Domenici on January 26, 2006, and referred to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources reported S. 177 without amendment, on March 7, 2005, S. Rept. 109–15. H.R. 2720 was introduced by Representative Pearce on May 26, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On December 13, 2005, H.R. 2720 was reported, without amendment, by the Committee on Resources, H.Rept. 109–341 pt. 1, and the Committee on Agriculture was discharged. On May 2, 2006, H.R. 2720 passed the House, without amendment, by a voice vote, under suspension of the rules. On May 3, 2006, H.R. 2720 was received in the Senate and held at the desk. On September 29, 2006, H.R. 2720 passed the Senate, without amendment, by unanimous consent. On October 11, 2006, H.R. 2720 was signed by the President into Public Law 109–320.

**Public Law 109–382 (S. 4001)**

To designate certain land in New England as wilderness for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation system and certain land as a National Recreation Area, and for other purposes (approved December 1, 2006).

The New England Wilderness Act of 2006 designates specified Federal lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service in the White Mountain National Forest area of New Hampshire as wilderness
areas and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System (lands to be known as the Wild River Wilderness and lands to be incorporated in the Sandwich Range Wilderness).

The Act also designates specified Federal lands managed by the Forest Service in Vermont as wilderness areas and National Wilderness Preservation System components (lands to be known as the Glastenbury Wilderness, the Joseph Battell Wilderness, the Breadloaf Wilderness, the Bye Brook Wilderness, the Peru Peak Wilderness, and the Big Branch Wilderness). The measure requires the Forest Service to allow the continuance of Appalachian National Scenic Trail, the Long Trail, the Catamount Trail, and the marking and maintenance of associated trails structures consistent with the management direction established under the Green Mountain National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

The Act also designated specified Federal lands managed by the Forest Service in Vermont as the Moosalamoo National Recreation Area. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, to administer the Area in accordance with laws applicable to National Forest System units and the management direction established for the Moosalamoo Recreation and Education Management Area under such Management Plan.

Legislative History: S. 4001 was introduced by Senator Sununu on September 29, 2006, and passed by the Senate without amendment. On that same date the bill was received in the House and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On November 15, 2006, S. 4001 passed the House, without amendment, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On December 1, 2006, S. 4001 was signed by the President into Public Law 109–382.

Public Law 109-387 (H.R. 4559)

To provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land to the towns of Laona and Wabeno, Wisconsin, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain isolated parcels of National Forest System land in Florence and Langlade Counties, Wisconsin, and for other purposes (approved December 12, 2006.)

The Act directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey two specified parcels of National Forest System land in Forest County, Wisconsin, to the towns of Laona and Wabeno, at their request, for use as industrial park sites in exchange for the appraised fair market value of the parcels.

The Act also authorizes the Secretary to sell specified parcels of NFS land located in Florence and Langlade counties, Wisconsin, for fair market value. The measure makes the proceeds available to the Secretary to acquire land for inclusion in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest.

Legislative History: H.R. 4559 was introduced by Representative Mark Green on December 15, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 21, 2006, H.R. 4559 was ordered reported, amended, to the House by the Committee on Agriculture. On September 26, 2006, H.R. 4559 passed the House, as amended, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On September 27, 2006, H.R. 4559 was received in the Senate. On November 16, 2006, the bill passed the Senate, without amendment, by unani-
mous consent clearing the measure for the President. On December 12, 2006, H.R. 4559 was signed by the President into P.L. 109-387.

Public Law 109-389 (H.R. 5103)

To provide for the conveyance of the former Konnarock Lutheran Girls School in Smyth County, Virginia, which is currently owned by the United States and administered by the Forest Service, to facilitate the restoration and reuse of the property, and for other purposes (approved December 12, 2006).

The Act directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey property in the Jefferson National Forest, Smyth County, Virginia, containing the former Konnarock Lutheran Girls School to the Evangelical Lutheran Coalition for Mission in Appalachia.

Legislative History: H.R. 5103 was introduced by Representative Rick Boucher on April 5, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 21, 2006, H.R. 5103 was ordered reported, as amended, by the Committee on Agriculture by a voice vote. On September 26, 2006, H.R. 5103 passed the House, as amended, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On September 27, 2006, H.R. 5103 was received in the Senate. On November 16, 2006, the bill passed the Senate, without amendment, by unanimous consent, clearing the measure for the President. On December 12, 2006, the bill was signed by President into P.L. 109-389.

Public Law 109-467 (S. 4093)

To amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend a suspension of limitation on the period for which certain borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance (approved December 22, 2006).

The Act will modify the expiration date of a provision of the 2002 farm bill dealing with farm credit so that it expires concurrent with the rest of the farm bill. Currently, a provision of the farm bill dealing with guaranteed loans for farmers and ranchers expires on December 31, 2006. The rest of the farm bill however, does not begin to expire until September 30, 2007.

Legislative History: S. 4093 was introduced by Senator Tom Harkin on December 6, 2006, read twice in the Senate, read the third time, and then passed without amendment by unanimous consent. On December 7, 2006, S. 2093 was held at the desk in the House. On December 8, 2006, S. 2093 passed the House, without amendment, by unanimous consent. On December 22, 2006, the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 467.

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 109–8 (S. 256)

To amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (approved April 20, 2005).
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).


Legislative History: S. 256 was introduced by Senator Chuck Grassley on February 1, 2005. The bill was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On February 15, 2005, the bill was reported by the committee without a written report. The bill was considered by the Senate on March 1, March 2, March 3, March 4, March 7, March 8 and on March 10, 2005, and the bill passed Senate with amendments by 74 yeas to 25 nays. The House received the bill on March 14, 2005, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services. On March 16, 2005, the House Judiciary ordered the report H. Rept. 109–31 Part I. On April 8, 2005, the Committee on Financial Services discharged the bill. On April 14, 2005 the bill passed House by a vote of 302 yeas to 126 nays. On April 20, 2005, the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 109–8.

Public Law 109–19 (H.R. 3021)

To reauthorize the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program through September 30, 2005 (approved July 1, 2005).

The Act will continue the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program grants to support welfare program programs to States, territories, and Indian tribes, supplemental grants provided to certain States, and other related provisions. It also will extend funding for mandatory child care, abstinence education, and transitional medical assistance for this period.

Legislative History: H.R. 3021 was introduced by Congressman Wally Herger on June 22, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. On June 29, 2005, the bill passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On July 30, 2005, the bill passed the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent. On July 31, 2005, the bill was signed by the President into Public Law 109–19.

Public Law 109–53 (H.R. 3045, S. 1037)

To implement the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement Act (approved August 2, 2005).

The Act implements the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, entered into with the governments of Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua (CAFTA-DR). It is a reciprocal
trade agreement that replaces the U.S. unilateral preferential trade treatment extended to these 6 countries under the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA), and the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). It liberalizes trade in goods, services, and government procurement, and addresses intellectual property, investment, labor, and environmental issues. Most commercial and farm goods attain duty-free status immediately. Remaining trade will have tariffs phased out incrementally over five to 20 years. Duty-free treatment will be delayed longest for the most sensitive agricultural products. The agreement also has specific rules such as transitional safeguards, tariff rate quotas, and trade capacity building to address development and transition issues.

Legislative History: On June 23, 2005, H.R. 3045 was introduced in the House, and S. 1307 was introduced in the Senate. On June 30, 2005, S. 1307 was considered and passed in the Senate by a vote of 54 yeas to 45 nays. On July 25, 2005, H.R. 3045 was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, H. Rept. 109–182. On July 27, 2005, H.R. 3045 was considered and passed in the House by a vote of 217 yeas to 215 nays. On July 28, 2005, H.R. 3045 was received in the Senate and placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 180. It was also considered and passed in the Senate by a vote of 55 yeas to 44 nays. On August 2, 2005, President Bush signed H.R. 3045 into Public Law No. 109–53. On August 31, 2005, the Senate Committee on Finance filed S. Rept. 109–128 to accompany S. 1307.

Public Law 109–169 (H.R. 4340, S. 2027)

To implement the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement (approved January 11, 2006).

The U.S.-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement intends to offer a new market access for U.S. consumer, industrial, and agricultural products. The committee’s focus is the proposed expansion of U.S. agricultural product exports to Bahrain, which have ranged from $35 million in 2001 and $22 million in 2004. U.S. commodities that could benefit from this include meats, fruits and vegetables, cereals, and dairy products. In the immediate future, Bahrain will provide duty-free access for U.S. agricultural exports for 98 percent of agricultural tariffs. Within 10 years of the agreement, Bahrain will phase out the tariffs that remain on alcohol and tobacco. At the beginning of the 10th year, tariffs on U.S. alcohol and tobacco exported to Bahrain will cease. One requirement of the Agreement concentrates on rules of origin for agricultural products. This guarantees that there will not be challenges to the Agreement in regards to third-country inputs in the production sensitive products in Bahrain.

Legislative History: On November 16, 2005, Representative Roy Blunt introduced H.R. 4340 by request. H.R. 4340 was referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means that same day. Also on November 16, 2005, Senator Grassley introduced S. 2027, which was referred to the Committee on Finance. On December 6, 2005, H.R. 4340 was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 171, and the Committee on Ways and Means reported H. Rept. 109–318 without amendment. On December 7, 2005, H.R. 4340 was considered and passed in the House by a vote of 327 yeas to 95 nays. On
December 8, 2005, the Senate Committee on Finance reports No. 109–199 and S. 2027 was placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar, Calendar No. 306. On December 12, 2005 H.R. 4340 was received in the Senate and placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar, Calendar No. 322. On December 13, 2005 H.R. 4340 was passed in Senate without amendment by unanimous consent and cleared for the White House. On January 11, 2006, H.R. 4340 was signed by the President into Public Law No. 109–169.

Public Law 109–374 (S. 3880)

To provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individual committing animal enterprise terror (approved November 27, 2006).

The Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act amends the Federal criminal code to revise criminal prohibitions against damaging or interfering with the operations of an animal enterprise to include intentional damage or loss to any real or personal property and intentional threats of death or serious bodily injury against individuals (or their family members, spouses, or intimate partners) who are involved with animal enterprises. Expands such crime to include conspiracies and attempts. Revises and increases monetary and criminal penalties for such crime.

The measure also modifies the definition of “animal enterprise” to include (1) an enterprise that uses or sells animals or animal products for profit for educational purposes; and (2) an animal shelter, pet store, breeder, or furrier.

Legislative History: S. 3880 was introduced by Senator Inhofe on September 8, 2006, and referred to the Senate Committee on Judiciary. On September 30, 2006, S. 3880 passed the Senate with an amendment by unanimous consent. On November 13, 2006, the bill was referred to the House Committee on Judiciary and passed by the House, without amendment, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On November 27, 2006, the President signed S. 3880 into Public Law 109–374.

Appropriations

Public Law 109–54 (H.R. 2361)

Making appropriations for the Department of Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 (approved August 2, 2005).

The Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006, reduced Forest Service funding to $4.3 billion, a roughly 11 percent cut from the previous fiscal year.

Legislative History: H.R. 2361 was introduced and reported, H. Rept. 109–80, by Representative Charles Taylor on May 13, 2005. On May 19, 2005, the House passed H.R. 2361, by vote of 329 yeas and 89 nays. On June 10, 2005, the Senate reported on H.R. 2361 with an amendment in the nature of a substitute with written report No. 109–80. The Senate considered and passed H.R. 2361 with 94 yeas and 0 nays on June 29, 2005. On that same day, the Senate requested a conference. On July 26, 2005, House disagreed to Senate amendments and agrees to a conference. On the same day, the conference agreed to file conference report H. Rept. 109–188. The Rules Committee Resolution H. Res. 392 was reported and con-
sidered by the House on July 27, 2005. On July 28, 2005, Rule H. Res. 392 was passed by the House. On that same day, the House agreed to the conference report by 410 yeas to 10 nays. On July 29, 2005, the conference report was considered and passed by the Senate with 99 yeas and 1 Nay. On August 2, 2005, the act was signed by the president and became Public Law 109–54.

Public Law 109–97 (H.R. 2744)

Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (approved November 10, 2005).

The Act known as the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006 includes funding for all of the USDA (except the Forest Service), the Food and Drug Administration, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The law provides $15.0 billion above fiscal year 2005 levels, and contains $17.03 billion in discretionary spending and $83.07 billion for mandatory programs.

The Act also postpones country of origin labeling (COOL) until 2008 and expands the scope of the delay to include not only beef, but also lamb, pork, fresh fruits and vegetables, and peanuts. Furthermore, the Act prohibits the use of Federal funds to pay for the inspection of horses destined for human food.

7The National Organic Program was also amended by the Act in response to a recent court decision on organic standards that prohibits the use of synthetic substances and non-organic feed.


Public Law 109–102 (H.R. 3057)

Making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Exports Financing, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (approved November 14, 2005).

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2006 makes fiscal year 2006 appropriations for (1) the Export-Import Bank, including the Office of Inspector General, direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs, and administrative expenses; (2) Overseas Private Investment Corporation credit and insurance programs, including administrative expenses and for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans,
(and authority to undertake programs under title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 on Iraq; (3) the Trade and Development Agency; (4) expenses of the President in carrying out certain programs under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; (5) the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for child survival, nutrition, and disease programs, including HIV/AIDS.

Section 565 of title V of the bill as introduced in the House was of interest to the Committee on Agriculture because this section granted the authority to the President of United States to reduce debt owned to the Commodity Credit Corporation by poor countries. On June 28, 2005, a point of order was sustained against section 565, in that it violates House Rule XXI Clause 2 by changing existing law and inserts legislative language in an appropriations bill. However, the provision was added back in conference and therefore became public law.

Legislative History: H.R. 3057 was introduced and reported as an original measure, H. Rept. 109–152, by Representative Jim Kolbe on June 24, 2005. On June 28, 2005, the bill passed the House, amended, by a vote of 393 yeas and 32 nays. H.R. 3057 was received in the Senate, read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations on June 29, 2005. On June 30, 2005, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported favorably H.R. 3057 with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, S.Rept. 109–96. The Senate considered and passed H.R. 3057 with 98 yeas and 1 nay on July 20, 2005. On that same day, the Senate requested a conference. On October 27, 2005 the House disagreed to Senate amendments and agreed to a conference. On November 2, 2005, Conference Report H. Rept. 109–265 was filed in the House. On November 3, 2005, the House agreed to the conference report by 358 yeas to 39 nays. On November 10, 2005 the conference report was considered and passed by the Senate with 91 yeas to 0 nays. On November 14, 2005, the President signed H.R. 3057 into Public Law 109–102.

Public Law 109–148 (H.R. 2863)

Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (approved December 30, 2005).

The Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006 provided $1.17 billion in supplemental funding in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. This includes $1.076 billion for agriculture hurricane assistance, and $94 million for USDA avian influenza activities in preparation for a possible U.S. outbreak of avian flu. The cost of this supplemental was offset by transferring existing supplemental funds from FEMA, by a government-wide 1 percent recession of discretionary spending, and by additional rescissions to various accounts, including $66.1 million from USDA.

The $1.076 billion in hurricane assistance for USDA included:

$404 million for a new Emergency Forestry Conservation Reserve Program (to compensate private, non-industrial forest landowners who experienced large hurricane losses, for retiring their land);

$300 million for the Emergency Watershed Protection Program;
$200 million for the Emergency Conservation Program; and
$118 million for various rural development (housing and infra-
structure) programs.

The $94 million for USDA avian influenza activities included:
$71.5 million for Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
(APHIS) detection and response activities; and
$11.4 million for the Office of the Secretary, and the balance allo-
cated to research agencies.

Legislative History: H.R. 2863 was introduced and reported as an
original measure by Representative Bill Young on June 10, 2005.
See House Report 109–119. On June 20, 2005, the bill passed the
House, amended, by a vote of 398 yeas to 19 nays. On September
29, 2005, the Senate Committee reported, H.R. 2863, with amend-
ment in the nature of a substitute, S. Rept. 109–141. On October
7, 2005, H.R. 2863 passed the Senate, amended, by a vote of 97
yeas to 0 nays. On that same date, the Senate insisted on its
amendment, requested a conference and appointed conferees. On
December 14, 2005, the House agreed to a conference and ap-
359 was filed in the House with its passage occurring on December
19, 2006 by a vote of 308 yeas to 106 nays and 2 voting present.
On that same date the Senate passed the Conference Report by a
vote of 94 yeas to 1 nay. On December 30, 2005, the President

Public Law 109–234(H.R. 4939)
Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal
year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (approved
June 15, 2006).

The Act known as the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations
Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery
of 2006, provided $982 million in supplemental funding for USDA
programs, including $632 million as a second phase of agricultural
assistance for farmers, ranchers and producers affected by gulf
Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The Act also includes $350 million
for additional overseas food aid through P.L. 480 title II grants.

The $632 million is provided exclusively to the hurricane-affected
Gulf States, including $500 million for commodity losses:
$140 million for the Livestock Assistance program;
$100 million for the Emergency Forestry Conservation Re-
serve Program;
$95 million for fruits, vegetables, and nursery products;
$80 million for sugar cane losses;
$55 million for the tree assistance program;
$17 million for dairy;
$15 million for cottonseed;
$8 million for aquaculture; and
$10 million for USDA administrative expenses.

The remaining $132 million for hurricane disaster assistance was
allocated to:
$51 million for watershed restoration;
$26 million for rural development; and
$55 million for USDA to repair its own damaged facilities.

Legislative History: H.R. 4939 was introduced and reported as an
original measure by Representative Jerry Lewis on March 13,
passed the House, as amended, by a vote of 348 yeas to 71 nays. On April 5, the Senate reported H.R. 4939, with amendment in the nature of a substitute, S.Rept. 109–230. On May 4, 2006, H.R. 4939 passed the Senate, as amended, by a vote of 77 yeas to 21 nays. On that same date, the Senate also insisted on its amendment, requested a conference and appointed conferees. On May 23, 2006, the House disagreed to the Senate amendment, agreed to a conference and appointed conferees. On June 8, 2006, Conference Report 109–494 was filed in the House. On June 13, 2006, the Conference reported passed the House by a vote of 351 yeas to 67 nays. On June 15, 2006 the Conference Report passed the Senate by a vote of 98 yeas to 1 nay. On that same day, the President signed H.R. 4939 into Public Law 109–234.

Public Law 109–289 (H.R. 5631)

Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes—Division B: Continuing Appropriations Resolution for fiscal year 2007.

Public Law 109–289 was originally introduced as H.R. 5631, by Mr. Young of the Committee on Appropriations, on June 16, 2006. On June 20, 2006, the resolution passed the House by a vote of 407 yeas to 19 nays. On July 25, 2006, the resolution was agreed to in the Senate with an amendment by a vote of 98 yeas to 0 nays. Division B: Continuing Appropriations Resolution for fiscal year 2007 was included in the conference report to H.R. 5631, H. Rept. 109–676, and was passed by the House on September 26, 2006 by a vote of 394 yeas to 22 nays. The Senate passed the conference report on September 29, 2006 by a vote of 100 yeas to 0 nays. H. Rept. 109–676 was signed by the President on September 29, 2006 and became Public Law No: 109–289.

Public Law 109–289 (Division B), appropriates amounts for continuing operations, projects, or activities which were conducted in fiscal year 2006 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be made available in: (1) the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007; (2) the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the House of Representatives) or the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the Senate); (3) the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the House) or the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the Senate); (4) the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007; (5) the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007; (6) the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007; (7) the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2007; (8) the Military Construction, Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the House) or the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the Senate); (9) the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the House) or the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007 (in the Senate); and (10) the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District

Public Law 109–289 (Division B), continues any project or activity under such Acts at the current rate for operations or the rate permitted by the House and Senate actions, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2006, whenever the amount that would be made available or the authority that would be granted for such project or activity as passed by the House as of October 1, 2006, is the same as the amount or authority that would be available or granted under the same or other pertinent Act as passed by the Senate as of such date.

Public Law 109–289 (Division B), also discontinues any project or activity if no amount or authority is made available or granted for it by the House and Senate actions; requires continuation of a project or activity at the current fiscal year 2006 rate, or at the lower of the two rates as permitted by the action of the two Chambers, if both Chambers permit different rates; requires continuation of a project or activity, also, at the current fiscal year 2006 rate, or if lower at the rate permitted by action of the one Chamber, if only one Chamber has passed the pertinent appropriations Act; requires continuation at the current fiscal year 2006 rate of any project or activity funded for fiscal year 2006 but not included in the pertinent appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007 of the House as of October 1, 2006, if only the House has passed that Act for fiscal year 2007; and requires the same continuation at the current fiscal year 2006 rate for any project or activity whose pertinent appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007 has not been passed by either Chamber as of October 1, 2006.

(Section 106) Provides funding under this division until the earliest of: (1) enactment of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this division; (2) enactment of the applicable appropriations Act by both Chambers without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) November 17, 2006.

(Section 114) Continues through the date specified in section 106 certain activities for entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2006, and for activities under the Food Stamp Act of 1977. Declares that, notwithstanding such date, funds shall be available and obligations for mandatory payments due on or about November 1 and December 1, 2006.

(Section 115) Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) to enter into or renew contracts for 1 year, under conditions of the Housing Act of 1949, to provide assistance payments to owners of rental, congregate, or cooperative housing for persons and families of low income in multifamily housing projects.

(Section 116) Requires the Secretary to continue, through the date specified in section 106, the Water and Waste Systems Direct Loan Program under the authority and conditions (including the borrower’s interest rate and fees as of September 1, 2006) provided by the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006. (Note.—
For further action, see the discussion of Public Law 109–383 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”

Public Law 109–383 (H.J.Res. 102)
Making further appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

Public Law 109–383 was introduced as H.J. Res. 102, by Mr. Lewis of the Committee on Appropriations, on December 7, 2006. On December 8, 2006, the resolution passed the House by a vote of 370 yeas to 20 nays. On December 9, 2006, the resolution was agreed to in the Senate without amendment by Unanimous Consent. H.J. Res. 102 was signed by the President on December 12, 2006 and Became Public Law No: 109–383.


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
None

5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate

H.J.Res. 96, recognizing the contributions of the Christmas tree industry to the United States economy and urging the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs to raise awareness of the importance of the Christmas tree industry.

H.J.Res. 96 was introduced by Representative Virginia Foxx on September 19, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On November 14, 2006, H.J.Res. 96 passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On November 15, 2006, H.J.Res. 96 was received in the Senate with no further action taking place.

The joint resolution recognizes the contributions of the Christmas tree industry to the United States economy.

H.Con.Res. 438, expressing the sense of the Congress that continuation of the welfare reforms provided for in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 should remain a priority.

H.Con.Res. 438 was introduced by Representative Clay Shaw on June 27, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Agriculture, and Financial Services. On July 18, 2006, H.Con.Res. 438 passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On July 19, 2006, the resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance with no further action taking place.
The concurrent resolution expresses the sense of Congress concerning the importance of success in moving families from welfare to work, as well as in promotion healthy marriage and other means of improving child well-being.

_H.R. 503, To amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes._

_H.R. 503_ was introduced by Representative John Sweeney on February 1, 2005, and was referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. On July 13, 2006, the bill was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 6, 2006, the Committee on Agriculture reported H.R. 503 adversely, H.Rept. 109–617 pt. 1, to the House with the recommendation that the bill do not pass. The House of Representatives passed the bill by a vote of 263 yeas to 141 nays with one member voting the present on September 7, 2006. The bill was received in the Senate on September 8, 2006 and placed on the calendar. However, after passage of H.Res. 1011 in the House, the bill was returned for technical corrections. On September 19, 2006 the Senate received H.R. 503 for a second time and the bill once again was placed on the Senate calendar with no further action taking place.

The measure amends the Horse Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 1821) to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

The measure adds two new definitions to the Horse Protection Act. It defines “human consumption” and “slaughter.” The measure gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to detain any horse that is suspected of being sore or is suspected of being shipped off to a slaughtering facility. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for July 27, 2006, Hearing Serial No. 109–36.”)

_H.R. 585, 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._

_H.R. 585_ was introduced by Representative George Radanovich on May 10, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On December 6, 2005, H.R. 585 passed the House, as amended, by a voice vote under suspension of the rules. On December 12, 2005, H.R. 585 was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. On May 10, 2006, the Committee on Energy and
Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests held a hearing with no further action being taken.

The measure directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to solicit involvement by government officials of local gateway communities in the development of land use plans, programs, land use regulations, land use decisions, transportation plans, general management plans, and any other plans, decisions, projects, or policies for Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Lands Management which are likely to have a significant impact.

H.R. 586, To preserve the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on public lands, including wilderness areas, national monuments, and other specifically designated areas, administered by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service where there is a historical tradition of such use, and for other purposes.

H.R. 586 was introduced by Representative George Radanovich on February 2, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On May 15, 2006, Chairman Goodlatte received a letter from Congressman Pombo requesting the committee waive further consideration of the measure to allow its timely consideration. On May 16, 2006, the House motioned to suspend the rules and passed the bill by voice vote. On May 17, 2006, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The Right-to-Ride Livestock on Federal Lands Act of 2005 amends Public Law 91–383 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to preserve and facilitate the continued use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on parts of National Park System lands where there is a historical tradition of such use. Directs that as a general rule, all trails, routes, and areas used by such animals shall remain open and accessible for such use. Allows the Secretary of the Interior to implement a proposed reduction in the use and access of pack and saddle stock animals on such lands only after complying with the full review process required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

H.R. 975, to provide consistent enforcement authority to the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service to respond to violations of regulations regarding the management, use, and protection of public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 975 was introduced by Representative Thomas Tancredo on February 17, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On June 14, 2005, H.R. 975 was reported, without amendment, by the Committee on Resources, H.Rept. 109–128 pt. 1, and the Committee on Agriculture was discharged. On December 13, 2005, H.R. 975 passed the House, by a voice vote, under suspension of the rules.
On December 14, 2005, H.R. 975 was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with no further action being taken.

The Trail Responsibility and Accountability for the Improvement of Lands Act provides consistent laws for the violations of provisions under the four land management agencies’ (Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the United States Forest Service) enforcement authorities. Specifically, the bill would standardize penalty amounts, sentences, and other terms for certain misdemeanor violations under regulation by these agencies.

The measure also states that the Secretary of Agriculture may issue regulations to protect National Forest System lands from wildfire destruction, and that anyone who knowingly violates such regulation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

H.R. 4128, a bill entitled the Property Rights Protection Act of 2005, to prohibit the Federal Government from exercising its power of eminent domain for economic development and to use Congress’ spending power to discourage the State and local governments from using the power of eminent domain for economic development.

H.R. 4128 was introduced by Representative James F. Sensenbrenner, Jr. on October 25, 2005, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On November 3, 2005, H.R. 4128 passed the House by the yeas and nays: 376–38. The House Committee on Agriculture was allowed to control half the time allowed for floor debates because the Committee had recently reported a similar bill, H.R. 3405, the Strengthening the Ownership of Private Property Act of 2005 (STOPP Act of 2005).

H.R. 3405 was introduced by Representative Henry Bonilla on July 22, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committees on Transportation, Financial Services, Resources, and Education and the Workforce. The Committee on Agriculture reported the amended bill on October 31, 2005. Because the House was considering the similar bill, H.R. 4128, no further action was taken on the bill.

H.R. 3405 prohibits, until the earlier of 2 years after the takings prohibited by this Act or the day the property is returned to the original owner, Federal financial assistance under defined Federal economic development programs to a State or local government entity that (1) uses the power of eminent domain to take property from a private entity and transfer the ownership of, or a leasehold interest in, the property to another private entity; or (2) fails to provide, to any person displaced from property by the use of the power of eminent domain for any economic development purpose, relocation assistance under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. The measure accepts from the first clause property taken for (1) use by a public utility; (2) a road open to the public or common carriers; (3) an aqueduct, pipeline, or similar use; (4) a prison or hospital; or (5) any use during and in relation to a national emergency or national disaster declared by the President.
On November 4, 2005, H.R. 4128 was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senate has taken no further action on the measure.

H.R. 4128 prohibits any State or political subdivision from exercising its power of eminent domain for economic development if that State or political subdivision receives Federal economic development funds during the fiscal year. The bill defines “economic development” as taking private property and conveying or leasing it to a private entity for commercial enterprise carried on for profit or to increase tax revenue, the tax base, employment, or general economic health. It makes a State or political subdivision that violates such prohibition ineligible for any such funds for two fiscal years. H.R. 4128 also provides that such a State or political subdivision is not ineligible for such funds if it returns all real property that was improperly taken and replaces or repairs any property that was destroyed or damaged.

H.R. 4128 prohibits the Federal Government from exercising its power of eminent domain for economic development.

To ensure that injured private persons have recourse for takings which are prohibited under this bill, H.R. 4128 establishes a private cause of action for any private property owner who suffers injury as a result of a violation of this Act. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for September 7, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–15 and the discussion of H.R 3405 under 7. Bills Reported to the House But Not Considered.”)

H.R. 4200, a bill entitled the Forestry Emergency Recovery and Research Act, to provide for the recovery and restoration of forest lands damaged by a catastrophic event when such catastrophic event affects 1,000 acres or more of forest land.

H.R. 4200 was introduced by Representative Greg Walden on November 2, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources and additionally to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure. On May 4, 2006, the bill was reported by the Committee on Resources and discharged by the Committees on Agriculture and Transportation and Infrastructure. On May 17, 2006 H.R. 4200, as amended, passed the House by recorded vote: 243–182. On May 18, 2006 H.R. 4200 was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The Senate has taken no further action on the bill.

H.R. 4200 states that any catastrophic event over 1,000 acres must be quickly evaluated and restoration recommendations must be made. The Secretary may use existing law to address the problem, or, if expedited restoration work is needed, emergency procedures, requiring thorough environmental review of proposed actions but on a shortened time-line, would be available. This analysis would be performed by interdisciplinary teams within the agencies and would include full public notice and participation. In forest types that have been significantly researched, pre-approved management practices could be implemented immediately after environmental review. Emergency reforestation and restoration projects would then commence. Administrative appeals and litigation would follow the guidelines similar to those established under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA). Adjacent non-Federal
lands would also be included in the evaluation when desired by tribal, local government, and private landowners. The evaluation would determine if expedited reforestation and other recovery work are needed in the area and would also identify research opportunities.

The bill also strengthens research methods by (1) requiring forest health partnerships with colleges and universities when establishing post-catastrophe research projects; (2) requiring development of independent, third-party peer reviewed research protocols; (3) allowing peer reviewed research projects to be established in areas affected by catastrophe; and (4) authorizing research projects on Forest Service Experimental Forests.

In addition, the legislation would expand authorized uses of several funding sources for both Federal and non-Federal land, including annual appropriations, Knutson-Vandenberg, Salvage Sale, Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery, and FEMA funds. The Act would also authorize technical assistance from Federal employees for non-Federal landowners.

Finally, H.R. 4200 ensures collaboration with tribes, State and local governments, colleges and universities, and other interested people. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for December 7, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–23.”)

H.R. 4473, a bill to reauthorize and amend the Commodity Exchange Act to promote legal certainty, enhance competition, and reduce systemic risk in markets for futures and over-the-counter derivatives, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4473 was introduced by Chairman Bob Goodlatte on December 8, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services. On December 14, 2005, H.R. 4473 passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On December 15, 2005, H.R. 4473 was received in the Senate and placed on the calendar with no further action taking place.

The CFTC Reauthorization Act amends the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) to revise Commodities Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) jurisdiction over an agreement, contract, or retail transaction in foreign currency.

H.R. 4473 specifies that CFTC jurisdiction extends to any agreement, contract, or transaction in foreign currency that is a commodity contract of sale for future delivery or an option on such a contract, and is offered to, or entered into with a person that is not an eligible contract participant, unless the counterparty, or the person offering to be the counterparty, of the person is (1) a financial institution; (2) a specified broker, dealer, or associated person registered under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; (3) a specified futures commission merchant registered under CEA; (4) a specified insurance company or affiliate; (5) a financial holding company; or (6) an investment bank holding company. The measure also extends registration requirements to particular persons participating in the solicitation or recommendation of any such agreement, contract, or transaction.

The measure authorizes CFTC to bring anti-fraud actions in off-exchange principal-to-principal futures transaction. Provides that person shall not be obligated, in connection with a covered futures
transaction with another person, to disclose to such other person nonpublic information that may be material to the market price, rate or level of such commodity or transaction except as necessary to make any statement not materially misleading.

The measure also directs the agencies represented on the President’s Working Group on Financial Markets to work to ensure that the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the CFTC have taken action to permit risk-based portfolio margining for security options and security futures products by September 30, 2006 and by June 30, 2006, the trading of futures on certain security indexes by resolving issues related to debt security indexes and foreign security indexes.

H.R. 4473 also instructs CFTC to increase transparency of natural gas prices by conducting surveillance of trading in natural gas contracts and a review of the factors that caused significant and highly unusual change in the settlement price of any physically delivered natural gas futures contract traded on a contract market or derivatives transaction execution facility. The measure directs CFTC to require any person holding, maintaining, or controlling any position in a contract of sale of natural gas for future delivery or option on such a contract, at or exceeding reportable limits, to maintain and provide upon CFTC request records for 5 years regarding the position, including any related contract, agreement, or transaction in natural gas to which the person is a party.

The bill increases the civil penalty for specified commodity market manipulation-related offenses to $1 million or triple the monetary gain for each such violation and increases the criminal penalty for specified commodity trading-related felonies from five to 10 years imprisonment. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for March 3, 9, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–2.)

H.R. 4761, to provide for exploration, development, and production activities for mineral resources on the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4761 was introduced by Representative Bobby Jindal on February 15, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Resources. On June 21, 2006, the Committee on Resources adopted an amendment that funds provisions of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 from receipts from the development of oil and natural gas resources of the outer Continental Shelf. The adoption of this amendment would have resulted in a sequential referral of the bill, however, after an exchange of letters between the respective committees, the Committee on Agriculture waived consideration of the bill in order to expedite the consideration before the full House. On June 26, 2006, H.R. 4761 was reported by the Committee on Resources, H.Rept. 109–531. On June 29, 2006, the bill passed the House, as amended, by a vote of 232 yeas to 187 nays. On July 10, 2006, the bill was received in the Senate with a first reading occurring on August 3, 2006, and a second reading occurring on September 5, 2006. No further action has taken place.

Section 30 of the H.R. 4761, the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006 provides $50 million from Outer Continental Shelf (OSC) receipts for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 to fund
the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Public Law 106–393). The Secure Rural Schools Act provides funding for rural forested counties that no longer receive revenues from Federal timber sales due to the collapse of the Federal timber program in the 1990’s. The revenues received by counties are to be used on public education and transportation, resources projects on public land and search, rescue and emergency services. It is intended that funding only be provided if the authority to initiate projects under the Secure Rural Schools Act (due to expire at the end of fiscal year 2006) is reauthorized.

H.R. 5025, to protect for future generations the recreational opportunities, forests, timber, clean water, wilderness and scenic values, and diverse habitat of Mount Hood National Forest, Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5025 was introduced by Representative Walden on March 28, 2006, and was referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. The bill was ordered to be reported from the Resources Committee, as amended, in the nature of a substitute, by unanimous consent, on July 19, 2006. On July 24, 2006, the bill passed the House, as amended, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. It was received in the Senate and read twice and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on July 25, 2006, with no further action taking place.

The Mount Hood Stewardship Legacy Act designates specified wilderness areas in Mount Hood National Forest as wilderness and as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The bill authorizes the Secretary to use funds received from the special account established by this Act to support recreation purposes related to Mount Hood. The measure also directs the Secretary to establish the Mount Hood National Forest Recreational Advisory Council.

The bill sets forth provisions for the consideration of Forest Service roads in Mount Hood for conversion to recreational uses. H.R. 5025 authorizes the construction of a trail in Mount Hood suitable for use by persons with disabilities and authorizes and directs the Secretary to work with the State of Oregon to develop an integrated, multi-modal transportation plan for the Mount Hood region. The bill also directs the Secretary to conduct a study regarding a specified gondola connection and intermodal transportation center.

H.R. 5025 requires (1) the development of a forest stewardship plan to address those areas of Mount Hood with a high incidence of insect or disease infestation (or both), heavily overstocked tree stands, or moderate-to-high risk of unnatural catastrophic wildfire; and (2) a study to assess the amount of sustainable biomass available in Mount Hood. The bill authorizes the Secretary to complete memoranda of understanding that outline stewardship goals to manage the watersheds of Mount Hood. Lastly, H.R. 5025 requires the establishment of (1) a Crystal Springs watershed special resources management unit in Oregon; and (2) priority-use areas in Mount Hood for the gathering of first foods by Indian tribe members with treaty-reserved gathering rights; requires separate land exchanges; (1) involving specified Government Camp and Cooper
Spur lands; and (2) regarding the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail.

_H.R. 5313, to reserve a small percentage of the amounts made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the farmland protection program to fund challenge grants to encourage the purchase of conservation easements and other interests in land to be held by a State agency, county, or other eligible entity, and for other purposes._

H.R. 5313 was introduced by Representative Jim Gerlach on May 9, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 21, 2006 H.R. 5313 was ordered reported, without amendment by the Committee on Agriculture. On September 26, 2006, H.R. 5313 passed the House, without amendment, under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On September 27, 2006, the bill was received in the Senate with no further action taking place.

H.R. 5313 known as the Open Space and Farmland Preservation Act amends the Farm Security Act of 1985 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to reserve at least 15 percent of farmland protection program funds for grants to support cooperative efforts by eligible State agencies, counties, or other eligible entities to purchase conservation easements and other interests in eligible land. The bill further provides that the titles to such interests shall be held by eligible entities and not the United States.

Other Bills

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

_H.R. 1817, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes._

H.R. 1817 was introduced by Representative Christopher Cox on April 26, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. On May 3, 2005, the bill was reported, amended, H.Rept. 109–71 pt. 1, to the House and sequentially referred to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Government Reform, Judiciary, Science, Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and the Intelligence for a period ending not later than May 13, 2005. On May 13, 2005, the bill was reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, amended, H.Rept. 109–71 pt. II and by the Committee on the Judiciary, amended, H.Rept. 109–71 pt III. On May 18, 2005, the bill passed the House, amended, by a vote of 424 yeas to 4 nays. On May 19, 2006, H.R. 1817 was received in the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs with no further action taking place.

Section 309 of the Act requires the Secretary to report to the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on how the Department of Homeland Security will implement applicable rec-
ommendations from a GAO report on the protection of agriculture from a terrorist attack.

H.R. 4167, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4167 was introduced by Representative Mike Rogers on October 27, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. On February 28, 2006, the bill was reported, without amendment, by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, H.Rept. 109–379. On March 8, 2006, the bill passed the House, amended, by a vote of 283 yeas to 139 nays. On March 9, 2006, H.R. 4167 was referred to the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions. No further action was taken.

The National Uniformity for Food Act of 2005 amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) to prohibit any State or political subdivision from establishing or continuing in effect for any food in interstate commerce: (1) any requirement that is not identical to specified FFDCA provision (that does not have substantially the same language and the difference would result in the imposition of materially different requirements), including those related to adulterated foods, unsafe food additives, and new animal drugs; or (2) any notification requirement that provides for a warning concerning the food’s safety that is not identical to FFDCA provisions.

The measure also allows a State or political subdivision to enforce a State law that contains a requirement that is identical to a requirement in such FFDCA provisions unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services has considered a proposal for, and published a determination not to promulgate, a regulation relating to such requirement; and current State notification or food safety requirements to continue for 180 days, during which such State may petition for an exemption or a new national standard.

The bill also requires a State to petition for an exemption or to establish a national standard regarding any requirement under FFDCA or the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act relating to food regulation. Allows the Secretary of Health and Human Service to provide such an exemption if the requirement: 1) protects an important public interest that would otherwise be unprotected; 2) would not cause any food to be in violation of any Federal law; and 3) would not unduly burden interstate commerce. Requires the Secretary to expedite consideration of such a petition that involves a notification requirement to warn of cancer or reproductive or birth defects or to provide information that will allow parents or guardians to understand, monitor, or limit a child’s exposure to cancer-causing agents or reproductive or development toxins.

H.R. 4167 allows a State to establish a requirement that would otherwise violate FFDCA provisions relating to a national uniform nutrition labeling or this Act if the requirement is needed to address an imminent hazard to health that is likely to result in serious adverse health consequences and if other requirements are met.

The measure also declares that this Act does not preempt State and local laws relating to freshness dating, open date labeling, grade labeling, a State inspection stamp, religious dietary labeling,
organic or natural designation, returnable bottle labeling, unit pricing, a statement of geographic origin, dietary supplements, or a consumer advisory relating to food sanitation imposed on a food establishment or recommend by the Secretary.

Furthermore, section 3 provides that this Act takes effect if the Secretary certifies to Congress that its implementation will pose no additional risk to the public health or safety from terrorists attacks relating to the food supply.

Appropriations

H.R. 5384, Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5384 was introduced and reported as an original measure by Representative Bonilla of the Committee on Appropriations, H.Rept. 109–463 & 109–463 Part 2, on May 12, 2006. On May 23, 2006, the bill passed the House by a vote of 378 yeas to 46 nays. On May 24, 2006, H.R. 5384 was received in the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations with no further action being taken.

The Act provided $17.8 billion in discretionary spending, and $76.1 billion in mandatory spending for a total of $93.9 billion. Of the $17.8 billion allocated for discretionary spending, $16.2 billion is for USDA (except the forest service), $1.5 billion is for the FDA, and $109 million is for the CFTC. The actual discretionary spending allowed by the bill is closer to $18.4 billion because the bill limits certain mandatory programs authorized in the 2002 farm bill and applies those savings (over $600 million) to discretionary programs. The actual discretionary amount is about $100 million less than the comparable fiscal year 2006 spending level, and spending on the so-called “appropriated mandatory” programs shows a decrease of about $7 billion from the fiscal year 2006 levels. Broken down, it provided (1) $1.054 billion for the Farm Service Agency; (2) $1.2 billion for the Agricultural Research Service; (3) $791 million for conservation activities; (4) $853 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service; (5) $904 million for the Animal and Plant Healthy Inspection Service; (6) $37.9 billion for the food stamp program; (7) $13.3 billion for child nutrition programs; (8) $5.244 billion for Special Supplemental Nutrition Programs for Women, Infants and Children; (9) $1.2 billion for the Food for Peace Program; (10) $90 million for Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy detection and prevention activities; and (11) $80 million for Avian Flu Pandemic countermeasures and monitoring.

The Act also satisfied an administration request by allocating $33 million for a National Animal Identification Program, but conditioned the funds on the publication of an advanced notice of proposal making in the Federal Register containing a complete and detailed plan for the National Animal Identification System. The Act also included report language outlining concerns about the animal ID program’s progress and transparency, prohibited the Risk Management Agency from using funds to implement the Premium Reduction Program for the 2008 insurance year, prohibited USDA from closing any county FSA office without first holding public
hearings and providing notice to Congress, rejected the administration's request to end, and instead provided $25 million to expand, the free fresh fruit and vegetable program in schools, prohibited the FDA from using funds to prevent the reimportation of prescription drugs approved by the FDA, and prohibited the FDA from using funds provided in the bill to give conflict of interest waivers to any voting members of any of its advisory committees. (Note.— For further action, see the discussion of Public Law 109–289 and Public Law 109–383 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)


H.R. 5386 was introduced and reported as an original measure by Representative Taylor of the Committee on Appropriations, H.Rept. 109–465, on May 15, 2006. On May 18, 2006, the bill was passed the House by a vote of 293 yeas to 128 nays. On May 19, 2006, H.R. 5386 was received in the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations with no further action being taken.

This Act provided $25.94 billion for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies and programs. Among the proposed decreases for fiscal year 2007 from the fiscal year 2006 level are (1) $–99.5 million for the national Park Service; (2) $–65.5 million for the Forest Service; (3) $–55.4 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service; (4) $–48.7 million for the Environmental Protection Agency; (5) $–39.6 million for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and (6) $–38.7 million for the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians. Increases for fiscal year 2007 included (1) $148.4 million for Indian Health Service; (2) $31.2 million for the Bureau of Land Management; (3) $15.8 million for the U.S. Geological Survey; and (4) $9.0 million for each of the national Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Act also prohibited funds from being used for the sale or slaughter of wild horses and burros (as defined in P.L. 92–195); prohibited funds from being used to plan, design, study, or build roads in the Tongass National Forest, in Alaska, for harvesting timber; included $244 million for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program (PILT); continued at $7.4 million the special supplemental funding Congress provided in fiscal year 2006 for the study, monitoring, and early detection of highly pathogenic avian flu, through the virus strain H5N1; retained the moratoria on oil and natural gas leasing in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS); prohibited further testing of pesticides on human subjects; and included language prohibiting the US Environmental Protection Agency from issuing final regulations defining wetlands as navigable waters of the United States under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Note.— For further action, see the discussion of Public Law 109–289 and Public Law 109–383 under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)
H.R. 5522, Making Appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5522 was introduced and reported as an original measure, H. Rept. 109–486, by Representative Jim Kolbe on June 5, 2006. On June 8, 2006, the bill passed the House, as amended, by a vote of 373 yeas and 34 nays. On June 12, 2006, H.R. 5522 was received in the Senate, read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. On July 10, 2006, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported favorably H.R. 5522 with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, S.Rept. 109–277, with no further action taking place.

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2007 makes fiscal year 2007 appropriations for (1) the Export-Import Bank, including the Office of Inspector General, direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs, and administrative expenses; (2) Overseas Private Investment Corporation credit and insurance programs, including administrative expenses and for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, (and authority to undertake programs under title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in Iraq; (3) the Trade and Development Agency; (4) expenses of the President in carrying out certain programs under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; (5) the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for child survival, nutrition, and disease programs, including HIV/AIDS.

Section 565 of title V of the bill as introduced in the House was of interest to the Committee on Agriculture because this section granted the authority to the President of United States to reduce debt owned to the Commodity Credit Corporation by poor countries. On June 9, 2006, a point of order was sustained against section 565, because it violates House Rule XXI Clause 2 by changing existing law and inserting legislative language in an appropriations bill. (Note.—For further action, see the discussion of Public Law 109–289 and Public Law 109–383 under "1. Bills Enacted Into Law.")

6. Concurrent Resolutions Approved

None

7. Bills Reported to the House But Not Considered

H.Con.Res. 424, expressing the sense of Congress that it is the goal of the United States that, not later than January 1, 2025, the agricultural, forestry, and working land of the United States should provide from renewable resources not less than 25 percent of the total energy consumed in the United States and continue to produce safe, abundant, and affordable food, feed, and fiber.

H.Con.Res. 424 was introduced by Chairman Bob Goodlatte on June 7, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Resources. On September 21, 2006, H.Con.Res. 424 was ordered reported, without amendment, by the Committee on Agriculture by a voice vote. On September 29, 2006 and the Committee on Resources discharged. On September 29, 2006, H.Con.Res. 424 was reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture, H.Rept.
109–710 pt. 1. On that same date the measure was discharged by the Committee on Resources and an extension was granted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce until November 17, 2006. No further action was taken.

H.Con.Res. 424 expresses the sense of Congress that it is the goal of the United States that by January 1, 2025, U.S. agricultural, forestry, and working land should provide from renewable resources not less than 25 percent of the total U.S. energy consumption and continue to produce safe, abundant, and affordable food, feed and fiber.

Before reaching this resolution, H. Con. Res. 424 states that the production of renewable energy from agricultural, forestry, and working lands is beneficial to national security, rural economies, and the environment. H. Con. Res. 424 further states a belief that the development and use of renewable energy will stabilized the cost and availability of energy in the United States and that supportive policies and incentives will make increased use practical effective.

H.R. 517, to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 517 was introduced by Representative Greg Walden on February 2, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources. On May 18, 2005, the Committee on Resources ordered reported, without amendment, the bill to the House. On June 9, 2005, H.R. 517 was reported to the House, H.Rept. 109–117 pt. 1. No further action was taken.

The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2005 amends the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-determination Act of 2000 to extend the Act through fiscal year 2013, including the authority for special and county projects on National Forest System (NFS) and certain Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands.

The measure also amends the Act to allow eligible counties to receive the full payment amount with respect to payments from NFS lands for the benefit of public education and transportation or the BLM lands for the benefit of public safety, law enforcement, education, and other public purposes effective through fiscal year 2013. H.R. 517 gives eligible counties the opportunity to make payment elections in writing during the last quarter of fiscal year 2006 and reserve specified revenues, fees, penalties, and miscellaneous receipts (exclusive of required deposits) in the event of a shortfall.

The bill further requires counties participating in county projects to submit to the Secretary concerned a specified written notification for each project for which the participating county obligated county funds and requires the Secretary concerned to review such notifications and report annually to specified congressional committees. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for April 21, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–5.”)
H.R. 599, to provide a source of funds to carry out restoration activities on Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

H.R. 599 was introduced by Representative Mark Udall on February 2, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On May 18, 2005, the Committee on Resources, ordered reported H.R. 599, as amended, by unanimous consent. On June 14, 2005, the bill was reported to the House, as amended, H. Rept. 109–129 pt. 1. No further action was taken.

The Federal Lands Restoration, Enhancement, Public Education, and Information Resources Act of 2005 amends the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the National Park Service Organic Act, the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, and Federal laws relating to National Forest System Lands, to make available any moneys received from fines or any moneys received from collateral payments in lieu of appearance for violations of rules and regulations applicable to Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for certain restoration and public informational activities on such lands. The measure also transfers any such excess funds to the Crime Victims Fund established under the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.

H.R. 1640, to ensure jobs for our future with secure and reliable energy.

H.R. 1640 was introduced by Representative Joe Barton on April 14, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Resources, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Agriculture. On July 29, 2005, H.R. 1640 was reported, with amendments, by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, House Report 109–215, pt. 1. On that same date, H.R. 1640 was discharged from all other Committees. Because the House was considering the similar bill, H.R. 6, no further action was taken on the bill.

The measure sets forth an energy research and development program, including (1) energy efficiency; (2) renewable energy; (3) oil and gas; (4) coal; (5) Indian energy; (6) nuclear matters and security; (7) vehicles and motor fuels, including ethanol; (8) hydrogen; (9) electricity; and (10) energy tax incentives.

H.R. 1905, Small Tracts Reform Act

H.R. 1905 was introduced by Representative John Doolittle on April 27, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On July 14, 2005, the Committee on Resources reported the bill without amendment, H.Rept. 109–169 pt. 1. On that same date, the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from further consideration. No further action was taken.

H.R. 1905 amends the Small Tracts Act by eliminating the $150,000 cap on the value of land to be exchanged. Additionally, the bill applies to mineral fractions, interspersed parcels, lands affected by encroachment or erroneous surveys, road rights-of-way, or
other parcels of land in which the sale or exchange is not practicable under any other authority and the management of the area is inefficient.

The bill also provides for two land transfers between the Forest Service and private landowners in the Tahoe National Forest in California. The land transfers will allow the Forest Service to add contiguous land to its existing boundaries.

H.R. 3405, to prohibit the provision of Federal economic development assistance for any State or locality that uses the power of eminent domain power to obtain property for private commercial development or that fails to pay relocation costs to persons displaced by use of the power of eminent domain for economic development purposes.

H.R. 3405 was introduced by Representative Henry Bonilla on July 22, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Resources, and Education and the Workforce. On October 7, 2005, the Committee on Agriculture ordered reported, H.R. 3405, as amended, by a vote of 40 yeas to 1 nay. On October 31, 2005, H.R. 3405 was reported to the House, as amended, H.Rept. 109–261 pt. 1. On that same date all other Committees discharged from further consideration. No further action was taken.

Private ownership of property is vital to our freedom and our prosperity, and is one of the most fundamental principles embedded in our Constitution. The founders realized the importance of property rights when they codified the Takings clause of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which requires that private property shall not be taken “for public use, without just compensation.” This clause created two conditions to the government taking private property—that the subsequent use of the property is for the public and that the government gives the property owners just compensation.

However, the Supreme Court’s 5–4 decision in Kelo v. City of New London is a step in the opposite direction. This controversial ruling expands the ability of State and local governments to exercise eminent domain powers to seize property under the guise of “economic development” when the “public use” is as incidental as generating tax revenues or creating jobs, even in situations where the government takes property from one private individual and gives it to another private entity.

By defining “public use” so expansively, the Court essentially erased any protection for private property as understood by the founders of our nation. In the wake of this decision, State and local governments can use eminent domain powers to take the property of any individual for nearly any reason. Cities may now bulldoze private citizens’ homes, farms, and small businesses to make way for shopping malls or other developments.

H.R. 3405, The Strengthening the Ownership of Private Property (STOPP) Act of 2005, as amended by the House Agriculture Committee, would create a strong incentive for State and local governments to refrain from using eminent domain powers to take private property from one owner and give it to another private owner. Specifically, the bill prohibits all Federal economic development fund-
The legislation also withholds Federal economic development funding from any State or local government that uses eminent domain for economic development purposes, and does not then comply with the procedures in the Uniform Relocation Act, which would require State and local governments to pay relocation costs for individuals affected by eminent domain proceedings. (Note.—For further action see the discussion of H.R. 4128 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate” and also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for September 7, 2005, Hearing Serial No. 109–15.”)

**H.R. 3818, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into partnership agreements with entities and local communities to encourage greater cooperation in the administration of Forest Service activities on and near National Forest System lands, and for other purposes.**

H.R. 3818 was introduced by Representative Walden on December 6, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and in addition to the Committee on Resources. On October 19, 2005, the Committee on Resources ordered reported H.R. 3818, amended, by unanimous consent. On December 6, 2005, the bill was reported, as amended, H.Rept. 109–325 pt. 1. No further action was taken.

The Forest Service Partnership Enhancement Act of 2005 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, to enter into agreements, including cost-share agreements, with cooperators for (1) developing, producing or selling education and interpretive materials and products; (2) developing, conducting, or selling education and interpretive programs and services; (3) constructing, maintaining, or improving facilities for the sale or distribution of educational and interpretive materials, products, and services; (4) operating facilities; (5) selling health and safety convenience products; (6) collecting funds from the sale of such materials, products, programs, and services; (7) activities to restore and maintain the ecological integrity and biodiversity of NFS lands; (8) watershed restoration and enhancement activities on NFS lands, or on other lands that benefit resources on NFS land within the same watershed, for protecting, restoring, and enhancing resources, including fish and wildlife habitat, or reducing risk from natural disaster where public safety is threatened; and (9) such other cooperative activities as the Secretary considers to be appropriate.

The measure directs the Secretary to require such terms and conditions in an agreement as are necessary to protect investments to be made by the United States, including terms related to the ownership of any facilities or improvements constructed or improved under such an agreement.

H.R. 3818 also sets forth provisions concerning cost-sharing, including providing for in-kind contributions and the treatment of funds received under an agreement.

Lastly, the bill repeals certain authorities relating to cooperative arrangements for the printing of educational materials and the continuation of the Challenge Cost Share Program and the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Agreements.
H.R. 3849, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to implement pesticide-related obligations of the United States under the international conventions or protocols known as the PIC Convention, the POPs Convention, and the LRTAP POPs Protocol.

H.R. 3849 was introduced by Representative Lucas on September 21, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On July 20, 2006, the Committee on Agriculture held a hearing to review H.R. 3849, Hearing Serial No. 109–35. On July 27, 2006, the bill was ordered reported, without amendment, to the House by a voice vote. On September 19, 2006, the measure was reported, without amendment, by the Committee on Agriculture, H.Rept. 109–668. No further action was taken.

H.R. 3849 provides the necessary legislation to implement the Federal, Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)-related provisions of three international agreements, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals in International Trade (PIC), and the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP POPs Protocol). U.S. ratification of these three agreements requires targeted amendments to both FIFRA and the Toxics Substances Control Act (TSCA) to ensure that the United States can meet and effectively implement the obligations of the agreements.

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) aims to protect human health and the environment from chemicals that are of particular concern because they are known to be toxic, bioaccumulative, resistant to natural breakdown, and capable of long-range transport. Each of the twelve chemicals in the Convention has been scientifically linked to adverse human health effects and are already banned, severely restricted, or controlled in the United States. These chemicals are still in use in many places abroad, particularly in developing countries. The Convention prohibits production and use of eight pesticides and industrial chemicals subject to certain exemptions. The Convention also restricts DDT use to public health applications and prohibits new PCB production, while imposing import and export controls on listed chemicals. Parties promote the application of Best Available Technologies (BAT) on key industrial sources and ensure POPs wastes are managed in an environmentally sound manner. The Convention creates a science-based procedure to consider the addition of other chemicals that may be POPs. The Convention entered into force in May 2004.

The Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP) POPs Protocol is a regional agreement negotiated primarily by developed countries. It was finalized prior to the global Stockholm Convention, and the Protocol was used in some ways as a model for the Convention. The structure and core obligations of the Stockholm Convention and LRTAP POPs agreements are very similar in restricting the production, use, or release of certain toxic chemicals. There are three main differences between the two agreements. First, the LRTAP POPs is a regional agreement open only to states in Europe, the former Soviet States, Canada, and the United States. Second, the LRTAP POPs Protocol does not include
the same kind of trade measures nor provisions for financial and technical assistance found in the POPs treaty. Finally, the LRTAP POPs Protocol covers four additional chemicals in its scope, each of which is banned or controlled in the United States. The LRTAP POPs Protocol entered into force in October of 2003.

The Rotterdam Convention establishes an information-sharing process that facilitates informed decision-making about whether to import a listed chemical. Both importing and exporting parties have responsibilities to facilitate information exchange on the risks associated with a listed chemical. The scope of the Convention is limited to banned or severely restricted industrial chemicals and pesticides and to severely hazardous pesticide formulations. Importing parties make a notification of whether and how they will allow for imports of each listed chemical, and exporting parties ensure that any exports are not contrary to an importing party’s notification. The Rotterdam Convention includes a technical committee, the Chemical Review Committee, which reviews notifications in accordance with the Convention’s criteria, and may recommend to the parties whether to list additional chemicals. The Convention entered into force in February of 2004.

Over the last 30 years, the United States has taken extensive steps to address the twelve substances covered by the POPs Convention and the sixteen LRTAP substances, as well as the thirty-nine substances found on the PIC list. As a result, the United States is generally in compliance with the treaty. There are only a few small gaps to close in terms of U.S. legislative authorities, such as formally prohibiting production of listed pesticides and prohibiting potential future use of unregistered pesticides. The legislation passed by this Committee closes those gaps by amending FIFRA, and a complementary bill has been passed by the House Energy and Commerce Committee (H.R. 4591) amending the Toxic Substance Control Act.

H.R. 4084, to amend the Forest Service use and occupancy permit program to restore the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the special use permit fees collected by the Secretary in connection with the establishment and operation of marinas in units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4084 was introduced by Representative Herger on October 19, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture in addition to the Committee on Resources. On June 7, 2006, H.R. 4084 was reported, without amendment, by the Committee on Resources, H. Rept. 109–490, Part I. The Committee on Agriculture requested an Executive Comment from the USDA on June 12, 2006 with no further action being taken.

The measure amends the Forest Service use and occupancy permit program to require amounts collected in connection with the issuance of a special use permit for a marina at a unit of the National Forest System (NFS) derived from the public domain to be deposited in an existing special account in the Treasury established for the Secretary of Agriculture for specified recreation management purposes. H.R. 4084 also prohibits the Secretary from using such amounts for biological monitoring for listed or candidate spe-
cies under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. In addition, the legislation requires at least 80 percent of the permit fees collected at a specific unit of the NFS to be expended for that unit and permits the Secretary to transfer up to 20 percent of such fees to appropriations available to enhance recreation opportunities at other NFS units. (Note.—See also the discussion under “D. Oversight. Summaries for July 20, 2006, Hearing Serial No. 109–35.”)

8. Bills Ordered Reported But Not Reported

None

9. Bills Defeated in the House

H.R. 5059, to designate the Wild River Wilderness in the White Mountain National Forest in the State of New Hampshire, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5059 was introduced by Representative Charles Bass on March 30, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Resources and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 25, 2006, the bill was considered in the House under suspension of the rules, however, failed by a vote of 223 yeas to 167 nays, with less than two-thirds of those present voting in the affirmative.

The New Hampshire Wilderness Act of 2006 designates specified Federal lands in the White Mountain National Forest area of New Hampshire as a wilderness area (which shall be known as the Wild River Wilderness) and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System. (Note—For further action, see the discussion for P.L. 109-XXX (S. 4001) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)

H.R. 5062, to designate as wilderness certain National Forest System land in the State of New Hampshire.

H.R. 5062 was introduced by Representative Jeb Bradley on March 30, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On September 25, 2006, the bill was considered in the House under suspension of the rules, however, failed by a vote of 223 yeas to 167 nays, with less than two-thirds of those present voting in the affirmative.

The bill designates specified Federal lands in the White Mountain National Forest area of New Hampshire as wilderness and incorporates such lands into the Sandwich Range Wilderness. (Note—For further action, see the discussion for P.L. 109-XXX (S. 4001) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)

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 108th 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 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 109th Congress (Note.—To see a copy of the Oversight Plan as submitted, see “I. Summary of Organization, Jurisdiction, and Oversight Plan of the Committee on Agriculture”.)

1. Oversight hearings

March 1, 2005: Review of the Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) rule providing for Canadian beef and cattle imports. Full committee. Hearing Serial No. 109–1.

The purpose of this hearing was to review the USDA’s rule providing for Canadian beef and cattle imports. The U.S. closed its border to Canadian beef and cattle imports after the December 23, 2003 discovery of a single case of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) in the U.S. in a cow of Canadian origin. In December 2004, the USDA published the final rule establishing minimal-risk regions which will become effective on March 7, 2005. The U.S. remains committed to protecting the safety of the food supply and domestic cattle population through an array of protective measures including the feed ban, Specified Risk Material (SRM) removal and a robust BSE surveillance system. Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns testified that Canada has a robust inspection program and that the feed ban is reducing the risk of transmission of BSE in the Canadian cattle population. In future dealings with BSE, the U.S. efforts must remain rooted in sound science, with an eye toward the long term structure and economic health of the beef and cattle industry due to the far-reaching implications for producers, processors, retailers and consumers.


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which was established in 1974 and set to expire in September 2005. The CFTC was last reauthorized 4 years ago in the enactment of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 (CFMA), which effectuated major changes with respect to the regulation of exchange-traded futures contracts, over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives, and “security futures.” The CFMA has accomplished much of its intended purpose. Its purpose was to provide regulatory relief to foster industry growth and a level playing field, while still protecting market in-
tegrity for all participants. Dr. Sharon Brown-Hruska, Acting Chairman of the CFTC, testified that under the CFMA there is more access than ever for U.S. customers wanting to trade on foreign exchanges as well as for foreign customers wanting to trade in the U.S. markets. (Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 4473 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The subcommittee heard testimony from 14 witnesses representing interested associations and exchanges. The CFTC was established in 1974 and is set to expire in September 2005. The CFTC was last reauthorized 4 years ago in the enactment of the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 (CFMA), which effectuated major changes with respect to the regulation of exchange-traded futures contracts, over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives, and “security futures”. Technological changes have allowed the futures industry and options market to grow and evolve into an around-the-clock global industry. Since the passage of the CFMA, futures markets have grown and developed tremendously, as well as faced some difficulties and challenges. (Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 4473 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the methyl bromide (MeBr) Critical Use Exemption (CUE) process under the Montreal Protocol. The subcommittee heard testimony from two panels of witnesses, including Claudia McMurray, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environment, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State, and industry representatives. The Montreal Protocol revised its original decision to phase out MeBr use and production completely to enable exemptions for uses of MeBr regarded as critical. The criteria to qualify MeBr use as critical were to be based solely on scientific review; however, recent meetings of the Parties in Nairobi indicate that the review process has become largely political. The 2007 nomination has not been as similar as expected to the ultimate nomination of 2006. Parties to the Montreal Protocol agreed to specific criteria that would determine uses that would qualify as critical when Congress amended the Clean Air Act in 1998, demonstrating a degree of trust in the international process.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the final regulations issued by the Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) concerning the policy of “payment of cash in advance” and the effect of the redefinition of the payment policy on U.S. agricultural trade with Cuba. The Committee heard from two panels of witnesses including the Director of OFAC, Robert W. Werner. This hearing took place because several farm groups and
Members of Congress raised concerns over the potential loss of exports due to the February 22, 2005 OFAC ruling requiring U.S. agricultural exporters to receive payment from Cuba before shipping commodities. Since Congress passed the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act in October of 2000, the United States has become the top supplier of food products to Cuba. The sentiment of the Committee was that the “payment of cash in advance” policy should not be changed, as both the United States and Cuba were benefiting from and in agreement with the previous policy.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the implementation of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000. This act, set to expire in September 2006, created new cooperative partnerships between citizens in forest counties and Federal land managers to develop forest health improvement projects on public lands, simultaneously stimulating job development and community economic stability. The act assists counties within or adjacent to forest reserves to offset the effects of removing these lands from economic development. Over 4,400 schools have received funding to restore programs in rural communities, and over 780 counties have received funding for local county road maintenance. Over 2,500 forest improvement projects have addressed fuels reduction, habitat improvement, watershed restoration, road maintenance and rehabilitation, reforestation, campground and trail improvement, and noxious weed eradication. Chairman Bob Goodlatte and Ranking Member Collin Peterson introduced H.R. 517 to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools Act until 2013. The Honorable Mark Rey, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment testified, along with representatives of forest county administration and education, and the forest industry. (Note.—See the discussion for H.R. 517 under “7. Bills Reported to the House but Not Considered.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the economic impact of Asian soybean rust on the U.S. farm sector. Asian Soybean Rust (ASR), a fungal disease that affects the growth of soybeans, among other plants, was first discovered in the U.S. in November 2004 and is not thought to have had any measurable effect on the 2004 soybean production. This has provided time for the soybean sector to prepare strategies to guard against possible ASR damage to the 2005 soybean crop and beyond. ASR was first discovered in Japan in 1902 and has spread to Asia, Australia, Africa, South America and North America. Airborne spores can travel up to 400 miles per day. Once infected with ASR, soybean plants are covered with rust lesions that reduce photosynthesis and stunt the growth of the plant. Currently 19 pesticide products are approved to treat ASR, but EPA officials believe that developing plant resistant varieties would be the most effective and least expensive safeguard. The USDA is coordinating a research initiative to tackle ASR with a

The purpose of this hearing was to review the delivery and effectiveness of the Federal crop insurance system. The Federal crop insurance program, which consists of 22 plans on over 350 agricultural commodities, provides a safety net that enables producers to protect themselves from devastating crop losses due to weather, invasive pests, and disease. The hearing focused on crop insurance, soybean rust and Premium Reduction Plans (PRP), just one week after the first case of soybean rust in the 2005 season was found in Georgia. In light of the soybean rust situation, the Risk Management Agency (RMA) was expected to inform farmers as to which production practices will be required of them in order for them to qualify for indemnity under their crop insurance policies. The hearing also discussed Premium Reduction Plans (PRP), which allow approved insurance providers to offer reduced premiums to farmers corresponding to demonstrated efficiencies in delivering crop insurance below the administrative and operating expense reimbursement. Officials from the USDA, as well as crop insurance industry representatives, presented testimony and were be encouraged to offer feedback to ensure that the system meets the needs of U.S. producers.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the U.S. Grain Standards Act (USGSA). The USGSA was set to expire in September 2005, and the administration submitted to the Committee a reauthorization proposal that would extend the USGSA 10 years, through September 2015. Specifically, reauthorization is required to maintain several authorities so that the Federal Grain Inspection Service (FGIS) will continue operating. The authorities are needed to allow FGIS to collect and invest fees to cover administrative expenses, perform official inspections and weighing, supervise weighing; to receive appropriations; and to sustain the USDA Grain Inspection Advisory Committee. Testimony was given by a USDA official and grain industry representatives. Reauthorization is expected in the coming months. (Note.—See the discussion for Public Law 109–83 (S. 1752, H.R. 3421) under “1. Bills Enacted Into Law.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to give the administration the opportunity to explain how it believes the new national forest management planning regulations will increase the efficiency of the forest planning process and reduce conflicts over forest plans. The National Forest Management Act (NFMA), enacted in 1979, required the Forest Service to develop a forest plan that specified expected outputs, made land allocations, and placed restrictions on certain types of timber harvesting activities. The Forest Service issued reg-
ulations to guide the planning process in 1979, and slightly revised these in 1982. The 1982 regulations required development and detailed analysis of multiple alternatives for each planning unit, and the development of detailed Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) for new plans or plan revisions. In practice, this extensive process produced little valuable information for forest managers. In 2002, the Forest Service issued a draft revision to the planning rule and issued a final rule in 2004. The 2004 rule requires that plans set broad overall goals based on a comprehensive review of the condition of the land and the history of program outputs. To meet conservation requirements, the new rule adopts an ecosystem-based, rather than species-based approach to habitat protection. In addition, each unit must adopt an Environmental Management System (EMS). The EMS, coupled with annual monitoring, and comprehensive review of progress towards the goals every 5 years, provides a mechanism to correct management actions. The new rules also will allow forest planning and plan revisions to occur every 2 to 3 years, rather than the current five to 7 years under the 1982 rule. The 2004 planning rule is an attempt to streamline what has become a very cumbersome and expensive process; however, the agency is proposing to take on new responsibilities in terms of implementing and monitoring the EMS, so the overall costs will be only slightly lower than those under the 1982 rule. Testimony was given by USDA officials and forestry and wildlife experts. (Note.—See the discussion for H.R. 4200 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate”, and “A. Main Legislative Activities, Healthy Forests Restoration Act Implementation”)  


The purpose of this hearing was to review the needs, capabilities and obstacles facing foreign food aid programs. The United States currently funds several programs that provide agricultural commodities to support economic development or grant emergency relief overseas. Authorized by the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act and other permanent legislation, these programs include Food for Peace, Food for Progress, the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust and the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. The subcommittee also examined a USAID proposal providing for the transfer of $300 million of the agency’s $1.2 billion budget for the purpose of purchasing foreign agricultural commodities in areas experiencing food emergencies and the possible effects of the World Trade Organization’s Doha Development Round on how food aid is provided. Testimony was given by representatives from the USDA, USAID, non-governmental food assistance organizations and commodity groups.  

June 22, 2005: Hearing to recognize and review the U.S. Forest Service in its centennial year. Full committee. Hearing serial No. 109–11.  

The purpose of this hearing was to recognize and review the U.S. Forest Service on its centennial. The Committee commended the Forest Service and its first Chief, Gifford Pinchot, for their commitment to conservation and dedicated service in caring for the nation’s forests. The chairman introduced a house resolution to honor and mark the official centennial of the Forest Service. The com-
mittee also evaluated the performance of the Forest Service over the last 100 years. The committee focused on the agency’s level of efficiency and encouraged the Forest Service to promote multiple use benefits as it enters its second century. Testimony was heard from the current Chief of the Forest Service, representatives from the forestry industry and conservation groups.

July 21, 2005: “Review of Agriculture’s Role in a renewable fuels standard. Full committee. Hearing Serial No. 109–12. The purpose of this hearing was to examine and discuss the role of agriculture and forestry products as sources for biofuels. Rising fuel prices, dependence on foreign oil from unstable regions, and environmental issues have spurred an already growing interest in domestically produced renewable fuels. The chairman commented on the importance of developing alternative fuels and creating new markets for agricultural products. He stressed the importance of minimizing economic costs to other sectors and markets that a renewable fuels standard might create. House and Senate conferees also met this week to find common ground on energy bills passed earlier this year. The House energy bill calls for a 5 billion gallon renewable fuel standard (RFS), while the Senate version contains an 8 billion gallon RFS. In June, the Chairman and Ranking Member Peterson cosponsored the Renewable Fuels Act of 2005 to establish an 8 billion gallon RFS by 2012. Testifying at the hearing were Minnesota Governor and Chairman of the Governors’ Ethanol Coalition, Tim Pawlenty, USDA Chief Economist Keith Collins, and representatives from the National Farmers Union, National Corn Growers Association, Virginia Biodiesel Refinery, Virginia Poultry Growers Cooperative, and the American Forest and Paper Association. (Note.—See the discussion under “A. Main Legislative Activities, Healthy Forests Restoration Act Implementation.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review agricultural research at the Fort Keogh Livestock and Range Research Laboratory in Miles City, Montana. The mission of the Fort Keogh Livestock and Range Research Laboratory is to research and develop ecologically and economically sustainable rangeland-based livestock production systems. Historically significant research accomplishments of the Laboratory are in the areas of animal genetics, reproductive physiology, nutrition, and range management. Presently, the program focuses on both the rangeland resource and the grazing animals. Recent accomplishments include successful development of a simple, user-friendly, drought management decision support system and the development of sire selection indices that optimize profit from future progeny.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the specialty crop industry. California is an agriculturally diverse State that contributes significantly to U.S. agriculture production. The hearing covered a variety of issues including trade, market access, conservation, research, and pests and diseases affecting the fruit, nut, vegetable, wine and nursery industries. In 2004, wide diversity in agri-
culture and policy domination by a few large program crops prompted concerned Members to introduce and pass the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act. Ranking Minority Member Ed Case testified that the hearing highlighted the incredible diversity of U.S. specialty crops and armed them to work with the USDA on rapid and full implementation of the Act. The hearing included an opportunity for the Chairman and members of the California Delegation to visit local agriculture operations in the Lodi, California, area.


The purpose of this hearing was to review Canada and Australia’s experience with implementing national animal identification systems. In August 2005, the USDA announced its decision to pursue a National Animal Identification System (NAIS) based on a public/private partnership. In anticipation of the development of the new system, the Committee invited witnesses from Australia and Canada to comment on their experience with implementation of a private sector-based NAIS. “In a relatively short period of time, both nations have moved forward systems that are the envy of many in the international livestock community, and I think their experience in developing these systems is well worth our time and attention,” said Chairman Goodlatte. According to the USDA, animal movement data will be maintained in a private system that can be accessed when necessary by State and Federal animal health authorities and the system will allow for tracking of animals from point of origin to processing within 48 hours.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the development of a private sector-based national animal identification system (NAIS). In July 2005, the USDA announced plans to implement a NAIS. The plan is based on a public/private partnership that enables the private sector to maintain animal movement data while allowing the government quick and effective access to livestock information in case of a disease outbreak or other livestock-related health threat. Subcommittee Chairman Hayes sought to gain input from producer groups about the direction the USDA has chosen to take in animal identification. “I firmly believe that the best way for a national animal ID program to work is for the producers and industry to work with USDA to develop a system, rather than having bureaucrats in Washington mandate a burdensome, costly program that fails to protect confidentiality,” said Chairman Hayes. (Note.—See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, Animal ID.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the state of the farm economy and the impact of Federal policy on agriculture. Net cash farm income levels reached record highs in each of the past 2 years. However, USDA forecasts for 2005 indicate a significant dip
in net farm income from 2004. Higher costs for energy, fertilizer, manufactured inputs, crop and livestock losses, and interest rates contribute to the projected decline in net farm income. The effects of recent natural disasters, including Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, are expected to further increase production costs for farmers. Agriculture Committee Ranking Member Collin Peterson said, “We need to address the immediate needs of producers facing disaster situations; however, we must also recognize what farmers already know — crop insurance and ad hoc disaster packages are often inadequate and unpredictable. It is time to look seriously at implementing a standing disaster program, so the guesswork is removed from our farm and nutrition programs in the event of a disaster. (Note.— See the discussion for ‘‘A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.’’)


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the impact that the current state of Mississippi River transportation is having on agricultural markets. Roughly 1 billion bushels of grain, or 60 percent of U.S. grain exports, traverse the waters of the Mississippi annually, but damage caused by Hurricane Katrina temporarily disrupted shipping and export operations along the Mississippi and several points in the Gulf region. Furthermore, effects were not limited to the Gulf States. 33 States rely on the Mississippi River and its tributaries to move goods to the port facilities for export. “Export facilities are operating at about 2/3 capacity due to difficulties with the barge logistics system and the difficulty of dealing with nearly 500 barges containing damaged grain,” said Chairman Goodlatte. He urged the USDA to make additional resources available to clear the barges of storm-damaged grain and get the barges back in operation as soon as possible.

Mississippi River transportation has also been affected by severe drought conditions in the upper Midwest which caused reduced water levels in the Illinois and Upper Mississippi Rivers. Lower water levels coupled with high fuel prices and limited transportation options in the wake of the hurricane have contributed to higher barge rates. While transportation along the Mississippi is gradually returning to normal, it will be some time before the entire shipping infrastructure is operating at full capacity. The Committee will continue to monitor the progress along the Mississippi and the port facilities.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the status of the agricultural negotiations in the Doha Development Round. In October, U.S. Trade Representative Rob Portman submitted a comprehensive trade proposal to the World Trade Organization to jumpstart the negotiations in Geneva. Previously, Chairman Goodlatte sent a letter to U.S. Trade Representative Portman outlining four principles which he believes will guide support for final agreement: (1) improvements in real market access, (2) greater harmonization in trade-distorting domestic support, (3) elimination of export subsidies, and (4) greater certainty and predictability regarding WTO
litigation. The chairman noted that these principles would be very beneficial to gaining Congressional support for such an agreement. Chairman Goodlatte stated, “Those of us interested in promoting U.S. agriculture around the world believe our farmers and ranchers can do better in world markets once barriers of all kinds are reduced or eliminated.” The Committee heard testimony from Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns and Ambassador Robert Portman as well as a variety of industry representatives. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, Trade.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review recent litigation involving Forest Service firefighting and forest health efforts. In September, a California district court ruled in the Earth Island Institute v. Ruthenbeck case that projects proposed by the Forest Service under Categorical Exclusion (CE) were subject to the notice, comment, and appeal provisions of the Appeals Reform Act (ARA). The ARA requires that Forest Service projects implementing National Forest plans be subject to public notice, comment, and appeal. Currently, projects without significant environmental impacts need not be subject to the provisions of the Appeals Reform Act and can be conducted using Categorical Exclusions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Projects conducted under a CE cannot deviate from a forest plan and cannot be carried out in a wilderness area, threatened or endangered species habitat, or wetlands.

Plaintiffs in the Earth Island Institute suit and similar litigation claim forest development harms the forest environment. If the Earth Island decision is correct, it would require public notice and comment on the development of forest plans, timber sales, litigation over both forest plans and projects, and other minor projects which would further complicate the planning process and delay critical projects. “The forest service believes that almost 600,000 acres of fuel treatments will be delayed at least through the winter. Twenty two salvage logging projects will also be delayed, reducing the value of the already dead timber by at least 50 percent and denying badly needed economic activity to rural areas,” said Chairman Goodlatte. “Even after extensive documentation and public involvement, the Forest Service is still routinely sued by environmental advocacy groups. The question in my mind is: at what point have we lost sight of environmental results because of our excessive attention to bureaucratic process?” (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, Healthy Forests Restoration Act Implementation”).


The purpose of this hearing was to review issues related to the prevention, detection, and eradication of avian influenza (AI). Recently, media and governments worldwide have raised extreme concern about the prevalence and dangers of an Avian Influenza Pandemic. Although the disease has not reached North America and has only been found to infect those humans who live and work closely with live poultry, the panic has come at a great cost to the
U.S. poultry industry. Chairman Goodlatte noted that in the wake of the Avian Influenza scare, estimates suggest disruptions in poultry consumption are costing the U.S. poultry industry some $88 million per month.

The hearing allowed Members the chance to look at the animal health aspects of avian influenza and current preventative measures employed by U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. poultry industry. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Administrator Dr. Ron DeHaven testified about protecting the U.S. from the introduction of Asian bird flu and the safety of our nation’s poultry products. “Producers and processors have developed strategies for managing this problem and continually invest considerable time and resources to prevent introduction of AI into their flocks. For the agriculture community, AI is a well-understood challenge that is already a part of their production routine,” said Chairman Goodlatte.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the USDA’s watershed programs. The USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) administers four watershed programs including the Watershed Surveys and Planning Program, Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations Program, Watershed Rehabilitation Program, and Emergency Watershed Protection Program. These programs are designed to maintain safe drinking water, control erosion, preserve wildlife habitat and implement flood protection measures. This hearing addressed the issue of the more than 11,000 flood control dams that have been built across the U.S., many of which are approaching their 50-year life span. Subcommittee Chairman Lucas noted that the government cannot meet the funding demands due to the size and scope of the projects requested by the public. He asked witnesses to discuss whether or not the NRCS was adequately staffed to handle the workload and the current state of projects, as well as earmarks in appropriations.


The purpose of this hearing was to better understand how the USDA determines Posted County Prices (PCPs) and how accuracy throughout the system can be improved. USDA monitors and sets over 88,000 PCPs each day. PCPs are used to determine county level loan rates and Marketing Assistance Loan program benefits for commodities. Marketing Assistance Loans provide farmers with short-term funds to cover expenses until their commodities are marketed. In the event that local markets prices dip below the established loan rate, producers can choose to put the crop under loan or forgo the loan and opt for a Loan Deficiency Payment (LDP). The LDP is the difference between the loan rate and the PCP. PCP's play an integral role in the structure of our farm programs, and they will be instrumental in the development of the next farm bill.

The purpose of this field hearing was to listen to producers’ concerns regarding the development next farm bill. This hearing was held in Fayetteville, North Carolina and was the first in a series of hearings the Committee plans to accomplish and involved testimony from two panels of witnesses representing the diverse agricultural interests of North Carolina. The 2002 farm bill provides for the continuation of agricultural programs and will expire in 2007.

(Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


The purpose of this field hearing was to listen to producers’ concerns regarding the development next farm bill. This hearing was held in Auburn, Alabama. Fifteen Members were present, and they heard from two panels of witnesses who gave testimony about the future of farm policy. This was the second in a series of hearings the Committee planned and was attended by over 200 members of the community including producers, officials, and students. Originally started with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the 2002 farm bill provides for the continuation of agricultural programs and will expire in 2007. Participants agreed that it is imperative that the 2007 farm bill ensures the competitiveness of American producers in providing a safe and affordable food supply.

(Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


The purpose of this field hearing was to discuss and review the possible effects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ (Corps) two spring pulses, which are required by the Endangered Species Act to facilitate the spawning of the endangered pallid sturgeon. Subcommittee Chairman Moran heard from many witnesses who raised the concern that the USDA’s Risk Management Agency (RMA) will not cover any possible crop loss due to the Corps’ spring pulses. Eldon Gould, Administrator of the RMA, stated at the hearing that the RMA would not make and Federal crop insurance payments because the action is a Federal mandate and not a natural occurrence. Farmers and representatives of other groups protested the RMA’s inability to make payments for any loses that might result from the Corps actions.


This was the third hearing in a series of hearings scheduled to listen to producers’ concerns about the enactment of the next farm bill. It was held in Stockton, California, to review the 2002 farm bill. Committee members heard from two panels of witnesses including producers, packers and marketers, and agribusiness leaders on a wide variety of farm policy issues. There were mixed feelings about the 2007 farm bill. Some witnesses advocated for a continuation of the current policies while others urged further exam-
ination of United States farm policy. It is essential for policymakers to listen to the testimony from those who will be directly and indirectly affected by the 2007 farm bill. All participants seemed to agree that the U.S. needs a policy that will continue to promote the competitiveness of U.S. producers. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


In Nebraska City, Nebraska, members of the House Committee on Agriculture heard from local producers, agribusiness leaders, and agriculture officials who gave testimony concerning the upcoming 2007 farm bill. This fourth hearing of the series discussed a wide range of issues such as renewable energy, commodity programs, rural development. Some of the witnesses expressed concern over the tightened budget, while others focused more on the legislation itself and the World Trade Organization negotiations. Members continued examining the feedback from individuals representing all aspects of U.S. agriculture. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Subcommittee Chairman Jerry Moran convened a hearing to hear from experts and representatives about the Federal crop insurance program. Witnesses discussed important topics such as multiple-year losses, disaster assistance, and a premium reduction plan, and the upcoming farm bill reauthorization. The program, which began in 1930, has changed over the years with one of the most significant changes being the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1980 which created a partnership between the Federal Government and private insurance companies within the program. Crop insurance has been mentioned repeatedly in the recent field hearings reviewing Federal farm policy and will be one subject of focus when the drafting of the legislation begins.


In Valdosta, Georgia, members of the subcommittee heard testimony on a variety of farm policy issues related to the upcoming farm bill including commodity programs, export markets, market access, and crop insurance. This is the subcommittee’s first in a series of hearings to review the 2002 farm bill. Witnesses reflected the diversity of Georgia’s agricultural production and included poultry, cotton, peanut, livestock, soybean, wheat, corn, fruit and vegetable producers. Agriculture is Georgia’s largest industry, contributing over $5.1 billion annually in cash receipts to the State’s economy. Georgia ranks first in the Nation in the production of poultry, eggs and peanuts and second in cotton production. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Subcommittee Chairman Frank Lucas chaired a hearing to review rural development programs and examine the rural development title of the 2002 farm bill. The Agriculture Committee pro-
vided an estimated $870 million in the 2002 farm bill for programs such as rural broadcast and broadband services, rural strategic investment, and rural business investment, as well as value-added market development grants and drinking water assistance grants. The subcommittee heard from a wide variety of witnesses including the USDA’s Under Secretary for Rural Development, Thomas Dorr, as well as representatives of various rural development agencies and organizations. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Subcommittee Chairman Jerry Moran convened the second in a series of two hearings to review the Federal crop insurance program. The hearing provided the subcommittee with an opportunity to gather feedback from producers about the delivery and implementation of the program. Federal crop insurance is designed to help agricultural producers mitigate unavoidable risks that directly affect the agriculture industry such as adverse weather, natural disasters, disease and insect infestation. The Federal crop insurance program was created in 1930 and has undergone significant legislative reform in subsequent years. Changes have helped make crop insurance more affordable for farmers and increase participation rates.


Chairman Bob Goodlatte chaired a hearing to review the role of futures markets in determining gasoline prices. As the average price of gas nationwide approached $3, Chairman Goodlatte sought to ensure that activity on the futures markets was not unduly influencing the high price of gasoline. The regulation of the futures market falls under the Committee’s jurisdiction. The chairman’s goal was to determine if there is indeed reason to believe there are problems in the futures market, what type of surveillance is being conducted to prevent and detect manipulation and if the regulators are equipped with the appropriate authority and enforcement mechanisms needed. Witnesses Walter Lukken, Commodity Futures Trading Commission Commissioner, and James Newsome, President and CEO of the New York Mercantile Exchange, testified that they had not discovered any manipulation or inappropriate activity in the futures market. The witnesses testified that they believed they had sufficient tools and authority to prevent and detect manipulation in the futures market.


The subcommittee met to review Federal commodity programs as part of its ongoing effort to assess various aspects of the 2002 farm bill. Convening in Coolidge, Arizona, the subcommittee heard firsthand from producers affected by Federal agricultural policies, such as livestock programs, land values and crop insurance. In addition to echoing concerns shared by many U.S. farmers, the witnesses focused on matters especially important to Southwestern producers, such as the scarcity of irrigation water and increasing land devel-
development costs. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


The subcommittee convened in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania to review programs under the subcommittee’s jurisdiction in anticipation of reauthorizing the 2002 farm bill. Subcommittee members heard from two panels of witnesses, which included dairy, livestock, and specialty crop producers and reflected the diversity of Pennsylvania’s agricultural sector. Subcommittee Chairman Lucas voiced his intention to hold several additional hearings to specifically examine various conservation, credit, and rural development programs prior to the 2002 farm bill’s expiration.


The Committee continued its review of the 2002 farm bill by holding its fifth field hearing to examine Federal farm policy. Committee members convening in Greeley, Colorado heard from two panels of witnesses comprised of local producers. The witnesses expressed concerns of particular significance to Colorado agriculture, such as public land issues, irrigation water scarcity and program crop support. Several producers also conveyed the importance of livestock to the Coloradan economy, 75.5 percent of which derives from livestock cash receipts. Chairman Goodlatte used the public forum to announce the launch of a web-based feedback form located on the Committee’s website, which is intended to provide producers throughout the country with an opportunity to contribute input about farm policy. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


The Committee held its sixth farm bill field hearing in an effort to hear directly from producers across the country. Angelo State University in San Angelo, Texas, served as the site for the hearing, which attracted over two hundred producers, agribusiness leaders, and agriculture officials. Two panels of witnesses, representing more than fifteen types of agricultural production, testified on issues ranging from commodity loan rates to World Trade Organization negotiations. Chairman Goodlatte noted the significance of meeting in Texas, as Texas accounted for about seven percent of the total U.S. agricultural income at the time of the hearing. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Subcommittee Chairman Gil Gutknecht conducted this field hearing in order to review the future of renewable fuels and flex-fuel vehicles. Chairman Gutknecht, Ms. Herseth, Mr. King, and Mrs. Schmidt were present to hear testimony from three panels of witnesses. Though not mentioned in the title of the subcommittee, Chairman Gutknecht’s subcommittee has jurisdiction over the agricultural aspect of the renewable fuels issue. Chairman Gutknecht
stated that the most beneficial thing that can be done for ethanol and biodiesel would be the creation of markets. The first panel featured Undersecretary for Rural Development Thomas Dorr. The second panel and third panel consisted of producers and other business professionals who discussed the growth in the renewable fuel sector.


Chairman Gutknecht called this forum to order to review the state of the upper Midwest dairy industry. In his opening remarks, Chairman Gutknecht stated that the dairy industry has changed significantly in recent years. He said it can no longer be looked at from a regional perspective or even a domestic one. Three panels of witnesses offered comments, including Agricultural Marketing Service Administrator Lloyd Day, Upper Midwest Milk Marketing Area Administrator Paul Kyburz, Dr. Bob Cropp from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and leaders from the region’s dairy associations, cooperatives, and processing companies. The Minnesota and Wisconsin dairy industries have a $23 billion economic impact on their States, including nearly 190,000 jobs. Minnesota and Wisconsin are among the top dairy producing and processing States in the nation. Approximately 90 people attended this forum. It was the third meeting Chairman Gutknecht convened to gather feedback from producers regarding programs under his subcommittee’s jurisdiction.


Chairman Goodlatte called this field hearing to order to review Federal farm policy. Seven committee members and three other Members of Congress attended the hearing and heard from two panels of witnesses about a variety of farm policy issues including specialty crops, conservation programs, labor, and marketing issues. The field hearing gave Members of Congress a chance to hear directly from farmers in the Pacific Northwest about their experience with farm programs and their vision for future farm policy. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Moran called this hearing to review efforts to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in the crop insurance program. In a House-wide effort to curb wasteful spending, Chairman Moran exercised the subcommittee oversight authority to determine if sufficient prevention and detection efforts are in place in the administration of the crop insurance program. As farming is an inherently risky enterprise, many producers rely on insurance policies to protect their investments in land, livestock, seed, and crops. In order to ensure that insurance options are available to producers, the Congress passed the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1980 and created a unique partnership between private insurance companies and the Federal Government within the crop insurance program. In
2005, the program provided producers with over $44 billion in liability protection through about 1.2 million policies. The RMA estimates less than one half of one percent of the agency’s spending in 2005 was a result of waste, fraud, and abuse. Members heard from two panels of witnesses. The subcommittee plans on continuing to closely monitor the crop insurance program as well as other programs under its jurisdiction to ensure that administering agencies have the authority and tools needed to curb waste, fraud, and abuse.


Chairman Goodlatte called this field hearing in Canandaigua, New York, to review Federal farm policy. Seven members of the Committee attended the hearing. These Members heard from two panels of witnesses about a variety of farm policy issues including, specialty crops, forestry, crop insurance, WTO negotiations, research, and dairy issues. In 2004, New York’s agricultural generated more than $3.6 billion. Dairy is the State’s leading agricultural product and accounts for one-half of all receipts. New York ranks third in the Nation in dairy production. The State also produces a variety of specialty crops, livestock, fruits and vegetables, and traditional row crops including hay, soybeans, corn, oats and wheat. (Note.—See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


The purpose of this hearing was to review the role of agriculture in the renewable fuels market. As the U.S. strives to become more energy independent, renewable fuels derived from agricultural products and byproducts play an increasingly prominent role in this effort. The renewable energy market provides America’s farmers and ranchers with new opportunities to market their products and even to generate revenue from traditional waste products. The Energy Policy Act, signed into law by the President in 2005, contained a renewable fuels standard (RFS) provision, the purpose of which is to increase renewable fuels production to 7.5 billion gallons by 2012. In early June, Chairman Goodlatte and Ranking Minority Member Collin Peterson introduced a resolution, H. Con. Res. 424, setting a goal of producing 25 percent of the total energy consumed in the U.S. on America’s farms, ranches, and in forests by the year 2025. The Committee heard from three panels of witnesses including Under Secretary for Rural Development Tom Dorr who spoke about the President’s Advanced Energy Initiative as well as representatives from General Motors, Iogen, and the Agriculture Utilization Research Institute. Additionally, witnesses representing a variety of agricultural producer groups provided testimony.


Chairman Goodlatte called a field hearing in Staunton, Virginia, to review Federal farm policy. Staunton, Virginia, is located in the heart of Virginia’s Sixth Congressional District, the district represented by Chairman Goodlatte. Approximately 250 producers and agriculture officials attended the hearing. There are 47,600 farms in Virginia, averaging 181 acres in size and employing more than
48,000 full-time and part-time workers. Taken together, agriculture and forestry are Virginia’s No. 1 industry, contributing more than $47 billion to the State economy annually and representing more than 15 percent of total employment. Two panels of witnesses appeared before the Committee and provided a broad overview of Virginia’s multi-faceted agricultural economy. Fourteen members of the Committee attended the hearing. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Goodlatte and Ranking Minority Member Collin Peterson convened a field hearing to review Federal farm policy in Marshall, Minnesota. Marshall, Minnesota is located in Minnesota’s Seventh Congressional District, the district represented by Ranking Member Peterson. Approximately 150 producers and local officials attended the hearing. Two panels of witnesses appeared before the Committee and provided a broad overview of Minnesota’s diverse agricultural economy. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Goodlatte convened the Committee’s final field hearing to review Federal farm policy in Scottsburg, Indiana. Twelve Committee members attended the hearing and heard from two panels of witnesses representing agricultural producers in Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, and Michigan. Indiana agricultural production contributes roughly $25 billion to Indiana’s economy. The agriculture sector employs 16 percent of the State’s population and produces $5.5 billion in cash farm receipts. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Frank Lucas convened a hearing to review conservation programs. This was the first in a series of hearings the purpose of which is to examine conservation issues and help determine priorities for next farm bill. The 2002 farm bill has been characterized as the “greenest” farm bill to date. It created new voluntary incentive programs and increased funding for conservation programs by more than 80 percent. The Committee heard from two panels of witnesses including Mark Rey, the USDA’s Undersecretary for Natural Resources and Environment, and various industry representatives. (Note,— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Moran convened a field hearing in Wall, South Dakota, to review programs under the Committee’s jurisdiction. This was the subcommittee’s third hearing in a series of hearings to review risk management and commodity programs in anticipation of the reauthorization of farm programs next year. The hearing included discussions about payment limitations, disaster assistance, livestock programs, conservation, and marketing programs. The five members that attended the hearing heard from two panels of
witnesses. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Hayes convened a hearing in Sioux Center, Iowa, to hear from Iowa’s agricultural producers about current farm policy and to gather input about future farm policy. The subcommittee heard from two panels of witnesses representing Iowa agriculture industry including livestock, crop, vegetable, and grain producers. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Goodlatte convened a meeting of the full Agriculture Committee to hear testimony from agriculture processors and suppliers from across the nation. The Committee has been conducting field hearings across the U.S. to review Federal farm policy in anticipation of the creation of the next farm bill; this was the first in a long series hearings on the topic planned for Washington, DC. The meeting was attended by 28 members of the Committee. Witnesses expressed concern that an increased demand in biofuels will adversely affect conservation efforts. Chairman Goodlatte noted that due to budget constraints affecting the Federal Government, it is likely the new farm bill budget will be the same size as the current version, if not smaller. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Moran convened a hearing to hear testimony about Federal farm policy. The witnesses were former Secretaries of Agriculture John Block, Clayton Yeutter and Dan Glickman. The 18 members of the subcommittee who were present heard an array of testimony from the former secretaries about the formation of previous farm bills. It marked the first time in the 180-year history of the Agriculture Committee that a panel of former members testified before the Committee. The secretaries noted the different climate in which the next farm bill will be written. They pointed out the possible effects of a new WTO agreement and noted that a new agreement must be a consideration in formulating the next farm bill. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Gil Gutknecht convened a hearing in Fresno, California, to hear testimony from dairy producers and processors from across the State. The hearing was one in a series of meetings held by Chairman Gutknecht to hear from the dairy industry before formulating the next farm bill. The meeting was attended by two other members of the Agriculture Committee, Reps. Dennis Cardoza and Jim Costa. California is the country’s leading producer of milk, yielding 19 percent of the national milk supply. Ad-
Additionally, one out of every six dairy cows in the Nation is located on one of California’s 2,200 dairy farms.


Chairman Frank Lucas convened a hearing of his subcommittee to hear from Oklahoma producers in anticipation of writing the new farm bill next year. The meeting was also attended by Agriculture Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte as well as Representative Tim Holden. Several of the witnesses noted that drought and other natural disasters must be factored into the writing of the next farm bill. The producers noted that a significant percentage of farmland in Oklahoma is in a flood plain. The witnesses further pointed out how rising fertilizer and fuel costs have been difficult for the agriculture community to endure. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Goodlatte convened a meeting of the full Agriculture Committee to hear testimony from agriculture producers and commodity group representatives. The hearing was the 13th of the year, and the 2nd hearing in Washington, to review Federal farm policy in anticipation of the reauthorization of the farm bill. The 27 Members present heard testimony from witnesses who asked the Committee to consider the timing of the new farm bill and how it will be affected by trade negotiations. Several witnesses spoke of the importance of maintaining the agricultural safety net in the next farm bill. Many of the witnesses also stressed the need to continue existing conservation programs. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Moran convened a hearing to review Federal farm policy in anticipation of the reauthorization of the farm bill. Five agricultural economists testified before the Committee about the role farm economics will play in the formulation of the next farm bill. The group discussed how pending trade agreements will affect the formulation of farm policy. The economists spent extensive time discussing commodity supports and crop insurance. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)


Chairman Hayes convened this hearing of his subcommittee to hear from a panel of specialty crop farmers. The hearing was held in anticipation of the reauthorization of the farm bill. The 18 members of the subcommittee present heard from a seven-person panel about the issues facing specialty crop producers in the coming years. The panel members highlighted the need for more research money for specialty crops in order for the sector to remain competitive. Specialty crops yield half of the revenue of the agriculture industry in the United States and are produced in all 50 States. (Note.— See the discussion for “A. Main Legislative Activities, farm bill.”)

Chairman Lucas convened a hearing of his subcommittee to review EPA pesticide regulation. The hearing was attended by 10 members who heard from three witnesses. The witnesses testified about the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), which marked its 10-year anniversary this year, as well as the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act, which is scheduled to be reauthorized in 2008. The members heard from witnesses regarding the ongoing efforts to harmonize pesticide labeling between the United States and Canada as mandated by the North American Free Trade Agreement. The panel mentioned the difficulty of harmonizing the two countries' standards while maintaining a high level of quality and efficacy for pesticides. Of particular concern discussed by subcommittee members regarding EPA's recently published "National Ambient Air Quality Standards" that eliminated the earlier proposed exemption from the course particulate matter standard for agriculture and mining sources.

2. Legislative Hearings


The purpose of the hearing was to examine the impact of the Kelo v. City of New London decision and to analyze the merits of H.R. 3405, the "Strengthening the Ownership of Private Property (STOPP) Act of 2005." On June 23, 2005 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of the city of New London, Connecticut, expanding the authority of State and local governments to use the powers of eminent domain to seize homes and businesses from individuals under the guise of economic improvement, increased tax revenue, job creation or the like. A week after the Court's ruling, the House, by a margin of 10 to 1, passed a motion disagreeing with the Court. This was the first hearing held by the House of Representatives to examine potential effects of this ruling. "Private ownership of property is vital to our freedom and our prosperity and is one of the most fundamental principles embedded in the U.S. Constitution," said Chairman Bob Goodlatte. The STOPP Act mandates that if a State or local government uses eminent domain for economic development and takes land from one private entity to give to another, then that State or locality will not be eligible to receive Federal funding for any projects receiving Federal economic development assistance. Chairman Goodlatte further stated, "No one should have to live in fear of the government snatching up his home, farm, or business, and I am committed to ensuring that our rights are protected as the founders intended." (Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 4128 under "5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate", and H.R. 3405 under "7. Bill Reported to the House But Not Considered." See also the discussion under "A. Main Legislative Activities, Eminent Domain.")

The purpose of the hearing was to review H.R. 4200, the Forest Emergency Recovery and Research Act which was introduced in early November. The Forest Emergency Recovery and Research Act provides a mechanism to quickly repair forests damaged by catastrophic events such as fires, ice storms, or hurricanes. Over one million acres of national forests are in need of reforestation and the number is steadily increasing with each catastrophic event. Areas already in need of reforestation are more susceptible to forest fires, invasive species and insect outbreaks. H.R. 4200 would enable land managers to engage in active management practices to restore forest health by removing excess fuel loads and dead and dying trees, improving water and air quality, restoring landscapes and species habitat and preventing a further backlog of reforestation projects.

(Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 4200 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate”, and “A. Main Legislative Activities, Healthy Forests Restoration Act Implementation.”)


Chairman Goodlatte convened a hearing to review H.R. 3849, legislation necessary to ratify three international treaties regulating the use of chemicals to protect human health as well as environmental health. The treaties involved include: the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (PICs), the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants to the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP POPs), and the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (POPs). H.R. 3849 would amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) to put the U.S. in compliance with the treaties. (Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 3849 under “7. Bills Reported to the House But Not Considered.”)

July 27, 2006: Hearing to review H.R. 503 — to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes. Full committee. Hearing Serial No. 109–36.

Chairman Goodlatte convened a hearing to review H.R. 503, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption. Immediately following the hearing, the Committee convened a business meeting to consider H.R. 503. H.R. 503 was ordered to be reported, as amended, “unfavorably to the House with a recommendation that it not be agreed upon” by a 37–3 vote. Six amendments were offered and agreed to by voice vote. During the hearing, the Committee heard from two panels of witnesses including the Honorable Don Sherwood, former Agriculture Committee Ranking Minority Member Charlie Stenholm as well as witnesses representing organizations that oppose the bill. (Note.— See the discussion for H.R. 503 under “5. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate.”)
E. PRINTED HEARINGS (BY SERIAL NO.)


109–6 ASIAN SOYBEAN RUST. Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research and Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management. April 27, 2005.


109–10 FOOD AID PROGRAMS. Subcommittee on Specialty Crops and Foreign Agriculture Programs. June 16, 2005.


109–13 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH. Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research. August 12, 2005 (Miles City, MT).


109–18 MISSISSIPPI RIVER TRANSPORTATION ON AGRICULTURAL MARKETS. Full committee. October 26, 2005.


109–25 FEDERAL FARM POLICY. Full committee. February 6, 2006 (Fayetteville, NC), February 7, 2006 (Auburn, AL), March 3, 2006 (Stockton, CA), March 4, 2006 (Nebraska City, NE), May 8, 2006 (Greeley, CO), May 9, 2006 (San Angelo, TX), June 10, 2006 (Yakima, WA), June 26, 2006 (Canandaigua, NY), July 17, 2006 (Staunton, VA), July 22, 2006 (Marshall, MN), and July 24, 2006 (Scottsburg, IN).


PRINTED HEARINGS (BY SUBJECT)


FEDERAL FARM POLICY. Full committee. February 6, 2006 (Fayetteville, NC), and February 7, 2006 (Auburn, AL), March 3, 2006 (Stockton, CA), March 4, 2006 (Nebraska City, NE), May 8, 2006 (Greeley, CO), May 9, 2006 (San Angelo, TX), June 10, 2006 (Yakima, WA), June 26, 2006 (Canandaigua, NY), July 17, 2006 (Staunton, VA), July 22, 2006 (Marshall, MN), July 24, 2006 (Scottsburg, IN). Serial 109–25.


F. HEARINGS NOT PRINTED

Full committee. Open business meeting. Organizational meeting for the 109th Congress. Approval by voice vote of committee rules, committee oversight plan, and budget views and estimates letter to be forwarded to the Committee on the Budget. February 16, 2005.

Full committee. Open business meeting. H.R. 3421, to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act, to facilitate the official inspection at export port locations of grain required or authorized to be inspected under such Act, ordered favorably reported to the House; and H.R. 3408, to reauthorize the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 and to amend the swine reporting provisions of that Act, ordered favorably reported to the House. July 27, 2005.


Full committee. Open business meeting. Chairman's mark for title I-Agriculture, for insertion in the reconciliation bill, ordered favorably reported to the Budget Committee. October 28, 2005.


Full committee. Open business meeting. Approval by voice vote of budget views and estimates letter to be forwarded to the Committee on the Budget. February 16, 2006.


Full committee. Open business meeting. H.R. 503, to amend the Horse Protection Act, ordered unfavorably reported, as amended, to the House; and H.R. 3849, the PICS and POPs Conventions and the LRTAP POPs Protocol Implementation Act, ordered favorably reported to the House. July 27, 2006.

Full committee. Open business meeting. H.R. 5313, the Open Space and Farmland Preservation Act, ordered favorably reported to the House; H.R. 5103, to provide for the conveyance of the former Konnarock Lutheran Girls School in Smyth County, VA, ordered favorably reported, as amended, to the House; H.R. 4559, to provide for the conveyance of National Forest System land to Laona and Wabeno, Wisconsin, and for other purposes, ordered favorably reported, as amended, to the House; and H. Con. Res. 424, expressing the sense of Congress that it is the goal of the United States that, not later than January 1, 2025, the agricultural, for-
estry, and working land of the U.S. should provide from renewable resources not less than 25 percent of the total energy consumed in the U.S. and continue to produce safe, abundant, and affordable food, feed, and fiber, ordered favorably reported to the House. September 21, 2006.

G. COMMITTEE PRINTS


III. APPENDIX

A. EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS


321—January 26, 2005; 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; Change in the Minimum Maturity Requirements for Fresh Grapefruit (Docket No. FV05–905–1 IFR). Received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


326—January 26, 2005; Letter from the 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. FV05–959–1 IFR). Received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

327—January 26, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Emerald Ash Borer Quarantines Areas (Docket No. 02–125–2). Received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


442—February 1, 2005; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Confidential Information and Commission Records and Information—Received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
443—February 1, 2005; Letter from the 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 December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


446—February 1, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 04–045–02). Received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

447—February 1, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—User Fees for Agricultural Quarantines and Inspection Services (Docket No. 04–042–1) (RIN: 0579-AB88). Received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

448—February 1, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; Minimal-Risk Regions and Importation of Commodities (Docket No. 03–080–3) (RIN: 0579–AB73). Received January 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


524—February 2, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Delegation of Authority (Docket No. 04–120–1) Received December 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


604—February 8, 2005; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Application Procedures for Registration as a Derivatives Transaction Execution Facility or Designation as a Contract Market (RIN: 3038–AC14). Received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
February 8, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, FSIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations (Docket No. 03–026F) (RIN: 0583-AD05). Received January 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 8, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Exemption of Organic Handlers From Assessments for Market Promotion Activities Under Marketing Order Programs (Docket No. FV03–900–1 FR) Received January 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 9, 2005; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Reporting Levels and Recordkeeping (RIN: 3038-AC08). Received January 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 9, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 04–130–1) Received January 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 9, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Surety Requirements (RIN: 0575-AC60). Received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 9, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Clementines, Mandarins, and Tangerines From Chile (Docket No. 02–081–3) (RIN: 0579-AB77). Received December 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 14, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—2004 Ewe Lamb Replacement and Retention Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AH15). Received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 14, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nonrecourse Marketing Assistance Loan and Loan Deficiency Payment Regulations for Honey (RIN: 0560-AH18). Received January 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 17, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Proposed Data Collection, Reporting, and Recordkeeping Requirements Applicable to Cranberries Not Subject to the Cranberry Marketing Order (Docket No. FV01–926–1 FR) Received February 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 17, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Redistricting and Reapportionment of Producer Membership on the California Olive Committee (Docket No. FV04–932–2 FR) Received February 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

February 17, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Add Malaysia to List of Regions in Which
Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Subtype H5N1 is Considered to Exist (Docket No. 04–091–1) Received February 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


908—March 1, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Octanamide, N, N-dimethyl and Decanamide, N, N-dimethyl; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance


911—March 1, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Avermectin B1 and its delta-8, 9-isomer; Pesticide Tolerance (OPP–2004–0400; FRL–7695–7) Received February 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


913—March 1, 2005; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting notification of the 2005 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency’s current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix, in accordance with section 1206 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989.

1016—March 3, 2005; Letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—United States Standards for Wheat (RIN: 580-AA86). Received February 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1017—March 3, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt Revision of Regulations for Importing Wheat (Docket No. 02–057–2) (RIN: 0579-AB74). Received February 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1018—March 3, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Swine; Add Arkansas, Louisiana, and Michigan to List of Validated Brucellosis Free States (Docket No. 04–103–2) Received February 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1118—March 9, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Spring Viremia of Carp; Payment of Indemnity (Docket No. 02–091–2) Received February 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1159—March 15, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly Removal of Quarantined Area (Docket No. 02–096–4) Received March 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1160—March 15, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly Removal of Quarantined Area (Docket No. 04–106–2) Received March 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1312—March 21, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Establishment of Minimum Size and Maturity Requirements for Lightly Colored Sweet Cherries Varieties (Docket No. FV04–923–1 FR) Received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1313—March 21, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2004–2005 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV04–985–2 IFR-A) Received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1314—March 21, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Addition of Slovakia to the List of Countries Eligible To Export Meat Products to the

1315—March 21, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; Minimal-Risk Regions and Importation of Commodities Partial Delay of Applicability (Docket No. 03–080–6) (RIN: 0579-AB73). Received March 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1521—April 13, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual assessment of the cattle and hog industries, pursuant to Public Law 106–472 7 U.S.C. 181, et seq.

1522—April 13, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, 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. FV05–916–1 IFR) Received April 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1523—April 13, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Transition Assessments (RIN: 0560-AH31). Received February 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1596—April 14, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Paecilomyces lilacinus strain 251; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2004–0397; FRL–7708–4) Received April 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1597—April 14, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the

1598—April 14, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus thuringiensis Modified Cry3A Protein (mCry3A) and the Genetic Material Necessary for its Production in Corn; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2005–0073; FRL–7704–4) Received March 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1664—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s “Major” final rule—Tobacco Transition Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AH30). Received April 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1665—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s “Major” final rule—2003 and 2004 Livestock Credit Corporation, USDA (RIN: 0560-AH25). Received April 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1666—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt Regulated Areas (Docket No. 04–118–1) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1667—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Classical Swine Fever Status of Mexican States of Campeche, Quintana Roo, Sonora, and Yucatan (Docket No. 02–002–2) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1668—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–925–1 FR) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1669—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–993–1 FR) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1670—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2004–2005 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV04–985–2 IFR–A2) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1671—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packaged in Riverside County, CA; Modification of the Qualification Requirement for Approved Manufacturers of Date Products (Docket No. FV04–987–1 FR) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
1672—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–959–1 FIR) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1673—April 18, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–955–1 IFR) Received March 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1709—April 21, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pistachios Grown in California Establishment of Continuing Assessment Rate and Reporting Requirements (Docket No. FV04–983–2 FR) Received March 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1726—April 25, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill “To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory costs, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such Act, and for other purposes”.

1811—May 4, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Benoxacor Partial Grant and Partial Denial of Petition, and Amendment of Tolerance to Include S-Metolachlor (OPP–2005–0080; FRL–7709–2) Received April 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1886—May 9, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus thuringiensis VIP3A Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for its Production; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2005–0083; FRL–7706–7) Received April 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1911—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Removal of Regulated Areas (Docket No. 05–011–1) Received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1912—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—West Indian Fruit Fly; Regulated Articles (Docket No. 04–127–1) Received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1913—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; California (Docket No. 05–010–1) Received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1914—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Committed Traveltime (Docket No. 04–108–1) Received April 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1915—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Export Inspection and Weighing Waiver for High Quality Specialty Grains Transported in Containers (RIN: 0580-AA87). Received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


1918—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmit-
ting the Department’s final rule—Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment (Docket No. LS–04–09) Received March 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1919—May 10, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Transition Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AH30). Received April 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

1938—May 11, 2005; Letter from the Inspector General, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s investigative report of the Forest Service (FS) fatalities that occurred in the Cramer Fire in the Salmon-Challis National Forest in Idaho on July 22, 2003, pursuant to Public Law 107–203.


2069—May 23, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–932–1 FR) Received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2070—May 23, 2005; Letter from the Chief, EBT Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Stamp Program, Regulatory Review: Standards for Approval and Operation of Food Stamp Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) (Amendment No. 394) (RIN: 0584-AC37). Received April 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2071—May 23, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Accounting Requirements for RUS Telecommunications Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AB77). Received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2072—May 23, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 04–130–2) Received April 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2074—May 23, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Introductions of Plants Genetically Engineered To Produce Industrial Compounds (Docket No. 03–038–2) (RIN: 0579-AB89). Received May 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2075—May 23, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt Compensation for Custom Harvesters in Northern Texas (Docket No. 03–052–3) Received May 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2253—June 9, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—American Indian Livestock Feed Program, Livestock Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AH26). Received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2254—June 9, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Swine; Add Florida to List of Validated Brucellosis-Free States (Docket No. 05–009–1) Received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2255—June 9, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill “To amend the United States Grain Standards Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover administrative and supervisory costs, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such Act, and for other purposes.”

2413—June 17, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Revision of User Fees for 2005 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers (CN–05–001) (RIN: 0581-AC43). Received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2414—June 17, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, 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-A39 DA–04–03A) Received June 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2474—June 29, 2005; Letter from the Director, Legislative Affairs Staff, NRCS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Conservation Security Program (RIN: 0578-AA36). Received June 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2643—July 13, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Imidacloprid Pesticide Tolerance (OPP–2005–


2688—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Investment of Customer Funds and Record of Investments (RIN: 3038-AC15). Received June 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2689—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Department’s final rule—In the Matter of the New York Mercantile Exchange, Inc. Petition To Extend Interpretation Pursuant to section 1a(12)(C) of the Commodity Exchange Act—Received June 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2692—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Onions Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, OR; Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–958–1 IFR) Received June 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2693—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, OR; Relaxation of Handling Regulations (Docket No. FV05–945–1 IFR) Received June 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2694—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Suspension of Handling and Reporting Requirements, Extension of the Suspension of Outgoing Inspection and Volume Control Regulations, and Extension of the Suspension of the Prune Import Regulation (Docket No. FV05–993–2 IFR) Received June 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2696—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Northeast Marketing Area; Order Amending the Order (Docket No. AO–14–A70; DA–02–01) Received April 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2697—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–948–2 IFR) Received June 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2698—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–922–1 IFR) Received June 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2699—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–915–1 FR) Received June 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2700—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–946–1 FR) Received June 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2701—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Changes in Container and Reporting Requirements (Docket No. FV05–915–2 IFR) Received June 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2705—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mexican Fruit Fly Interstate Movement of Regulated Articles (Docket No. 03–059–3) Received June 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2706—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza; Additional Restrictions (Docket No. 04–011–2) Received June 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2707—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Phytophthora Ramorum; Vacuum Heat Treatment for Bay Leaves (Docket No. 04–092–2) Received June 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2708—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus Canker Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 05–005–2) Received June 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2709—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle Additions to Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 05–027–1) Received May 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2710—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly (Docket No. 02–096–5) Received June 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2711—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Designated Marketing Associations for Peanuts (RIN: 0560-AH20). Received June 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2713—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees (RIN: 0572-AB81). Received April 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2714—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Specifications and Drawings for 12.4 7.2 kV Line Construction—Received April 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


2716—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Assessment and Apportionment of Administrative Expenses; Loan Poli-
cies and Operations; Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Disclosure to Shareholders; Capital Adequacy Risk-Weighting Revisions (RIN: 3052-AC09). Received June 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2717—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Borrower Rights (RIN: 3052-AC24). Received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2735—July 14, 2005; Letter from the Assistant Director, Directives and Regulations Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Special Areas; State Petition for Inventoried Roadless Area Management (RIN: 0596-AC10). Received May 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

2815—July 19, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual assessment of the cattle and hog industries, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.,

2890—July 19, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the Department’s Annual Report to Congress on the Biomass Research and Development Initiative for fiscal year 2005, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2624 note.

2891—July 20, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California Revision to Requirements Regarding Credit for Promotion and Advertising (Docket No. FV05–981–1 IFR) Received June 30, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3032—July 22, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza; Additional Restrictions (Docket No. 04–011–3) Received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3148—July 25, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Order Amending Marketing Order No. 946 (Docket No. AO-F&V–946–3; FV03–946–01 FR) Received July 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3149—July 25, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis Reduction in Timeframe for Movement of Cattle and Bison from Modified Accredited and Accreditation Preparatory States or Zones Without an Individual Tuberculosis Test (Docket No. 04–065–1) Received May 24, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
3150—July 25, 2005; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Disclosure to Shareholders; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Federal Agriculture Mortgage Corporation General Provisions; Federal Agriculture Mortgage Corporation Governance; Federal Agriculture Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Federal Agriculture Mortgage Corporation Disclosure and Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3052-AC18). Received July 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3306—July 27, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis & Development, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; New Mexico (Docket No. 04–068–1) Received July 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3359—July 27, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled, “To provide for greater efficiency in the management and realignment of administrative sites on the National Forest System”.

3362—July 28, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pistachios Grown in California Establishment of Reporting Requirements (Docket No. FV05–983–1 FR) Received July 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

3363—July 28, 2005; Letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Increase in Fees and Charges for Egg, Poultry, and Rabbit Growing (Docket No. PY–05–001) (RIN: 0581-AC44). Received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3366—July 28, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Glycerol Ester of Gum Rosin (Docket No. 2003F–0471) Received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3370—July 28, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Potassium Triodide; Pesticide Chemical Not Requiring a Tolerance or an Exemption from Tolerance (OPP–2004–0322; FRL–7714–4) Received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3378—July 28, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pinoxaden Pesticide Tolerance (OPP–2005–
105


3515—July 29, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; California (Docket No. 05–010–2) Received July 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


3868—September 14, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, “To amend the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain financial assistance to the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau”.

3907—September 14, 2005; Letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Congressional Relations, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting two proposed bills to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

3959—September 19, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, “to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, at the request of a participating State, to convey to the State, by quitclaim deed, without consideration, any land or interests in land acquired within the State under the Forest Legacy Program”.

4007—September 20, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Revisions in Requirement of Certificates of Privilege (Docket No. FV05–966–1 FR) Received September 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4008—September 20, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modification of Pack Requirements (Docket No. FV05–946–3 IFR) Received September 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4009—September 20, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Suspension of Provision Regarding Eligibility of Walnut Marketing Board Members (Docket No. FV05–984–1 IFR) Received September 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4011—September 20, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus Thuringiensis Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1 Proteins and the Genetic Material Necessary of Their Production in Corn; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2005–0211-FRL–7735–4) Received September 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4012—September 20, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Aminopyridine Ammonia,

4093—September 21, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the Department’s Annual Report to Congress on the Biomass Research and Development Initiative for fiscal year 2004, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 7624 note.

4145—September 26, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Lactic Acid, 2-Ethylhexyl Ester; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2003–0230; FRL–7729–5) Received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4146—September 26, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—S-metolachlor Pesticide Tolerance (OPP–2004–0326; FRL–7716–1) Received September 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4148—September 26, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus Thuringiensis Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1 Proteins and the Genetic Material Necessary for Their Production in Corn; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2005–0211; FRL–7735–4) Received September 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4152—September 26, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Lindane Tolerance Actions (OPP–2004–0246; FRL–7734–3) Received September 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4153—September 26, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Reynoutria Sachalinensis Extract; Ex-


4398—October 6, 2005; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—title IV Conservators, Receivers, and Voluntary Liquidations; Receivership Repudiation Authorities (RIN: 3052-AC26). Received September 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4399—October 6, 2005; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations Investments, Liquidity,
and Divestiture (RIN: 3052-AC22). Received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4440—October 6, 2005; Letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization; Standards of Conduct and Referral of Known or Suspected Criminal Violations; Loan Policies and Operations; Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Disclosure to Shareholders; Preferred Stock (RIN: 3052-AC21). Received September 20, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4576—October 19, 2005; 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; Regulated Articles (Docket No. 04–127–2) Received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4577—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mexican Fruit Fly; Quarantined Areas and Treatments for Regulated Articles (Docket No. 02–129–5) Received October 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4578—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Commodity Supplemental Food Program—Plain Language, Program Accountability, and Program Flexibility (RIN: 0584-AC84). Received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4579—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Removal of Regulated Areas (Docket No. 05–011–2) Received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4580—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Swine; Add Florida to List of Validated Brucellosis-Free States (Docket No. 05–009–2) Received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4581—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act Delegation of Authority (Docket No. 05–012–1) Received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4582—October 19, 2005; Letter from the 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; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allot-
ment Percentage for Class 1 (Scotch) and Class 3 (Native) Spear-mint Oil for 2005–2006 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV05–985–2 IFR) Received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4583—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rates (Docket No. FV05–916–3 FR) Received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4584—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendment to the Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order (FV–05–701–IFR) Received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4585—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Mideast Marketing Area; Interim Order Amending the Order (Docket No. AO–166–A39; DA–05–01–A) Received September 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4623—October 19, 2005; Letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s March 2005 “Treasury Bulletin”, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a).

4624—October 20, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Collection of State Commodity Assessments (RIN: 0560–AH35). Received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4625—October 20, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Additions to Quarantined Areas in Arkansas and Tennessee (Docket No. 05–030–1) Received August 23, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4626—October 20, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Tomato Lycopene Extract and Tomato Lycopene Concentrate (Docket No. 2001C–0486) (formerly Docket No. 01C–0486). Received August 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4714—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Protected Plant Permits (Docket No. 04–137–1) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4715—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the
Department’s final rule—Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act: Revisions to Authority Citations (Docket No. 05–012–2) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4716—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; Michigan (Docket No. 05–035–1) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4717—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, FVP, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–920–2 FR) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4718—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, FVP, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Continued Suspension of Handling and Assessment Collection Regulations (Docket No. FV05–979–2 IFR) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4719—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, FVP, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Relaxation of Pack Requirements (Docket No. FV05–920–1 FR) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4721—October 25, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Appalachian and Southeast Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders (Docket No. AO–388-A15 and AO–366-A44; DA–03–11) Received October 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4807—October 27, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Stall Reservations at Import Quarantine Facilities (Docket No. 02–024–2) Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


4869—October 31, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition and
Removal of Quarantined Areas in New Jersey (Docket No. 05–066–1) Received October 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4870—October 31, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tuberculosis; Amend the Definition of Affected Herd (Docket No. 02–111–2) Received October 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4871—October 31, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; New Mexico (Docket No. 04–068–3) Received October 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4890—November 2, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Guaranteed Farm Ownership and Operating Loan Requirements (RIN: 0560-AG65). Received October 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

4891—November 2, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Modifying Procedures and Establishing Regulations To Limit Shipments of Small Sizes of Red Seedless Grapefruit (Docket No. FV05–905–2 IFR) Received September 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5083—November 9, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Emerald Ash Borer Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 05–067–1) Received November 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5191—November 15, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2-Bromo–2-Nitro–1, 3-Propanediol (Bronopol); Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance (OPP–2005–0280; FRL–7743–5) Received November 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5194—November 15, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sulfosulfuron Pesticide Tolerances for

5227—November 16, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Business and Industry Guaranteed Loan Program Annual Renewal Fee (RIN: 0570-AA34). Received October 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5228—November 16, 2005; Letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Review Inspection Requirements for Graded Commodities (RIN: 0580-AA89). Received November 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5229—November 16, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Control Committee Rules and Regulation (Docket No. FV05–927–2) Received November 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5230—November 16, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulations Governing the California Clingstone Peach (Tree Removal) Diversion Program (Docket No. FV05–82–01-FR) (RIN: 0581-AC45). Received November 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5231—November 16, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, CA; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–987–1 FR) Received November 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5532—December 7, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Arizona-Las Vegas Marketing Area Order Amending the Order (Docket No. AO–271-A37; DA–03–04-A) Received November 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5591—December 12, 2005; Letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization and Functions; Releasing Information; Privacy Act Regulations; Farm Credit Administration Board Meetings; and Enforcement of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs or Activities Conducted by the Farm Credit Administration (RIN: 3052-AB82). Received November 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5617—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Export Inspection and Weighing Waiver for High Quality Specialty Grains Transported in Containers (RIN: 0580-AA87) Received December 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5618—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Chief, Electronic Benefit Transfer Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Stamp Program, Reauthorization: Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) and Retail Food Stores Provisions of the Food Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2002 (Amendment No. 397) (RIN: 0584-AD28). Received December 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5619—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; Minimal-Risk Regions and Importation of Commodities Unsealing of Means of Conveyance and Transloading of Products (Docket No. 03–080–8) (RIN: 0579-AB97). Received December 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5620—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Flag Smut Importation of Wheat and Related Products (Docket No. 05–058–3) Received December 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5621—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Fruits and Vegetables (Docket No. 03–048–2) Received December 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5622—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt Addition and Removal of Regulated
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Areas in Arizona (Docket No. 05–078–1) Received December 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5699—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Whole Cuts of Boneless Beef from Japan (Docket No. 05–004–2) (RIN: 0579-AB93). Received December 14, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5700—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of draft legislation, which would provide that the preparation of certain reports required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), are deemed to fulfill the requirements for similar reports under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (RPA).

5701—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption Vitamin D3 (Docket No. 2004F–0374) Received December 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5824—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing and Sale of Fluid Milk in Schools (RIN: 0584-AD57). Received December 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5831—December 16, 2005; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of draft legislation to assist the Department in the development of a National Natural Resources Conservation Foundation.

5861—December 18, 2005; Letter from the Administrator, Housing and Community Facilities Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Direct Single Family Housing Loans and Grants (RIN: 0575-AC54). Received December 9, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5912—December 22, 2005; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Dichlomid Extension of Time-Limited

5955—January 31, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Revision of Fees for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetables Terminal Market Inspection Services (Docket Number FV–04–310) (RIN: 0581-AC46). Received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5956—January 31, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Termination of Marketing Order No. 931 (Docket No. FV05–931–1 FR) Received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


5958—January 31, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–993–5 FIR) Received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5959—January 31, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, FSIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Addition of Chile to the List of Countries Eligible to Export Meat and Meat Products to the United States (Docket No. 02–019F) (RIN: 0583-AD16). Received January 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

5960—January 31, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Biological Products; Bacterial Vaccines and Toxoids; Implementation of Efficacy Review (Docket No. 1980N–0208) Received January 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6241—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions—February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6242—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Black Stem Rust Movement Restrictions
and Addition of Rust-Resistant Varieties (Docket No. 04–003–2) Received February 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6243—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Add Argentina to the List of Regions Considered Free of Exotic Newcastle Disease (Docket No. 04–083–3) Received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6244—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; Minnesota (Docket No. APHIS–2006–004) Received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6245—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; ID (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0001) Received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6246—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Treatments for Fruits and Vegetables (Docket No. 03–077–2) Received January 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6247—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV05–984–2 FR) Received January 7, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6248—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2005–2006 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV05–985–IFR A) Received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6249—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Upper Midwest Marketing Area; Order Amending the Order (Docket No. AO–361-A39; DA–04–03-A) Received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6250—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2005–2006 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV06–982–1 IFR) Received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6252—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV06–905–1 IFR) Received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6254—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Food Labeling: Health Claims; Soluble Dietary Fiber From Certain Foods and Coronary Heart Disease (Docket No. 2004P–0512) Received January 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6255—February 16, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Food Labeling; Ingredient Labeling of Dietary Supplements That Contain Botanicals; Withdrawal (Docket No. 2003N–0346) Received January 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6516—March 8, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Add Portions of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Santa Clara Counties, CA, to the List of Quarantined Areas (Docket No. APHIS–2005–0116) Received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6517—March 8, 2006; Letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Cottonseed Payment Program (RIN: 0560–AH29). Received January 30, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6518—March 8, 2006; Letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization; Standards of Conduct and Referral of Known or Suspected Criminal Violations; Loan Policies and Operations, Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; General Provisions; Definitions; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System (RIN:

6583—March 8, 2006; Letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule—Golden Parachute and Indemnification Payments (RIN: 3055-AA08). Received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6696—March 15, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Flumiclorac Pentyl; Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2005–0311; FRL–7764–1) Received March 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6722—March 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Add Kazakhstan, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine to List of Regions in Which Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Subtype H5N1 is Considered to Exist (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0010) Received February 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6735—March 16, 2006; Letter from the Assistant Director, Directives and Regulations Branch, Office of Regulatory and Management Services, USDA Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use (RIN: 0596-AC11). Received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6768—March 29, 2006; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Definition of “Client” of a Commodity Trading Advisor (RIN: 3038-AC20). Received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
6769—March 29, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Emerald Ash Borer Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 05–067–2) Received March 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6770—March 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV06–932-IFR) Received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6771—March 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Update and Clarify a Shell Egg Grading Definition (Docket No. PY–05–003) (RIN: 0581-AC47). Received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6772—March 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendments to the Potato Research and Promotion Plan (Doc. No. FV–05–702-IFR) Received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

6773—March 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Avocados Grown in South Florida; Florida Avocado Maturity Requirements Correction (Docket No. FV06–915–1 C) Received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


6980—April 26, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Acreage Reports and Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AG20). Received March 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7030—April 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pyraclostrobin Pesticide Tolerances (EPA-HQ-


7092—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Legislative Affairs Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s “Major” final rule—Healthy Forest Reserve Program—Received April 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7093—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Peppers From Certain Central American Countries (Docket No. 05–003–3) Received March 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7094—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt Addition and Removal of Regulated Areas in Arizona (Docket No. 05–078–2) Received March 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7095—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tuberculosis Reduction in Timeframe for Movement of Cattle and Bison From Modified Accredited and Accreditation Preparatory States or Zones Without an Individual Tuberculin Test (Docket No. 04–065–2) Received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7096—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle Interstate Movement of Pine Bark Products From Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 04–031–2) Received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7097—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle Additions to Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 05–027–2) Received March 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7098—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Relaxation of Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 (Docket No. FV05–948–1 FRA) Received March 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7099—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt Criteria for Releasing Fields From Regulation (Docket No. 04–134–2) Received March 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7100—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Pacific Northwest and Arizona-Las Vegas Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders (Docket No. AO–368-A32, AO–271-A37; DA–03–04B) Received March 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
7101—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV06–989–1 IFR) Received March 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7102—May 1, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington Establishment of Continuing Assessment Rates and Modification of the Rules and Regulations (Docket No. FV05–927–01 FR) Received March 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7283—May 4, 2006; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of draft legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of certain National Forest System lands and retain receipts.

7497—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Alternative Market Risk and Credit Risk Capital Charges for Futures Commission Merchants and Specified Foreign Currency Forward and Inventory Capital Charges (RIN: 3038-AC05). Received March 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7498—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk Income Loss Contract Program (RIN: 0560-AH47). Received April 26, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7499—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Emerald Ash Borer Quarantined Areas (Docket No. 02–125–4) Received March 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7500—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Legislative Affairs Branch, Chief, NRCS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grassland Reserve Program (RIN: 0578-AA38). Received April 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7501—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending Orders (Docket No. AO–14-A75, et al.; DA–06–06) Received May 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7502—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Tomato Lycopene Extract and Tomato Lycopene Concentrate (Docket No. 2001C–0486) (formerly Docket No. 01C–0486). Received March 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7503—May 15, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption Glycerides and Polyglycides (Docket No. 1991F–0457) (formerly Docket No. 91F–0457) Received March 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7516—May 16, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s “Major” final rule—Percentages for Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program Advance Payments (RIN: 0560-AH49). Received May 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
7517—May 16, 2006; Letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—National Forest System Land Management Planning (RIN: 0596-AC43). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


7519—May 16, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Benzaldehyde, Captafol, Hexaconazole, Paraformaldehyde, Sodium dimethylthiocarbamate, and Tetradifin; Tolerance Actions (EPA-HQ-OPP–2005–0322; FRL–8065–1) Received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7520—May 16, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Pantoea Agglomerans Strain C9–1; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0267; FRL–7772–6) Received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7622—May 24, 2006; Letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Safe and Disposal of National Forest System Timber; Timber Sale Contracts; Indices to Determine Market-Related Contract Term Additions (RIN: 0596-AC29). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7623—May 24, 2006; Letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sale and Disposal of National Forest System Timber; Free Use to Individuals; Delegation of Authority (RIN: 0596-AC09). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7969—June 12, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Requirements for Requests To Amend Import Regulations (Docket No. 02–132–2) (RIN: 0579-AB63). Received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

7970—June 12, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Food Labeling: Health Claims; Soluble Dietary Fiber From Certain Foods and Coronary Heart Disease (Docket No. 2004P–0512) Received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8013—June 12, 2006; Letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s March 2006 “Treasury Bulletin”, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a).

8041—June 14, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Boscalid Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2003–0246; FRL–8064–4) Received April 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8046—June 14, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Potassium Silicate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0299; FRL–8069–6) Received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8088—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Small Lots of Seed Without Phytosanitary Certificates (Docket No. 02–119–2! 02–119–2 (RIN: 0579-AB78). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8089—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Standards for Privately Owned Quarantine Fa-
cilities for Ruminants (Docket No. 00–022–2) Received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8090—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Baby Corn and Baby Carrots From Zambia (Docket No. 05–059–2) Received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8092—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tuberculosis in Captive Cervids; Extend Interval for Conducting Reaccreditation Test (Docket No. 04–094–2) Received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8093—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Suspension of Container Regulations (Docket No. FV06–922–1 IFR) April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8094—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Removal of Container Regulations (Docket No. FV06–923–1 IFR) Received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8095—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, 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. FV06–916 917–1 IFR) Received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8096—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Eligibility Requirements for USDA Graded Shell Eggs (Docket No. PY–98–006) (RIN: 0581-AC50). Received May 1, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8097—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Modifying Procedures and Establishing Regulations to Limit Shipments of Small Sizes of Red Seedless Grapefruit (Docket No. FV05–905–2 FIR) Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8099—June 15, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pesticides Minimal Risk Tolerance Exemptions


8111—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and in Umatilla County, OR; Suspension of Handling Regulations, Establishment of Reporting Requirements, and Suspension of the Fresh Prune Import Regulation (Docket No. FV06–924–1 IFR! IFR) Received May 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8112—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Adjust Representation on the Hass Avocado Board (Doc. No. FV–06–701-IFR) Received May 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8114—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agriculture Marketing Service, 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 2006–2007 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV06–985–1 FR) Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8115—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Add Kazakhstan, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine To List of Regions In Which Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Subtype H5N1 is Considered in Exist (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0010) Received May 18, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8116—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Director, Program Accountability Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Stamp Program Civil Rights Data Collection (RIN: 0584-AC75). Received May 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8117—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—2005 section 32 Hurricane Disaster Programs (RIN: 0560-AH45). Received May 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8118—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the

8134—June 16, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Grains and Similarly Handled Commodities—Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments for the 2006 Through 2007 Crop Years; Cotton (RIN: 0560-AH38). Received May 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8137—June 19, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Ohio, West Virginia, and Wisconsin (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0029) Received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8138—June 19, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Transfer of Sugar Program Marketing Allocations (RIN: 0560-AH37). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8140—June 19, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Food Labeling: Health Claims; Dietary Noncariogenic Carbohydrate Sweeteners and Dental Caries (Docket No. 2004P–0294) Received April 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8251—June 22, 2006; Letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Recreation Fees (RIN: 0596-AC35). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8253—June 26, 2006; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill entitled, “Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) Budget proposals”.


8333—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Senior Program Specialist, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Stamp Program; Employment and Training Program Provisions of the Farm Security and

8334—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Appeal Procedures (RIN: 0560-AG88). Received June 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8335—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—2005 section 32 Hurricane Disaster Programs (RIN: 0560-AH45). Received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8336—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grains and Similarly Handled Commodities—Marketing Assistance Loans and Loan Deficiency Payments for the 2006 Through 2007 Crop Years; Cotton (RIN: 0560-AH38). Received June 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8337—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Emergency Conservation Program (RIN: 0560-AH43). Received June 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8338—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Conservation Reserve Program—Emergency Forestry Conservation Reserve Program (RIN: 0560-AH44). Received June 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8339—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle Additions to Quarantined Areas; Wisconsin (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0039) Received June 2, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8340—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—States Approved to Receive Stallions and Mares from CEM-Affected Regions; Indiana (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0020) Received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8341—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Fruits and Vegetables; Untreated Citrus from Mexico (Docket No. 03–048–3) Received June 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8344—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final
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8345—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan Redistricting (Doc. No. FV–05–704–IFR) Received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8346—June 29, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Revision of Reporting and Assessment Requirements (Docket No. FV06–955–1 IFR) Received June 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8347—July 10, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Citrus From Peru (Docket No. 03–113–3) Received May 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8351—July 10, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Technical Amendments; Change of Address for the Office of Pesticide Programs (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0403; FRL–8070–7) Received June 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8352—July 12, 2006; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of draft legislation entitled, “To establish a program to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of aiding Federal agriculture conservation programs”.

8353—July 12, 2006; Letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, “Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) Budget proposals”.

8354—July 13, 2006; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—In the Matter of the New York Mercantile Exchange, Inc. Petition to Extend Interpretation Pursuant to section 1a(12)(C) of the Commodity Exchange Act—Received July 01, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8355—July 13, 2006; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commis-
sion’s final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions—Received July 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8540—July 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV06–923–2 IFR) Received June 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8541—July 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendment to the Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order (Docket No. FV–05–701-FR) Received June 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8542—July 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Standards for Approval of Warehouses for Storage of CCC Commodities (RIN: 0560-AE50). Received July 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8611—July 18, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Standards for Approval of Warehouses for Storage of CCC Commodities (RIN: 0560-AH51). Received July 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8612—July 18, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Add Denmark to the List of Regions Free of Exotic Newcastle Disease (Docket No. 02–089–3) Received July 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8613—July 18, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus Thuringiensis Cry1A.105 Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for Its Production in Corn in or on All Corn Commodities; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0554; FRL–8076–5) Received July 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8614—July 18, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus Thuringiensis Cry2Ab2 Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for Its Production in Corn in or on All Corn Commodities; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0553; FRL–8076–6) Received July 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8758—July 25, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2006–2007 Marketing Year (Docket No. FV06–985–2 IFR) Received July 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).
8775—July 25, 2006; Letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Land Uses; Special Uses; Recovery of Costs for Processing Special Use Applications and Monitoring Compliance With Special Use Authorizations (RIN: 0596-AB36). Received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8823—July 27, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulations Regarding Employee Conflicts of Interest (RIN: 0560-AH57). Received July 19, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

8824—July 27, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Gypsy Moth Regulated Articles (Docket No. 00–067–2) (RIN: 0579-AB55). Received July 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8827—July 27, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Idaho (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0001) Received July 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


8829—July 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2-Propenoic Acid, 2-Methyl-, Polymer with Butyl 2-Propenoate, Methyl 2-Methyl–2-Propenoate, Methyl 2-Propenoate and 2-Propenoic Acid, Graft, Compound with 2-Amino–2-Methyl–1-Propanol; Tolerance Exemption (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0555 FRL–8077–4) Received July 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9051—Aug. 2, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final
rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Suspension of Continuing Assessment Rate (Docket No. FV06–948–1 IFR) Received July 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9052—Aug. 2, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California Order Amending Marketing Order Nos. 916 and 917 (Docket No. AO–90-A7 FV05–916–1) Received July 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9054—Aug. 2, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Amendment to Egg Research and Promotion Rules and Regulations (Docket No. PY–06–001) Received July 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9085—September 6, 2006; Letter from the Director, Office of Energy Policy and New Uses, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Office of Energy Policy and New Uses; Designation of Biobased Items for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0503-AA26). Received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9086—September 6, 2006; Letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization; Termination of System Institution Status (RIN: 3052-AC29). Received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9192—September 7, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Azoxystrobin Pesticide Tolerance


9197—September 7, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Copper Sulfate Pentahydrate; Tolerance Exemption in or on Various Food and Feed Commodities (EPA-HQ-OPP–2005–0314; FRL–8085–3) Received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9202—September 7, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Sanitizers with No Food-Contact Uses in Registered Pesticide Products; Revocation of Tolerance Exemptions (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0495; FRL–8086–1) Received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9203—September 7, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Inorganic Bromide; Tolerance Actions
Received August 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9241—September 8, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—2, 6-Diisopropylnaphthalene; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0373; FRL–8081–9) Received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9243—September 8, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Paraquat Dichloride; Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0664; FRL–8089–3) Received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9246—September 8, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Inert Ingredients; Revocation of Tolerance Exemptions with Insufficient Data for Reassessment (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0230; FRL–8084–1) Received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9247—September 8, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Inert Ingredient Revocation of the Tolerance Exemption for Mono-and Bis-(1H, 2H, 2H-perfluoralkyl) Phosphates Where the Alkyl Group is Even Numbered and in the C6-C12 Range (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0253; FRL–8082–3) Received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9322—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions—Received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9323—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cooperative Marketing Associations (RIN: 0560-AH42). Received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9324—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Guaranteed Loans—Retaining PLP Status and Payment of Interest Accrued During Bankruptcy and Redemption Rights Periods (RIN: 0560-AH07). Received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9325—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment No. 2 To Change the Name of the U.S.A. Cultivated Blueberry Council and Increase Membership (Doc. No. FV–03–701–FR) Received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9326—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Cotton Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—User Fees for 2006 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers (CN–06–001) (RIN: 0581-AC58). Received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9327—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the Beet Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations—Final Rule (No. LS–01–06) Received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9328—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Relaxation of the Minimum Grade Requirement (Docket No. FV06–922–2 IFR) Received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9329—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Tomatoes From Certain Central American Countries (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0009) Received August 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9330—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Untreated Oranges, Tangerines, and Grapefruit From Mexico Transiting the United States to Foreign Countries (Docket No. 00–086–2) Received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9331—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Agricultural Inspection and AQI User Fees Along the U.S.

9332—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments (Docket No. 1998C) Received August 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9333—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Fenpuroximate Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0216; FRL–8087–6) Received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9334—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Kresoxim-methyl Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0333; FRL–8088–1) Received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9336—September 13, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Quinoxyfen Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0167; FRL–8088–8) Received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9428—September 15, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition and Removal of Quarantined Areas in New Jersey (Docket No. 05–066–2) Received September 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9566—September 25, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—User Fees for Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Services (Docket No. 04–042–2) (RIN: 0579-AB88). Received September 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9567—September 25, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Interstate Movement of Garbage From Hawaii; Municipal Solid Waste (Docket No. 05–002–4) (RIN: 0579-AC12). Received September 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9634—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Table Grapes From Namibia (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0025) Received September 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9635—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area

9636—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Storage, Handling, and Ginning Requirements for Cotton Marketing Assistance Loan Collateral (RIN: 0560-AH48). Received September 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9637—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program—Tropical Regions (RIN: 0560-AH19). Received September 20, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9638—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Endothall Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–0018; FRL–8080–7) Received August 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9640—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Propiconazole Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0347; FRL–8092–1) Received September 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9644—September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Buprofezin Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0170; FRL–8092–2) Received September 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Difenoconazole Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0024; FRL–8085–1) Received September 12, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Eucalyptus Oil Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0024; FRL–8089–7) Received September 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Epoxiconazole Pesticide Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2005–0071; FRL–8080–9) Received September 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

September 27, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pantoea Agglomerans Strain E325; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0617; FRL–8091–6) Received September 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


September 28, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle Additions to Quarantined Areas; Wisconsin (Docket No. APHIS–2006–0039) Received September 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

September 28, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption Bacteriophage Preparation (Docket No. 2002F–0316 (formerly 02F–0316)) Received September 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


September 29, 2006; Letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final

9717—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Low Pathogenic Avian Influenza; Voluntary Control Program and Payment of Indemnity (Docket No. APHIS–2005–0109) (RIN: 0579-AB99). Received September 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9718—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle Host Material From Canada (Docket No. 00–073–3) (RIN: 0579-AB79). Received September 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9719—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date (Docket No. 1998C–0790) Received September 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).

9720—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bentazon, Carboxin, Dipropyl Isoinchomerone, Oil of Lemongrass (Oil of Lemon) and Oil of Orange, Tolerance Actions (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0056; FRL–8093–5) Received September 26, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9723—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—p-Chlorophenoxyacetic acid, Glyphosate, Difenzoquat, and Hexazinone Tolerance Actions (EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0036; FRL–8089–6) Received September 26, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


9726—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Flumetsulam Pesticide Tolerance


9840—September 29, 2006; Letter from the Secretaries, Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of draft legislation entitled, “the Healthy Forests Partnership Act”.

9980—November 14, 2006; Letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Bacillus Thuringiensis Modified Cry3A Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for Its Production in Corn; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance EPA-HQ-OPP–2006–0784; FRL–8096–4! Received October 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A).


B. PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS AND OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST.


Remarks congratulating Pope Benedict XVI. Submitted April 19, 2005.


Message to Congress transmitting legislation and supporting documents to implement the Dominican Republic-Central America-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Submitted June 23, 2005.


Presidential Proclamation. To modify duty-free treatment under the generalized systems of preferences and certain rules of origin under the North American Free Trade Agreement, and for other purposes. Proclamation No. 7912. Submitted June 29, 2005.


Remarks on signing the Dominican Republic-Central America-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Submitted August 2, 2005.


Notice of intention to enter into a Free Trade Agreement with Oman. Submitted October 17, 2005.


Transmitting proposed legislation to implement the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement. Submitted November 16, 2005.

Letter to congressional leaders transmitting a Notice of Intention to enter into a Free Trade Agreement with the Republic of Peru. Submitted January 6, 2006.


Presidential Proclamation. To Implement the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement with respect to Guatemala, and for other purposes. Proclamation No. 8034. Submitted June 30, 2006.


Notice of intention to enter into a Free Trade Agreement with Colombia. Submitted August 24, 2006.

Letter to congressional leaders transmitting a notice of intention to enter into a Free Trade Agreement with Colombia. Submitted August 24, 2006.

Message on the 90th Anniversary of the National Park Service. Submitted August 24, 2006.


Memorandum on continuation of the exercise of certain authorities under the Trading with the Enemy Act. Submitted September 13, 2006.


Memorandum on promoting sustainable fisheries and ending destructive fishing practices. Submitted October 2, 2006.


C. STATUTORY REPORTS


Charter: Renewal of the Advisory Committee on Forest County Payments, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Submitted by USDA, January 5, 2005.


GAO: Mad Cow Disease, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, February 25, 2005.


GAO: Report on major rule promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC), entitled, “Tobacco Transition Assessments,” pursuant to section 801(a)(2)(A) of title 5, USC. Submitted by GAO, March 8, 2005.

FCA: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board, pursuant to the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971. Submitted by FCA, March 9, 2005.


GAO: Means-Tested Programs, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, March 11, 2005.


EPA: Letter from Thomas V. Skinner, Acting Administrator, EPA, to Chairman Bob Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, indicating intent to extend comment period on EPA’s air quality compliance agreement for animal feeding operations to May 2, 2005 and the sign-up period to July 1, 2005. Submitted by EPA, March 15, 2005.


GAO: Oversight of Food Safety Activities, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, March 30, 2005.


USDA: Letter from Bill Hawks, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, USDA, to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding the European Union’s debarking requirement for wood pallets. Submitted by USDA, April 1, 2005.

USDA: Proposed land purchase in Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri, required by section 17(b) of the National Forest Management Act of 1976, P.L. 94–588, as amended. Submitted by USDA, April 1, 2005.


GAO: Forest Service, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April 15, 2005.

Department of the Treasury: Quarterly Report, January 1-March 31, 2005, Office of Foreign Assets Control, pursuant to the Trade

Charter: Renewal of the Intergovernmental Advisory Committee, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Submitted by the USDA, April 18, 2005.

USDA: Letter from Bill Hawks, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, to Chairman Bob Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding the Arizona-Las Vegas and Pacific Northwest Federal Milk Marketing Orders. Submitted by USDA, April 18, 2005.


GAO: Technology Assessment, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April 26, 2005.


GAO: USDA's Preparation for Asian Soybean Rust, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, May 17, 2005.


USDA: Notification of request under the Freedom of Information Act for a list of almond growers covered by a Federal marketing order, required by section 1663 of the Food Security Act of 1985.


USDA: Letter from USDA Secretary Johanns to Chairman Bob Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding the Air Quality Compliance Agreement for animal feeding operations. Submitted by USDA, August 11, 2005.


USDA: Letter from USDA Secretary Johanns to Chairman Bob Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding USDA's enhanced surveillance program for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE). August 25, 2005.


EPA: Letter from Stephen L. Johnson, Administrator, to Chairman Bob Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding the EPA’s consent agreement for animal feeding operations. Submitted by EPA, September 28, 2005.


Department of the Treasury: Letter from Secretary Snow to Chairman Goodlatte regarding CFTC v. Zelener. Submitted by the Department of the Treasury, November 3, 2005.


Charter: Renewal of the Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Submitted by USDA, November 18, 2005.


USDA: Proposed land purchase in Cherokee National Forest, Tennessee, required by section 17(b) of the National Forest Man-


GAO: Tobacco Settlement, pursuant to request. Submitted by GAO, April 11, 2006.


USDA: Seven user fee proposals which would shift the funding of covered activities from the Government to the beneficiaries of the activities. Submitted by USDA, May 4, 2006.


USDA: Data collected as part of the enhanced surveillance program for bovine spongiform encephalopathy in the United States. Submitted by USDA, May 10, 2006.


USTR: Letter from Ambassador Rob Portman, United States Trade Representative, to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding patent disclosure discussions. Submitted by USTR, May 18, 2006.


EPA: Final rule entitled, “Pesticides; Procedural Regulations for Registration Review; Final Review,” as required by section 23 (a)(3)


GAO: Report on a major rule promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, entitled, “Conservation Reserve Program—Emergency Forestry Conservation Reserve Pro


USDA: Letter from W. Ron DeHaven, Administrator, APHIS, to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding USDA’s efforts to ensure the well-being of all horses while in transport to slaughter in the United States. Submitted by USDA, July 24, 2006.


USDA: Letter from Secretary Johanns to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding the current status of the Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy Surveillance Program. Submitted by USDA, August 11, 2006.


EPA: Letter from William L. Wehrun, Acting Assistant Administrator, to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, acknowledging proposal to revise the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter. Submitted by EPA, August 17, 2006.


Charter: Renewal of the National Advisory Committee to the United States Representative to the Council of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Submitted by EPA, September 1, 2006.


USDA: Letter from Bruce I. Knight, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding dairy product make allowances. Submitted by USDA, September 12, 2006.


EPA: Letter from William L. Wehrum, Acting Assistant Administrator, EPA, to Chairman Goodlatte, Committee on Agriculture, regarding EPA's proposal to revise the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter. Submitted by EPA, September 15, 2006.


FCA: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board, pursuant to the Farm Credit Act of 1971. Submitted by FCA, November 3, 2006.

E. MEMORIALS

19—May 4, 2005; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New York, relative to a resolution memorializing Congress to pass a joint resolution of disapproval to nullify the United States Department of Agriculture decision to resume the importation of live Canadian cattle on March 7, 2005, thereby establishing Canada as a minimum-risk country in respect to Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy, or Mad Cow Disease.
36—July 26, 2005; Memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 35 memorializing the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of Agriculture to provide assistance, including additional emergency funding, in the effort to mitigate the infestation of the Emerald Ash Borer.

37—July 26, 2005; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 277 urging the Congress of the United States to stop cuts in agriculture-related programs and initiatives in the fiscal year 2006 federal budget.

66—July 27, 2005; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 277 urging the Congress of the United States to stop cuts in agriculture-related programs and initiatives in the fiscal year 2006 federal budget.

121—July 28, 2005; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Substitute Senate Joint Memorial No. 8010 petitioning the United States Department of Agriculture regarding Canadian beef importation and export of United States beef.

165—July 28, 2005; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 05-015, concerning opposition to the “Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act”.

169—September 14, 2005; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution 05-1058 expressing support for the “25 By 25” initiative and promoting the increased production of renewable energy by the agricultural community.

182—October 26, 2005; Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 05-015 concerning opposition to the “Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act”.

245—December 18, 2005; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 29 urging the Congress of the United States to recognize the statutory concessions made by the State of Montana and urged to obtain meaningful and substantive funding for the impacts from the federal wolf reintroduction program that was forcibly established in Montana.

306—May 2, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution No. 441 supporting the vision of “25 by 25”, whereby agriculture will provide twenty-five percent of the total energy consumed in the United States by the year 2025, while continuing to produce abundant, safe, and affordable food and fiber.

321—June 8, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 35 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to continue funding and operation of the United States Department of Agriculture’s Agricultural Research Service located in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

333—June 8, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5042 urging support of the “25 x 25” initiative.

383—July 19, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 12 urging American
farmers, ranchers, and food producers be enabled to compete freely and trade fairly in foreign markets.

384—July 19, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 2001 urging the Congress of the United States to enact a 2007 farm bill that is supportive of the specialty crop industry.

402—July 19, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 11 urging the United States Forest Service to enter a decision granting a special use permit allowing Idaho Department of Fish and Game to land helicopters in the wilderness for the purpose of monitoring gray wolves.

403—July 19, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 14 demanding that the Federal Lands Recreation Act be repealed and that no recreational fees authorized under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act be imposed to use federal public land in the State.

404—July 19, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 20 declaring that should the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act be repealed, the authority for permitting outfitters and guides be replaced immediately to allow for operations to continue uninterrupted and special use fee currently assessed by reauthorized under a new authority.

405—July 19, 2006; Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 21 urging the Congress of the United States to support federal legislation transferring management of National Forest System lands within Idaho to the State of Idaho to be managed for the benefit of rural counties and schools.

444—September 8, 2006; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 120 urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to support H.R. No. 3468 to control the introduction and spread of invasive species and diseases in Hawaii.

F. PETITIONS

9—March 15, 2005; Petition of the Kentucky House Committee on Agriculture and Small Business, relative to a resolution petitioning the United States Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture to take the necessary steps to allow tobacco producers to sell the excess tobacco from their 2004 crop.

28—July 28, 2005; Petition of the Marinette County Board of Supervisors, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 192 urging the Congress of the United States to take action to eliminate the gridlock occurring in Forest Service Land Use Planning and in the implementation of timber sale projects.

60—July 28, 2005; Petition of the Ashland County Board of Supervisors, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. R06–2005–810 requesting the Congress of the United States to approve the continuation of Pub. L. 106–393 for an additional 6 years and that the current rate plus an annual increase in the appropriated amount be at the full rate of national inflation.

63—July 28, 2005; Petition of the County of Marathon, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. R–29–05 requesting that the Con-
gress of the United States take action to eliminate the gridlock that is occurring in Forest Service Land Use Planning and in the implementation of timber sale projects that are permissible within approved Forest Plan.


65—July 28, 2005; Petition of the County of Marathon, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. R–27–05 urging the Congress of the United States to restore Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Funding from the Federal Government to Townships Containing Federal Forest Lands to the fiscal year 2005 Level Plus Inflation.

98—December 18, 2005; Petition of the Oconto County Board of Supervisors, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 49 petitioning the Congress of the United States to reauthorize and fund Pub. L. 106–393, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

99—December 18, 2005; Petition of the Oconto County Board of Supervisors, Wisconsin, relative to Resolution No. 48 requesting the Congress of the United States to take action to eliminate the gridlock that is occurring in Forest Service Land Use Planning and in the implementation of timber sale projects that are permissible within approved Forest Plans.