

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG  
ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2015

---

JUNE 4, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

---

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

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4800]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in  
explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for Ag-  
riculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and  
Related Agencies for fiscal year 2015.

CONTENTS

	Page
Title I—Agricultural Programs .....	3
Title II—Conservation Programs .....	34
Title III—Rural Development Programs .....	36
Title IV—Domestic Food Programs .....	44
Title V—Foreign Assistance and Related Programs .....	52
Title VI—Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....	54
Title VII—General Provisions .....	66

OVERVIEW

The fiscal year 2015 discretionary spending in this bill totals \$20,880,000,000, which is at the same level as the fiscal year 2014 enacted level and an increase of \$457,226,000 above the budget request. While the total discretionary funding provided in the bill appears significantly higher than the President's budget request, the budget request included several untenable and unsupported pro-

posals to reduce spending knowing that the reductions would not be accepted by most Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis.

The funding levels provided in this appropriations bill continue to demonstrate how seriously this Committee takes its responsibility to fund the highest priority programs and activities while controlling spending to help address the Nation's debt, deficit, and economic challenges.

#### OVERSIGHT AND HEARINGS

Consistent with the Committee on Appropriations Oversight Plan, as approved and transmitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration in January 2013, the Subcommittee began the fiscal year 2015 process committed to maintaining the Committee's focus on comprehensive oversight of Federal discretionary spending under the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. In order to thoroughly review the President's budget request for fiscal year 2015 and examine how funds appropriated in previous years had been managed, the Subcommittee held 10 hearings for the mission areas, agencies, and programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). The hearings included:

- USDA Inspector General—March 5, 2014
- Commodity Futures Trading Commission—March 6, 2014
- Secretary of Agriculture—March 14, 2014
- USDA Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services—March 25, 2014
- USDA Research, Education, and Economics—March 26, 2014
- Food and Drug Administration—March 27, 2014
- USDA Marketing and Regulatory Programs—April 2, 2014
- USDA Food Safety—April 3, 2014
- USDA Rural Development—April 4, 2014
- USDA Field Agencies—April 8, 2014

As stewards of the taxpayer's dollar, the Subcommittee is responsible for ensuring the funds under its jurisdiction are wisely invested and properly used. As such, the Subcommittee established three objectives to guide its hearings, oversight activities, and the development of its bill and report recommendations for fiscal year 2015. These objectives include robust oversight, ensuring the appropriate level of regulation to protect producers and the public, and ensuring funding is targeted to vital programs.

Through its oversight activities, the Subcommittee can help identify and reduce waste, fraud, and abuse. It is joined in this effort by USDA's Inspector General. During the hearing with the Inspector General, the Subcommittee focused on USDA information technology systems, fraud in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and how well USDA's agencies are managing their programs.

The Subcommittee continued its discussion on SNAP and the other nutrition programs when it heard from USDA's Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services mission area. When it convened to review CFTC's budget request, the Subcommittee continued to promote sound investment in information technology and program management. The Subcommittee made clear that it does not tol-

erate fraud or abuse in any program, knowing that fraud undermines support for all programs.

The second objective of ensuring the appropriate level of regulation to protect producers and the public was the focus of the hearings with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Commissioner of FDA, and USDA's Food Safety mission area. The Subcommittee was particularly interested in USDA's plans to implement the recently enacted 2014 farm bill and how FDA is implementing the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA). FDA's decisions regarding prescription drug approvals also received scrutiny, as well as the Food Safety and Inspection Service's plans for using modern science and improving public health.

The Subcommittee also discussed implementation of the 2014 farm bill during its hearing with USDA's field agencies, including the Farm Service Agency, Risk Management Agency, Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

The third objective is to ensure funding is targeted to vital programs. Because the Subcommittee knows that it cannot fulfill all requests for funding, it focuses on those that are most effective and broadly supported and those that address imminent threats, such as citrus greening and the virulent viruses affecting the swine industry. In particular, agriculture's priority programs and needs were covered in the hearings on USDA's marketing, regulatory, research, and rural development programs.

The Subcommittee will monitor the issues identified and discussed at the hearings, as well as others relevant to the management of USDA, FDA, CFTC, and the Farm Credit Administration and will maintain its oversight efforts throughout the 113th Congress to ensure taxpayer dollars are wisely and prudently used on behalf of the American people.

## TITLE I

### AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

#### PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$43,778,000
2015 budget estimate .....	46,816,000
Provided in the bill .....	41,284,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	-2,494,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-5,532,000

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee for each office and activity:

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provision
Office of the Secretary .....	\$5,051	\$5,086	\$5,051
Office of Tribal Relations .....	498	502	498
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination .....	1,496	1,507	1,507

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY—Continued

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provision
Office of Advocacy and Outreach .....	1,209	1,217	1,209
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration .....	804	809	804
Departmental Administration .....	22,786	25,661	22,811
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	3,869	3,897	3,869
Office of Communications .....	8,065	8,137	5,535
Total .....	\$43,778	\$46,816	\$41,284

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Secretary, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$41,284,000. The Committee recommendation includes the following offices under the Office of the Secretary: Office of the Secretary; Office of Tribal Relations; Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination; Office of Advocacy and Outreach; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; Departmental Administration; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations; and Office of Communications.

*Pay Cost.*—The Committee does not include requested funding for a civilian pay increase across the Department.

*Improper Payments.*—The Office of the Inspector General recently reported that USDA's agencies and offices have made progress toward improving their processes to identify, report, and reduce improper payments. However, USDA estimated it made \$6,200,000,000 in improper payments in fiscal year 2013. The Committee finds this unacceptable and strongly encourages the Secretary to make a concerted effort to significantly reduce USDA's improper payments in fiscal year 2015.

*CCC Report.*—The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a report on November 15, 2014, and May 16, 2015, on planned uses of funding under the authorities of Section 4 and Section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

*Notification.*—Within 30 days from the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the allocation of the funds provided to the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations by USDA agency, along with an explanation for the agency-by-agency distribution of the funds.

*State Office Collocation.*—The Committee continues to direct that any reallocation of resources related to the collocation of state offices scheduled for fiscal year 2015 and subsequent years is subject to the Committee's reprogramming procedures required under law.

*Administrative Provision.*—The Committee directs the Secretary to advise the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, through the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, of the status of all reports requested of the Department in this bill at the time of submission of the fiscal year 2016 budget and monthly thereafter. The Committee reminds the Secretary that all correspondence related to the directives in this bill must be addressed to the Committee on Appropriations.

*Loan and Grant Programs.*—The Committee directs the Department, through the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, to provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the

House of Representatives and the Senate on the status of obligations and funds availability for the loan and grant programs provided in this bill.

The Committee further directs that if an estimate of loan activity for any program funded in Titles I and III of this bill indicates that a limitation on authority to make commitments for a fiscal year will be reached before the end of that fiscal year, or in any event whenever 75 percent of the authority to make commitments has been utilized, the Secretary shall promptly notify the Committees in writing, through the Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

*Need for Better Communication from USDA.*—As part of the Committee’s oversight responsibilities, the Members of the Committee must be informed of the activities, pending and proposed actions, and expenditures made by USDA and its respective agencies so that Congress can determine whether laws and programs are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress. The Committee should not have to require reports and briefings to receive information and data pertinent to its jurisdiction. In addition to the reporting and approval requirements stated in this report and accompanying bill, the Department is advised to increase both the timing and frequency of communication on major policy and spending activities so that Congress may conduct its oversight responsibilities as expected by U.S. taxpayers.

*GSA Rent and DHS Security Expenses.*—In accordance with the Committee’s statement in H. Rpt. 113–116, as well as the shift of expenses within the fiscal year 2015 budget proposal, the funding levels in this bill reflect the estimated costs included in the budget request so that agencies will now begin to manage and pay their own respective rent and security expenses. The Committee reiterates its continued concern for the increasing costs of rent and related operations, especially at a time when staffing levels are decreasing and such costs limit an agency’s ability to apply limited resources to the highest priorities and core responsibilities. Any future requests for increases to rent and security costs will need to be accompanied by detailed justifications.

*Emerging Livestock Diseases.*—The Committee is concerned about the growing incidence of the porcine epidemic diarrhea virus and swine delta coronavirus and strongly encourages USDA to utilize its research, extension, and animal health resources in partnership with pork producers, related industries, and land-grant universities to quickly develop and deploy effective control and management tools.

*Food Safety Collaboration at USDA.*—The Committee is pleased with USDA’s recent announcement in May 2014 of a collaborative effort between the Food Safety and Inspection Service and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to provide a more comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach to address foodborne health hazards potentially associated with meat and poultry products. The collaborative effort represents progress towards improving communications and sharing of information between the agencies to uncover root causes of foodborne illnesses and the practices that can mitigate food safety issues. The Committee commends USDA for taking such actions and directs USDA to keep the Committee apprised of the results of the collaborative efforts in addressing food safety.

*Design-Build.*—The Committee encourages the Department to use the design-build method of project delivery when appropriate.

*Invasive Species.*—The Committee recognizes the threats posed by invasive plant species and the need to protect, restore, and enhance native plants, including those that are endangered or threatened. The Committee encourages the Agricultural Research Service (ARS), the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) to support the research, education, and conservation of native plants.

*Flexibility in Loan and Loan Guarantee Levels.*—The bill includes language to exceed by up to 25 percent the limitation on loan and loan guarantee levels without budget authority upon written notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

*Scientific Integrity.*—Pursuant to the President’s 2009 memorandum and as directed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, USDA adopted a scientific integrity policy in 2011. It appears to conform to the President’s directive by requiring the use of information based upon well-established scientific processes, including peer review where appropriate, making the Department’s scientific findings and conclusions publicly available, and ensuring a mechanism is in place to resolve disputes regarding scientific processes or the integrity of scientific information. The Committee directs the Secretary to ensure all USDA agencies are complying with the policy and using it as a requirement in their policy and regulatory decisions.

#### EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

##### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST

2014 appropriation .....	\$16,777,000
2015 budget estimate .....	16,854,000
Provided in the bill .....	16,777,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	— — —
2015 budget estimate .....	– 77,000

##### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Economist, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$16,777,000.

*Drought Resilience.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of understanding and being prepared for drought and encourages the Office of the Chief Economist to continue to work with partners on drought-related issues.

*Policy Research.*—The Committee includes \$4,000,000 for policy research under 7 U.S.C. 3155 for entities with existing institutional capacity, including staff, databases, models, and long-term, well-documented experience, to conduct complex economic and baseline analysis for the benefit of USDA, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Congress.

## NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

2014 appropriation .....	\$12,841,000
2015 budget estimate .....	13,430,000
Provided in the bill .....	13,317,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+476,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-113,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the National Appeals Division, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$13,317,000.

## OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

2014 appropriation .....	\$9,064,000
2015 budget estimate .....	10,292,000
Provided in the bill .....	9,392,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+328,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-900,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$9,392,000.

## OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

2014 appropriation .....	\$44,031,000
2015 budget estimate .....	45,199,000
Provided in the bill .....	45,025,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+994,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-174,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$45,025,000. This includes \$22,000,000 for cybersecurity activities.

*IT Purchase Approvals.*—Recognizing that some agencies require more oversight and monitoring than others, the Committee provides the Office of the Chief Information Officer flexibility to set thresholds for approval of agency IT expenditures. As such, the Committee directs the Chief Information Officer to develop a plan that reflects the unique situation of each agency while allowing the Office of the Chief Information Officer to continue to exercise prudent judgment and provide expert advice regarding the expenditure of taxpayer resources on IT investments. The Committee expects the plan will be updated as needed, but not less than every two years, and directs the office to submit the plan to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress for review prior to implementation.

## OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

2014 appropriation .....	\$6,213,000
2015 budget estimate .....	6,080,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,028,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	-185,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-52,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$6,028,000.

*Assessments.*—The Committee remains concerned that the assessments the Department charges its agencies for government- and department-wide activities continue to escalate. Since these assessments are borne by the agencies, and Congress did not specifically provide increases to the agencies for these costs, most of the funding for the increase has come at the expense of programs. The Committee continues to direct the Office of the Chief Financial Officer to scrutinize the need for each activity, to consider its benefit to the mission of each agency, and to limit spending wherever possible, especially in regards to assessments for the creative media and broadcast center; promotional, voluntary activities; and activities not specifically authorized by Congress.

## OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2015 budget estimate .....	898,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	— — —

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

## OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$21,400,000
2015 budget estimate .....	24,236,000
Provided in the bill .....	24,070,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+2,670,000
2015 budget estimate .....	– 166,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Civil Rights, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$24,070,000.

## AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2014 appropriation .....	\$233,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	64,825,000
<sup>1</sup> Provided in the bill .....	54,825,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	– 178,175,000
2015 budget estimate .....	– 10,000,000

<sup>1</sup>Funding for Rental Payments and Building Security is funded from Agency accounts in FY 2015.

For Agriculture Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$54,825,000.

*Report on Headquarters Modernization.*—The Committee directs the Department within 60 days of enactment of this Act to provide a comprehensive report on headquarters modernization efforts, beginning with the initial plan developed in 1995 and continuing through project completion. The report should include amounts appropriated and obligated by fiscal year and estimates for future fis-

cal years. Each fiscal year should include a percentage showing completion of the projects and projected completion for future years by building and phase. The report should include a narrative describing challenges faced in completing the project and variations from estimated costs.

The following table represents the Committee's specific recommendations for this account:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	2014 enacted	2015 budget request	Committee provisions
Rental Payments .....	\$164,470	---	---
Department of Homeland Security.			
Building Security .....	13,800	---	---
Building Operations .....	54,730	\$64,825	\$54,825
Total .....	\$233,000	\$64,825	\$54,825

#### HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$3,592,000
2015 budget estimate .....	3,600,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,600,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+8,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Hazardous Materials Management, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$3,600,000.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

2014 appropriation .....	\$89,902,000
2015 budget estimate .....	97,240,000
Provided in the bill .....	97,020,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+7,118,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-220,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Inspector General (OIG), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$97,020,000. This includes requested funding to support the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

*Anti-Fraud Efforts.*—The Committee appreciates OIG's continued efforts to raise public awareness of successful Federal investigations of fraud. Such efforts are intended to deter participants from engaging in the misuse of taxpayer dollars and to maintain a high level of integrity in all of USDA's programs. The Committee encourages OIG to continue its efforts to work with all of USDA's agencies to deter fraud, waste, and abuse in the Department's programs.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

2014 appropriation .....	\$41,202,000
2015 budget estimate .....	47,567,000
Provided in the bill .....	44,383,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+3,181,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-3,184,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the General Counsel, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$44,383,000.

OFFICE OF ETHICS

2014 appropriation .....	\$3,440,000
2015 budget estimate .....	3,867,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,440,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- - -
2015 budget estimate .....	- 427,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Ethics, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$3,440,000.

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

2014 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2015 budget estimate .....	898,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$898,000.

*Brown Marmorated Stink Bug.*—The Committee appreciates the continuing work of ARS and NIFA regarding the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug. This pest is causing significant damage to agricultural crops, particularly the apple crop in the mid-Atlantic States, and has spread to more than 41 States and the District of Columbia. The Committee encourages ARS and NIFA to work collaboratively with APHIS and state partners to identify and implement appropriate controls.

*Emerging Livestock Diseases.*—The Committee is concerned about the growing incidence of the porcine epidemic diarrhea virus and swine delta coronavirus and their potential effect on pork producers and consumers. The Committee strongly encourages USDA to more effectively utilize the resources of its in-house research capabilities and to work with other USDA agencies, land-grant universities, and other research partners as well as pork producers and related industries to quickly develop, approve, and disseminate effective control and management tools.

*Lyme Disease Research.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the ongoing research efforts of ARS and NIFA regarding

tick-borne illnesses. As the agency continues to build upon its research efforts to protect humans and livestock from tick-borne illnesses, the Committee encourages ARS, in conjunction with other agencies, to maintain its efforts and consider both the human and economic impacts of Lyme disease on communities in the United States.

*Office of Pest Management Policy.*—The Committee commends the Office of Pest Management Policy for its work providing the Department, other Federal agencies, producers, and other interested stakeholders scientifically sound analysis of pest management issues important to agriculture, especially methyl bromide transition, pesticide resistance management, and the development of antimicrobials to combat citrus greening. The Committee encourages the Under Secretary to better utilize this office and directs ARS to continue to support its vital work.

*Pollinators and Colony Health Research.*—The Committee recognizes that Colony Collapse Disorder and related colony health issues are a significant concern to beekeepers, honey producers, farmers, researchers, policymakers, and the public and appreciates USDA’s logical, scientifically based approach to studying these issues and supports its proposed research plans for fiscal year 2015. The Committee directs the Department to continue to focus on the challenges facing pollinators.

*Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research.*—The Committee is concerned about the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research created by the 2014 farm bill and reports that the Department intends to obligate \$200,000,000 in mandatory funds to the Foundation by the end of the fiscal year but before the Foundation has been established and any matching funds have been received as required by law. The Committee directs USDA not to expend any funds except those related to the appointment of members of the board and the preparation of by-laws, conflict of interest policies, and standards of conduct until the Committee receives and approves these documents. The Committee directs USDA to report to it no later than January 1, 2015.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

2014 appropriation .....	\$78,058,000
2015 budget estimate .....	83,446,000
Provided in the bill .....	85,784,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+7,726,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+2,338,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Economic Research Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$85,784,000.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

2014 appropriation .....	\$161,206,000
2015 budget estimate .....	178,999,000
Provided in the bill .....	169,371,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+8,165,000
2015 budget estimate .....	–9,628,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$169,371,000, of which \$47,842,000 is for the Census of Agriculture.

The Committee provides \$2,000,000 as requested to expand beekeeper surveys.

## AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2014 appropriation .....	\$1,122,482,000
2015 budget estimate .....	1,104,403,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,120,253,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 2,229,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+15,850,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Agricultural Research Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,120,253,000.

The Committee does not concur with the agency's proposed closures and redirections of research programs and provides sufficient funding for ARS to maintain existing investments.

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

*Alfalfa Research.*—The Committee supports research into alfalfa seed and forage systems which hold the potential to increase yields and milk production and improve genetics.

*Aquatic Animal Health.*—The Committee supports ARS's work with land-grant universities and other Federal partners to develop solutions to aquatic animal pathogens in the marine, freshwater, and aquaculture environments and encourages the agency to continue its efforts in this area.

*Cheat Grass Eradication.*—The Committee encourages ARS to continue research on cheat grass eradication, control, and the reduction of fuel loads, including late-season grazing techniques, and to work with the NRCS on this effort.

*Citrus Greening Disease Research.*—The Committee commends ARS's research efforts on citrus greening disease and encourages the agency to continue working to develop methods to reduce transmission and enhance immunity in citrus trees and to work with industry, universities, growers, and other partners to develop effective control mechanisms. The Committee also encourages ARS to coordinate its efforts with the Multi-Agency Coordination group.

*Coffee Plant Health.*—The Committee appreciates ARS's work to address existing and emerging challenges to coffee production in the United States and commends the agency's work through its Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center with the University of Hawaii and coffee grower groups. The Committee encourages ARS and its partners to maintain support for coffee plant health research

and requests a report on ARS's current and planned activities on this issue within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

*Domestic and Bighorn Sheep.*—The Committee recognizes the challenges caused by infectious disease problems arising from wild-life-domestic animal agriculture interactions, particularly between domestic sheep and wild bighorn sheep. The Committee encourages ARS to work to determine the role of domestic sheep in causing die-offs of bighorn sheep from respiratory disease and develop methods to reduce transmission and enhance immunity.

*Emerging Cereal Rust Diseases.*—The Committee continues to be concerned about emerging cereal rust diseases, particularly Ug99, and the threat they pose to domestic and world food supplies. The Committee encourages ARS to continue its work on these diseases, including the development of Ug99-resistant wheat varieties.

*Food Pathogen Detection.*—The Committee notes the advances in the detection of dangerous pathogens in the food supply and encourages ARS to continue research to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of new technologies.

*Forest Products Research.*—The forest products sector is an important part of the U.S. economy. The Committee supports research on wood quality, forest product evaluation standards and valuation techniques, and ARS's continuing work with the Forest Products Laboratory.

*FOV Race 4 Cotton Research.*—The Committee recognizes the serious threat that fusarium oxysporum f. sp. Vasinfectum (FOV), particularly the strain FOV Race 4, poses to the U.S. cotton industry. The Committee encourages ARS to continue research efforts to combat FOV Race 4 and to work with industry and other partners to develop effective control measures to eradicate this disease and prevent its spread nationwide.

*Horticultural Research and Education.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the U.S. National Arboretum and its role as a center of discovery and education, as well as a destination for more than half a million visitors every year. The Committee encourages the agency to continue to support the Arboretum.

*Human Nutrition Research.*—There is strong evidence that nutrition plays a vital role in how a person ages, particularly its significance for preventative health care and degenerative and age-related disease. Research is needed to address the needs of the rapidly growing number of older Americans. The Committee encourages ARS to continue research relating to the effect of nutrition on aging.

*Lower Mississippi River Basin.*—The Committee recognizes the groundwater problems in the Lower Mississippi River Basin and encourages ARS to continue research to quantify how appropriate use of conservation practices and technology affect water quantity.

*National Agricultural Library.*—The Committee requests that ARS maintain a focus on agriculture-related legal issues within the National Agricultural Library. The Committee recognizes agriculture-related legal issues are being litigated on an increasingly frequent basis, the complexity and scope of these legal issues continues to broaden, and that the National Agricultural Library plays an important role in assisting all stakeholders with understanding these issues.

*Porcine Virus Research.*—The Committee is aware of ongoing research to identify mechanisms of viral pathogenesis, transmission, and immunity to porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDv) and provides \$1,000,000 to strengthen efforts to identify the genetic virulence factors of PEDv, identify a protective immune response including transmission of maternal antibodies through the milk, and evaluate new vaccine platforms for the development of improved PEDv vaccines.

*Pulse Health Initiative.*—The Committee is aware of the need to investigate the ability of pulse crops, such as dry beans, dry peas, lentils, and chickpeas, to provide solutions to critical health issues and to improve the sustainability of crop rotations by improving the nitrogen-fixing abilities of pulse crops. The Committee encourages ARS to continue its work on these important issues.

*Research on Sediments.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of finding solutions to the problems associated with soil erosion, including erosion and sedimentation in stream channels and the loss of nutrients and agricultural chemicals from farm fields.

*Sclerotinia Initiative.*—The Committee is aware of the importance of controlling Sclerotinia in sunflowers, soybeans, canola, edible beans, peanuts, peas, lentils, and chickpeas and encourages ARS to continue its support of this initiative.

*Wild Rice Research.*—Wild rice is the only cereal grain native to North America, but it is still in its infancy as a domesticated crop. Wild germplasm and previously developed varieties have been lost. The Committee urges ARS to consider molecular characterization of wild rice to prevent future losses and maximize the potential for this crop.

*Cooperative Agreements.*—The Committee encourages ARS to work with university partners to ensure long-term maintenance and infrastructure needs can be addressed within current permit and lease arrangements.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2014 appropriation .....	— — —
2015 budget estimate .....	\$155,000,000
Provided in the bill: .....	155,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+155,000,000
2015 estimate .....	— — —

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For ARS Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$155,000,000 for priorities identified in the USDA Agricultural Research Service Capital Investment Strategy, April 2012.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

2014 appropriation .....	\$772,559,000
2015 budget estimate .....	837,747,000
Provided in the bill .....	774,465,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+1,906,000
2015 budget estimate .....	–63,282,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Research and Education Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$774,465,000.

*Agricultural Research Enhancement Awards.*—The Committee continues to direct that not less than 10 percent of the competitive research grant funds be used for USDA’s agriculture research enhancement awards program, including USDA–EPSCoR, in accordance with 7 U.S.C. 450i.

*Biomass and Water Quality Research at 1890 Institutions.*—The Committee encourages NIFA to support funding to explore new technologies for the development of renewable power and fuels from biomass and agricultural residues and to develop new approaches to water quality.

*Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2016.*—The Committee appreciates NIFA’s efforts to provide additional information in its budget requests over the past two years. For the fiscal year 2016 budget request, the Committee is particularly interested in the request for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative and requests that the agency provide greater detail on the levels proposed to be allocated to and the expected publication date, scope, and allocation level for each request for awards to be published under each priority area specified in section 2(b)(2) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(2)).

*Citrus Disease Research Program.*—The 2014 farm bill established the Emergency Citrus Disease Research and Extension Program, which is intended to discover and develop tools for early detection, control, and eradication of diseases and pests that threaten domestic citrus production and processing, and provided \$25,000,000 per year in mandatory funding for the program through the Specialty Crop Research Initiative. The Committee believes research projects funded under this authority should be prioritized based on the critical threat of citrus greening and encourages NIFA, to the maximum extent practicable, to follow the recommendations of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Advisory Board’s citrus disease subcommittee and to collaborate with the Huanglongbing Multi-Agency Coordination group.

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

*Industrial Hemp Research.*—The Committee encourages NIFA to work with the eligible research institutions and state departments of agriculture, as authorized by Sec. 7606 of P.L. 113–79, to conduct research on industrial hemp.

*Livestock and Poultry Waste Research.*—The Committee recognizes the benefits of improved methods of managing animal waste in livestock and poultry production and encourages NIFA to support research and development of innovative technologies, particu-

larly those that are operationally and economically feasible and have a high probability of widespread implementation.

*Research at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.*—The Committee encourages NIFA to continue to support biotechnology by promoting research at the land-grant colleges and universities, including the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and directs NIFA to encourage partnerships among universities and industry.

*Zoonotic Disease Research.*—The eradication of zoonotic livestock diseases has been a priority of Federal and state animal health officials, as was reflected in the Agricultural Act of 2014. The Committee recognizes the need for this research and encourages NIFA to support the development of improved management tools for zoonotic livestock diseases that have significant wildlife reservoirs.

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee:

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	2014 enacted	2015 estimate	Committee provision
Hatch Act .....	7 U.S.C. 361a–i .....	\$243,701	\$243,701	\$243,701
McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act .....	16 U.S.C. 582a through a–7 ...	33,961	33,961	33,961
Research at 1890 Institutions (Evans-Allen Program).	7 U.S.C. 3222 .....	52,485	52,485	52,485
Payments to the 1994 Institutions .....	534(a)(1) of P.L. 103–382 .....	3,439	3,439	3,439
Education Grants for 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(b) .....	19,336	19,336	19,336
Education Grants for Hispanic-Serving Institutions ..	7 U.S.C. 3241 .....	9,219	9,219	9,219
Education Grants for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions.	7 U.S.C. 3156 .....	3,194	3,194	3,194
Research Grants for 1994 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 301 note .....	1,801	1,801	1,801
Capacity Building for Non Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture.	7 U.S.C. 3319i .....	4,500	---	---
Grants for Insular Areas .....	7 U.S.C. 3222b–2, 3363 and 3362 .....	1,800	1,800	2,000
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(b) .....	316,409	325,000	325,000
Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment .....	7 U.S.C. 3151a .....	4,790	4,790	5,000
Food and Agriculture Resiliency Program for Military Veterans.	7 U.S.C. 2662(e) .....	---	2,500	---
Continuing Animal Health and Disease Research Program.	7 U.S.C. 3195 .....	4,000	---	5,000
Supplemental and Alternative Crops .....	7 U.S.C. 3319d .....	825	---	---
Critical Agricultural Materials Act .....	7 U.S.C. 178 et seq. ....	1,081	---	---
Multicultural Scholars, Graduate Fellowship and Institution Challenge Grants.	7 U.S.C. 3152(b) .....	9,000	---	9,000
Secondary and 2-year Post-Secondary Education .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(j) .....	900	---	900
Aquaculture Centers .....	7 U.S.C. 3322 .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education .....	7 U.S.C. 5811, 5812, 5831, and 5832 .....	22,667	22,667	22,667
Farm Business Management .....	7 U.S.C. 5925f .....	1,450	---	---
Sun Grant Program .....	7 U.S.C. 8114 .....	2,500	---	---
Alfalfa and Forage Research Program .....	7 U.S.C. 5925 .....	1,350	---	---
Minor Crop Pest Management (IR–4) .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	11,913	11,913	11,913
Special Research Grants:	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....			
Global Change/UV Monitoring .....	.....	1,405	1,405	1,405
Potato Research .....	.....	1,350	---	---
Forest Products Research .....	.....	1,350	---	---
Total, Special Research Grants .....	.....	4,105	1,405	1,405
Innovation Institutes .....	.....	---	75,000	---
Necessary Expenses of Research and Education Activities:				
Grants Management Systems .....	.....	7,830	9,830	7,830

## RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES—Continued

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	2014 enacted	2015 estimate	Committee provision
Federal Administration—Other Necessary Expenses.	.....	6,303	5,746	6,303
GSA Rent and DHS Security Expenses	.....	---	5,960	6,311
<b>Total, Necessary Expenses</b>	.....	<b>14,133</b>	<b>21,536</b>	<b>20,444</b>
<b>Total, Research and Education Activities.</b>	.....	<b>\$772,559</b>	<b>\$837,747</b>	<b>\$774,465</b>

## NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

2014 appropriation	.....	(\$11,880,000)
2015 budget estimate	.....	(11,880,000)
Provided in the bill	.....	(11,880,000)
Comparison:		
2014 appropriation	.....	---
2015 budget estimate	.....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund, the Committee provides \$11,880,000.

The Committee notes that the endowment fund has a cost of \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2015.

## EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

2014 appropriation	.....	\$469,191,000
2015 budget estimate	.....	468,968,000
Provided in the bill	.....	467,339,000
Comparison:		
2014 appropriation	.....	-1,852,000
2015 budget estimate	.....	-1,629,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Extension Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$467,339,000.

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee:

## EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provision
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(b) and (c) programs and Cooperative Extension.	7 U.S.C. 343(b) and (c) and 208(c) of P.L. 93-471	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
Extension Services at 1890 Institutions	7 U.S.C. 3221	43,920	43,920	43,920
Extension Services at 1994 Institutions	7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)	4,446	4,446	4,446
Facility Improvements at 1890 Institutions	7 U.S.C. 3222b	19,730	19,730	19,730
Renewable Resources Extension Act	16 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.	4,060	4,060	4,060
Rural Health and Safety Education Programs	7 U.S.C. 2662(i)	1,500	---	---
Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database Program	7 U.S.C. 7642	1,250	---	1,250
Women and Minorities in STEM Fields	7 U.S.C. 5925	400	---	400
Food Safety Outreach Program	7 U.S.C. 7625	---	2,500	2,500
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(d):	7 U.S.C. 343(d)			
Food and Nutrition Education	.....	67,934	67,934	67,934
Farm Safety and Youth Farm Safety Education Programs.	.....	4,610	4,610	4,610

## EXTENSION ACTIVITIES—Continued

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provision
New Technologies for Agricultural Extension ....	.....	1,550	1,750	1,750
Children, Youth, and Families at Risk .....	.....	8,395	8,395	8,395
Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program .....	.....	3,039	3,039	3,039
<b>Total, Section 3(d) .....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>85,528</b>	<b>85,728</b>	<b>85,728</b>
Necessary Expenses of Extension Activities:				
Agriculture in the K–12 Classroom .....	.....	552	---	---
Federal Administration—Other Necessary Ex- penses for Extension Activities .....	.....	7,805	8,584	5,305
<b>Total, Necessary Expenses .....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>8,357</b>	<b>8,584</b>	<b>5,305</b>
<b>Total, Extension Activities .....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>\$469,191</b>	<b>\$468,968</b>	<b>\$467,339</b>

## INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

2014 appropriation .....	\$35,317,000
2015 budget estimate .....	28,821,000
Provided in the bill .....	32,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	– 3,317,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+3,179,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Integrated Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$32,000,000. The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee.

## INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provision
Water Quality Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	\$4,500	\$---	\$---
Methyl Bromide Transition Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	1,996	---	2,000
Organic Transition Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
Regional Rural Development Centers .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	998	998	1,000
Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative .....	7 U.S.C. 3351 .....	6,680	6,680	7,000
Crop Protection/Pest Management Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626, 7 U.S.C. 450i(c), and 7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	17,143	17,143	18,000
<b>Total, Integrated Activities .....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>\$35,317</b>	<b>\$28,821</b>	<b>\$32,000</b>

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND  
REGULATORY PROGRAMS

2014 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2015 budget estimate .....	898,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+ \$5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$898,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$821,721,000
2015 budget estimate .....	834,341,000
Provided in the bill .....	867,505,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+45,784,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+33,164,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Salaries and Expenses, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$867,505,000.

Included in this funding level are increases of \$42,567,000 for the cost of GSA rent and for security expenses reimbursed to the Department of Homeland Security; an increase of \$2,000,000 for Overseas Technical and Trade Operations activities in order to help resolve sanitary and phytosanitary trade issues that could result in the opening of new markets and retaining and expanding existing market access for U.S. agricultural products; an increase of \$500,000 for the National Veterinary Stockpile to assist in the supply of critical veterinary countermeasures that would be used for emergency preparedness and response efforts in the event of an intentional or unintentional introduction of an animal disease into the U.S. market; and an increase of \$5,000,000 for the Citrus Health Response Program to help address the damaging effects of citrus greening disease. Also, the recommended funding level includes an increase of \$3,500,000 to address the devastating effects of porcine epidemic diarrhea virus. Within this total, \$1,000,000 is for Veterinary Diagnostics in support of the National Animal Health Laboratory Network, and \$2,500,000 is for the Swine Health line item.

The following table reflects the amounts provided by the Committee:

	Committee provision
Animal Health Technical Services .....	\$35,339,000
Aquatic Animal Health .....	2,253,000
Avian Health .....	52,340,000
Cattle Health .....	92,500,000
Equine, Cervid, and Small Ruminant Health .....	19,500,000
National Veterinary Stockpile .....	4,222,000
Swine Health .....	24,750,000
Veterinary Biologics .....	16,417,000
Veterinary Diagnostics .....	32,540,000
Zoonotic Disease Management .....	9,523,000
<i>Subtotal, Animal Health</i> .....	<i>289,384,000</i>
Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (Appropriated) .....	26,900,000
Cotton Pests .....	11,520,000

	Committee provision
Field Crop & Rangeland Ecosystem Pests .....	8,826,000
Pest Detection .....	27,446,000
Plant Protection Methods Development .....	24,549,000
Specialty Crop Pests .....	156,500,000
Tree & Wood Pests .....	47,417,000
<i>Subtotal, Plant Health</i> .....	<i>303,158,000</i>
Wildlife Damage Management .....	87,428,000
Wildlife Services Methods Development .....	18,856,000
<i>Subtotal, Wildlife Services</i> .....	<i>106,284,000</i>
Animal & Plant Health Regulatory Enforcement .....	16,224,000
Biotechnology Regulatory Services .....	18,135,000
<i>Subtotal, Regulatory Services</i> .....	<i>34,359,000</i>
Contingency Fund .....	470,000
Emergency Preparedness & Response .....	16,966,000
<i>Subtotal, Safeguarding and Emergency Preparedness</i> .....	<i>17,436,000</i>
Agriculture Import/Export .....	14,099,000
Overseas Technical and Trade Operations .....	22,114,000
<i>Subtotal, Safe Trade &amp; International Technical Assistance</i> .....	<i>36,213,000</i>
Animal Welfare .....	28,010,000
Horse Protection .....	697,000
<i>Subtotal, Animal Welfare</i> .....	<i>28,707,000</i>
APHIS Information Technology Infrastructure .....	4,251,000
Physical/Operational Security .....	5,146,000
GSA Rental and DHS Security Payments .....	42,567,000
<i>Subtotal, Agency Management</i> .....	<i>51,964,000</i>
Total, Salaries & Expenses .....	\$867,505,000

*Animal Welfare.*—The bill funds the Animal Welfare program at \$28,010,000 in order to ensure that minimum standards of care and treatment are provided for certain animals bred for commercial sale, used in research, transported commercially, or exhibited to the public.

*Aquatic Animal Health.*—Nearly half of the seafood consumed across the world is the product of aquaculture. In addition, the aquaculture industry is a critical and growing part of the U.S. economy. Unfortunately, the monitoring of aquatic animal health issues is not adequate to meet the needs of a growing industry. For example, the shrimp and catfish aquaculture industries are losing revenue due to the lack of tracking and monitoring of aquatic animal pathogens. These losses could have been prevented if the pathogens had been promptly identified and effective treatments or prevention procedures were developed and available. The Committee encourages the agency to support and protect this important industry. Collaborative efforts among the agency, industry, and other Federal and state partners are essential to improving preparedness, surveillance, and response capabilities, as well as reducing the likelihood of disease spread.

*Biotechnology Regulatory Services.*—The Committee continues to be concerned about the time it takes the agency to review biotechnology product petitions for regulatory determination. USDA's data showed that it took, on average, almost 900 days for eight

products to be approved in 2013 despite the agency's recent efforts to improve the review process. In addition, the backlog of petitions still remains. The Committee encourages the agency to continue to find ways to improve the permit review process and to reduce the number of petitions awaiting determination. The Committee provides the requested funding necessary to ensure regulatory decisions can be made in a more timely and predictable manner.

*Brown Marmorated Stink Bug.*—The Committee is aware of the growing threat to fruits, vegetables, other crops, and ornamentals throughout the mid-Atlantic region from the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug. It has been found in more than 41 States and the District of Columbia. The Committee directs APHIS to treat this pest as a priority and to continue to assist ARS, NIFA, and state partners with biological control technology once such tools are available.

*Cervid Health.*—Data from 2007 indicate that the cervid industry in the United States accounts for 5,600 deer farms and 1,900 elk farms, has an economic value of \$894,000,000, and supports nearly 30,000 jobs. This industry continues to participate in the agency's national, voluntary herd certification program (HCP) that supports the domestic and international marketability of U.S. cervid herds. The Committee encourages APHIS to maintain its commitment to the HCP and the cervid industry and directs the agency to spend no less than \$3,000,000 for cervid health activities. Within the funds provided, the agency should give consideration to indemnity payments if warranted.

*Citrus Health Response Program (CHRP).*—CHRP is a national effort to protect the U.S. industry from the ravages of invasive pests and diseases. These funds are designed to partner with state departments of agriculture and industry groups to address the challenges of citrus pests and diseases. In addition to the funds provided in this account, the Committee encourages APHIS to utilize the funds available in the newly consolidated Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention Programs account to the greatest extent possible in an attempt to sustain the economic viability of the citrus industry.

*Cost Sharing with States and Other Cooperators.*—The Committee directs APHIS to maximize the use of cost-sharing agreements or matching requirements with States, Territories, producers, foreign governments, non-governmental organizations, and any other recipient of services in order to reduce the cost burden on the agency.

*Cotton Pests.*—The Committee is concerned that every effort be made by APHIS and the cotton industry to ensure the boll weevil does not re-infest areas of the United States where it has been successfully eradicated. The Boll Weevil Eradication Program (BWEPE), an outstanding example of a public-private partnership, has successfully eradicated the boll weevil from all U.S. cotton-producing regions except for the extreme lower parts of Texas in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) bordering Tamaulipas, Mexico. Growers in the LRGV, with assistance from APHIS and the support of the entire industry, continue to conduct an active program to eradicate the boll weevil. The LRGV serves as the barrier between boll weevil infested areas of Mexico and boll weevil-free areas of the United States. The Department is directed to work with the U.S. cotton in-

dustry to develop a plan of action to protect the United States from re-infestation and to report its findings to the Committee not less than 120 days after enactment of this Act.

*Designated Qualified Person Program.*—The Committee directs APHIS to maintain transparency and consistency in the enforcement of the Horse Protection Act when dealing with the regulated industry.

*Emerging Plant Pests.*—The Committee expects the Secretary to continue to use the authority provided in this bill to transfer funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) for the arrest and eradication of animal and plant pests and diseases that threaten American agriculture. By providing funds in this account, the Committee is enhancing, not replacing, the use of CCC funding for emergency outbreaks.

*Feral Swine Management.*—The Committee is aware of the growing economic and ecological damage caused by feral swine across the United States. Conservative estimates indicate feral swine are present in 44 States, and agricultural losses and control efforts cost \$1,500,000,000 annually. The Committee continues to support the agency's national feral swine management program and provides the FY 2014 enacted funding level to continue activities aimed at reducing the damage caused by these invasive pests.

*Huanglongbing Emergency Response.*—The Committee encourages APHIS to allocate sufficient resources in order to continue vital management, control, and associated activities to address citrus greening. The disease, for which there is no cure, has caused the removal of 200,000 acres of citrus in Florida and has affected Texas. In addition, the agency is encouraged to support priorities and strategies identified by the Huanglongbing Multi-Agency Coordination group which will benefit the citrus industry. The agency should appropriately allocate resources based on critical need and maximum effect to the citrus industry.

*Phytophthora ramorum.*—The Committee expects APHIS to continue its efforts to manage *P. ramorum* while minimizing disruption to the interstate movement of plant materials and commercial trade. The agency should use an appropriate portion of funds from the Specialty Crop Pests account to expeditiously implement the review of the Federal Order governing shipment of plant materials from quarantined and regulated counties as well as to continue its review of the efficacy of the pre-notification requirements for western nurseries. APHIS also should continue efforts to partner with the regulated States to develop new best management practices regarding *P. ramorum* during the effective period of the Order.

*Potato Cyst Nematode Eradication.*—The Committee includes funding to maintain resources for the potato cyst nematode eradication program at the fiscal year 2014 level in order to continue with successful efforts to eradicate this pest. If left untreated, this pest could spread, affecting other crops.

*Wildlife Damage Management.*—While receiving support from co-operators to conduct wildlife management operations, special emphasis should be placed on those areas such as oral rabies vaccination, livestock protection, predator damage management, and other such activities that will reduce or eliminate threats to agricultural industries. The Committee expects APHIS to fund national rabies

control and surveillance efforts at the same levels expended in fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

*Conehead Termite.*—The Committee is concerned about the threat the recently introduced conehead termite poses to agricultural crops, trees and shrubs, wood and paper products, as well as homes and other structures. Fortunately, the geographic scope of this invasive species is still limited. However, without expeditious action the conehead termite will gain a foothold, spread throughout the country, and have a significant economic impact. Therefore, the Committee directs APHIS to make it a priority to provide States that the conehead termite has invaded with the technical assistance needed to develop, implement, and administer an effective eradication program.

*Customs and Border Protection and USDA Inspection.*—International trade is a vital part of the Nation’s economy. However, the discrepancy between USDA and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) handling of inbound goods transportation has led to confusion and increased risk for multiple parties. The Committee directs USDA to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate within 90 days of enactment of this Act on how USDA and CBP processes can be streamlined and how liability standards can be brought in sync for cargo that is released to a warehouse, released to a buyer in the United States, or exported to a foreign country.

*Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection (AQI).*—The Committee is aware of the proposed rules regarding adjustment to fees for AQI services and overtime reimbursement rates. The proposed rule related to AQI services includes the increase of some existing fees and the establishment of several new fees that will affect a wide variety of industries, including pest treatment providers, international and domestic shippers, and importers. Many of these services are not currently subject to a fee and strong evidence was not presented in the proposed rule to support the need for these new fees. The agency should exercise due diligence in determining the comprehensive impacts of these new fees on the related industries, especially given the coupling effect of the increased overtime reimbursement rates. The Committee encourages the agency to fully analyze these impacts, including extending the public comment period and consulting with stakeholders to allow ample time for those impacted by the fees to provide input.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2014 appropriation .....	\$3,175,000
2015 budget estimate .....	3,175,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,175,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$3,175,000.

## AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

## MARKETING SERVICES

2014 appropriation .....	\$79,914,000
2015 budget estimate .....	82,963,000
Provided in the bill .....	81,192,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+1,278,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-1,771,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Marketing Services of the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$81,192,000.

The Committee recommendation provides funding equivalent to the fiscal year 2014 level for the National Organic Program as well as the Pesticide Data Program. The Committee notes that the Agricultural Act of 2014 provides mandatory funding for the Specialty Crop Block Grant program and the Organic Production and Market Data Initiative.

*Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling (COOL).*—The Committee is aware that the governments of Canada and Mexico have challenged a final rule published in the *Federal Register* on May 24, 2013, (78 Fed. Reg. 31367) claiming that it violates the United States’ international trade obligations in cases WT/DS384 and WT/DS386, which are pending before a compliance panel of the World Trade Organization (WTO). It is estimated that U.S. exports to the two countries will suffer an economic impact of approximately \$2,000,000,000 in retaliatory actions should the final adjudication of this matter by the WTO determine the COOL requirements are inconsistent with U.S. international trade obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade annexed to the WTO agreement, the WTO agreement, or the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade referred to in section 101(d)(5) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(5)). Additionally, the USDA Chief Economist noted at a House Agriculture Committee hearing on April 30, 2014, that USDA has found that COOL has little impact on consumer meat choices based on survey data.

The Committee directs USDA not to implement or enforce the COOL final rule should the WTO issue a final ruling against the United States. Furthermore, the Secretary is directed to promptly issue a notice in the *Federal Register* announcing that the COOL rule is suspended until further notice if the final ruling is against the United States.

*Organic Integrity.*—The Committee is aware of concerns about recent administrative and procedural changes implemented by the National Organic Program regarding the procedures used to review the use of synthetic materials allowed for continued use in organic products. The Committee notes the importance of respecting the role of public comments in these review procedures, and encourages the agency to ensure continued, robust stakeholder participation in the National List “sunset” process.

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2014 limitation .....	(\$60,435,000)
2015 budget limitation .....	(60,709,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(60,709,000)
Comparison:	
2014 limitation .....	+274,000
2015 budget limitation .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee provides a limitation of \$60,709,000 on Administrative Expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY  
(SECTION 32)

## (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	(\$20,056,000)
2015 budget estimate .....	(20,317,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(20,056,000)
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	-261,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Marketing Agreements and Orders Program, the Committee provides a transfer from section 32 funds of \$20,056,000.

The following table reflects the status of this fund for fiscal years 2014 and 2015:

## ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD FISCAL YEARS 2014–2015

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate
Appropriation (30% of Customs Receipts) .....	\$9,211,183	9,714,923
<i>Less Transfers:</i>		
Food and Nutrition Service .....	-8,011,569	-8,299,923
Commerce Department .....	-130,144	-131,000
Total, Transfers .....	-8,141,713	-8,430,923
Prior Year Appropriation Available, Start of the Year .....	313,530	119,000
Prior Year Collections and Recoveries .....	---	---
Unavailable for Obligations (recoveries & offsetting collections) .....	---	---
<i>Transfer of Prior Year Funds to FNS (Fruit &amp; Vegetable)</i> .....	-117,000	-119,000
Budget Authority: .....	1,266,000	1,284,000
Rescission of Current Year Funds .....	-189,000	-121,000
Appropriations Reduced 7.2 Percent by Sequestration .....	-79,703	---
Appropriations Reduced 7.3 Percent by Sequestration .....	---	-82,000
<i>Unavailable for Obligations (Fruit &amp; Vegetable transfer to FNS)</i> .....	-119,000	-122,000
Available for Obligation: .....	878,297	959,000
<i>Less Obligations:</i>		
Child Nutrition Programs (Entitlement Commodities) .....	465,000	465,000
State Option Contract .....	5,000	5,000
Removal of Defective Commodities .....	2,500	2,500
Emergency Surplus Removal .....	196,900	---
Small Business Support .....	---	---
Disaster Relief .....	5,000	5,000
Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases .....	29,100	206,000
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program .....	41,000	40,000
Estimated Future Needs .....	79,119	180,734

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD FISCAL YEARS 2014–  
2015—Continued  
[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate
<i>Total, Commodity Procurement</i> .....	823,619	904,234
Administrative Funds:		
Commodity Purchase Support .....	34,622	34,710
Marketing Agreements and Orders .....	20,056	20,056
<i>Total, Administrative Funds</i> .....	54,678	54,766
Total Obligations .....	878,297	959,000
Unobligated Balance, End of Year .....	---	---
Unavailable for Obligations (Fruit and Vegetable transfer to FNS) .....	119,000	122,000
<i>Balances, Collections and Recoveries Not Available</i> .....	---	---
Total End of Year Balances .....	\$119,000	\$122,000

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

2014 appropriation .....	\$1,363,000
2015 budget estimate .....	1,235,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,235,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 128,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Payments to States and Possessions, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,235,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2014 appropriation .....	\$40,261,000
2015 budget estimate .....	44,017,000
Provided in the bill .....	43,722,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+3,461,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- 295,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, the Committee provides \$43,722,000.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

2014 limitation .....	(\$50,000,000)
2015 budget limitation .....	(50,000,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(50,000,000)
Comparison:	
2014 limitation .....	---
2015 budget limitation .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee includes a limitation on inspection and weighing services expenses of \$50,000,000. The bill includes authority to exceed by 10 percent the limitation on inspection and weighing services with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

2014 appropriation .....	\$811,000
2015 budget estimate .....	816,000
Provided in the bill .....	816,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$816,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

2014 appropriation .....	\$1,010,689,000
2015 budget estimate .....	1,001,402,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,005,189,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 5,500,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+3,787,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,005,189,000.

The following table reflects the Committee’s recommendations for fiscal year 2015:

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Recommendation
Federal inspection .....	\$889,356
Public health data communication infrastructure system .....	34,580
International food safety and inspection .....	16,589
State food safety and inspection .....	60,905
Codex alimentarius .....	3,759
Total, Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	\$1,005,189

*Humane Methods of Slaughter.*—FSIS shall ensure that inspectors hired with funding previously specified for enforcement under the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act focus their attention on overseeing compliance with humane handling rules for live animals as they arrive and are offloaded and handled in pens, chutes, and stunning areas, and that all inspectors receive robust national training, including on the Regulatory Essentials, Humane Animal Tracking System, and Public Health Information System.

*Buffalo/Bison Inspection.*—The Committee urges FSIS to enhance its work with Tribes to set up voluntary, fee-for-service programs for the slaughter of Tribally-raised buffalo and bison. In doing so, FSIS should work with the InterTribal Buffalo Council and make the Council aware of opportunities such as mobile slaughter and trade associations that may be able to assist them in qualifying for inspection and beginning their operations.

*Water Conserving Technologies.*—The Committee supports the agency’s efforts to encourage innovation and modernization at slaughter and processing establishments. The Committee is aware of technologies that allow hand-washing facilities to be immediately

activated and deactivated in a hands-free manner. In order to encourage water conservation and reduce cross-contamination, the Committee directs FSIS to utilize water-conserving technologies and pursue implementation as soon as practicable.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN  
AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

2014 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2015 budget estimate .....	898,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-- --

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$898,000.

The Committee is concerned about waste, fraud, and abuse in programs administered by the Farm Service Agency (FSA) and the Risk Management Agency (RMA). Therefore, the Secretary is directed to certify that any newly approved payment, loan, grant, subsidy, or insurance claim from a program administered by FSA or RMA does not include individuals or entities that have been permanently debarred from participating in USDA programs.

*Farm Bill Implementation.*—The Committee is aware that the Agricultural Act of 2014 provided \$100,000,000 in mandatory funds for FSA to implement title I of the Act. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a detailed plan by October 1, 2014, on how this funding will be utilized. At a minimum, the plan should include information on any interagency agreements or contracts with the private sector and other non-Federal entities; the purpose, amounts, and dates of estimated obligations; and the number of part-time, temporary, or related staff hired to assist with implementation. On October 1, 2014, and every quarter thereafter until the funds are expended, the Committee directs the Secretary to provide a status report on the obligations and outlays and expects that the Committee will be notified if there are any significant deviations from the plan. The Committee reminds the Secretary that funding is not available to hire new full-time equivalent staff at FSA. As such, this funding should not be used for that purpose.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	Transfer from program accounts	Total, FSA S&E
2014 appropriation .....	\$1,177,926,000	(\$310,087,000)	(\$1,488,013,000)
2015 budget estimate .....	1,139,323,000	(309,880,000)	(1,449,203,000)
Provided in the bill .....	1,205,068,000	(309,880,000)	(1,514,948,000)
Comparison:			
2014 appropriation .....	+27,142,000	- 207,000	(+26,935,000)
2015 budget estimate .....	+65,745,000	- - -	(+65,745,000)

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Farm Service Agency, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,205,068,000 and transfers of \$309,880,000 for a total program level of \$1,514,948,000.

*FSA Budget Request.*—The Committee does not support the proposals in the budget submission that include significant funding shifts with no justification and basis to support them. The Committee is displeased with the agency's budget request as there is no rationale for the proposed changes. The request proposed a reduction in costly headquarters and state office staff personnel while shifting the costs to hire the same number of personnel in the field while simultaneously decreasing 815 non-Federal staff years. No clear plan of how these actions would be implemented in a timely manner in order to sustain the significant reductions was provided in the justification, and no evidence of the impact of such actions was offered to the Committee to form a reasonable opinion on the matter. The Committee would like to remind the agency that submitting such budget requests is a waste of taxpayer resources. The Committee encourages the agency to develop more meaningful budget requests in the future. The Committee supports more efficient policies, practices, and operations in the delivery of farm programs across the country, but it will require the appropriate supporting data and documentation to form a corresponding decision.

*Proposal to Close County Offices.*—The President's fiscal year 2015 budget proposed to close or consolidate an estimated 250 FSA county offices and reduce the non-federal staff years by roughly 815 full time equivalents as part of an effort to modernize the Department's farm program delivery system. The Committee supports greater efficiency in the management of limited Federal tax dollars and supports the consolidation of locations or activities when there is a strong case for such a proposal. However, the President's budget proposal is both flawed and untimely. Department officials have shown great difficulty in explaining the justification for this proposal when questioned by this Committee and other oversight committees. Secondly, in order to maintain quality service within a reasonable timeframe, the Department should have the requisite infrastructure and support in place before moving offices into a "model service center" location. The Department has failed to demonstrate that the information technology systems are mature enough to support this concept. Thirdly, preparing for a consolidation of offices while county employees continue implementation of the 2014 farm bill is ill-timed. Lastly, the ability to deliver farm programs to stakeholders is contingent upon an analysis on the needs of a particular county office or offices within a particular region. Therefore, in addition to the requirements mandated by the 2008 farm bill for office closures, the Department is directed to conduct, complete, and submit an evaluation of workload assessments for proposed office closures to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate prior to the closure of any FSA county offices.

*MIDAS.*—The Committee has strong concerns regarding the delays and potential cost overruns associated with the Modernize and Innovate the Delivery of Agricultural Systems (MIDAS) program. As designed, the system is supposed to improve the delivery

of FSA farm program benefits and services through re-engineered business processes and the adoption of enhanced and modernized information technology. While FSA made some initial progress in 2013 with the release of the Farm Records and Business Partner functionality, little progress is evident or expected for fiscal year 2014. Over a year ago, FSA notified the Committee that the agency was in the process of reviewing the timeline for the next phases and future rollouts of the project via a re-baseline process. The purpose of the re-baseline project was to align the project scope with the most recent schedule and projected available funding. Congress has appropriated nearly \$400,000,000 to support the modernization of a farm program delivery system. The total lifecycle costs of this program continue to grow beyond the initial estimates and will continue to grow if the Department fails to manage this project in a far more efficient manner. FSA must continue to proceed with plans for the original functionality that would build existing farm program applications into an integrated system that delivers increased efficiency and security and not continue down a path of siloed applications that fail to improve upon the capabilities originally promised to the Nation's farmers and ranchers. The Committee directs USDA to provide quarterly briefings in writing and in person to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations starting on October 1, 2014.

## STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$3,782,000
2015 budget estimate .....	3,404,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,404,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 378,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For State Mediation Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$3,404,000.

## GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

2014 appropriation .....	\$5,526,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -
Provided in the bill .....	2,500,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 3,026,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+2,500,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Grassroots Source Water Protection Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$2,500,000. The Committee notes that the Agricultural Act of 2014 provided \$5,000,000 in mandatory funds for this program.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$250,000
2015 budget estimate .....	<sup>1</sup> 500,000
Provided in the bill .....	<sup>1</sup> 500,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+250,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

<sup>1</sup>Current indefinite appropriation.

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Dairy Indemnity Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary (estimated to be \$500,000 in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request).

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

ESTIMATED LOAN LEVELS

2014 loan level .....	\$5,527,278,000
2015 budget estimate .....	6,402,114,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,402,114,000
Comparison:	
2014 loan level .....	+874,836,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund program account, the Committee provides a loan level of \$6,402,114,000.

The following table reflects the loan levels for the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund program account:

AGRICULTURE CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 level	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provisions
Farm loan programs			
Farm ownership:			
Direct .....	\$575,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Farm operating:			
Direct .....	1,195,620	1,252,004	1,252,004
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	1,500,000	1,393,443	1,393,443
Emergency loans .....	34,658	34,667	34,667
Indian tribe land acquisition loans .....	2,000	2,000	2,000
Conservation loans:			
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	150,000	150,000	150,000
Indian highly fractionated land .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Boll weevil eradication .....	60,000	60,000	60,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$5,527,278</b>	<b>\$6,402,114</b>	<b>\$6,402,114</b>

## ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

	Direct loan subsidy	Guaranteed loan subsidy	Grants	Administrative expenses
2014 appropriation .....	\$71,714,000	\$18,300,000	---	\$314,719,000
2015 budget estimate .....	63,957,000	14,770,000	\$2,500,000	314,918,000
Provided in the bill .....	63,957,000	14,770,000	---	314,918,000
Comparison:				
2014 appropriation .....	-7,757,000	-3,530,000	---	+199,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---	---	-2,500,000	---

The following table reflects the costs of loan programs under credit reform:

## AGRICULTURE CREDIT PROGRAMS—SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provisions
Farm loan subsidies:			
Farm ownership:			
Direct .....	\$4,428	---	---
Farm operating:			
Direct .....	65,520	\$63,101	\$63,101
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	18,300	14,770	14,770
Emergency loans .....	1,698	856	856
Indian highly fractionated land .....	68	---	---
Individual development accounts .....	---	2,500	---
Total .....	90,014	81,227	78,727
ACIF expenses:			
Salaries and expenses .....	306,998	306,998	306,998
Administrative expenses .....	7,721	7,920	7,920
Total, ACIF expenses .....	\$314,719	\$314,918	\$314,918

## RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2014 appropriation .....	\$71,496,000
2015 budget estimate .....	76,779,000
Provided in the bill .....	77,094,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,598,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+315,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISION

For the Risk Management Agency, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$77,094,000.

*Quarantine Endorsement Pilot Project.*—The Committee supports RMA's current quarantine endorsement pilot project for avocado and citrus growers in California and seeks input on the expansion of this pilot to other specialty crop growers throughout the United States, provided that any insurance product offered is actuarially sound. The Committee directs RMA to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 90 days of enactment of this Act on the cost, benefits, and challenges of expanding the pilot program.

*Timely Communication of Changes in Coverage.*—Crop insurance represents a key risk management tool for agricultural producers

around the country and any changes to their insurance policies can have an immediate impact on critical financial and business decisions. The Committee understands that RMA will implement changes in an effort to reduce the loss ratios in the crop insurance industry, but it is concerned by the timeliness and the manner in which RMA notifies purchasers of changes to crop insurance coverage. The Committee expects RMA will address this issue and ensure effective and efficient administration of the crop insurance program.

*Standard Reinsurance Agreement.*—The Committee is aware of concerns that the Standard Reinsurance Agreement (SRA) currently in effect has caused disparate treatment of crop insurance agents depending on the crop(s) they service and expects that as the Department begins the process of renegotiating the SRA it will address this inequality.

## CORPORATIONS

### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

2014 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$9,502,944,000
2015 budget estimate .....	<sup>1</sup> 8,666,022,000
Provided in the bill .....	<sup>1</sup> 8,666,022,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	– 836,922,000
2015 budget estimate .....	– – –

<sup>1</sup>Current indefinite appropriation.

### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund, the Committee provides an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary (estimated to be \$8,666,022,000 in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request).

### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

#### REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$12,538,880,000
2015 budget estimate .....	<sup>1</sup> 9,067,281,000
Provided in the bill .....	<sup>1</sup> 9,067,281,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	– 3,471,599,000
2015 budget estimate .....	– – –

<sup>1</sup>Current indefinite appropriation.

### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Committee provides such sums as may be necessary to reimburse for net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be \$9,067,281,000 in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request).

## HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

## (LIMITATION ON EXPENSES)

2014 limitation .....	(\$5,000,000)
2015 budget estimate .....	(5,000,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(5,000,000)
Comparison:	
2014 limitation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For CCC Hazardous Waste Management, the Committee provides a limitation of \$5,000,000.

## TITLE II

## CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

## OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

2014 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2015 budget estimate .....	898,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$898,000.

## NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

## CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

2014 appropriation .....	\$812,939,000
2015 budget estimate .....	814,772,000
Provided in the bill .....	843,053,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+30,114,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+28,281,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Conservation Operations, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$843,053,000.

The Committee provides \$9,100,000 for the Snow Survey and Water Forecasting Program; \$9,200,000 for the Plant Materials Centers; and \$78,000,000 for the Soil Surveys Program. The Committee provides \$746,753,000 for conservation technical assistance and directs NRCS to continue to invest in the Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP). The Committee provides an increase of \$1,500,000 for the Conservation Delivery Streamlining Initiative (CDSI). The Committee is pleased with the results of CEAP and the agency's efforts to modernize the delivery of conservation programs and services through CDSI and encourages the continuation of these efforts.

*Agricultural Conservation Easement Program.*—Due to the unique ecological needs of each State, the Committee encourages NRCS to work with state and local partners to address these needs and to ensure the priority needs and projects in each State, such as those that are leveraged by public and private resources, are addressed, as appropriate.

*Cheat Grass Eradication.*—The Committee encourages NRCS to continue to assist farmers and ranchers to eradicate, control, and reduce the fuel loads associated with cheat grass and to collaborate with ARS, as appropriate, on research related to cheat grass.

*Conservation Practice Standards.*—The Committee is aware that NRCS has been pressured to modify its conservation practice standards in certain circumstances for purposes not related to the conservation of farm and ranch land. The Committee recognizes that conservation practice standards are science-based, undergo a thorough technical review, are open to the public for notice and comment, and reflect the best available knowledge on how to achieve the identified conservation and environmental objective. The Committee directs NRCS to maintain its long-standing process for developing and updating its conservation practice standards.

*Herbicide Resistance.*—The Committee reminds NRCS of the challenges many producers are facing due to the spread of herbicide-resistant weeds and encourages it to ensure agency staff, partners, and producers are aware of conservation practice standards and conservation activity plans to address herbicide-resistant weeds, and that financial assistance through certain conservation programs is available to assist producers in their efforts to control these weeds.

*Locally Led Conservation.*—The Committee recognizes that locally led conservation is the foundation of the Nation's highly successful legacy of conservation and encourages NRCS to work with State, Tribal, local, and other partners on voluntary stewardship projects that preserve working agricultural lands while protecting watersheds and wildlife habitat.

*National Marine Sanctuaries.*—The Committee urges the agency to continue the collaborative agreement with the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries to address agricultural sources of runoff, such as sediments, nitrates, and pesticides.

*Resource Conservation and Development Councils.*—The Committee recognizes RC&Ds have been valuable partners in conservation and encourages NRCS to continue working with local councils, as appropriate, to ensure conservation programs meet local resource needs.

*Sage Grouse Initiative.*—The Committee supports NRCS's sage grouse conservation efforts. Through the initiative, NRCS provides technical and financial assistance to help landowners conserve sage grouse habitat on their land. The initiative is an integral part of efforts by Federal agencies, several western States, and private landowners to help preclude the listing of the sage grouse as an endangered species.

*Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Plan.*—The Committee directs NRCS to establish a long-term, multi-year plan to guide needed investments in watershed surveys and planning and watershed operations as authorized under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, P.L. 83-566. The plan should estab-

lish a process for setting and ranking watershed operations and flood prevention priorities, reflecting the agency's mission, goals, and requirements; consideration of existing investment in planning, infrastructure, and land treatment; and future needs for investment to improve watershed condition or prevent or mitigate watershed impairments. The plan should also include estimated funding requirements. As the agency develops the plan, the Committee encourages it to provide interested parties an opportunity to provide input. The agency is directed to develop the plan and report to Congress within 90 days after enactment of this Act.

#### WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

2014 appropriation .....	\$12,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	— — —
Provided in the bill .....	25,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+13,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+25,000,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Watershed Rehabilitation Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$25,000,000.

### TITLE III

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

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

2014 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2015 budget estimate .....	898,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	— — —

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$898,000.

*Program Consolidation.*—The Committee does not concur with the proposal to consolidate Rural Development's (RD) business and economic development programs into the Rural Business and Cooperative Grants Program.

*Resource Conservation and Development Councils.*—The Committee recognizes RC&Ds have been valuable partners in rural economic development and encourages RD to continue working with local councils, as appropriate, to address local economic development needs.

*Reporting Requirements.*—The Committee reminds Rural Development that any action that relocates an office or employees and reorganizes offices, programs, or activities must be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate as required by law.

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES**  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	FY 2014 level	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provisions
Appropriations .....	\$203,424,000	\$225,101,000	\$224,201,000
Transfer from:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account .....	415,100,000	397,296,000	415,100,000
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account .....	4,439,000	4,249,000	4,439,000
Healthy Foods, HNI .....	-- --	750,000	-- --
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loan Program Account .....	34,478,000	33,000,000	34,478,000
<b>Total, RD Salaries and Expenses .....</b>	<b>\$657,441,000</b>	<b>\$660,396,000</b>	<b>\$678,218,000</b>

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Rural Development mission area, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$224,201,000.

This includes \$15,000,000 for the Comprehensive Loan Accounting System.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Administrative expenses
2014 appropriation .....	\$25,148,567,000	\$38,968,000	\$415,100,000
2015 budget estimate .....	24,603,565,000	47,748,000	397,296,000
Provided in the bill .....	25,290,648,000	98,020,000	415,100,000
Comparison:			
2014 appropriation .....	+142,081,000	+59,052,000	-- --
2015 budget estimate .....	+687,083,000	+50,272,000	+17,804,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account, the Committee provides a loan level of \$25,290,648,000.

*Housing Program Eligibility.*—The Committee directs the Rural Housing Service (RHS) to provide a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act on its implementation of the three-part test to determine a community’s eligibility to participate in rural housing programs as required by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The report should include information on the factors the agency uses to determine whether a community is “rural in character” and when a “serious lack of mortgage credit exists”. The report also should include a history of the agency’s actions using this three-part test since the 2000 U.S. Census and its implementation of the changes made by the Agricultural Act of 2014.

*Risk Management.*—USDA’s Rural Development mission area manages about 1.2 million loans that have a value of \$200,000,000,000; \$130,000,000,000 of this is in the rural housing and community facility portfolio. Given the size of the Federal investment in rural housing programs, the Committee believes RHS should actively monitor and manage this portfolio to mitigate risk. As such, the Committee directs RHS to provide a report within 30 days of enactment of this Act on the risk in its portfolio and how

it is managed. The Committee further directs the agency to expeditiously create and fill a position of Chief Risk Officer whose responsibility it will be to manage and mitigate the agency's financial risk.

*Section 502 Intermediary Pilot Program.*—The bill directs the Secretary to continue and expand the pilot program for packaging section 502 direct loans. The pilot allows non-profit organizations to prepare and review applications for single family loans, saving Federal funds and staff time. The Committee expects RHS to expeditiously implement this program.

The following table reflects the loan levels for the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 level	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provisions
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Loans:			
Single family housing (sec 502):			
Direct .....	\$900,000	\$360,000	\$1,042,276
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Housing repair (sec 504) .....	26,280	26,279	26,372
Rental housing (sec 515) .....	28,432	28,432	28,398
Multi-family guaranteed (sec 538) .....	150,000	150,000	150,000
Site development loans .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Credit sales of acquired property .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Self-help housing land development fund .....	5,000	--	5,000
Farm labor housing .....	23,855	23,854	23,602
<b>Total, Loan authorization .....</b>	<b>\$25,148,567</b>	<b>\$24,603,565</b>	<b>\$25,290,648</b>

The following table reflects the costs of loan programs under credit reform:

ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 level	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provision
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account (loan subsidies and grants):			
Single family housing (sec 502):			
Direct .....	\$24,480	\$26,568	\$76,920
Housing repair (sec 504) .....	2,176	3,687	3,700
Rental housing (sec 515) .....	6,656	9,812	9,800
Farm labor housing .....	5,656	7,681	7,600
<b>Total, Loan subsidies .....</b>	<b>38,968</b>	<b>47,748</b>	<b>98,020</b>
Farm labor housing grants .....	8,336	8,336	8,336
RHIF expenses:			
Administrative expenses .....	\$415,100	\$397,296	\$415,100

#### RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2014 appropriation .....	\$1,110,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	1,088,500,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,088,500,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	– 21,500,000
2015 budget estimate .....	– – –

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rental Assistance Program, the Committee provides a program level of \$1,088,500,000.

The Committee appreciates USDA’s proposals to address challenges within the Rental Assistance Program and provides authority to limit the second renewal of contracts during the same 12-month period.

MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

2014 appropriation .....	\$32,575,000
2015 budget estimate .....	28,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	28,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 4,575,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

For the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$28,000,000, including \$8,000,000 for the rural housing voucher program.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$25,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	10,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	30,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+20,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$30,000,000.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$32,239,000
2015 budget estimate .....	25,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	27,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 5,239,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+2,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Housing Assistance Grants program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$27,000,000.

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$32,520,000
2015 budget estimate .....	21,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	30,500,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 2,020,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+9,500,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Community Facilities Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$30,500,000.

The following table provides the Committee’s recommendations as compared to the budget request:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 level	FY 2015 estimated	Committee provisions
Loan levels:			
Community facility direct loans .....	(\$2,200,000)	(\$2,200,000)	(\$2,200,000)
Community facility guaranteed loans .....	(59,543)	(- - -)	(73,222)
Subsidy and grants:			
Community facility guaranteed loans .....	3,775	- - -	3,500
Community facility grants .....	13,000	17,000	13,000
Rural Community Development Initiative .....	5,967	- - -	5,000
Economic Impact Initiative .....	5,778	- - -	5,000
Tribal college grants .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
<b>Total, Rural Community Facilities Program subsidy and grants .....</b>	<b>\$32,520</b>	<b>\$21,000</b>	<b>\$30,500</b>

The following is included in bill language for the Rural Community Facilities Program: \$5,000,000 is for the Rural Community Development Initiative.

#### RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE

##### RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$96,539,000
2015 budget estimate .....	30,190,000
Provided in the bill .....	65,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 31,539,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+34,810,000

##### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Business Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$65,000,000.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations as compared to the budget request:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 level	FY 2015 estimated	Committee provision
Loan level:			
Business and industry guaranteed loans .....	(\$958,097)	(\$590,802)	(\$880,626)
Subsidy and grants:			
Business and industry guaranteed loans .....	66,971	30,190	45,000
Rural business enterprise grants .....	24,318	- - -	20,000
Rural business opportunity grants .....	2,250	- - -	- - -
Delta regional authority .....	3,000	- - -	- - -
<b>Total, Rural Business Program subsidy and grants .....</b>	<b>\$96,539</b>	<b>\$30,190</b>	<b>\$65,000</b>

The following programs are included in bill language for the Rural Business Program account: \$500,000 for rural transportation technical assistance; and \$4,000,000 for Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, of which \$250,000 is for transportation technical assistance. The Committee notes that the 2014 farm bill consolidated the Rural Business Opportunity and Rural Business Enterprise grant programs.

INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM FUND ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Administrative expenses
2014 appropriation .....	\$18,889,000	\$4,082,000	\$4,439,000
2015 budget estimate .....	10,013,000	3,084,000	4,249,000
Provided in the bill .....	16,234,000	5,000,000	4,439,000
Comparison:			
2014 appropriation .....	- 2,655,000	+918,000	- - -
2015 budget estimate .....	+6,221,000	+1,916,000	+190,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account, the Committee provides for a loan level of \$16,234,000.

For the loan subsidy, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$5,000,000. In addition, the Committee provides \$4,439,000 for administrative expenses.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

	Loan level
2014 appropriation .....	\$33,077,000
2015 budget estimate .....	59,456,000
Provided in the bill .....	59,456,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+26,379,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- - -

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account, the Committee provides for a loan level of \$59,456,000.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$26,050,000
2015 budget estimate .....	16,087,000
Provided in the bill .....	22,050,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 4,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+5,963,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Rural Cooperative Development Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$22,050,000.

The total includes \$2,500,000 for a cooperative agreement for the Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas program and \$10,750,000 for the value-added agricultural product market development grant program.

The Committee notes that the 2014 farm bill provided \$63,000,000 in mandatory funding for value-added agricultural product market development grants.

## RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

2014 appropriation .....	\$3,500,000
2015 budget estimate .....	10,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,500,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	-6,500,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Energy for America Program, the Committee provides a loan level of \$33,081,000 and an appropriation of \$3,500,000 for the loan subsidy to make loans as authorized by section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107).

The Committee notes that the 2014 farm bill provides \$50,000,000 in mandatory funding for this program in fiscal year 2015.

## RURAL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM ACCOUNT

2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	\$6,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	4,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+4,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-2,000,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Business Investment Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$4,000,000, which will support \$39,254,000 in loans.

## RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

## RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$462,371,000
2015 budget estimate .....	304,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	466,893,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+4,522,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+162,893,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$466,893,000.

*Water Supplies for Very Small Communities.*—The Committee is aware of concerns that RUS grant programs do not adequately help small, disadvantaged, and severely disadvantaged communities access the funding and expertise necessary to develop sustainable water supplies or otherwise improve their water systems and directs the agency to focus its efforts to assist these communities with predevelopment planning to help them address their water supply needs.

The following table provides the Committee's recommendations as compared to the budget request:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 Level	FY 2015 level	Committee provisions
Loan levels:			
Water and waste direct loans .....	(\$1,200,000)	(\$1,200,000)	(\$1,200,000)
Water and waste guaranteed loans .....	(50,000)	---	(84,746)
Direct Loans authorized by P.L. 83-566 .....	(40,000)	---	---
Subsidy and Grants:			
Guaranteed Subsidy .....	355	---	500
Water and Waste Revolving Fund .....	1,000	---	1,000
Water Well System Grants .....	993	---	993
Grants for the Colonias and AK/HI .....	66,500	36,480	66,500
Water and Waste Technical Assistance Grants .....	19,000	9,120	19,000
Circuit Rider Program .....	15,000	7,600	15,000
Solid Waste Management Grants .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
High Energy Cost Grants .....	10,000	---	---
Water and Waste Disposal Grants .....	345,523	246,800	359,900
Total Subsidies and Grants .....	\$462,371	\$304,000	\$466,893

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

## LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Administrative ex- penses
2014 appropriation .....	\$6,190,000,000	---	\$34,478,000
2015 budget estimate .....	5,345,000,000	---	33,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,190,000,000	---	34,478,000
Comparison:			
2014 appropriation .....	---	---	---
2015 budget estimate .....	+845,000,000	---	+1,478,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account, the Committee provides a loan level of \$6,190,000,000. In addition, the Committee provides \$34,478,000 for administrative expenses.

The Committee does not concur with the proposal to limit the use of rural electrification loans and instead directs USDA to work with borrowers to finance the most reliable and cost-effective electricity source that meets their needs.

The Committee is concerned about the RUS Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, published February 2, 2014, regarding its environmental policies and procedures and directs the agency to report to the Committee by September 1, 2014, regarding the proposal's potential to increase workload and decrease effectiveness of its programs.

The following table reflects the loan levels for the Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provisions
Loan authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct, FFB .....	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Guaranteed underwriting .....	500,000	---	500,000
Subtotal .....	5,500,000	5,000,000	5,500,000
Telecommunications:			
Direct, Treasury rate .....	690,000	345,000	690,000
Total, Loan authorizations .....	\$6,190,000	\$5,345,000	\$6,190,000

## DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 estimate	Committee provisions
Broadband Program:			
Loan authorization .....	\$34,483,000	\$44,238,000	\$24,077,000
Loan subsidy .....	4,500,000	8,268,000	4,500,000
Grants .....	10,372,000	20,372,000	10,372,000
Distance learning and telemedicine:			
Grants .....	24,323,000	24,950,000	20,000,000
Total, Loan subsidy and grants .....	\$39,195,000	\$53,590,000	\$34,872,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$34,872,000, which includes \$20,000,000 for distance learning and telemedicine grants.

*Broadband Loan Program Priorities.*—Funding provided for the broadband program is intended to promote broadband availability in those areas where there is not otherwise a business case for private investment in a broadband network. The Committee directs RUS to focus expenditures on projects that bring broadband service to currently unserved households.

## TITLE IV

## DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

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

2014 appropriation .....	\$811,000
2015 budget estimate .....	816,000
Provided in the bill .....	816,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+5,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$816,000. The Committee expects USDA to continue implementation of section 743 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 (P.L. 113–76).

The Committee remains concerned about the lack of communication and delay by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) in completing requested reports. Reports requested by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, as well as information regarding FNS programs, are an important part of the Committees' oversight responsibilities. The directives and issues that are specified in the House, Senate, or conference report are very important to the Committee, and dates are mandatory. FNS is expected to keep the Committee apprised of activities and issues, especially those mentioned in Committee reports. FNS is reminded that the Committee reserves the right to call before it any agency that does not submit reports on time.

FNS is directed to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate the FNS Research and Evaluation Plan each fiscal year when this report is available.

The Committee directs FNS to continue making all policy documents related to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program (including, but not limited to, instructions, memoranda, guidance, and questions and answers) available to the public on the Internet within one week of their release to state WIC administrators.

The Committee directs FNS to work with States to ensure full compliance with the law that all WIC and SNAP participants meet all program eligibility requirements. FNS also is directed to ensure these programs are not being promoted to ineligible individuals, which would increase program costs.

The *Dietary Guidelines for Americans* emphasize that Americans should consume more fruits and vegetables in all of their forms. In order to maximize the value of the benefits nutrition program participants receive, the Committee urges FNS to recognize in relevant agency publications related to all Federal nutrition programs, including nutrition education programs, the nutritional benefits provided by all forms of fruits, vegetables, and beans, whether canned, dried, fresh, or frozen.

*Impact of the Affordable Care Act on SNAP and WIC.*—The Committee is aware that FNS is examining how the Affordable Care Act (ACA) will impact and possibly increase enrollment for SNAP and WIC. The ACA expands eligibility for Medicaid and it is expected that this will lead to an increase in SNAP and WIC applications. The Committee directs FNS to provide an update, including all white papers and memos, on both of these projects within 30 days of enactment of this Act. As these projects continue, FNS is directed to keep the Committee apprised of any additional reports and provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate with the final results of these studies.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$19,287,957,000
2015 budget estimate .....	20,537,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	20,523,795,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+1,235,838,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- 13,205,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Child Nutrition Programs, the Committee provides \$20,523,795,000. Included in this total is \$25,000,000 for school meals equipment grants and \$27,000,000 for summer electronic benefit transfer (EBT) pilot projects. In carrying out summer EBT projects, the Committee encourages FNS to select populations in both rural and urban areas that have not been piloted.

*School Meals.*—The Committee is concerned about the challenges and costs that local schools face in implementing the various regulations from the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. Schools from across the Nation have expressed concern with increased food costs and plate waste coupled with decreased participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), all of which is resulting in at least half of all school food authorities to experience a decline in revenue. A February 27, 2014, GAO report found that student participation in the NSLP declined by 1.2 million students from school year 2010–11 through school year 2012–13. Additional meal requirements are scheduled to be implemented in the 2014–15 school year as well as the “Smart Snacks in School” interim final rule.

To address the concerns of local schools, the FY 2014 conference report directed the Secretary to establish a waiver process for schools incurring costs to provide more time to comply with some of these regulations. On March 14, 2014, the Secretary responded he did not have the statutory authority to grant such waivers. Therefore, the Committee includes bill language that provides schools with flexibility by allowing schools experiencing a financial loss for at least a six-month period to seek a waiver from compliance with the final regulations. The Committee directs USDA to implement this provision in a timely and streamlined manner. Schools receiving a waiver under this provision shall, at a minimum, implement the nutrition standards in effect prior to the final rule issued on January 26, 2012. The bill language does not provide for a change in reimbursement rates and only applies to the 2014–15 school year.

As schools seek to implement the school meal standards, the Committee encourages USDA to consider ways to assist schools with technical assistance and training, including the services of not-for-profit culinary institutions, to provide healthy, cost-effective foods that students will eat.

The Committee recognizes the importance of cultural and regional differences in food items served in the NSLP and the School Breakfast Program (SBP). Numerous food products are undergoing reformulation to meet the new nutrition standards. Some that have

been developed are not widely available, do not have the proper stability or consistency to be served on school lunch lines, and are not palatable when compared to traditional and regional foods. The Committee encourages FNS to issue guidance within 90 days of enactment of this Act to school food authorities that provides alternative options in regards to culturally and regionally diverse food products served in the NSLP and SBP.

Furthermore, the Committee is aware of concerns with the requirements in the proposed rule published in the *Federal Register* on February 4, 2014, “Professional Standards for State and Local School Nutrition Programs Personnel.” The Committee notes that the proposed standards could create economic hardship and adverse effects on workforce capacity issues, which are better addressed by local school districts. The Committee strongly encourages FNS to work with stakeholders to ensure any professional standards do not result in unintended consequences for local schools.

Lastly, the Committee directs USDA to submit a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act that describes whether or not all of the food sold in all USDA cafeterias and vending machines in the Washington, D.C., National Capital Area meet the same nutrition standards as those required for the NSLP, SBP, and the “Smart Snack” rule.

*Prioritization of Monitoring and Compliance Reviews.*—The Committee directs the Secretary to allow States to vary the frequency of monitoring and compliance reviews of each school food authority based on past school performance, with no cycle extending more than five years as granted in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010.

*Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program.*—The Committee recognizes that Section 4214 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 provided \$5,000,000 for the pilot project for canned, frozen, or dried fruits and vegetables, in addition to funds made available for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program. The Committee directs USDA to implement the pilot at the beginning of the 2014–15 school year so that children in selected schools will have access to all forms of fruits and vegetables for the duration of the school year. This will ensure the full effects of the pilot program can be evaluated in a timely manner to comply with the January 1, 2015, statutory deadline for an interim report. The Committee encourages the Secretary to select States for participation that are geographically diverse, face barriers to accessing fresh fruits and vegetables, and have a large number of students eligible for free and reduced price meals.

The following table reflects the Committee recommendations for the child nutrition programs:

[Dollars in Thousands]

Child Nutrition Programs:	
School lunch program .....	\$11,369,079
School breakfast program .....	3,904,967
Child and adult care food program .....	3,149,700
Summer food service program .....	492,738
Special milk program .....	10,350
State administrative expenses .....	264,016
Commodity procurement .....	1,199,797
Food safety education .....	2,709

[Dollars in Thousands]

Coordinated review .....	10,000
Computer support and processing .....	11,226
CACFP training and technical assistance .....	8,095
CNP Studies and Evaluations .....	20,074
CN Payment Accuracy .....	9,789
Farm to School Tactical Team .....	2,251
Team Nutrition .....	15,504
Healthier US School Challenge .....	1,500
School Meals Equipment Grants .....	25,000
Summer EBT Demonstration .....	27,000
<i>Total</i> .....	\$20,523,795

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

2014 appropriation .....	\$6,715,841,000
2015 budget estimate .....	6,823,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,623,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	- 92,841,000
2015 budget estimate .....	- 200,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$6,623,000,000.

The Committee received a revised estimate from USDA showing that \$6,623,000,000 would serve all eligible participants in fiscal year 2015. The decrease from the President's budget request is based upon several important factors. First, USDA has decreased the estimated average monthly participation rate from 8.6 million women, infants, and children to 8.5 million. Birth rates continue to be at a record low according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Second, USDA is projecting that more funding will be available through recovery and carryover funds than originally estimated. Furthermore, the Secretary has \$125,000,000 in the WIC contingency reserve fund as a safety net to meet unexpected demand. With lower participation rates, higher carryover funds, and a sufficient reserve fund, USDA has revised the estimate to better reflect actual program needs. The Committee will continue to monitor WIC participation, carryover funds, and food costs and take additional action as necessary to ensure that funding provided in fiscal year 2015 is sufficient to serve all eligible applicants.

The Committee provides for continuation of the breastfeeding peer counselor program, infrastructure, and investments in management information systems within the total amount provided in the bill. The Committee also provides \$25,000,000 for States to continue transitioning from paper checks and vouchers to an EBT system. EBT is a proven, effective tool in combatting waste, fraud, and abuse, and all WIC state agencies are mandated to have an EBT system in place by October 1, 2020.

*Income Eligibility Standards.*—The Committee recognizes that in response to the February 2013 GAO report, “WIC Program: Improved Oversight of Income Eligibility Determination Needed,” USDA issued income eligibility guidance to all state agencies in

April 2013. The Committee directs USDA to submit a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act on the policies, procedures, training, and technical assistance it has provided to state WIC agencies on income eligibility determination and verification. The report shall include information on the extent to which all state WIC agencies have complied with the use of a standard set of income eligibility and verification criteria.

*Cost Management within WIC State Agencies.*—The Committee supports USDA’s efforts to rein in the cost of WIC food items while ensuring nutritional value and food choices for participants. As state agencies consider options for cost containment, the Committee directs FNS to closely monitor this process to ensure there are no unintended consequences for participants, vendors, or product manufacturers.

*Fraudulent Activities.*—The Committee is aware that some individuals are selling WIC benefits or WIC-purchased infant formula or food items on social media sites and by other means, which is a violation of Federal WIC regulations. The Committee notes FNS issued a policy memo in February 2012 describing these fraudulent activities as a program violation. The Committee directs FNS to provide a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act describing how this policy is enforced and how many state agencies have issued claims and sanctions against participants for committing these activities.

*Eligible Foods.*—The Committee includes bill language to ensure that all varieties of fresh, whole, or cut vegetables, except for vegetables with added sugars, fats, or oils are eligible for purchase through the WIC program.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2014 appropriation .....	\$82,169,945,000
2015 budget estimate .....	84,256,387,000
Provided in the bill .....	82,251,138,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+81,193,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-2,005,249,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Committee provides \$82,251,138,000. The total amount includes \$3,000,000,000 for a contingency reserve to be used only in the amount necessary.

*Fraud, Waste, and Abuse.*—The Committee has repeatedly directed USDA to permanently debar retailers and participants from the program if found guilty of fraud and abuse. However, a July 2013 OIG audit report identified 586 store owners that were allowed to continue participating in SNAP at other locations after being permanently disqualified. These ineligible store owners redeemed millions of dollars in SNAP benefits. The Committee directs FNS to enforce the regulations to ensure ineligible retailers and participants will be permanently disqualified from the program and directs FNS to report within 60 days of enactment of this Act on how the agency has addressed the deficiencies found by the OIG audit.

The Committee directs FNS to report within 60 days of enactment of this Act on the compliance of state agencies in the use of

the National Directory of New Hires and an immigration verification system as required by the Agricultural Act of 2014. The Committee notes additional funding has been provided for FNS to fight trafficking and fraud and directs FNS to keep the Committee apprised as fraud prevention provisions are implemented.

*Recruitment Activities.*—The Committee directs USDA to ensure Section 4018 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 is implemented and enforced in a manner consistent with the statute which prohibits USDA from conducting recruitment activities, advertising the program, and from entering into agreements with foreign governments to promote SNAP benefits. The Committee directs USDA to enforce this provision to ensure state agencies are not reimbursed for similar activities consistent with the statute.

*Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.*—The Committee is aware of the interest in transitioning the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands into SNAP. The FY 2014 House report, as well as the Agricultural Act of 2014, directed the Secretary to conduct a feasibility study on establishing a SNAP program in the Northern Mariana Islands. The Committee expects USDA to complete this study in accordance with the statutory deadlines established in the Agricultural Act of 2014.

The following table reflects the Committee recommendations for SNAP:

[Dollars in Thousands]

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Account:	
Benefits .....	\$71,503,411
Contingency Reserve .....	3,000,000
<i>Administrative Costs:</i>	
State Administrative Costs .....	4,118,995
Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program .....	407,000
Employment and Training .....	447,227
Mandatory Other Program Costs .....	174,743
Discretionary Other Program Costs .....	998
Administrative Subtotal .....	5,148,964
Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico (NAP) .....	1,930,128
American Samoa .....	7,752
Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations .....	119,736
TEFAP Commodities .....	324,000
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands .....	12,148
Community Food Project .....	9,000
E&T Work Pilot .....	190,000
Pilots and Demonstration .....	1,000
Program Access .....	5,000
Subtotal .....	2,598,764
Total .....	\$82,251,138

#### COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2014 appropriation .....	\$269,701,000
2015 budget estimate .....	275,701,000
Provided in the bill .....	275,701,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+6,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	— —

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee provides an appropriation of \$275,701,000 for the Commodity Assistance Program. The recommended funding level for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program is \$208,682,000.

The Committee recommendation includes \$16,548,000 for the Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program.

The Committee has included \$49,401,000 for administrative funding for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP).

For the Food Donations Programs, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,070,000 for Pacific Island Assistance.

*TEFAP Handling and Distribution Costs.*—In addition to the grant funds to support commodity handling and distribution costs, the bill permits States to use up to 10 percent of the funds provided for purchasing TEFAP commodities to help with the costs of storing, transporting, and distributing commodities. The Committee expects state agencies to consult with their emergency feeding organizations on the need for the conversion of such funds.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

2014 appropriation .....	\$141,348,000
2015 budget estimate .....	155,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	150,824,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+9,467,000
2015 budget estimate .....	−4,176,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Nutrition Programs Administration, the Committee provides \$150,824,000.

The Committee does not provide funding for the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion to develop Federal dietary guidance for infants and children from birth to 24 months of age or to promote the Dietary Guidelines for Americans or MyPlate. The nutrition education services provided through WIC, along with other Federal nutrition education programs, are available to assist with the dietary and nutritional needs of infants and children. The Committee also notes that USDA does significant advertising of the Dietary Guidelines, MyPlate, and other resources to promote healthier lifestyles. These efforts are combined with the “Let’s Move!” campaign and use of this information by the public and private sectors.

*Dietary Guidelines.*—The Committee is concerned that the advisory committee for the 2015 *Dietary Guidelines for Americans* is considering issues outside of the nutritional focus of the panel. Specifically, the advisory committee is showing an interest in incorporating sustainability, climate change, and other environmental factors and production practices into their criteria for establishing the next dietary recommendations, which is clearly outside of the scope of the panel. The Committee directs the Secretary to ensure that the advisory committee focuses only on nutrient and dietary recommendations based upon sound nutrition science and not pursue an environmental agenda. Should environmental or production factors be included in the panel’s recommendations to USDA and the Department of Health and Human Services, the Committee ex-

pects the Secretary to reject their inclusion in the final 2015 *Dietary Guidelines for Americans*.

TITLE V  
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS  
FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	Transfer from export loan account	Total
2014 appropriation .....	\$177,863,000	\$6,394,000	\$184,257,000
2015 budget estimate .....	182,563,000	6,394,000	188,957,000
Provided in the bill .....	182,563,000	6,394,000	188,957,000
Comparison:			
2014 appropriation .....	+4,700,000	---	+4,700,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---	---	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$182,563,000 and transfer of \$6,394,000.

The Committee does not provide language authorizing the use of funds to pay overseas staff during a lapse in appropriations.

*Performance Goals and Budget Justifications.*—The Committee stresses the need for defining budgetary needs based on performance goals and outcome-based measures, as defined in the April 2013 report from USDA’s Office of Inspector General. These goals should be included in the budget justifications for increases, decreases, and base activities. Furthermore, the Agency’s budget submission includes a major object class breakout overall; however, it would be more beneficial for the Committee to have the percentage of spending by major budget object class for each program and funding source, similar to other USDA agency’s submissions. The Committee directs the agency to include these criteria in future budget justifications.

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

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$2,735,000
2015 budget estimate .....	2,528,000
Provided in the bill .....	2,528,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	– 207,000
2015 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the administrative expenses to carry out the credit program of Food for Peace Title I, Food for Peace Act, and the Food for Progress Act, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$2,528,000.

## FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$1,466,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	1,400,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,466,000,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	+66,000,000

For Food for Peace Title II grants, the Committee provides \$1,466,000,000, of which \$375,000,000 is for non-emergency assistance.

*Food Aid Funding.*—The Committee believes the \$66 million reduction in the President’s Budget request for Food for Peace Title II is simply a budgetary tactic used to give the appearance of savings. This proposed reduction must be viewed against the backdrop of the Administration’s recent request to use the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust fund for the first time in several years to respond to emerging food aid crises around the world. For these reasons, the Committee provides funding for Title II at current levels.

*Food Aid Reform.*—The Committee does not provide the changes to the Food for Peace Act requested in the President’s budget. The Committee notes that the recently passed 2014 farm bill reformed the program and effectively removed the practice of monetization. As noted in the President’s Feed the Future initiative, there are numerous programs across 10 Federal agencies that allow flexibility by providing a variety of cash assistance, technical assistance, and direct food donation programs. Transforming the Food for Peace program into a cash program would be duplicative of other programs and counter to the reforms Congress recently enacted in the 2014 farm bill.

*GAO Recommendations.*—In March 2014, GAO issued a report (GAO–14–277) that cites deficiencies in the U.S. Agency for International Development’s (USAID) processes for monitoring and evaluating the repositioning of food aid. Specifically, GAO recommended that USAID systematically collect and ensure the reliability of data for prepositioned food aid and systematically monitor and assess the effectiveness of food aid’s delivery time frames and cost.

Also in March 2014, GAO issued a report (GAO–14–22) that cites deficiencies and unwillingness to use a system designed for shipping time and cost data collection called Web Based Supply Chain Management (WBSCM). The report also noted USAID’s lack of collection of information on individual food aid shipments. That report recommended that USDA and USAID work together to ensure USDA receives accurate data and improve WBSCM’s functionality.

The Committee directs USDA to update the written agreement from 1991 with USAID to clearly define roles and responsibilities in managing food aid programs. The Committee notes that without accurate data and the use of cost-tracking systems the estimation of increased beneficiaries due to proposed reforms is difficult to formulate.

The Committee finds GAO’s recommendations useful and directs USDA to report to the Committee within 45 days of enactment of this Act on its plans to implement GAO’s recommendations in consultation with USAID.

MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM GRANTS

2014 appropriation .....	\$185,126,000
2015 budget estimate .....	185,126,000
Provided in the bill .....	198,126,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+13,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	+13,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$198,126,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT (LOANS)

CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2014 appropriation .....	\$6,748,000
2015 budget estimate .....	6,748,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,748,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Credit Guarantee Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$6,748,000.

TITLE VI

RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

[DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS]

	Appropriation	User fees	Total, FDA S&E
2014 appropriation .....	\$2,551,905	\$1,794,765	\$4,346,670
2015 budget estimate .....	2,575,383	1,867,968	4,443,351
Provided in the bill .....	2,574,080	1,867,968	4,442,048
Comparison:			
2014 appropriation .....	+22,175	+73,203	+95,378
2015 budget estimate .....	-1,303	---	-1,303

The Committee provides an appropriation of \$2,574,080,000 in new budget authority for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). In addition, the Committee recommends the following user fee amounts: \$798,000,000—prescription drugs; \$128,282,000—medical devices; \$312,116,000—human generic drugs; \$21,014,000—bio-similar biologicals; \$22,464,000—animal drugs; \$6,944,000—animal generic drugs; \$566,000,000—tobacco products; \$1,434,000—food

and feed recalls; \$6,414,000—food reinspection; and, \$5,300,000—voluntary qualified importers. The combination of new budget authority and user fees provides FDA with a total discretionary salaries and expenses level of \$4,442,048,000. This total does not include permanent, indefinite user fees for mammography, pharmacy compounding, export, and color certification estimated at \$33,356,000.

The Committee recommendation does not include proposed user fees for food facility registration and inspection, food import, international courier, cosmetics, or food contact notification.

The Committee does not include requested funding for a civilian pay increase across the agency.

The Committee recommendation maintains the fiscal year 2014 funding levels for the medical countermeasures initiative as well as recent increases for import safety. The Committee includes an additional \$25,000,000 for food safety activities and \$12,000,000 for pharmacy compounding activities. The funding provided is to support the food safety activities outlined in the request, such as the development of guidance, providing technical assistance to industry and technical support to FDA inspectors, as well as training for FDA and state inspectors. This investment is to help ensure the quality and consistency of inspections within the new FSMA prevention framework.

*FSMA Food Safety Preventative Controls for Human Food Rule.*—FDA is directed not to implement an interim final or final rule regarding food safety plans under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) until regulatory requirements for supplier verification and testing programs are proposed for public review and comment as well as an economic analysis of the costs and benefits associated with the regulatory requirements pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act.

Given the diversity in the food industry, FSMA was designed to be risk-based, flexible, and science-based. A one-size-fits-all approach will not work. Yet, the Committee is very concerned with the overly prescriptive regulatory approach that the agency is taking with many of the regulations including the monitoring of preventive controls and verification testing activities. Accordingly, FDA shall ensure all FSMA regulations are risk-based, flexible, and science-based, and embrace the well-established and recognized standards for food safety already employed through much of the industry.

*Need to Manage Priorities.*—The Committee is concerned that FDA is not taking necessary and required steps to provide agency stakeholders adequate input or economic consideration on an expanding list of highly technical regulatory proposals. In addition, the agency has provided questionable cost estimates on proposed rules, guidance documents, and notices of tentative determination. The food supply chain has been forced to provide comment on OMB Redline text on important FSMA proposed rules, not formally published in the *Federal Register*. Moreover, the agency's dramatic shift in how it determines ingredient safety has tremendous potential to expose the Nation's largest manufacturing sector and the agency to costly litigation that may unnecessarily lead to higher costs and taxpayer dollars with unknown benefits. At a time when the agency is requesting additional appropriations and revenue

from user fees, the Committee recommends that the agency not overextend itself at the cost to consumer confidence and the Nation's economic health.

*FDA Partnerships Under FSMA.*—The purpose of FSMA is to reform the nation's food safety laws to ensure a safe public food supply. As FDA continues implementation of FSMA, the Committee encourages FDA to work in partnership with existing government food safety programs through Memorandum of Understandings to verify compliance with FSMA to rules once they are finalized as a way to eliminate duplication of activities under the law.

*Pharmacy Compounding.*—The Committee provides an increase of \$12,000,000 for pharmacy compounding activities specified in the Drug Quality and Security Act (DQSA). The Committee urges FDA to complete inspections of compounding facilities that clearly fall within the agency's jurisdiction and take all necessary enforcement actions needed to promote the safety of the drug supply chain. For those pharmacies unaffected by DQSA, state boards of pharmacy are the proper regulator of state licensed pharmacies and should remain so. The Committee will continue to monitor FDA spending and oversight over compounding pharmacies to ensure the intent of both funding and legislation approved by Congress is observed.

*Menu Labeling.*—The Committee remains concerned with FDA's proposed rule to regulate Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items at Chain Restaurants. The Committee is further concerned that FDA has not properly considered alternatives or appropriately measured their impact on affected entities. The Committee continues to urge FDA to adopt the proposed alternative Option 2 definition of similar retail food establishments, which only applies the rule to restaurants or retail establishments where the primary and majority of business is the selling of food for immediate consumption or the selling of food that is processed or prepared on the premises. The Committee directs FDA to complete and submit to the Committee a detailed cost-benefit analysis, to be used in the final rule's review by the Office of Management and Budget, including an analysis of the agency's proposed options for the defining of "similar retail food establishments" that fully incorporates the information provided by affected non-restaurant entities and determines which option is most compliant with Executive Orders 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review) and 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review).

The Committee believes that the agency should take into account the increased costs and logistical challenges chain restaurants will face in meeting the requirements of the proposed rule. To meet the requirements of the law, FDA should consider a clear, conspicuous statement of required nutritional information on a prominently displayed poster adjacent to the menu board and nutritional information to be provided in pamphlet form prominently displayed next to drive-through menu boards as meeting such requirements.

Consistent with the intent of Congress to enhance the provision of accurate and accessible nutritional information to consumers, the Committee urges FDA to modify the respective provisions in the proposed rule to permit restaurants and similar retail food establishments to: (1) label the number of calories in a multi-serving menu item that is typically divided before presentation to the consumer, by labeling the number of calories in the common unit divi-

sion of that multi-serving menu item, or by labeling the number of servings and number of calories per serving; (2) determine and disclose nutrient content for variable standard menu items that come in different flavors, varieties, or combinations using methods that will enhance accuracy and accessibility to consumers, including ranges, averages, individual labeling of flavors or components, or labeling of one preset standard build; and (3) disclose nutrient content using a remote-access menu, such as one available on the Internet instead of an in-store menu, in cases where the majority of orders are placed by customers who are off-premises. Furthermore, regarding the “reasonable basis” standard applied to restaurants and similar retail food establishments under Section 403(q)(5)(H)(iv) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Committee urges FDA to accept allowances for variation in nutrient content, such as brought about by variations in serving size, inadvertent human error in formulation of menu items, and variations in ingredients. FDA should not hold restaurants and similar retail food establishments liable for such variation in nutrient disclosure. If FDA’s proposed rule has been finalized prior to the issuance of this report, the Committee directs FDA to issue guidance within six months of the date of this report to inform regulated industry of the interpretations of the nutrition labeling requirements set forth above.

*Bioethics Committee.*—The Committee directs the agency to utilize a bioethics committee within the Department of Health and Human Services to review novel cellular and gene therapy matters before the Office of Cellular, Tissue, and Gene Therapies. The bioethics committee should be tasked with reviewing scientific and bioethical considerations prior to the approval of clinical trials, especially those involving oocyte modifications. FDA is directed to report to the Committee at a minimum of 30 days prior to a final agency decision on such matters.

*Imported Pet Food Product Transparency.*—As of December 2013, FDA has received more than 4,600 complaints of illness related to consumption of chicken, duck, or sweet potato jerky treats, nearly all of which are imported from China. The reports involve more than 5,400 dogs, 23 cats, and include more than 900 canine deaths. These incidents date back to 2007. The Committee requests that FDA provide it with a summary of all activities, including discussion of noteworthy timeframes, associated with the investigation into the pet illnesses related to these products within 60 days of the enactment of this Act. In addition, the Committee requests that the agency provide it with an annual summary report on the status of the investigation into these illnesses beginning in April 2014 until the issue has been resolved.

*Over-the-Counter (OTC) Cold Medicines for Children.*—The Committee is concerned that FDA has not issued a proposed rule revising the monograph regulating the labeling of OTC cough and cold products for children. The Committee directs the agency to publish a proposed rule by June 30, 2014, based on scientific evidence for safety and efficacy in pediatric populations and consistent with the October 19, 2007, joint recommendations of its Pediatric Advisory Committee and Nonprescription Drugs Advisory Committee. While the Committee appreciates the agency’s effort to explore possible

improvements to the OTC drug monograph process, these efforts should not impede the prompt publication of this proposed rule.

*Drug Shortages.*—The Committee is aware that shortages of critical drugs persist following the 2012 enactment of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA). Surveys conducted by the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists, the American Hospital Association, and the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists report persistent shortages of drugs used in anesthesia care, oncology, and other services, owing primarily to problems in manufacturing, which impair patient access to care and patient experiences in the healthcare system, delay surgical procedures, and possibly increase overall healthcare costs. Therefore, within the funding provided, the Committee directs the Commissioner to continue to prioritize the public reporting of manufacturing shortages, and to work with industry to prevent conditions that might lead to drug shortages.

*Seafood Advisory.*—The Committee is concerned that after many years, FDA has not published updated advice on seafood consumption for pregnant women, mothers, and children. Seafood is an important part of a healthy diet which contains critical vitamins and nutrients, such as Omega 3s, which are essential during pregnancy to ensure optimal fetal and child development. The Committee directs FDA to publish final advice to pregnant women on seafood consumption in conjunction with all applicable parties as directed in House Report 112–101 and Senate Report 112–73 by June 30, 2014. FDA shall issue its final seafood risk benefits assessment at the same time as the seafood advice. The seafood advice shall be consistent with the latest science and contain a clear and actionable advice that will enable the public, medical, and scientific communities to make informed dietary decisions and recommendations. Finally, FDA shall provide a progress report to the Committee 30 days after the enactment of this Act and every 30 days thereafter until the advisory and seafood risk benefits assessment are published.

*ANDA Review Prioritization.*—In its Generic Drug User Fee Act commitment letter, FDA affirmed that in order to provide more certainty to the generic drug industry, it would expedite the review of Paragraph IV applications that become eligible for approval during the review period and other applications that have the potential to be the first generics to market. Within 45 days of enactment of this Act, the Committee directs FDA to report to the Committee how it has prioritized its abbreviated new drug application review process to ensure first generics are approved on the earliest possible date.

*Mammography Quality Assurance Advisory Committee.*—The Committee urges FDA to quickly follow up the November 2011 meeting of the National Mammography Quality Assurance Advisory Committee by promptly reviewing the evidence supporting including information related to an individual's breast density in the mammogram lay report and physician report.

*Accelerated Approval.*—The Committee is concerned that FDA has underutilized the accelerated approval authority codified in FDASIA. Congress created this authority to facilitate review and approval of drugs to treat patients with rare, life-ending diseases that cannot reasonably be pursued through the standard FDA ap-

proval process. The Committee directs FDA to report on the way it has used this authority since 2012, its plans to use it in the future, and a justification for using this authority for diseases that are not life-ending.

*Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy.*—The Committee commends the collaboration between FDA and the Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy community to advance useful regulatory tools for benefit-risk considerations in this disease population and drug development guidance. The Committee supports the agency’s engagement with the patient population for these purposes and to enable the appropriate use of regulatory flexibility as provided in FDASIA.

*Special Protocol Assessment Agreements.*—The Committee is concerned about questions that have arisen in connection with the rescission of a Special Protocol Assessment Agreement (SPA), including fundamental questions concerning FDA’s adherence to the statutory and regulatory guidelines that apply to the SPA process as well as to questions concerning fairness to the sponsors. The Committee would like to reiterate that FDA is expected to adhere to the established standard as informed by the *Congressional Record* and the 1997 PDUFA Goals Letter.

The Committee is aware of FDA’s ability to rescind a SPA agreement reached under section 505(b)(5)(C)(ii) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act only if it demonstrates that “a substantial scientific issue essential to determining the safety or efficacy of the product has been identified after the testing has begun.”

This standard is informed by the *Congressional Record* and the 1997 PDUFA Goals Letter. The Congressional report explains that Congress intended “that such agreements should be binding on both parties” except when “a substantial scientific issue has come to light after an agreement has been reached and testing has begun, which has a direct bearing on the safety or effectiveness of the product.”

The Committee also expects that, as a matter of public policy and fundamental fairness to the sponsor, FDA should be accountable for continued diligence in identifying issues that bear on the continued enforceability of a SPA agreement and in notifying the sponsor of such issues within a reasonable period of time after FDA becomes aware.

To ensure agreement over the standard to rescind a SPA, the Committee directs FDA to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate within 60 days of enactment of this Act regarding the standard by which FDA would rescind a SPA. Lastly, to ensure agreement over the standard to rescind a SPA, the Committee directs FDA to revise and re-issue, after public comment, its existing guidance regarding SPA agreements to clarify the agency’s interpretation of the statutory standard regarding SPA agreements and the rescission of such agreements.

*Blood Plasma Products.*—The Committee notes that the FDA Circular of Information for the Use of Human Blood and Blood Components states that plasma from different sources has identical clinical indications. Plasma from manual donation may be transfused and if not needed for that indication, may be sent for further manufacture into biologics such as immunoglobulin, clotting factor concentrates, and albumin. However, plasma from automated donation may be transfused but cannot be shipped for further manufac-

ture until approximately one year after the donation. At that point the plasma is too old to be manufactured into other biologics and is destroyed and wasted. This seems illogical since there is a shortage of these biologic products in the United States. The Committee directs FDA to report back within 60 days of enactment of this Act on the scientific or medical justification for the different post-donation manufacturing policies and under what circumstances those policies might be adjusted to allow for the more timely use of plasma from automated donations into other biologics.

*Sunscreen Ingredient Review.*—The Committee is extremely concerned that another year has passed without FDA completing its review of the pending Time and Extent Applications (TEAs) and the OTC Monograph rulemakings on sunscreens. Immediate action on sunscreens should be a priority since the need for sunscreens is evidenced by the nearly one million people that are currently living with skin cancer and the fact that melanoma is the fifth leading cause of cancer in the U.S. this year. FDA has listed actions related to sunscreen as a high priority in the Unified Agenda since 2008.

While the Committee is encouraged that FDA has issued two sunscreen final rules and feedback letters to some sunscreen TEA applicants, significantly more work remains to protect Americans from developing skin cancer. The Committee directs FDA to complete its review by December 2014 of the remaining safety and effectiveness submissions already submitted for sunscreen active ingredients that have been found eligible for potential inclusion in the sunscreen monograph via TEAs and to work expeditiously on completing the OTC monograph rulemakings. The Committee is also encouraged that FDA is seeking input from stakeholders on how to modernize the OTC Drug Review, including the TEA process, and directs FDA to continue to work with stakeholders through the process and explore ways to improve the OTC Drug Review more broadly.

*Import Clearance Process.*—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security acting through U.S. Customs and Border Protection, should consider reprioritizing existing funding to ensure sufficient FDA personnel are available to clear shipments expeditiously at the time of their arrival at the port of entry including outside normal working hours and on holidays. The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security acting through U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall develop a Trusted Trader Program designed to allow shipments from highly compliant importers to be released with minimal documentation or additional information being provided. This program should be designed in a way as to not jeopardize the safety of food and medical products under the agency's jurisdiction. Recognizing that FDA has a responsibility to ensure legitimate trade is cleared rapidly and that compliant shipments are not unduly detained, the agency will provide a report to relevant Committees of Congress on two statistics that measure the effectiveness of its targeting rules twice each year, beginning six months after the passage of this measure, and again after one year. This report will contain: (1) the number of shipments being identified for FDA examination as a percentage of all shipments subject to FDA regulatory review, and (2) the number of violative products detained as a percentage of those being held.

*Deeming Regulations.*—The Committee is encouraged that FDA has provided options for a way forward on distinguishing between premium cigars and other tobacco products in its recently proposed rule “Deeming Tobacco Products To Be Subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as Amended by the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act; Regulations on the Sale and Distribution of Tobacco Products and Required Warning Statements for Tobacco Products” (Docket No. FDA-2014-N-0189). In particular, the Committee notes that FDA is considering excluding premium cigars from the scope of this proposed rule through Option 2. The Committee believes this could be a viable solution, given that the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act makes little mention of cigars throughout the legislation, and there is even less evidence that Congress intended to focus on the unique subset of premium cigars. The Committee notes that premium cigars are shown to be distinct from other tobacco products in their effects on youth initiation, the frequency of their use by youth and young adults, and other such behavioral and economic factors.

*Artificial Pancreas.*—The Committee commends FDA for taking critical steps in advancing artificial pancreas systems, including its recent approval of the threshold suspend system. The Committee encourages FDA to continue collaboration with key stakeholders to ensure that artificial pancreas systems are further developed, tested, and approved, ensuring timely access to safe and effective systems for patients with type 1 diabetes.

*Natural Claims.*—The Committee requests that the Commissioner submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a detailed document describing the agency’s current policy with respect to natural claims on food products within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

*Regulation of Tree Nuts.*—The Committee urges FDA to consider the exemption of tree nut producers from regulation under section 419 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act if such tree nuts meet the criteria for “rarely consumed raw” and the recipient of the produce performs commercial processing that adequately reduces pathogens as described in the proposed regulation “Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption; Proposed Rule”.

*Generic drug labeling.*—The Committee is deeply concerned with FDA’s proposed rule regarding “Supplemental Applications Proposing Labeling Changes for Approved Drugs and Biological Products” that would change longstanding policy and allow generics to alter their label without FDA’s prior approval. Ironically, FDA published this proposed rule after the agency’s recent success in launching the Sentinel Initiative. This initiative helps to electronically track the safety of drugs once they reach the market, especially in terms of identifying drug safety communications.

The Committee is unaware of evidence of a need to change existing regulations. The proposed rule has the potential to threaten public health by creating unprecedented patient and provider confusion by having multiple labels for the same product, therefore undermining the longstanding policy of sameness. The Committee urges FDA to maintain a system where prescription drug labels on the market are FDA-approved, grounded in scientific evidence, and

present no opportunity for mismatched dispensing or use information between the name brand drug and the generic version drug.

Additionally, sufficient evidence is lacking on how FDA derived such a low cost estimate for this proposed rule. Under the proposed rule, generic and brand manufacturers could assume additional obligations and possible liability, which may drive smaller companies from the market, increase the cost of generic medications, and lead to additional drug shortages. FDA's cost impact analysis has not accounted for or addressed these or other unintended consequences, and further the Committee is concerned about the resources necessary to carry out such a significant policy change.

FDA must clear up any potential confusion that will likely be created in going forward with the currently proposed regulation. The agency must also justify the cost of such a regulation that fails to provide a net health benefit to consumers and providers. The Committee directs the agency to complete a new economic analysis of the rule, paying particular attention to the cost of pharmaceutical products, before FDA finalizes the rule and report back to the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

*National Antimicrobial Response Monitoring System (NARMS).*—The Committee expects FDA to provide funding for the National Antimicrobial Response Monitoring System at \$7,800,000 and urges FDA to consider providing additional funding for this program if warranted. The Committee encourages FDA to utilize NARMS as part of the strategy to preserve the effectiveness of antibiotics. The agency should continue to use the NARMS data for evaluating new food animal antibiotics, guiding policy and regulations on the use of antibiotics, conducting risk assessments, and tracking changes in resistance to identify potential human and animal health problems.

*FDA User Fee Collections/Obligations.*—The Committee continues to be concerned about the financial management of FDA's user fee programs. The Committee directs that not later than November 1, 2014, and each month thereafter through the months covered by this Act, the Commissioner to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate a report on user fees collected for each user fee program included in the Act. The report shall also include monthly obligations incurred against such fee collections. The first report shall include a distinct categorization of the user fee balances that are being carried forward into fiscal year 2015 for each user fee account as well as a detailed explanation of what accounts for the balance and what the balance will be used for.

*Finalization of the Veterinary Feed Directive.*—The Committee directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to require FDA to finalize the Veterinary Feed Directive regulation by December 2014.

*Food Safety Monitoring.*—The Committee notes that the National Agriculture and Food Defense Strategy Plan is being finalized as required by Section 108 of Public Law 111-353. As research needs are identified to carry out this section, the Committee encourages FDA to consider funding research that would provide portable and technologically advanced testing platforms needed to effectively

monitor and protect against intentional adulteration of the food supply.

*Cosmetics and Colors.*—The Committee directs the Office of Cosmetics and Colors (OCAC) to respond by March 15, 2015, to a citizen petition setting safety levels for trace amounts of lead in cosmetics. The Committee notes that every year since FY 2012, it has repeatedly requested that OCAC respond to this petition. The Committee urges OCAC to make this a priority.

*Food and Veterinary Medicine.*—The Committee is aware of the important support provided to FDA’s food and veterinary medicine programs and through its research and program relations with their centers of excellence. The Committee encourages FDA to maintain an appropriate funding level for both FSMA-related activities and the base work performed by these centers.

*Concerns with Opioid Application Approvals.*—The Committee is alarmed by a growing trend of prescription drug and opioid abuse. The Committee notes that FDA has taken a number of positive steps in recent years to address this complex challenge. However, the Committee is discouraged by FDA’s 2013 approval of a New Drug Application for Zohydro, a high-dose undiluted painkiller containing hydrocodone. While the United States makes up only 4.6 percent of the world’s population, its residents consume 99 percent of the world’s supply of hydrocodone. These drugs are now the most widely prescribed painkillers in the U.S., and emergency room visits involving hydrocodone rose from 38,000 in 2004 to more than 115,000 in 2010.

Approving this powerful narcotic without any abuse deterrent formulation, despite the strong opposition of the relevant FDA expert Advisory Panel, seems counter to the assertion that “the prevention of prescription opioid abuse is of the highest priority for the FDA.” The DEA Administrator indicated to the Committee that the agency is spending considerable resources to educating agents, diversion investigators, and tactical diversion squads about the approval of this medication that “frightens us all.” In addition to strong concerns that the drug is ripe for misuse and addiction, the Committee is concerned that approving new applications without abuse deterrent properties will stifle innovation in this newly emerging field of scientific research.

The Committee therefore requests that FDA provide a report within 60 days of enactment, including a detailed accounting of FDA’s methodology for post-market tracking of Zohydro and findings to date. In addition, the Committee encourages FDA to continue its outreach to the medical community and provide data about the utilization of REMS-compliant training programs by prescribers. Lastly, the Committee includes bill language that prevents FDA from obligating \$20,000,000 of its discretionary funding for the Office of the Commissioner unless the agency finalizes the draft guidance entitled “Industry Guidance: Abuse-Deterrent Opioids—Evaluation and Labeling”. If by June 30, 2015, FDA does not complete this guidance, the \$20,000,000 will be used by the Office of Criminal Investigation to assist in the prevention of opioid drug abuse.

*Tobacco Product Smuggling.*—The Committee understands that nearly one in four packs of cigarettes consumed in Texas is smuggled in from Mexico and more than half of the cigarettes consumed

in New York are the result of interstate smuggling operations. In addition, an average of one out of every five packs of cigarettes consumed in California, Arizona, and New Mexico are the result of smuggling operations. FDA’s regulation over tobacco products provides the agency with unique expertise and intelligence in the area of tobacco sales and market dynamics. The Committee recommends FDA’s Office of Criminal Investigations assist Federal, state, and local agencies in targeting the highest-level criminal tobacco trafficking organizations by gathering intelligence and disseminating leads with their partner organizations to help address this illicit activity.

*Compassionate Use.*—The Committee is concerned with a lack of useful data regarding the number of Expanded Access (sometimes called compassionate use) requests made on behalf of patients that are denied by sponsors of investigational products. In order to obtain an accurate understanding of the scope of this problem, the Committee requests that GAO conduct a review of how FDA is working with all stakeholders to accelerate the approval of innovative, safe, and effective medicines and how FDA takes into account safety and efficacy data from Expanded Access programs.

*Sunscreen Labeling Regulations.*—The Committee is pleased that FDA finalized regulations establishing significant new labeling and testing requirements for products marketed under FDA’s monograph for over-the-counter sunscreen drug products. The Committee directs the FDA to finalize its proposed rule limiting the maximum Sun Protection Factor to ‘50’ or ‘50+’ and issue a proposed rule to establish testing and labeling standards for sunscreen sprays.

*Scientific Integrity.*—Pursuant to the President’s 2009 memorandum and as directed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, FDA adopted a scientific integrity policy in 2012. It appears to conform to the President’s directive by maintaining a firm commitment to science-based, data-driven decision making, facilitating the free flow of scientific and technical information, and requiring a fair and transparent approach to resolving scientific disputes. The Committee directs the Commissioner to ensure all FDA centers agencies are complying with the policy and using it to guide their policy and regulatory decisions.

*Calorie Display in Vending Machines.*—The Committee is also concerned with FDA’s proposed rule to regulate Food Labeling and Calorie Labeling of Articles of Food in Vending Machines. To meet the requirements of the law, FDA should accept a clear, visible display of calories on the front of the package of articles of food sold from a vending machine or on the front of the vending machine as meeting such requirements.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2014 appropriation .....	\$8,788,000
2015 budget estimate .....	8,788,000
Provided in the bill .....	8,788,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	---
2015 budget estimate .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Buildings and Facilities of the Food and Drug Administration, the Committee provides \$8,788,000.

## INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

## COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

2014 appropriation .....	\$215,000,000
2015 budget estimate .....	280,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	217,578,000
Comparison:	
2014 appropriation .....	+2,578,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-62,422,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$217,578,000, of which \$52,578,000 is for the purchase of information technology and \$1,885,000 is for the Inspector General.

*Swap Dealer de minimis.*—The Committee directs the Commission to provide clarity to market participants by amending CFTC regulation 1.3(ggg)(4) to require a rulemaking by the Commission, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, before the “phase-in level” currently in effect is automatically reduced.

*Pay Cost.*—The Committee does not include requested funding for a civilian pay increase across the Commission.

*Regulations.*—The Committee is concerned about duplicative and overreaching regulations that are resource intensive. The Committee includes bill language directing the Commission to submit cost-benefit studies of these regulations to the Committees of jurisdiction.

*Five-year Strategic Information Technology Plan.*—The Committee notes that the Commission did not submit a five-year, strategic technology investment plan per the directive in H. Rpt. 113–166. The Committee directs the Commission to develop the plan. It is essential that the Committee know where and how these investments are to be made with the funding provided in this bill per the President’s request for information technology.

*Academic Research.*—The Committee notes its concern regarding the Commission’s reduction of the independent economic research by visiting scholars within the Office of Chief Economist (OCE). Since December 2012, the Commission has reduced the number of economists in the OCE by over 50%, access to equipment used for research has become limited, and no new visiting academics have joined. It has taken over a year to approve publication of some economic papers, delaying research on issues such as high frequency trading. On May 13, 2014, MIT professor and former CFTC Chief Economist testified before Congress on high frequency trading. It was revealed that his research was held up by the Commission for over a year. This raises concern given the Commission’s pending rule on high frequency trading and the research program as a whole. The Committee will continue to monitor this situation.

## FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2014 limitation .....	(\$62,600,000)
2015 budget estimate .....	(65,100,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(54,000,000)
Comparison:	
2014 limitation .....	-8,600,000
2015 budget estimate .....	-11,100,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For a limitation on the expenses of the Farm Credit Administration (FCA), the Committee provides \$54,000,000.

This limitation reflects FCA's approximate average level of obligations over the past 5 years. Authority is provided for FCA to exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent upon notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

## TITLE VII

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## (INCLUDING RESCISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The General Provisions contained in the accompanying bill for fiscal year 2015 are fundamentally the same as those included in last year's appropriations bill.

The following general provisions are included in the bill:

Section 701: Limitation on the purchase of passenger motor vehicles.

Section 702: Transfer authority regarding the Working Capital Fund.

Section 703: Limitation on certain obligations.

Section 704: Indirect cost rates for cooperative agreements with nonprofit institutions.

Section 705: Disbursement of rural development loans.

Section 706: Authority of the Chief Information Officer relating to new IT systems.

Section 707: Availability of mandatory conservation program funding.

Section 708: Rural Utility Service borrower eligibility.

Section 709: Rescission of certain unobligated balances.

Section 710: Availability of agency funds for information technology.

Section 711: Funding availability for liquid infant formula.

Section 712: Prohibition on first-class airline travel.

Section 713: Use of funds authorized by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

Section 714: Limitation on funds for commodities under the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act.

Section 715: Funding for advisory committees.

Section 716: Indirect costs for competitive agricultural research grants.

Section 717: Limitation on certain funds.

Section 718: Limitation on certain funds.

Section 719: Language on user fee proposals without offsets.

Section 720: Language on reprogramming.

- Section 721: Language on fees for the business and industry guaranteed loan program.
- Section 722: Language on questions for the record.
- Section 723: Language regarding prepackaged news stories.
- Section 724: Language on prohibition on paid details in excess of 30 days.
- Section 725: Language on the mohair program.
- Section 726: Language regarding spending plans.
- Section 727: Language on controls over humanitarian food assistance.
- Section 728: Language regarding Single Family Housing Direct Loan Program.
- Section 729: Language regarding USDA loan programs.
- Section 730: Language regarding the Packers and Stockyards Act.
- Section 731: Transfer authority regarding the Working Capital Fund.
- Section 732: Language regarding the naming of buildings.
- Section 733: Language regarding farm disaster programs.
- Section 734: Language regarding prescription drug approvals.
- Section 735: Language regarding federal felonies.
- Section 736: Language regarding federal tax liability.
- Section 737: Limitation on certain funds.
- Section 738: Language regarding the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children.
- Section 739: Language regarding school meal programs.
- Section 740: Sense of Congress regarding the Extension Service.
- Section 741: Language regarding the use of funds for certain horse inspection activities.
- Section 742: Language regarding purchases made through Child Nutrition Programs.
- Section 743: Spending Reduction Account.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

### TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following lists the transfers of unexpended balances included in the accompanying bill.

1. *Hazardous Materials Management*.—The bill allows the funds appropriated to the Department for hazardous materials management to be transferred to agencies of the Department as required.

2. *Departmental Administration*.—The bill requires reimbursement for expenses related to certain hearings.

3. *Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations*.—The bill allows a portion of the funds appropriated to the Office of the Assistant Secretary to be transferred to agencies.

4. *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service*.—Authority is included to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer from other appropriations or funds of the Department such sums as may be necessary to combat emergency outbreaks of certain diseases of animals, plants, and poultry.

5. *Funds for Strengthening Markets, Income, and Supply*.—The bill limits the transfer of section 32 funds to purposes specified in the bill.

6. *Farm Service Agency Salaries and Expenses.*—The bill provides that funds provided to other accounts in the agency may be merged with the salaries and expenses account of the Farm Service Agency.

7. *Dairy Indemnity Program.*—The bill authorizes the transfer of funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation, by reference.

8. *Commodity Credit Corporation.*—The bill includes language allowing certain funds to be transferred to the Foreign Agricultural Service for information resource management activities.

9. *Rural Development Salaries and Expenses.*—The bill provides that prior year balances from certain accounts shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

10. *Rural Community Facilities Program Account, Rural Business Program Account, and Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account.*—The bill provides that balances from the Rural Community Advancement Program may be transferred to and merged with these accounts.

11. *Child Nutrition Programs.*—The bill includes authority to transfer section 32 funds to these programs.

12. *Foreign Agricultural Service Salaries and Expenses.*—The bill allows for the transfer of funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loan Program Account.

13. *Food for Peace Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account.*—The bill allows funds to be transferred to the Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses account. The bill also provides that funds made available for the cost of title I agreements and for title I ocean freight differential may be used interchangeably.

14. *Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program.*—The bill provides for transfer of funds to the Foreign Agricultural Service and to the Farm Service Agency for overhead expenses associated with credit reform.

15. *Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and Expenses.*—The bill allows funds to be transferred among activities.

16. *General Provisions.*—The bill allows unobligated balances of discretionary funds to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

#### CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(A) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill that directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

The bill includes a number of provisions which place limitations on the use of funds in the bill or change existing limitations and which might, under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law:

1. *Office of the Secretary.*—Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses, as determined by the Secretary.

2. *Departmental Administration.*—Language is included to reimburse the agency for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings.

3. *Agricultural Research Service.*—Language is included that allows the Agricultural Research Service to grant easements at the Beltsville, MD, agricultural research center and to grant easements

at any facility for the construction of a research facility for use by the agency.

4. *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*—A provision carried in the bill since fiscal year 1973 regarding state matching funds has been continued to assure more effective operation of the brucellosis control program through state cost sharing, with resulting savings to the Federal budget.

Language is included to allow APHIS to recoup expenses incurred from providing technical assistance goods, or services to non-APHIS personnel, and to allow transfers of funds for agricultural emergencies.

Language is included to limit the amount of funds for representational allowances.

5. *Agricultural Marketing Service, Limitation on Administrative Expenses.*—The bill includes language to allow AMS to exceed the limitation on administrative expenses by 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees. This allows flexibility in case crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur.

6. *Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Inspection and Weighing Services.*—The bill includes authority to exceed the limitation on inspection and weighing services by 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees. This allows for flexibility if export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur.

7. *Dairy Indemnity Program.*—Language is included by reference that allows the Secretary to utilize the services of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity payments.

8. *Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account.*—Language is included that deems the pink bollworm a boll weevil for the purposes of administering the boll weevil loan program.

9. *Risk Management Agency.*—Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

10. *Commodity Credit Corporation Fund.*—Language is included to provide for the reimbursement appropriation. Language is also included to allow certain funds transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used for information resource management. In addition, language is included which limits the amount of funds that can be spent on operation and maintenance costs of CCC hazardous waste sites.

11. *Natural Resources Conservation Service.*—Conservation Operations.—Language which has been included in the bill since 1938 prohibits construction of buildings on land not owned by the government, although construction on land owned by States and counties is permitted as authorized by law.

12. *Rural Development Salaries and Expenses.*—Language is included to allow funds to be used for advertising and promotional activities and to limit the amount of funds to provide modest non-monetary awards to non-USDA employees.

13. *Rental Assistance Program.*—Language is included which provides that agreements entered into during the current fiscal year be funded for a one-year period. Language also is included to renew contracts once during any 12-month period.

14. *Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).*—Language is included to purchase infant formula except in accordance with law and pay for activities that are not fully reimbursed by other departments or agencies unless authorized by law.

15. *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.*—Language is included to enter into contracts and employ staff to conduct studies, evaluations, or to conduct activities related to program integrity.

16. *Foreign Agricultural Service.*—Language carried since 1979 enables this agency to use funds received by an advance or by reimbursement to carry out its activities involving international development and technical cooperation. Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

17. *Commodity Futures Trading Commission.*—Language is included to limit the amount of funds for official reception and representation expenses.

18. *Farm Credit Administration.*—The bill includes authority to exceed the limitation on assessments by 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

19. *General Provisions.*—

Section 704: This provision provides that none of the funds in this Act may be made available to pay indirect costs charged against competitive agricultural research, education, or extension grants awarded by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture in excess of 10 percent of total direct costs.

Section 705: This provision allows funds made available in the current fiscal year for the Rural Development Loan Fund program account; the Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans program account; and the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account to remain available until expended to disburse obligations.

Section 706: Language is included that requires approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board for acquisition of new information technology systems or significant upgrades, and that prohibits the transfer of funds to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without the notification of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

Section 707: Language is included regarding the availability of funds for certain conservation programs.

Section 708: Language is included regarding certain Rural Utilities Service Programs.

Section 710: Language is included that allows unobligated balances of the Farm Service Agency and Rural Development mission areas to be used for information technology purposes.

Section 711: Language is included regarding reconstituted liquid concentrate infant formula issuance to WIC participants.

Section 712: Language is included regarding the prohibition of first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded in this Act.

Section 713: Language is included regarding the use of authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 715: Language is included that limits the amount of spending for USDA Advisory Committees.

Section 716: Language is included modifying matching requirements for certain research grants.

Section 717: Language regarding certain limitations.

Section 718: Language regarding certain limitations.

Section 719: Language is included that prohibits funds from being used to prepare a budget submission to Congress that assumes reductions from the previous year's budget due to user fee proposals unless the submission also identifies spending reductions which should occur if the user fees are not enacted.

Section 720: Language is included that requires certain reprogramming procedures of funds provided in Appropriations Acts.

Section 721: Language is included regarding fees for the business and industry guaranteed loan program.

Section 722: This provision prohibits the Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration from transmitting or making available to any non-Department of Agriculture or non-Department of Health and Human Services employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

Section 723: Language regarding prepackaged news stories.

Section 724: This provision prohibits any employee of the Department of Agriculture from being detailed or assigned to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

Section 725: Language is included regarding the mohair program.

Section 727: Language is included regarding the use funds for humanitarian food assistance programs.

Section 728: Language is included regarding the Single Family Housing Direct Loan Program.

Section 729: Language is included on certain USDA loan programs.

Section 730: Language is included regarding the Packers and Stockyards Act.

Section 731: Language is included regarding the Working Capital Fund.

Section 733: Language is included on farm disaster programs.

Section 734: Language is included regarding prescription drug approvals.

Section 735: Language is included regarding federal criminal felonies.

Section 736: Language is included regarding federal tax liability.

Section 737: Language is included to limit certain funds.

Section 738: Language is included regarding the WIC food package.

Section 739: Language is included regarding school meal programs.

Section 741: Language is included regarding the use of funds for certain horse inspection activities.

Section 742: Language is included regarding purchases made through Child Nutrition Programs.

Section 743: Spending Reduction Account.

DISCLOSURE OF EARMARKS AND CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED  
SPENDING ITEMS

Neither the bill nor the report contains any Congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**FULL COMMITTEE VOTES**

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: May 29, 2014

Measure: Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015

Motion by: Mr. Farr

Description of Motion: To strike a provision that would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a waiver process for a state to waive certain federal regulations for any school food authority that demonstrates a net loss from operating a food service program for a period of six months.

Results: Defeated 22 yeas to 29 nays

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
Mr. Cuellar  
Ms. DeLauro  
Mr. Farr  
Mr. Fattah  
Mr. Honda  
Ms. Kaptur  
Ms. Lee  
Mrs. Lowey  
Ms. McCollum  
Mr. Moran  
Mr. Owens  
Mr. Pastor  
Ms. Pingree  
Mr. Price  
Mr. Quigley  
Ms. Roybal-Allard  
Mr. Ryan  
Mr. Schiff  
Mr. Serrano  
Mr. Visclosky  
Ms. Wasserman Schultz

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
Mr. Amodei  
Mr. Calvert  
Mr. Carter  
Mr. Cole  
Mr. Crenshaw  
Mr. Culberson  
Mr. Dent  
Mr. Diaz-Balart  
Mr. Fleischmann  
Mr. Fortenberry  
Mr. Frelinghuysen  
Ms. Granger  
Mr. Graves  
Dr. Harris  
Ms. Herrera Beutler  
Mr. Joyce  
Mr. Kingston  
Mr. Latham  
Mr. Nunnelee  
Mrs. Roby  
Mr. Rogers  
Mr. Rooney  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Stewart  
Mr. Valadao  
Mr. Wolf  
Mr. Womack  
Mr. Yoder

**FULL COMMITTEE VOTES**

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

## ROLL CALL NO. 2

Date: May 29, 2014

Measure: Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015

Motion by: Mr. Dent

Description of Motion: To provide a funding limitation on price support loans to certain sugar processors.

Results: Defeated 18 yeas to 32 nays

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Amodei  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Mr. Graves  
 Dr. Harris  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mr. Moran  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Schiff  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Visclosky  
 Mr. Wolf  
 Mr. Womack

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Honda  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Mr. Nunnelee  
 Mr. Owens  
 Mr. Pastor  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Ms. Wasserman Schultz  
 Mr. Yoder

**FULL COMMITTEE VOTES**

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

## ROLL CALL NO. 3

Date: May 29, 2014

Measure: Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015

Motion by: Ms. Kaptur

Description of Motion: To strike a provision that prohibits the use of funds regarding certain poultry regulations.

Results: Defeated 18 yeas to 31 nays

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Honda  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Mr. Moran  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Schiff  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Visclosky  
 Ms. Wasserman Schultz

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Amodei  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Graves  
 Dr. Harris  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mr. Nunnelee  
 Mr. Owens  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Mr. Wolf  
 Mr. Womack  
 Mr. Yoder

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 4

Date: May 29, 2014

Measure: Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015

Motion by: Mr. Moran

Description of Motion: To prohibit the use of funds for certain horse inspection activities.

Results: Adopted 28 yeas to 22 nays

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fattah  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Dr. Harris  
 Mr. Honda  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Mr. Moran  
 Mr. Owens  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Schiff  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Ms. Wasserman Schultz  
 Mr. Wolf

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Amodei  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Graves  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mr. Nunnelee  
 Mr. Pastor  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Mr. Womack  
 Mr. Yoder

**FULL COMMITTEE VOTES**

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 5

Date: May 29, 2014

Measure: Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015

Motion by: Ms. Kaptur

Description of Motion: To strike a provision that prohibits the use of funds regarding certain poultry regulations and insert other provisions related to practices by livestock and poultry dealers.

Results: Defeated 20 yeas to 29 nays

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fattah  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Mr. Honda  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Mr. Moran  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Schiff  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Visclosky  
 Ms. Wasserman Schultz

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Amodei  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Graves  
 Dr. Harris  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mr. Nunnelee  
 Mr. Owens  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Mr. Womack  
 Mr. Yoder

**FULL COMMITTEE VOTES**

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

## ROLL CALL NO. 6

Date: May 29, 2014

Measure: Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2015

Motion by: Mr. Kingston

Description of Motion: To report the bill to the House, as amended.

Results: Adopted 31 yeas to 18 nays

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Amodei  
 Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Graves  
 Dr. Harris  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Mr. Kingston  
 Mr. Latham  
 Mr. Nunnelee  
 Mr. Owens  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Mr. Womack  
 Mr. Yoder

*Members Voting Nay*

Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Honda  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Mr. Moran  
 Mr. Pastor  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Schiff  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Visclosky  
 Ms. Wasserman Schultz

## STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program's success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

## PROGRAM DUPLICATION

No provision of this bill establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

## DIRECTED RULE MAKING

The bill does not direct any rule making.

## APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law for the period concerned:

[Dollars in Thousands]

Agency/Program	Last Year of authorization	Authorization Level	Appropriations in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
Multi-family Housing Revitalization Program .....	9/30/2014	32,575	32,575	28,000
Commodity Futures Trading Commission .....	9/30/2013	Such sums	215,000	217,578

## RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following lists the rescissions of unexpended balances included in the accompanying bill:

The bill proposes rescissions of \$155,000,000 of funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments under the Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account; \$50,000,000 from the Watershed Rehabilitation Program; \$122,000,000 from Section 32 funds; \$13,000,000 from Food for Peace Title I grants; and \$125,000,000 from the Emergency Livestock Assistance Program.

## COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CL. 3(E) (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee notes that the accompanying bill does not propose to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof.

## COMPARISON WITH THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following table compares the levels of new budget authority provided in the bill with the appropriate allocation under section 302(b) of the Budget Act:

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) Allocation		This bill	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Discretionary .....	20,880	21,848	20,880	<sup>1</sup> 21,716
Mandatory .....	114,937	107,310	114,937	<sup>1</sup> 107,310

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

## FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

Pursuant to section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following table contains five-year projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of outlays associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

[In millions of dollars]

Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:		
2015 .....		<sup>1</sup> 114,820
2016 .....		4,578
2017 .....		922
2018 .....		242
2019 and future years .....		- 888

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

## ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Pursuant to section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Budget Authority .....	38,896
Outlays .....	<sup>1</sup> 32,826

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

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the Secretary.....	5,051	5,086	5,051	---	-35
Office of Tribal Relations.....	498	502	498	---	-4
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination.....	1,496	1,507	1,507	+11	---
Office of Advocacy and Outreach.....	1,209	1,217	1,209	---	-8
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration..	804	809	804	---	-5
Departmental Administration.....	22,786	25,661	22,811	+25	-2,850
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,869	3,897	3,869	---	-28
Office of Communications.....	8,065	8,137	5,535	-2,530	-2,602
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary.....</b>	<b>43,778</b>	<b>46,816</b>	<b>41,284</b>	<b>-2,494</b>	<b>-5,532</b>
Executive Operations:					
Office of the Chief Economist.....	16,777	16,854	16,777	---	-77
National Appeals Division.....	12,841	13,430	13,317	+476	-113
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	9,064	10,292	9,392	+328	-900
<b>Subtotal, Executive Operations.....</b>	<b>38,682</b>	<b>40,576</b>	<b>39,486</b>	<b>+804</b>	<b>-1,090</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	44,031	45,199	45,025	+994	-174
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	6,213	6,080	6,028	-185	-52
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights.....	893	898	898	+5	---
Office of Civil Rights.....	21,400	24,236	24,070	+2,670	-166
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	(233,000)	(64,825)	(54,825)	(-178,175)	(-10,000)
Payments to GSA.....	164,470	---	---	-164,470	---
Department of Homeland Security.....	13,800	---	---	-13,800	---
Building operations and maintenance.....	54,730	64,825	54,825	+95	-10,000
Hazardous materials management.....	3,592	3,600	3,600	+8	---
Office of Inspector General.....	89,902	97,240	97,020	+7,118	-220
Office of the General Counsel.....	41,202	47,567	44,383	+3,181	-3,184
Office of Ethics.....	3,440	3,867	3,440	---	-427
Total, Departmental Administration.....	526,133	380,904	360,059	-166,074	-20,845
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.....	893	898	898	+5	---
Economic Research Service.....	78,058	83,446	85,784	+7,726	+2,338
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	161,206	178,999	169,371	+8,165	-9,628
Census of Agriculture.....	(44,545)	(48,044)	(47,842)	(+3,297)	(-202)
Agricultural Research Service: Salaries and expenses.....	1,122,482	1,104,403	1,120,253	-2,229	+15,850
Buildings and facilities.....	---	---	155,000	+155,000	+155,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	1,122,482	1,104,403	1,275,253	+152,771	+170,850

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Institute of Food and Agriculture:					
Research and education activities.....	772,559	837,747	774,465	+1,906	-63,282
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)	---	---
Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities Endowment Fund.....	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
Extension activities.....	469,191	468,968	467,339	-1,852	-1,629
Integrated activities.....	35,317	28,821	32,000	-3,317	+3,179
Total, National Institute of Food and Agriculture.....	1,277,067	1,335,536	1,273,804	-3,263	-61,732
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.....	893	898	898	+5	---
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	821,721	834,341	867,505	+45,784	+33,164
Buildings and facilities.....	3,175	3,175	3,175	---	---
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....	824,896	837,516	870,680	+45,784	+33,164

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Agricultural Marketing Service:</b>					
Marketing Services.....	79,914	82,963	81,192	+1,278	-1,771
Standardization activities (user fees) NA.....	(64,000)	(64,000)	(64,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(60,435)	(60,709)	(60,709)	(+274)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (Section 32):					
Permanent, Section 32.....	1,107,000	1,122,000	1,122,000	+15,000	---
Marketing agreements and orders (transfer from section 32).....	(20,056)	(20,317)	(20,056)	---	(-261)
Payments to States and Possessions.....	1,363	1,235	1,235	-128	---
<b>Total, Agricultural Marketing Service program...</b>	<b>1,248,712</b>	<b>1,266,907</b>	<b>1,265,136</b>	<b>+16,424</b>	<b>-1,771</b>
<b>Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	40,261	44,017	43,722	+3,461	-295
Limitation on inspection and weighing services....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	811	816	816	+5	---
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	1,010,689	1,001,402	1,005,189	-5,500	+3,787
Lab accreditation fees.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
<b>Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing....</b>	<b>6,231,666</b>	<b>6,175,033</b>	<b>6,290,901</b>	<b>+59,235</b>	<b>+115,868</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	893	898	898	+5	---
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,177,926	1,139,323	1,205,068	+27,142	+65,745
(Transfer from Food for Peace (P.L. 480)).....	(2,735)	(2,528)	(2,528)	(-207)	---
(Transfer from export loans).....	(354)	(354)	(354)	---	---
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(306,998)	(306,998)	(306,998)	---	---
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts.....	(310,087)	(309,880)	(309,880)	(-207)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,488,013)	(1,449,203)	(1,514,948)	(+26,935)	(+65,745)
State mediation grants.....	3,782	3,404	3,404	-378	---
Grassroots source water protection program.....	5,526	---	2,500	-3,026	+2,500
Dairy indemnity program.....	250	500	500	+250	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	1,187,484	1,143,227	1,211,472	+23,988	+68,245

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (ACIF) Program					
Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(575,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+925,000)	---
Guaranteed.....	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(2,575,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(+925,000)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(1,195,620)	(1,252,004)	(1,252,004)	(+56,384)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,500,000)	(1,393,443)	(1,393,443)	(-106,557)	---
Subtotal.....	(2,695,620)	(2,645,447)	(2,645,447)	(-50,173)	---
Emergency loans.....					
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(34,658)	(34,667)	(34,667)	(+9)	---
Conservation loans:		(2,000)	(2,000)	---	---
Guaranteed.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	---	---
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(5,527,278)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(+874,836)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	4,428	---	---	-4,428	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	65,520	63,101	63,101	-2,419	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	18,300	14,770	14,770	-3,530	---
Subtotal.....	83,820	77,871	77,871	-5,949	---
Emergency Loans.....					
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans.....	1,698	856	856	-842	---
Individual development account grants.....	68	---	---	-68	---
Subtotal.....	---	2,500	---	---	-2,500
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	90,014	81,227	78,727	-11,287	-2,500
<b>ACIF administrative expenses:</b>					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA).....	306,998	306,998	306,998	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	7,721	7,920	7,920	+199	---
Total, ACIF expenses.....	314,719	314,918	314,918	+199	---
<b>Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund...</b>					
(Loan authorization).....	404,733	396,145	393,645	-11,088	-2,500
Subtotal.....	(5,527,278)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(+874,836)	---
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,592,217	1,539,372	1,605,117	+12,900	+65,745

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Risk Management Agency, Administrative and operating expenses.....	71,496	76,779	77,094	+5,598	+315
<b>Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....</b>	<b>1,664,606</b>	<b>1,617,049</b>	<b>1,683,109</b>	<b>+18,503</b>	<b>+66,060</b>
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	9,502,944	8,666,022	8,666,022	-836,922	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund: Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	12,538,880	9,067,281	9,067,281	-3,471,599	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
<b>Total, Corporations.....</b>	<b>22,041,824</b>	<b>17,733,303</b>	<b>17,733,303</b>	<b>-4,308,521</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Total, Title I, Agricultural Programs.....</b>	<b>29,938,096</b>	<b>25,525,385</b>	<b>25,707,313</b>	<b>-4,230,783</b>	<b>+181,928</b>
(By transfer).....	(330,143)	(330,197)	(329,936)	(-207)	(-261)
(Loan authorization).....	(5,527,278)	(6,402,114)	(6,402,114)	(+874,836)	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(115,435)	(115,709)	(115,709)	(+274)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	893	898	898	+5	---
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations.....	812,939	814,772	843,053	+30,114	+28,281
Farm Security and Rural Investment program (transfer authority).....	---	(732,819)	---	---	(-732,819)
Total, Public Lands Conservation operations.....	812,939	1,547,591	843,053	+30,114	-704,538
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	12,000	---	25,000	+13,000	+25,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service....	824,939	814,772	868,053	+43,114	+53,281
Total, Title II, Conservation Programs.....	825,832	815,670	868,951	+43,119	+53,281

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development....	893	898	898	+5	---
Rural Development:					
Rural development expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	203,424	225,101	224,201	+20,777	-900
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(415,100)	(397,296)	(415,100)	---	(+17,804)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,439)	(4,249)	(4,439)	---	(+190)
(Transfer from Healthy Foods, HNI).....	---	(750)	---	---	(-750)
(Transfer from REILP).....	(34,478)	(33,000)	(34,478)	---	(+1,478)
(Transfer from RTB).....	---	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.....	(454,017)	(435,295)	(454,017)	---	(+18,722)
Total, Rural development expenses.....	(657,441)	(660,396)	(678,218)	(+20,777)	(+17,822)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502).....	(900,000)	(360,000)	(1,042,276)	(+142,276)	(+682,276)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Single family.....	(24,900,000)	(24,360,000)	(25,042,276)	(+142,276)	(+682,276)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing repair (Sec. 504).....	(26,280)	(26,279)	(26,372)	(+92)	(+93)
Rental housing (Sec. 515).....	(28,432)	(28,432)	(28,398)	(-34)	(-34)
Multi-family housing guarantees (Sec. 538).....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---
Site development loans (Sec. 524).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (Sec. 523).....	(5,000)	---	(5,000)	---	(+5,000)
Farm Labor Housing (Sec.514).....	(23,855)	(23,854)	(23,602)	(-253)	(-252)
<b>Total, Loan authorizations.....</b>	<b>(25,148,567)</b>	<b>(24,603,565)</b>	<b>(25,290,648)</b>	<b>(+142,081)</b>	<b>(+687,083)</b>
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502).....	24,480	26,568	76,920	+52,440	+50,352
Housing repair (Sec. 504).....	2,176	3,687	3,700	+1,524	+13
Rental housing (Sec. 515).....	6,656	9,812	9,800	+3,144	-12
Farm labor housing (Sec.514).....	5,656	7,681	7,600	+1,944	-81
<b>Total, Loan subsidies.....</b>	<b>38,968</b>	<b>47,748</b>	<b>98,020</b>	<b>+59,052</b>	<b>+50,272</b>
Farm labor housing grants.....	8,336	8,336	8,336	---	---
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	415,100	397,296	415,100	---	+17,804
<b>Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program.....</b>	<b>462,404</b>	<b>453,380</b>	<b>521,456</b>	<b>+59,052</b>	<b>+68,076</b>
<b>(Loan authorization).....</b>	<b>(25,148,567)</b>	<b>(24,603,565)</b>	<b>(25,290,648)</b>	<b>(+142,081)</b>	<b>(+687,083)</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rental assistance program:					
Rental assistance (Sec. 521).....	1,110,000	1,088,500	1,088,500	-21,500	---
Multi-Family Housing Revitalization Program Account:					
Rural housing voucher program.....	12,575	8,000	8,000	-4,575	---
Multi-family housing revitalization program.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	---	---
Total, Multi-family housing revitalization..	32,575	28,000	28,000	-4,575	---
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	25,000	10,000	30,000	+5,000	+20,000
Rural housing assistance grants.....	32,239	25,000	27,000	-5,239	+2,000
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct.....	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	---	---
Guaranteed.....	(59,543)	---	(73,222)	(+13,679)	(+73,222)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(2,259,543)	(2,200,000)	(2,273,222)	(+13,679)	(+73,222)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Community facility:					
Guaranteed.....	3,775	---	3,500	-275	+3,500
Grants.....	13,000	17,000	13,000	---	-4,000
Rural community development initiative.....	5,967	---	5,000	-967	+5,000
Economic impact initiative grants.....	5,778	---	5,000	-778	+5,000
Tribal college grants.....	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---
Total, RCFP Loan subsidies and grants....	32,520	21,000	30,500	-2,020	+9,500
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	89,759	56,000	87,500	-2,259	+31,500
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,694,738	1,625,880	1,725,456	+30,718	+99,576
(Loan authorization).....	(27,408,110)	(26,803,565)	(27,563,870)	(+155,760)	(+760,305)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Business--Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business Program Account:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans).....	(958,097)	(590,802)	(880,626)	(-77,471)	(+289,824)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy...	66,971	30,190	45,000	-21,971	+14,810
Rural business development grants.....	26,568	---	20,000	-6,568	+20,000
Delta regional authority.....	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---
Total, RBP loan subsidies and grants.....	96,539	30,190	65,000	-31,539	+34,810
Rural Business and Cooperative Grants.....	---	57,500	---	---	-57,500
Intermediary Lending Program Fund Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(18,889)	(10,013)	(16,234)	(-2,655)	(+6,221)
Loan subsidy.....	4,082	3,084	5,000	+918	+1,916
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	4,439	4,249	4,439	---	+190
Total, IRP Fund.....	8,521	64,833	9,439	+918	-55,394
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(33,077)	(59,456)	(59,456)	(+26,379)	---
Limit cushion of credit interest spending.....	(172,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(-17,000)	---
(Rescission).....	-172,000	-155,000	-155,000	+17,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Cooperative Development Grants:					
Cooperative development.....	5,800	---	5,800	---	+5,800
Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas.....	2,250	2,087	2,500	+250	+413
Grants to assist minority producers.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
Value-added agricultural product market development.....	15,000	11,000	10,750	-4,250	-250
Total, Rural Cooperative development grants.....	26,050	16,087	22,050	-4,000	+5,963
Rural Microenterprise Investment Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	---	(25,683)	---	---	(-25,683)
Loan subsidies and grants.....	---	3,290	---	---	-3,290
Total, Rural Microenterprise Investment.....	---	3,290	---	---	-3,290

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Energy for America Program					
(Loan authorization)	(12,760)	(47,259)	(33,081)	(+20,321)	(-14,178)
Loan subsidy	3,500	5,000	3,500	---	-1,500
Grants	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Total, Rural Energy for America Program	3,500	10,000	3,500	---	-6,500
Rural Business Investment Program Account					
(Loan authorization)	---	(39,254)	(39,254)	(+39,254)	---
Loan subsidy	---	4,000	4,000	+4,000	---
Grants	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
Total, Rural Business Investment Program	---	6,000	4,000	+4,000	-2,000
Healthy Foods, Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative:					
Grants	---	12,250	---	---	-12,250
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	---	750	---	---	-750
Total, Healthy Foods, Healthy Neighborhoods	---	13,000	---	---	-13,000
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	-37,390	-11,600	-51,011	-13,621	-39,411
(Loan authorization)	(1,022,823)	(772,467)	(1,028,651)	(+5,828)	(+256,184)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural water and waste disposal program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct.....	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	---	---
Guaranteed.....	(50,000)	---	(84,746)	(+34,746)	(+84,746)
Direct loans authorized by P.L. 83-566.....	(40,000)	---	---	(-40,000)	---
Total, Loan authorization.....	1,290,000	1,200,000	1,284,746	-5,254	+84,746
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Direct subsidy.....	---	---	---	---	---
Direct loans authorized by PL 83-566.....	---	---	---	---	---
Guaranteed subsidy.....	355	---	500	+145	+500
Water and waste revolving fund.....	1,000	---	1,000	---	+1,000
Water well system grants.....	993	---	993	---	+993
Colonias and AK/HI grants.....	66,500	36,480	66,500	---	+30,020
Water and waste technical assistance.....	19,000	9,120	19,000	---	+9,880
Circuit rider program.....	15,000	7,600	15,000	---	+7,400
Solid waste management grants.....	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---
High energy cost grants.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Water and waste disposal grants.....	345,523	246,800	359,900	+14,377	+113,100
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	462,371	304,000	466,893	+4,522	+162,893

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans</b>					
Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%.....	---	---	---	---	---
Direct, FFB.....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	---	---
Guaranteed underwriting.....	(500,000)	---	(500,000)	---	(+500,000)
Subtotal, Electric.....	(5,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,500,000)	---	(+500,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(690,000)	(345,000)	(690,000)	---	(+345,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(6,190,000)	(5,345,000)	(6,190,000)	---	(+845,000)
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	34,478	33,000	34,478	---	+1,478
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account..	34,478	33,000	34,478	---	+1,478
(Loan authorization).....	(6,190,000)	(5,345,000)	(6,190,000)	---	(+845,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications.....	(34,483)	(44,238)	(24,077)	(-10,406)	(-20,161)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(34,483)	(44,238)	(24,077)	(-10,406)	(-20,161)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants.....	24,323	24,950	20,000	-4,323	-4,950
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct.....	4,500	8,268	4,500	---	-3,768
Grants.....	10,372	20,372	10,372	---	-10,000
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	39,195	53,590	34,872	-4,323	-18,718
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	536,044	390,590	536,243	+199	+145,653
(Loan authorization).....	(7,514,483)	(6,589,238)	(7,498,823)	(-15,660)	(+909,585)
Total, Title III, Rural Development Programs.....	2,397,709	2,230,869	2,435,787	+38,078	+204,918
(By transfer).....	(454,017)	(435,295)	(454,017)	---	(+18,722)
(Loan authorization).....	(35,945,416)	(34,165,270)	(36,091,344)	(+145,928)	(+1,926,074)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	811	816	816	+5	---
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs.....	19,262,957	20,472,000	20,471,795	+1,208,838	-205
School breakfast program equipment grants.....	25,000	35,000	25,000	---	-10,000
Demonstration projects (Summer EBT).....	---	30,000	27,000	+27,000	-3,000
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	19,287,957	20,537,000	20,523,795	+1,235,838	-13,205
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	6,715,841	6,823,000	6,623,000	-92,841	-200,000
Supplemental nutrition assistance program: (Food stamp program).....	79,168,947	79,250,389	79,250,140	+81,193	-249
Reserve.....	3,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	---	-2,000,000
FDPIR nutrition education services.....	998	998	998	---	---
Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion.....	---	---	---	---	---
National food consumption survey.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Nutrition education.....	---	---	---	---	---
FY 2016 (first quarter).....	---	21,064,097	---	---	-21,064,097
Total, Food stamp program.....	82,169,945	105,320,484	82,251,138	+81,193	-23,069,346
Fiscal year 2015.....	(82,169,945)	(84,256,387)	(82,251,138)	(+81,193)	(-2,005,249)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Commodity assistance program:</b>					
Commodity supplemental food program.....	202,682	208,682	208,682	+6,000	---
Farmers market nutrition program.....	16,548	16,548	16,548	---	---
Emergency food assistance program.....	49,401	49,401	49,401	---	---
Pacific island and disaster assistance.....	1,070	1,070	1,070	---	---
<b>Total, Commodity assistance program.....</b>	<b>269,701</b>	<b>275,701</b>	<b>275,701</b>	<b>+6,000</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Nutrition programs administration.....</b>					
	141,348	155,000	150,824	+9,476	-4,176
<b>Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....</b>	<b>108,584,792</b>	<b>133,111,185</b>	<b>109,824,458</b>	<b>+1,239,666</b>	<b>-23,286,727</b>
FY 2015.....	(108,584,792)	(112,047,088)	(109,824,458)	(+1,239,666)	(-2,222,630)
<b>Total, Title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....</b>	<b>108,585,603</b>	<b>133,112,001</b>	<b>109,825,274</b>	<b>+1,239,671</b>	<b>-23,286,727</b>
FY 2015.....	(108,584,792)	(112,047,088)	(109,824,458)	(+1,239,666)	(-2,222,630)
<b>TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS</b>					
<b>Foreign Agricultural Service</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	177,863	182,563	182,563	+4,700	---
(Transfer from export loans).....	(6,394)	(6,394)	(6,394)	---	---
<b>Total, Salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>184,257</b>	<b>188,957</b>	<b>188,957</b>	<b>+4,700</b>	<b>---</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
 (Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Food for Peace Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account, Administrative Expenses					
Farm Service Agency, Salaries and expenses (transfer to FSA).....	2,735	2,528	2,528	-207	---
Unobligated balances (rescission).....	---	-13,000	-13,000	-13,000	---
Food for Peace Title II Grants: Expenses.....	1,466,000	1,400,000	1,466,000	---	+66,000
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses): Salaries and expenses (Export Loans): General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)..... Farm Service Agency S&E (transfer to FSA).....	6,394 354	6,394 354	6,394 354	---	---
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	6,748	6,748	6,748	---	---
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program grants.....	185,126	185,126	198,126	+13,000	+13,000
Total, Title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,838,472	1,763,965	1,842,965	+4,493	+79,000
(By transfer).....	(6,394)	(6,394)	(6,394)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	2,551,905	2,575,383	2,574,080	+22,175	-1,303
Prescription drug user fees.....	(760,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(+38,000)	---
Medical device user fees.....	(114,833)	(128,282)	(128,282)	(+13,449)	---
Human generic drug user fees.....	(305,996)	(312,116)	(312,116)	(+6,120)	---
Biosimilar biological products user fees.....	(20,716)	(21,014)	(21,014)	(+298)	---
Animal drug user fees.....	(23,600)	(22,464)	(22,464)	(-1,136)	---
Animal generic drug user fees.....	(7,328)	(6,944)	(6,944)	(-384)	---
Tobacco product user fees.....	(534,000)	(566,000)	(566,000)	(+32,000)	---
Food and Feed Recall user fees.....	(12,925)	---	(1,434)	(-11,491)	(+1,434)
Food Reinspection fees.....	(15,367)	---	(6,414)	(-8,953)	(+6,414)
Voluntary qualified importer program fees.....	---	---	(5,300)	(+5,300)	(+5,300)
Subtotal (including user fees).....	(4,346,670)	(4,430,203)	(4,442,048)	(+95,378)	(+11,845)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Mammography user fees.....	(19,318)	(19,705)	(19,705)	(+387)	---
Export and color certification user fees.....	(12,447)	(13,651)	(13,651)	(+1,204)	---
Food and Feed Recall user fees.....	---	(1,434)	---	---	(-1,434)
Food Reinspection fees.....	---	(6,414)	---	---	(-6,414)
Voluntary qualified importer program fees.....	---	(5,300)	---	---	(-5,300)
Pharmacy compounding fees (CBO estimate).....	---	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	---
Subtotal, FDA user fees.....	(1,826,530)	(1,902,324)	(1,902,324)	(+75,794)	---
Subtotal, FDA (with user fees).....	(4,378,435)	(4,477,707)	(4,476,404)	(+97,969)	(-1,303)
FDA New User Fees (Leg. proposals):					
Food Facility registration and inspection user fees.....	---	(60,120)	---	---	(-60,120)
Food import user fees.....	---	(169,021)	---	---	(-169,021)
International courier user fees.....	---	(5,807)	---	---	(-5,807)
Cosmetic user fees.....	---	(19,457)	---	---	(-19,457)
Food contact substance notification user fees....	---	(5,098)	---	---	(-5,098)
Subtotal, FDA new user fees (Leg Proposals).....	---	(259,503)	---	---	(-259,503)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Buildings and facilities.....	8,788	8,788	8,788	---	---
Total, FDA (w/user fees, including proposals)...	(4,387,223)	(4,745,998)	(4,485,192)	(+97,969)	(-260,806)
Total, FDA (w/enacted user fees only).....	(4,387,223)	(4,486,495)	(4,485,192)	(+97,969)	(-1,303)
Total, FDA (excluding user fees).....	2,560,693	2,584,171	2,582,868	+22,175	-1,303
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission 1/.....	215,000	280,000	217,578	+2,578	-62,422
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(62,600)	(65,100)	(54,000)	(-8,600)	(-11,100)
Total, Title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	2,775,693	2,864,171	2,800,446	+24,753	-63,725
<b>TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
Emergency livestock assistance program (rescission) (Sec. 709).....	---	-125,000	-125,000	-125,000	---
Limit Dam Rehab (Sec.717(1)).....	-153,000	---	-50,000	+103,000	-50,000
(rescission).....	---	-153,000	---	---	+153,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives (Sec.717(2))..	-272,000	-250,000	-95,000	+177,000	+155,000
Limit Agricultural Easement Program (Sec.717(3)).....	---	---	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000
Limit Conservation Stewardship Program (Sec.717(4))..	---	---	-31,000	-31,000	-31,000
Limit Biomass Crop Assistance Program (Sec.717(5))....	---	---	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000
Limit Rural Energy for America Program (Sec.717(6))...	---	---	-16,000	-16,000	-16,000
Limit Biorefinery Assistance (Sec.717(7)).....	---	---	-24,000	-24,000	-24,000
Limit fruit and vegetable program (Sec.718).....	-119,000	-122,000	-122,000	-3,000	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Section 32 (rescission) (Sec. 718).....	-189,000	-203,000	-121,000	+68,000	+82,000
Resource Conservation and Development (rescission) .....	-2,017	---	---	+2,017	---
Geographic Disadvantaged farmers .....	1,996	---	---	-1,996	---
Hardwood Trees (Reforestation Pilot Program).....	600	---	---	-600	---
Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments (rescission) .....	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Rural Housing Service (rescission) .....	-1,314	---	---	+1,314	---
Section 9005 Bioenergy program (rescission).....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Water Bank program .....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Section 9003 Biorefinery program (rescission).....	-40,694	---	---	+40,694	---
Hunger Commission .....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
FDA user fees .....	79,000	---	---	-79,000	---
Citrus greening (APHIS) .....	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Southwest Border Regional Commission.....	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
<b>Total, Title VII, General provisions.....</b>	<b>-708,429</b>	<b>-851,000</b>	<b>-624,000</b>	<b>+84,429</b>	<b>+227,000</b>
<b>Grand total .....</b>	<b>145,652,976</b>	<b>165,461,061</b>	<b>142,856,736</b>	<b>-2,796,240</b>	<b>-22,604,325</b>
Appropriations fiscal year 2015.....	(146,096,001)	(145,045,964)	(143,270,736)	(-2,825,265)	(-1,775,228)
Rescissions.....	(-443,025)	(-649,000)	(-414,000)	(+29,025)	(+235,000)
Advance appropriations, FY 2016.....	---	(21,064,097)	---	---	(-21,064,097)
(By transfer).....	(790,554)	(771,886)	(790,347)	(-207)	(+18,461)
(Loan authorization).....	(41,472,694)	(40,567,384)	(42,493,458)	(+1,020,764)	(+1,926,074)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(178,035)	(180,809)	(169,709)	(-8,326)	(-11,100)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2014 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015  
(Amounts in Thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs.....	29,938,096	25,525,385	25,707,313	-4,230,783	+181,928
Mandatory.....	(23,149,074)	(18,855,803)	(18,855,803)	(-4,293,271)	---
Discretionary.....	(6,789,022)	(6,669,582)	(6,851,510)	(+62,488)	(+181,928)
Title II - Conservation programs (discretionary).....	825,832	815,670	868,951	+43,119	+53,281
Title III - Rural development (discretionary).....	2,397,709	2,230,869	2,435,787	+38,078	+204,918
Title IV - Domestic food programs.....	108,585,603	133,112,001	109,825,274	+1,239,671	-23,286,727
Mandatory.....	(101,432,902)	(125,787,484)	(102,722,933)	(+1,290,031)	(-23,064,551)
Discretionary.....	(7,152,701)	(7,324,517)	(7,102,341)	(-50,360)	(-222,176)
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs (discretionary).....	1,838,472	1,763,965	1,842,965	+4,493	+79,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug 1/ Administration (discretionary).....	2,775,693	2,864,171	2,800,446	+24,753	-63,725
Title VII - General provisions (discretionary).....	-708,429	-851,000	-624,000	+84,429	+227,000
Total .....	145,652,976	165,461,061	142,856,736	-2,796,240	-22,604,325

MINORITY VIEWS OF THE HON. NITA LOWEY AND THE  
HON. SAM FARR

We voted against reporting the bill from committee because of our concerns about several aspects of the measure.

Among those concerns are two highly objectionable nutrition riders.

First, we are deeply concerned that the bill would allow school food authorities (SFAs) to get waivers from complying with the improved lunch and breakfast nutrition standards in the Healthy, Hunger-free Kids Act (HHFKA) if they can show that they are operating at a net loss.

At the signing ceremony for the HHFKA, President Obama explained the need for the act as follows:

“At a very basic level, this act is about doing what’s right for our children. Right now, across the country, too many kids don’t have access to school meals. And often, the food that’s being offered isn’t as healthy or as nutritious as it should be. That’s part of the reason why one in three children in America today are either overweight or obese.

“And we’re seeing this problem in every part of the country in kids from all different backgrounds and all walks of life. As a result, doctors are now starting to see conditions like high blood pressure, high cholesterol and Type II diabetes in children—these are things that they only used to see in adults. And this bill is about reversing that trend and giving our kids the healthy futures that they deserve.”

We believe that rather than going backwards and serving children in some schools less healthy meals, we should be encouraging USDA to continue giving schools the technical assistance they need to meet the standards. We should also be encouraging USDA to continue providing flexibility, where warranted, in meeting nutrition standards.

The approach in this bill, however, is unacceptable.

Second, we are very troubled by the inclusion of bill language requiring that white potatoes be eligible for purchase in the WIC program. WIC provides *supplemental* nutrition through specified foods. For fruits and vegetables, WIC benefits are provided through vouchers and are extremely limited—currently a maximum of \$10 per person per month.

USDA explained its policy with respect to white potatoes as follows:

The restriction of white potatoes, as recommended by the IOM, is based on data indicating that consumption of starchy vegetables meets or exceeds recommended amounts, and food intake data showing that white potatoes are the most widely used vegetable. Including white potatoes in the WIC food packages would not contribute towards meeting the nutritional

needs of the WIC population and would not support the goal of expanding the types and varieties of fruits and vegetables available to program participants, as recommended by the IOM.

Recognizing the interest in this issue, USDA has said that it would start the regular review of the food package that had been scheduled for 2015 a year earlier to determine if the exclusion of white potatoes is still based on the most current scientific information.

This is the right approach. Congress has never mandated the inclusion of a specific food item in the WIC food package in the history of the program. If this ill-advised provision were to become law, it would set a dangerous precedent for congressional efforts to undermine the scientific basis for WIC.

While funding levels in the bill are, in general, acceptable, there are some exceptions. The most notable is the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, funded at \$217.6 million, which is \$62.4 million below the president's request. As we said last year, the Republican majority must drop the pretense that the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act is going to be repealed and provide the agency the resources it needs to fulfill its mandate.

On the positive side, we are pleased that the bill restores Food for Peace (FFP) funding to the 2014 level of \$1.466 billion (\$66 million over the request) and increases funding for the McGovern-Dole program by \$13 million over 2014 and the request, to \$198.1 million.

However, we have strong concerns about the exclusion of important reforms that would have furthered the impact of each dollar spent on food aid. First, although the 2014 omnibus and the President's 2015 budget set aside \$35 million from the total FFP account for greater flexibility in development assistance, this was not included in this bill. The language would allow us to feed up to 200,000 more people at no extra cost to the taxpayer. Second, we would have liked to include the President's request to allow up to 25% of the total account to be used for cash-based food assistance in emergency situations. That language would allow us to assist about 2 million more people around the world at no additional cost. We hope that as this bill moves forward, we can include these provisions, promote local capacity development, and assist as many people as possible with the dollars we provide.

While we will do our best to address the problems we have described here as the legislative process moves forward, we do not support the bill in its current form.

NITA M. LOWEY.  
SAM FARR.