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

A. ORGANIZATION

The House of Representatives established the total authorized membership of the Committee on Agriculture for the 113th Congress at 46, with a party division of 25 Republicans and 21 Democrats. Among the committee members were 14 Representatives who were serving their first terms (LaMalfa, Hudson, Rodney Davis of IL, Collins of NY, Yoho, Negrete McLeod, Vela, Lujan Grisham, Kuster, Gallego, Enyart, Vargas, Bustos, and Maloney).

The Committee organized on January 23, 2013, into five subcommittees, four of which were assigned jurisdiction over major agricultural commodities and one that dealt with various related agricultural operations. The five subcommittees were constituted as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

(Ratio includes ex officio Members.)
(Frank D. Lucas, Chairman, and Collin C. Peterson, Ranking Minority Member, are ex officio Members of all Subcommittees.)
The Committee organized on January 25, 2011, into six subcommittees, five of which were assigned jurisdiction over major agricultural commodities and one that dealt with various related agricultural operations. The six subcommittees were constituted as follows:

**Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry** (Ratio 10–8 (Total 18))

GLENN THOMPSON, Pennsylvania, Chairman

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
BOB GIBBS, Ohio
ERIC A. “RICK” CRAWFORD, Arkansas
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
REID J. RIBBLE, Wisconsin
KRISTI NOEM, South Dakota
DAN BENISHEK, Michigan
VANCE M. McCALLISTER, Louisiana

**Jurisdiction:** Soil, water, and resource conservation, small watershed program, energy and biobased energy production, rural electrification, forestry in general and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

**Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management** (Ratio 16–13 (Total 29))

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas, Chairman

RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
BOB GIBBS, Ohio
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
ERIC A. “RICK” CRAWFORD, Arkansas
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
REID J. RIBBLE, Wisconsin
KRISTI NOEM, South Dakota
DAN BENISHEK, Michigan
DOUG LAMALFA, California
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois
CHRIS COLLINS, New York

**Jurisdiction:** Program and markets related to cotton, cottonseed, wheat, feed grains, soybeans, oilseeds, rice, dry beans, peas, lentils, the Commodity Credit Corporation, risk management, including crop insurance, commodity exchanges, and specialty crops.

**Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture** (Ratio 9–8 (Total 17))

AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia, Chairman

STEVE SOUTHERLAND II, Florida
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
JEFF DENHAM, California
STEPHEN LEE FINCHER, Tennessee
DOUG LAMALFA, California
RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois
CHRIS COLLINS, New York
TED S. YOHO, Florida

**Jurisdiction:** Fruits and vegetables, honey and bees, marketing and promotion orders, plant pesticides, quarantine, adulteration of seeds and insect pests, and or-
ganic agriculture, research, education and extension, biotechnology and foreign agriculture assistance, and trade promotion programs, generally.

Subcommittee on Livestock, Rural Development, and Credit (Ratio 14–12 (Total 26))

ERIC A. “RICK” CRAWFORD, Arkansas, Chairman

JOHN BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
STEVE KING, Iowa
RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
GLENN THOMPSON, Pennsylvania
SCOTT DesJARLAIS, Tennessee
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York
REID J. RIBLE, Wisconsin
JEFF DENHAM, California
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
TED S. YOHO, Florida

JIM COSTA, California, Ranking Minority Member
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
FILEMON VELA, Texas
MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico
PETE P. GALLEGOS, Texas
WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
CHERI BUSTOS, Illinois
KURT SCHRADER, Oregon
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut

Jurisdiction: Livestock, dairy, poultry, meat, seafood and seafood products, inspection, marketing, and promotion of such commodities, aquaculture, animal welfare, and grazing, rural development, farm security and family farming matters, and agricultural credit.

Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, and Nutrition (Ratio 7–6 (Total 13))

STEVE KING, Iowa, Chairman

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
BOB GIBBS, Ohio
STEVE SOUTHERLAND II, Florida
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
STEPHEN LEE FINCHER, Tennessee
VANCE M. McALLISTER, Louisiana

MARcia L. FUDGE, Ohio, Ranking Minority Member
JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts
MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico
GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD, California

Jurisdiction: Agency oversight, review and analysis, special investigations, food stamps, nutrition and consumer programs.

Section Endnotes

† December 11, 2013—Resigned from Committee and Subcommittees.
‡ February 26, 2013—Appointed to Subcommittee.
‡ February 26, 2013—Resigned from Committee and Subcommittees.
‡ February 26, 2013—Appointed to Committee and Subcommittees.
● January 28, 2013—Appointed to Subcommittee.
◆ March 13, 2014—Appointed to Subcommittee.

B. COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Under Rules adopted by the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress, the Committee on Agriculture’s (hereinafter also referred to as Committee) jurisdiction (See Rule X, clause 1 of the Rules of the House of Representatives) extended to—

(1) Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
(2) Agriculture generally.
(3) Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
(4) Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
(5) Agricultural economics and research.
(6) Agricultural education extension services.
(7) Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products, and commodities (not including distribution outside of the United States).
(8) Animal industry and diseases of animals.
(9) Commodity exchanges.
(10) Crop insurance and soil conservation.
(11) Dairy industry.
(12) Entomology and plant quarantine.
(13) Extension of farm credit and farm security.
(14) Inspection of livestock, poultry, meat products, and seafood and seafood products.
(15) Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
(16) Human nutrition and home economics.
(17) Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
(18) Rural electrification.
(19) Rural development.
(20) Water conservation related to activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress (House Document No. 106–320) provides the following concerning the Committee on Agriculture:

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

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

The 104th Congress consolidated the Committee’s jurisdiction over inspection of livestock and meat products to include inspection of poultry, seafood, and seafood prod-

---

1 References are to the volume and section of Hinds’ (volumes I–V, e.g., IV, 500) and Cannon’s (volumes VI–VIII, e.g., VI, 400) Precedents of the House of Representatives, and to the Congressional Record by date and page (e.g., January 3, 1953, p. 500).
ucts, and added subparagraph (20) relating to water con-
servation (sec. 202(a), H. Res. 6, Jan. 4, 1995, p. 464). Clerical and stylistic changes were effected when the House recodified its rules in the 106th Congress (H. Res. 5. Jan. 6, 1999, p. 47).

The Committee has had jurisdiction of bills for establishing and regulating the Department of Agriculture (IV, 4150), for inspection of livestock and meat products, regulation of animal industry, diseases of animals (IV, 4154; VII, 1862), adulteration of seeds, insect pests, protection of birds and animals in forest reserves (IV, 4157; VII, 1870), the improvement of the breed of horses, even with the cavalry service in view (IV, 4158; VII, 1865), and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, amending Horse Protection Act to prevent the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, or receiving of horses to be slaughtered for human consumption (July 13, 2006, p. 5270).

The Committee, having charge of the general subject of forestry, has reported bills relating to timber, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain (IV, 4160). The Committee on Natural Resources, and not this committee, has jurisdiction over a bill to convey land that is part of a National Forest created from the public domain (March 23, 2004, p. 1344). It has also exercised jurisdiction of bills relating to agricultural colleges and experiment stations (IV, 4152), incorporation of agricultural societies (IV, 4159), and establishment of a highway commission (IV, 4153), to discourage fictitious and gambling transactions in farm products (IV, 4161; VII, 1861), to regulate the transportation, sale and handling of dogs and cats intended for use in research and the licensing of animal research facilities (July 29, 1965, p. 18691); and to designate an agricultural research center (May 14, 1995, p. 11070). The Committee shares with the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction over a bill comprehensively amending the Immigration and Nationality Act and including food stamp eligibility requirements for aliens (Sept. 19, 1995, p. 25533).

The House referred the President’s message dealing with the refinancing of farm-mortgage indebtedness to the Committee, thus conferring jurisdiction (April 4, 1933, p. 1209).

The Committee has jurisdiction over a bill relating solely to executive level position in the Department of Agriculture (Mar. 2, 1976, p. 4958) and has jurisdiction over bills to develop land and water conservation programs on private and non-Federal lands (June 7, 1976, p. 16768)."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(9) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

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

(11) Programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds of the Department of Agriculture, including but not limited to the food stamp program and the commodity distribution program.

(12) Aquaculture programs of the Department of Agriculture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(24) Legislation regarding the Federal Reserve Board with respect to its authority to regulate the establishment of appropriate levels of margin on stock index futures contracts.

The Committee also reviews and studies, on a continuing basis, the current and prospective application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof. In addition, the Committee, along with other standing Committees of the House, has the function of reviewing and studying on a continuing basis the effect or probable effect of tax and other fiscal and monetary policies affecting subjects within their jurisdiction.

C. OVERSIGHT PLAN

The Committee on Agriculture met on February 13, 2013 to also fulfill the General Oversight Responsibility reporting requirements of Rule X 2(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives.
The following outline was prepared in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and approved by the Full Committee which was forwarded to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration on February 13, 2013:

**OVERSIGHT PLAN HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE 113TH CONGRESS**

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

### 2008 Farm Bill and Current Agricultural Conditions
- Review the current state of the U.S. farm economy;
- Review the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) implementation of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (FCEA) as extended;
- Review policy proposals regarding farm bill development;
- Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
- Review programs for waste, fraud and abuse;
- Review USDA’s initial and subsequent implementation of FCEA payment limit and adjusted gross income provisions;
- Review the state of credit conditions and availability in rural America;
- Review the impact of weather conditions on crop production;
- Review USDA’s activities regarding implementation of the U.S. Warehouse Act;
- Review USDA’s implementation of actively-engaged rules;
- Review of market situation, including impact of crop reports and projections;
- Review USDA’s implementation of the U.S. Grain Standards Act;
- Review USDA’s implementation of the Fair and Equitable Tobacco Reform Act of 2004;
- Review the impact of the potential sequestration order on programs and activities authorized by the Agriculture Committee;
- Review how Administrative Pay-Go is affecting Department actions; and
- Review discretionary actions by USDA that are not directly authorized by legislation.

### Energy
- Assess energy programs authorized by FCEA;
- Review administration of the Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP);
- Review activities funded by the Biomass Research and Development Act (BRDA) and input from the external BRDA Advisory Board;
- Review availability of agriculture and forestry feedstocks for renewable energy production;
• Review current status of research on energy crops and feedstocks;
• Review RUS electric loan program;
• Review electricity reliability in rural America;
• Review current provisions in existing law that support agriculture-based energy production and use;
• Review the implementation of the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS);
• Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
• Review renewable fuel programs and their impact on agriculture; and
• Review USDA's energy infrastructure initiative.

Conservation and the Environment
• Review the impact of regulatory activities by the EPA and its effect on agriculture productivity;
• Review the impact of regulatory activities carried out pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), or any proposed legislative changes to such Act, on agricultural producers;
• Review the impact of the Administration's regulatory activity relative to methyl bromide on production of agriculture in the U.S.;
• Review the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture;
• Review budget and program activities of the NRCS;
• Review implementation of all of USDA's conservation programs;
• Review NRCS's efforts to streamline program delivery and field operations;
• Review conservation streamlining initiatives to eliminate duplicative and overlapping programs;
• Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
• Review EPA's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its impact to U.S. agriculture;
• Review of potential impacts of EPA's Clean Air Act (CAA) regulatory program on U.S. agriculture;
• Review ongoing discussions and potential consequences for American agriculture under the United Nations Climate Change Conference;
• Review EPA’s implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), FIFRA and Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 3);
• Review the impact of litigation and rulemaking concerning FIFRA, ESA, CAA, CWA, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) and for impacts agricultural operations;
• Review the EPA’s regulatory actions in regard to pesticide evaluations;
• Review EPA’s regulation of Animal Feeding Operations;
• Review the non-emergency haying and grazing provisions of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP); and
• Review Total Maximum Daily Load strategies and impacts on production agriculture.

Federal Crop Insurance and Risk Management
• Review USDA’s implementation of crop insurance provisions of the FCEA;
• Review the role and effectiveness of Federal Crop Insurance;
• Review USDA’s and the Risk Management Agency’s (RMA) administration and oversight of Federal Crop Insurance;
• Review the availability of crop insurance as a risk management tool;
• Review of the adequacy and availability of risk management tools for the livestock and dairy industries;
• Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
• Review USDA’s activities designed to find and reduce crop insurance waste, fraud, and abuse;
• Review USDA’s crop insurance rating methodology and management of the Standard Reinsurance Agreement (SRA) process;
• Review RMA’s combination of revenue protection crop insurance products; and
• Review RMA’s progress in approving crop insurance products for under-served commodities.

Implementation of Title VII of Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act
• In its review of rulemakings required by Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111-203) (Dodd-Frank Act), the Committee will continue to ensure—
  (1) The U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) rulemaking process is transparent and that meaningful comment is allowed by the public;
  (2) An adequate cost-benefit analysis is performed by the CFTC for each proposed or finalized rule;
(3) The CFTC and SEC properly coordinate with both domestic and international financial regulators;
(4) Past exemptive relief orders or no action letters issued by the CFTC and SEC provide the proper relief for market participants;
(5) Any final or proposed regulations have not harmed or adversely impacted the U.S. economy or financial markets, including the impact on jobs and competitiveness; and

- The Committee will examine how Title VII rulemakings have impacted U.S. market structure;
- The Committee will also examine the developing impact of pending CFTC, SEC, and Prudential Regulator regulations, such as the imposition of new margin and capital requirements, and how they affect the ability of many “end-users” to utilize swaps to hedge against legitimate business risks;
- The Committee will examine the level of coordination between U.S. and international regulators for potential impacts on U.S. financial institutions compared to their foreign counterparts; and
- The Committee will examine the feasibility of timetables established by the Dodd-Frank Act in building the data, technology and connectivity necessary to meet regulatory objectives.

The U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission and Oversight of the Derivatives Markets

- Review the operations of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC);
- Review the growing consolidation and internationalization of futures exchange trading;
- Review market machinations for exchange traded energy and agricultural future products;
- Review enforcement and oversight capabilities of the CFTC both domestically and internationally;
- The Committee will continue to examine how the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and futures industry as a whole has addressed the MF Global and PFGBest bankruptcies from both an enforcement and regulatory reform standpoint to ensure that proper remedial action is taken to prevent future losses to segregated funds of customers;
- In light of the Commodity Exchange Act statutory authorization of the CFTC expiring at the end of FY 2013, the Committee will continue to examine all sectors of the U.S. derivatives and futures markets, including, but not limited to: exchange or swap execution facility trading; the roles of dealers, inter-dealer brokers, data repositories, and clearinghouses; trade and price reporting; and proposals aimed at protecting the segregated funds of futures customers;
- The Committee will continue to examine the ongoing investigation and enforcement action by the CFTC and other Federal regulators with respect to the manipulation of the London Interbank Offer Rate (LIBOR); and
The Committee will review all operations of the CFTC, including: a continued examination whether the cost-benefit analysis required by section 15a of the CEA is adequate with respect to proposed and finalized rules; the efficiency of internal Commission actions; and the enforcement and oversight capabilities of the CFTC both domestically and internationally.

Agriculture Trade and International Food Aid

- Review domestic subsidies and protection currently applied by agricultural product producing countries around the world;
- Review ongoing multilateral, regional, and bilateral trade negotiations (including WTO accession agreements) to assess their potential impact on U.S. agriculture;
- Review implementation of existing trade agreements and commitments as well as proposed new trade agreements and commitments to determine—
  (1) whether they are consistent with current U.S. law;
  (2) whether they will promote economic development in rural areas of the U.S.;
  (3) their impact or potential impact on current production of import sensitive agricultural commodities, and on exports of U.S. agricultural products;
  (4) their impact or potential impact on the overall competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural sector, including the production, processing and distribution of agricultural products; and
  (5) whether they provide adequate, enforceable provisions to minimize non-tariff barriers to U.S. exports.
- Monitor existing trade agreements to ensure trading partners are meeting obligations and enforcing trade commitments;
- Review farm export programs to determine how well they are promoting the interests of U.S. agriculture and examine proposals to improve, modify or expand such programs;
- Review U.S. food aid programs to determine their impact or potential impact on the reduction of world hunger. In particular, the committee will examine the potential impact of multilateral trade negotiations on the effectiveness of U.S. food aid programs;
- Review monitoring and evaluation activities carried out by USDA and USAID; and
- Review sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) barriers and other technical barriers to U.S. agricultural exports and examine USDA efforts to eliminate such barriers.

Agricultural Research and Promotion

- Review implementation of biosecurity protocols at USDA Agricultural ResearchService (ARS) laboratories;
- Review USDA’s implementation of research, education and extension programs authorized in FCEA;
- Review the administration of the ARS research stations and worksites;
• Review USDA’s continuing ability to conduct foreign animal disease research, training and diagnostic programs at the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility following the transfer of the center to the Department of Homeland Security;
• Assess Federal efforts to facilitate research and development of aquacultural enterprises, specifically focusing on the activities of the Joint Committee on Aquaculture;
• Review USDA’s regulation on organic standards;
• Review USDA’s collection of organic production and market data;
• Review administration of National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA);
• Review the administration of the Agricultural Food Research Initiative;
• Review efforts to leverage Federal research investment with state, local, and private sources of funding;
• Review coordination between ARS, Economic Research Service (ERS), NIFA and action agencies in USDA—such as NRCS and FSA—in order to prevent duplicative research;
• Review operation of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education, and Economics Advisory Board;
• Review USDA’s efforts to expand research and development of pathogen reduction technologies;
• Review the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA) findings regarding cloned animal products;
• Evaluate the current mix of research funding mechanisms to ensure maximum benefits from these investments to producers, processors and consumers;
• Review administration of USDA’s agricultural marketing and promotion programs;
• Review coordination between USDA and DOE on energy research programs;
• Review Congressional appropriation process and implications on research funding under ARS, ERS, NASS and NIFA;
• Review ARS, ERS, NASS and NIFA national program priorities;
• Oversight of research grant process to coordinate and prevent overlapping research; and
• Review the potential for research and technology transfer to address the needs of both the biofuels and livestock industries.

**Biotechnology**

• Review current regulations and research regarding animal and plant biotechnology;
• Review the FDA’s regulatory activities regarding genetically engineered animals;
• Assess USDA’s efforts to develop and promote benefits of biotechnology for increasing agricultural productivity and combating hunger globally;
• Review USDA’s management and controls over biotechnology-derived material; and
• Review the impact of litigation on USDA’s timeliness in resolving petitions to deregulate products of biotechnology.

U.S. Forest Service Administration
• Review U.S. Forest Service (USFS) strategy for dealing with wildfire for coming years, including the impact of hazardous fuels management, forest health efforts and fire preparedness;
• Continue to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the Forest Service fire management program;
• Review the impact of fire expenses on other USFS program delivery;
• Assess the USFS strategy for timber harvesting on Federal lands;
• Review impacts of environmental regulations on National Forest land management;
• Review economic impacts of National Forest land management on rural communities; and
• Review USFS efforts to promote utilization of National Forest timber for renewable energy purposes.

Dairy
• Review options to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of dairy programs; and
• Review efficiency of Federal Milk Marketing Order System.

Outreach and Civil Rights
• Review implementation of Section 14012 of the FCEA;
• Review the operations of the Office of Advocacy and Outreach;
• Monitor USDA’s outreach efforts to beginning, small and minority farmers/ranchers;
• Review of the operations of the office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights;
• Review USDA’s process for settling discrimination claims and evaluating individual claims submitted pursuant to such settlements;
• Review the delivery of USDA services and outreach efforts on Indian reservations and tribal lands;
• Review implementation of Section 14003 of the FCEA;
• Review current status of Agricultural Census and efforts to reach undercounted farmers and ranchers; and
• Review participation of minority farmers in FSA County/Local Committees as well as outreach to increase participation in County Committee elections.

USDA General Administration
• Review confidentiality of information provided to USDA by agricultural producers;
• Review USDA’s implementation of field office consolidation for the purpose of effectively and efficiently delivering commodity, conservation, energy and rural development programs;
• Review agency appeals process and granting of equitable relief as well as operation of the National Appeals Division;
• Review USDA’s efforts to modernize its Information Technology (IT) systems; and
• Review the administrative structure of USDA for effectiveness and additional efficiencies.

Farm Credit, Rural Development, and the Rural Economy
• Review Farm Credit Administration’s (FCA) regulatory program and activities regarding the Farm Credit System (FCS) to assure its safety and soundness;
• Review Farmer Mac activities and programs;
• Review FSA’s direct and guaranteed loan programs and graduation efforts;
• Review the Rural Electrification Act (REA);
• Review the farm economy and access to credit;
• Review implementation of rural development policies and authorities contained in FCEA and the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act;
• Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
• Conduct oversight of the USDA’s Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program;
• Review USDA Rural Development application processes and internal controls related to both the Farm Bill and P.L. 111–5 (Recovery Act) Programs;
• Review administration of the Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program;
• Conduct oversight of the implementation of the USDA’s Telecommunications Programs;
• Review the status of the Rural Telephone Bank;
• Assess state of rural water systems and effectiveness of Federal funding to build and upgrade those systems;
• Assess effectiveness of USDA programs targeted towards rural infrastructure;
• Review agriculture lending practices;
• Review public-private partnerships in lending through guaranteed loans;
• Review definition of “rural” under rural development programs; and
• Review rural development loan programs and default rates.

USDA Food and Nutrition Programs
• Review food and nutrition programs including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), fruit and vegetable initiatives, the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) and other commodity distribution programs;
• Assess the level of participation by states in SNAP and examine state options for administering SNAP;
• Review participant eligibility criteria for SNAP;
• Review the interaction between SNAP and other low-income assistance programs such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), and with provisions in the Affordable Care Act;
• Review SNAP work requirements and the efficiency and accountability of the SNAP Employment & Training program;
• Review efforts by USDA and the states to combat waste, fraud and abuse within nutrition programs;
• Review buying patterns of SNAP recipients and methods for encouraging balanced lifestyles;
• Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
• Review efforts by state SNAP administrators to modernize and streamline their programs;
• Review the Community Food Project Program to ensure cooperative grants are working;
• Review the SNAP retailer approval process; and
• Review the implementation of changes made to the SNAP Nutrition Education Program.

Specialty Crops
• Review implementation of the Specialty Crop Competitiveness Act;
• Assess operation of the Fruit and Vegetable (FAV) planting prohibition pilot program;
• Review the Specialty Crop Block Grant program to ensure that the grants awarded are enhancing the specialty crop industry;
• Review farmers market programs;
• Review implementation and effectiveness of cooperative plant health programs, including Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention and the Clean Plant Network; and
• Review the Specialty Crop Research Initiative.

Food Safety
• Review implementation of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act;
• Review implementation of the recent FDA Egg Safety Rule;
• Review USDA’s administration of meat and poultry inspection laws and the FDA’s food inspection activities to ensure the development of scientifically sound systems for food safety assurance;
• Review USDA’s implementation of the catfish inspection program;
• Review USDA’s efforts to educate consumers regarding safe food handling practices and streamline the assessment and approval of food safety technologies;
• Review implementation of new protocols for meat, poultry, eggs, or seafood safety inspection;
• Review USDA’s enforcement of the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act and humane handling regulations; and
• Review the mechanisms to establish scientifically based international food safety standards.

**Plant and Animal Health**

• Review enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act;
• Review enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act;
• Assess Federal efforts to reduce threats to human, animal, and plant health due to predatory and invasive species;
• Review efforts of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to manage wildlife conflicts in order to protect public health and safety;
• Assess USDA’s Animal Disease Traceability Plan; and
• Review implementation of Sec. 10201—Plant pest and disease management and disaster prevention.

**Livestock Marketing**

• Assess the effectiveness of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) in determining market manipulation in the livestock industry;
• Review structural changes in agribusiness and the potential cost and benefits for agricultural producers; and
• Review the USDA’s mandatory livestock price reporting system.

**Homeland and Agricultural Security**

• Oversight of USDA’s preparedness against terrorist threats to agriculture production;
• Review cooperative efforts between the Department of Homeland Security and USDA to prevent against foreign animal disease; and
• Review agriculture inspection activities under the Department of Homeland Security.

**Miscellaneous**

• Review the implementation and impact of The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) on USDA programs;
• Review the impact of transportation infrastructure issues on agriculture and forestry; and
• Review USDA’s implementation and enforcement of the country of origin labeling rule including actions taken by USDA to implement measures necessary to comply with the recommendations and rulings of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body on Certain Country of Origin Labeling Requirement.

**Consultation With Other Committees To Reduce Duplication**

• With Natural Resources Committee on forestry issues, ESA issues and other public land issues;
• With Science, Space, and Technology Committee on research;
• With Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce Committees on nutrition programs;
• With Ways and Means Committee on trade issues;
• With Homeland Security Committee on importation of animal and plant material and on research related to agroterrorism;
• With the Judiciary Committee on immigrant agricultural labor;
• With Energy and Commerce Committee on food safety and biomass energy programs both existing and new;
• With Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on CWA compliance issues;
• With Financial Services Committee on Dodd-Frank Act issues;
• With Foreign Affairs Committee on food aid and trade issues;
• With Small Business Committee on addressing economic opportunities for rural America; and
• With any other committee as appropriate.

II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES DURING THE 113TH CONGRESS

A. MAIN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Agriculture reported or otherwise considered a variety of bills in the 113th Congress covering many of the diverse areas within its jurisdictional interests.

Some of the major activities of the committee during the 113th Congress included the following:

Agenda for the House Agriculture Committee

• The Agriculture Committee approached its business in an open, transparent manner and maintained the strong bipartisan tradition of the Committee. One of the main priorities of the Committee during this Congress was to provide oversight to the various Federal agencies through the hearing process.
• The Agriculture Committee held 5 full committee hearings and 7 business meetings during the 113th Congress. Various subcommittees held 17 hearings during the 113th Congress.
• The Committee heard testimony from Administration officials on 21 occasions, including 16 testimonies from U.S. Department of Agriculture representatives; 1 from the Farm Credit Administration; 1 from the Federal Reserve; and 3 from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Additional testimony heard by the Committee was offered by a state government official, university researchers, nonprofit organizations, trade groups, and farmers and ranchers from across the United States and totaled 74 testimonies all together.
• The House Agriculture Committee successfully drafted and passed out of Committee a bipartisan farm bill that was the product of nearly three years of deliberation that was done in public with input from all perspectives. The farm bill was signed into law and became P.L. 113–79.
• The House Agriculture Committee successfully passed six bipartisan pieces of legislation aimed at reducing the negative impacts of Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act on market partici-
pants and end-users within various sectors of the economy. In addition, the Committee passed a bipartisan bill that would require the CFTC to prospectively quantify the cost and benefits of all regulations passed by the agency.

- The House Agriculture Committee held four hearings to examine the statutory reauthorization of the CFTC within the Commodity Exchange Act. The hearings focused on the CFTC’s role and place in overseeing the futures and swaps markets, current issues facing the Commission, current issues facing end-users and market participants, and recent regulatory proposals that were designed to better protect futures customers from unexpected market events.

- The House Agriculture Committee successfully drafted and passed out of Committee bipartisan legislation to reauthorize and improve the operations of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as well as address concerns relating to protecting customers from another failure such as MF Global and Peregrine Financial. This legislation was the product of a multi-year process.

_Agricultural Act of 2014_

- Repealed outdated policies while reforming, streaming, and consolidating nearly 100 government programs. These reforms contribute to deficit reduction of nearly $23 billion dollars.

- Eliminates direct payments and limits producers to risk management tools that offer protection when they suffer significant losses.

- Strengthens crop insurance, a successful public/private partnership that ensures farmers invest in their own risk management.

- Makes the first reforms to SNAP since the welfare reforms of 1996.

- Closes the “heat and eat” loophole that may increase benefit levels when states provide nominal LIHEAP assistance.

- The Act eliminates the practice of advertising, promoting, and recruiting for SNAP and restricts lottery winners and traditional college students.

- Establishes a 10 state pilot to empower states to engage able-bodied adults in mandatory work programs.

- The Act eliminates and consolidates 23 duplicative and overlapping conservation programs into 13.

- Authorize and strengthen livestock disaster assistance during devastating droughts.

- Invests in core specialty crop initiatives like the Specialty Crop Block Grants and Plant Pest and Disease Management and Prevention Programs.

- Maintains our investment in agriculture research that gives farmers and ranchers the ability to explore new ways to provide our country with the safest, most affordable, most reliable food supply in the world.
Customer Protection and End User Relief Act

- The bill reauthorizes and improves the operations of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as well as addresses concerns relating to protecting customers.
- Protects farmers and ranchers who use the futures markets to manage their risk by cementing several new and existing protections into law.
- Strives to enhance the efficiency of Commission operations.
- Provides much needed relief to end-users—those market participants that account for only 10 percent of the swaps market and had nothing to do with the 2008 financial crisis yet represent 94 percent of U.S. job creators—including farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and energy firms and utilities.

Legislation Reducing Burdens Associated with the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act

Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013

- The bill clarifies Congressional intent and provides an explicit exemption from margin requirements for non-financial end-users that qualify for the clearing exception, including cooperatives that are provided a clearing exemption by CFTC regulations.
- Over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives enable businesses across the country to manage the risks associated with their day-to-day operations.
- Consumers, in turn, benefit from companies’ prudent risk management activities through lower volatility in the prices of day-to-day goods and services such as food, electricity, and transportation.
- For this reason, Congress provided an explicit exemption from clearing and margin for end-users in Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. These exemptions are aimed at ensuring end-users do not have to divert precious working capital to margin requirements, keeping those dollars at work in the economy.
- While the CFTC has upheld Congressional intent in its margin proposal by exempting non-financial end-users, the banking regulators have proposed to require non-financial end-users to post margin when they trade with swap dealers that are banks, a problem that this bill addresses.

The Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013

- Swap data repositories serve as electronic warehouses for data and information regarding swap transactions. Historically, swap data repositories (SDRs) have regularly shared information with foreign regulators.
- Under Sections 725, 728 and 763 of the Dodd-Frank Act, when a foreign regulator requests information from a U.S. registered SDR or derivatives clearing organization (DCO), the SDR or DCO is required to receive a written agreement from the foreign regulator stating that it will abide by certain confidentiality requirements and will “indemnify” the Commissions for
any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for information.

- The concept of “indemnification”—requiring a party to contractually agree to pay for another party’s possible litigation expenses—is only well established in U.S. tort law, and does not exist in practice or in legal concept in foreign legal jurisdictions.

- These indemnification provisions—which were not included in the financial reform bill passed by the House of Representatives in December 2009—threaten to make data sharing arrangements with foreign regulators unworkable. Foreign regulators will most likely refuse to indemnify U.S. regulators for litigation expenses in exchange for access to data.

- As a result, foreign regulators may establish their own data repositories and clearing organizations to ensure they have access to data they need to perform their supervisory duties.

- This legislation strikes the indemnification requirements related to both swap data gathered by swap data repositories (SDRs) and data collected by the Commission from clearing-houses.

- The bill does maintain, however, that before an SDR, DCO, or the Commission can share information with other regulators, they have to receive a written agreement that the regulator will abide by certain confidentiality agreements.

The Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013

- This bipartisan legislation that would allow producers, utility companies, and other non-financial entities to continue entering into energy swaps with government-owned utilities (aka: utility special entities) without requiring them to register with the CFTC as a “swap dealers” solely because of their dealings with government-owned utilities.

- With a utility special entity there are no shareholders, so the costs imposed by this CFTC regulatory decision, born from the Dodd-Frank Act, will be paid for by everyday consumers and ratepayers of electric power and natural gas.

- As a group, public power utilities deliver electricity to one in every seven electricity customers in the United States—over 47 million people—serving some of the nation’s largest cities, such as Los Angeles, San Antonio, Seattle and Orlando. However, the vast majority of public power companies serve communities with populations of 10,000 people or less. There are over 2,000 municipal, state and locally-owned, not-for-profit electric utilities throughout the United States.

- This bill maintains the ability of utility special entities to specifically hedge risk associated with the generation of electric energy or production of natural gas, but does not include an exemption for interest rate, credit, equities, currency asset classes, or agriculture commodities, other than crude oil or gasoline fuel commodities used for electric energy generation.

- More importantly, this bill would not provide an exemption for utility special entities to enter into financial swaps, such as in-
terest rate swaps related to the issuance of municipal bonds or public debt (such as the type of interest rate swaps that contributed to Jefferson County, Alabama, filing for bankruptcy in 2011, the largest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history).

- Further, to ensure transparency, the bill still requires all special entity swap transactions to be reported to the CFTC.
- The bill will place utility special entities on a level playing field with everyone else in the marketplace, allowing many of them to keep the same swap counterparties they have used to manage risk with for years.

The “Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act”

- Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act was inserted during the Dodd-Frank Conference Committee deliberations in May and June of 2010 by former Senator Blanche Lincoln, despite opposition from some Senate Democrats and many Federal financial regulators. It is important to note that Section 716 was not included in the December 2009 House-passed version of the Dodd-Frank Act.
- Federal financial regulators who opposed Section 716's addition to the Dodd-Frank Act included: Current Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, former FDIC Chairwoman Sheila Bair, former Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, and former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker.
- On its face, Section 716 prevents any financial institution that trades certain types of swaps from receiving any type of “Federal assistance”—including access to the Federal Reserve discount window, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation coverage, or any future Federal “bailout” similar to what Congress approved in the fall of 2008 during the financial crisis.
- Due to this prohibition, Section 716 has the practical effect of forcing financial institutions from trading in certain types of swaps, and forces banks to “push out” or “spin off” their swaps business into new separately incorporated and capitalized trading businesses. However, Section 716 does not cover all swaps trading by a bank. Banks still would not be required to “push out” swaps used for hedging risks associated with their banking activities, including interest rate swaps, foreign currency swaps, and credit default swaps (CDS) on investment grade names that are centrally cleared.
- Since Dodd-Frank became law in July of 2010, no equivalent provisions have been adopted in any foreign jurisdictions that are working through their own derivatives reforms, placing U.S. firms at a competitive disadvantage with international banks.
- Earlier in 2013, U.S. Federal financial regulators effectively delayed implementation of Section 716 for both domestic banks and foreign banks doing business in the United States for up to two years (until July 2015).
- This is substantially similar to an amended version of H.R. 1838 from the 112th Congress that passed by voice vote out of the House Financial Services Committee in February of 2012. In March of 2013, the House Agriculture Committee approved

- The legislation would prevent financial institutions from forcing much of the remaining derivatives business outside of the bank, which is a more heavily regulated and more highly capitalized entity than a stand-alone affiliate.
- Likewise, forcing the banks to capitalize new entities without equivalent risk mitigating benefits will unnecessarily divert capital that could otherwise be at work in the economy, and could increase risk to the financial system.
- Notably, the bill amends Section 716 to limit the swap desk push-out requirement so that it does not apply to equity or commodity swaps. However, it will continue to apply to structured finance swaps that are based on an asset-backed security.
  - Retaining coverage of structured finance swaps based on asset backed securities is intended to respond to concerns that the derivatives activities of AIG (which were based upon mortgage backed securities) were highly risky and contributed to the financial crisis.

To Improve Consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the Costs and Benefits of Its Regulations and Orders

- The legislation requires the CFTC to meet the same analytical standards that President Obama mandated every Executive Agency to meet under Executive Order 13565. The Commission is currently exempt from them because it is an Independent Agency.
- A proper, comprehensive, cost-benefit analysis will foster more informed dialogue between regulators and stakeholders, and in turn produce rules and regulations that better meet the unique needs of derivative market participants.
- The bill provides for analysis and evaluation that is specific to the derivatives market and the structure of the CFTC. Further, it is consistent with and complementary to previous House-passed cost-benefit legislation.
- Importantly, the bill is not retroactive, and would not impact current rulemaking and regulatory processes already underway.

The Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act

- The bill requires a joint rulemaking from the CFTC and SEC on cross-border transactions, and would presume that the top nine (9) foreign jurisdictions by notional swap volume would be recognized as having sufficient regulatory supervision over their own markets unless the CFTC and SEC jointly determine otherwise.
- The final amended version of the bill took into consideration many technical comments provided since the March 14, 2013, Agriculture Full Committee hearing, including limiting the number of foreign jurisdictions that are recognized as being so-
phisticated enough to regulate their own markets (top nine globally) so that the swaps markets do not move to jurisdictions that have not implemented financial regulatory reforms.

- Further, the bill requires the Commissions to report to Congress any determination that a foreign jurisdiction is not broadly equivalent to the regulations of the United States.
- The bill also requires that any rule jointly issued by the two agencies must go through a joint rulemaking process subject to the Administrative Procedures Act. The CFTC and SEC have failed to do so since Dodd-Frank was signed into law, leading to tremendous domestic and international confusion and uncertainty.
- More importantly, no “guidance” from either Commission will have the force of law.
- Moreover, coordination between U.S. and international regulators limits regulatory arbitrage, and the unintended concentration of risk to the financial system.
- The U.S. must not be put at a competitive disadvantage because it was the first to act on financial regulatory reform.
- The legislation provides market participants transparency and certainty that U.S. and foreign regulators will finalize rules that effectively prevents market fragmentation and destabilization.
- The bill would require that the CFTC and SEC coordinate their rules for the swaps markets—a basic premise that should have started soon after Dodd-Frank was signed into law. Without domestic regulator coordination, getting the global rules right will be next to impossible, a dangerous possibility during times of economic uncertainty.

The Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act

- Inter-affiliate swaps are executed between entities within a single corporation or corporate group to allocate risk within the group. They allow for centralized hedging, whereby a corporation uses inter-affiliate swaps to combine its positions, executing most or all of its market-facing swaps through a single or small number of affiliates.
- Proposed derivatives rules under Dodd-Frank could require both inter-affiliate swaps and market-facing swaps to meet the same regulatory requirements, even though inter-affiliate swaps do not increase systemic risk.
- New regulations are meant to only apply to transactions that might increase systemic risk, not on inter-affiliate trading.
- Inefficient changes to current business practices: Currently companies use centralized hedging, where one or a small number of affiliates act as the external-facing party. This allows companies to concentrate trade expertise, better evaluate counterparty credit risk, and secure better pricing through economies of scale.
  - Centralized hedging also eliminates duplicative execution, accounting, settlement, compliance, and reporting functions, and allows a company to net positions held by its various affiliates.
• This bill requires inter-affiliate swaps and security-based swaps be reported to a swap data repository or the CFTC and SEC pursuant to reporting rules.
• Exempting inter-affiliate swaps would not lead to abuse because Section 721(c) of Dodd-Frank gives regulators explicit anti-evasion authority.
• Explicitly preserves regulatory authority under sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act and as well as authority to protect Federal and State insurance and guarantee funds.

B. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

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

Number of bills referred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate joint resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House resolutions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Disposition of Bills Containing Items Under the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bills enacted into law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills acted on by both Houses, but not enacted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills acted on by the House but not the Senate</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent Resolutions approved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills reported to the House but not considered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills defeated in the House</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Statistics on hearings and markups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Business Meetings</th>
<th>Hearings</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Committee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Commodities and Risk Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Energy, and Forestry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Operations, Oversight, and Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock, Rural Development, and Credit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Bills Enacted into Law


The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 was introduced by Chairman Frank Lucas on July 10, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On July 11, 2013
the bill passed the House, by a recorded vote of 216 yeas to 208 nays. On July 18, 2013 the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and inserted the text of S. 954 as previously passed by Senate and requested a conference. On September 28, 2013 the House agreed to the Senate amendment with an amendment pursuant to H. Res. 361 which included the text of H.R. 3102 as previously passed by the House on September 19, 2013. On October 1, 2013 the Senate disagreed to House amendment to the Senate amendment by a Unanimous Consent, requested a conference and appointed conferees. On October 11, 2013 the House insisted on its amendment and agreed to a conference with the appointment of conferees occurring on October 12, 2013. On October 30, 2013 a House-Senate Conference meeting was held to resolve the differences.

The 2008 Farm Bill governed policy for farm commodity support, horticulture, livestock, conservation, nutrition assistance, trade and international food aid, agricultural research, farm credit, rural development, bioenergy, and forestry. It originally expired in 2012, but the 112th Congress did not complete action and instead extended the law for one year (P.L. 112–240), leaving consideration of a new farm bill to the 113th Congress. After nearly three years of deliberations, Congress completed action on a new omnibus farm bill when conferees reported a conference agreement on January 27, 2014 (the Agricultural Act of 2014, H.R. 2642/H. Rept. 113–333); the full House approved the conference agreement on January 29 by a vote of 251 yeas and 166 nays. The Senate approved the conference report on February 4 with a vote of 68 yeas and 32 nays. The President signed the measure on February 7, 2014 and it became Public Law No. 113–79.

Within the new 2014 Farm Bill are provisions that reshape the structure of farm commodity support, expand crop insurance coverage, consolidate conservation programs, reauthorize and revise nutrition assistance, and extend authority to appropriate funds for many U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) programs through FY 2018, among many other provisions.

Under the conference agreement, farm support for traditional program crops is restructured by eliminating direct payments, the counter–cyclical price (CCP) program, and the Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program. Much of the savings associated with the elimination of these farm programs would be used to offset the cost of revising the remaining programs, adding permanent disaster assistance, and enhancing crop insurance.

The 2014 Farm Bill reauthorizes the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly food stamps) through FY 2018. The new measure restricts how a household’s receipt of Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) benefits can affect SNAP benefits, accounting for most of the nutrition budget savings.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected that if the mandatory programs of the 2008 Farm Bill were to continue, they would cost $973 billion over the next 10 years (FY 2014–FY 2023), which served as a baseline budget for deliberations on the 2014 Farm Bill. The conference agreement on the 2014 Farm Bill is projected to spend $956 billion over the next 10 years, of which $756 billion is for nutrition assistance and $200 billion is for the agri-
culture portion. Compared to the baseline, the 2014 Farm Bill conference agreement reduces projected spending and the deficit by $16.6 billion (−1.7%) over 10 years. This projected 10 year savings is closer to the Senate-passed bill level of $17.8 billion than the projected House-passed savings of $51.8 billion.

Title I—Commodities

Under the conference agreement, farm support for traditional program crops is restructured by eliminating direct payments, the counter-cyclical price (CCP) program, and the Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program. Since 1996, direct payments have been made to producers and landowners based on historical production of corn, wheat, soybeans, cotton, rice, peanuts, and other “covered” crops. Direct payments lost political support in recent years because recipients did not need to suffer a loss in order to receive a payment.

Approximately ¾ of the 10 year, $47 billion in savings associated with the elimination of current farm programs would be used to offset the costs of revising farm programs in Title I, adding permanent disaster assistance in Title I, and enhancing crop insurance in Title XI. The agreement provides farm programs (described below) for covered crops, except cotton, which has a new crop insurance policy (see “Farm Bill Title XI, Crop Insurance”). Under the conference agreement, authority is continued for marketing assistance loans, which provide additional low price protection at “loan rates” specified in previous law (with an adjustment made to the cotton loan rate). As in previous farm bills as well as in the 2013 Senate Farm Bill, the conference agreement suspends permanent price support authority under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949 until program authority expires in 2018. In contrast, the House bill would have repealed permanent law and made permanent the commodity support programs authorized in H.R. 2642.

The conference agreement borrows conceptually from current farm programs in order to enhance price or revenue protection for producers. Producers may choose between the following two programs linked to a decline in either price or revenue (price times yield).

- The conference agreement retains a counter-cyclical price program, called Price Loss Coverage or PLC, which makes a farm payment when farm price for a covered crop declines below its “reference price” set in statute (and the House bill). To better protect producers in a market downturn, the reference prices are higher than the parameters in the 2008 Farm Bill (called “target prices”). The Senate farm bill would have provided slightly lower levels of fixed reference prices for rice and peanuts, and significantly lower levels for other crops by using a market-based reference price calculated as 55% of a rolling five-year average (excluding the high and low years). As a major point of contention throughout the farm bill debate, the final bill continues current policy by making payments on 85% of historical plantings (or “base acres”), a provision designed to minimize the program’s effect on planting decisions. Base acres can be updated with plantings from 2009–2012. In contrast, the House bill would have made payments based on
85% of planted acreage to better align payments with producer risk, but critics contended that such a provision could lead to production distortions and trade disputes.

- **The conference agreement retains a revenue-based program, called Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC)**, which is designed to cover a portion of a farmer’s out-of-pocket loss (referred to as “shallow loss”) when crop revenues decline. Farmers may select ARC as an alternative to PLC. Like the PLC program, ARC payments are made on 85% of base acres. (This is in contrast to both the House and Senate bills, which would have made revenue program payments on planted acreage.) Payments are triggered when actual crop revenue drops below 86% of historical or “benchmark” revenue (compared with 88% in the Senate bill and 85% in the House bill). Farmers can select coverage at either the county or individual farm level.

These farm programs are separate from a producer’s decision to purchase crop insurance. However, farmers selecting the Price Loss Coverage (but not ARC) are also eligible to purchase an additional subsidized crop insurance policy to protect against “shallow losses” called the Supplemental Coverage Option (see Title XI, Crop Insurance below).

Five disaster programs were established in the 2008 Farm Bill for weather-induced losses in FY 2008–FY 2011. The conference agreement retroactively reauthorizes and funds four programs covering livestock and tree assistance, beginning FY 2012 and continuing without an expiration date, as provided in the House bill (the Senate bill had authorized the programs for only FY 2012–FY 2018). The crop disaster program from the 2008 Farm Bill (i.e., Supplemental Revenue Assistance, or SURE) was not reauthorized, but elements of it are folded into the new ARC by allowing producers to protect against farm-level revenue losses. In the Miscellaneous Title (XII), the conference agreement adopted the Senate bill provision to provide disaster benefits to tree fruit producers who suffered crop losses in 2012, and additional coverage levels are authorized under the Noninsured Crop Assistance Program (NAP).

Farm commodity programs have certain limits that cap payments (in the 2008 Farm Bill, $40,000 per person for direct payments, plus $65,000 for counter-cyclical and ACRE payments; limits may be doubled with a spouse). There is also an eligibility requirement based on adjusted gross income (AGI, in the 2008 Farm Bill a maximum of $500,000 per person for non-farm income and $750,000 for farm income). The 2014 Farm Bill sets a $125,000 per person cap on the total of PLC, ARC, marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments. This approach differs from the House and Senate bills, which had separate $50,000 and $75,000 limits for the new countercyclical and marketing loan programs, respectively. Although the total limit in the conference agreement is the same as in the two bills, some argue that this may allow larger payments from an individual program when payments from another program are small. The conference agreement applies the $125,000 limit to the total from all covered commodities except peanuts, with a separate $125,000 limit for peanuts—similar to 2008 Farm Bill law and the Senate proposal. Also regarding eligibility, the conference agreement instructs USDA to write regulations that
define “significant contribution of active personal management” to more clearly and objectively implement existing law. This differs from both the Senate and House bills, which would have deleted “actively personal management” and effectively required personal labor in the farming operation. For AGI limits, the conference agreement changes the AGI limit to a single, total AGI limit of $900,000. The AGI limit was $750,000 in the Senate bill and $950,000 in the House bill. The conference agreement does not cap total farm program spending, unlike the House bill’s cap of $16.96 billion for FY 2014–FY 2020 for combined payments under Price Loss Coverage and Revenue Loss Coverage.

For dairy policy, the conference agreement makes significant changes, including as in both bills the elimination of the dairy product price support program, the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program, and export subsidies. These are replaced by a new program, which makes payments to participating dairy producers when the national margin (average farm price of milk minus an average feed cost ration) falls below a producer-selected margin ranging from $4.00 per hundredweight (cwt.) to $8.00/cwt. No premium is charged for the minimum $4.00/cwt. Margin protection; however, premiums are charged for coverage at higher margins—the premium schedule differentiates for annual milk production of 4 million or fewer pounds and for production greater than 4 million pounds. The final bill removed a provision in S. 954 that would have subjected participating producers to a separate program to reduce incentives to produce milk when margins are low—the House bill had specifically excluded this provision. In addition, the final bill adopted a provision from the House bill that requires USDA to adhere to standard rulemaking procedures and to determine the market impacts of the new program during the rulemaking process. Separately, Federal Milk Marketing Orders have permanent statutory authority and continue intact. However, the Senate bill only included two additional provisions: one that would have required USDA to use a specified pre-hearing procedure to consider alternative formulas for Class III milk product pricing, and a second that would have required USDA to analyze and report on the potential effects of replacing end-product pricing with alternative pricing procedures. The final bill was silent on this matter.

The objective and structure of the sugar program are left unchanged from prior law in the conference agreement.

Title II—Conservation

The current agricultural conservation portfolio includes over 20 conservation programs. The Conservation title of the conference agreement reduces and consolidates the number of conservation programs, while also reducing mandatory funding over the 10 year baseline by close to $4 billion.

Many of the larger existing conservation programs, such as the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), and the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), are reauthorized, while smaller and similar conservation programs are “rolled” into them. In response to reduced demand and as a budget saving measure, the largest conservation program, CRP, is reauthorized with a reduced acreage enrollment
cap using a step down approach from the current 32 million acres to 24 million by FY 2018. CRP also is amended to include the enrollment of grassland acres similar to the Grasslands Reserve Program (GRP), which is repealed. EQIP, a program that assists producers applying conservation measures on land in production, is reauthorized in the conference agreement with a 5% funding carveout for wildlife habitat practices (similar to the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, WHIP, which is repealed). Funding for EQIP is reduced by a total of almost $500 million over 10 years, halfway between the Senate’s proposed reduction of $1 billion and the House bill’s proposal of none. CSP, another working lands program, is reauthorized at a reduced enrollment level of 10 million acres annually, down from 12.769 million acres annually under current law.

As in the House- and Senate-passed bills, the conference agreement creates two new conservation programs—the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) and the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)—out of several of the existing programs.

Conservation easement programs, including the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), Farmland Protection Program (FPP), and GRP, are repealed and consolidated to create ACEP. ACEP retains most of the program provisions in the current easement programs by establishing two types of easements: wetland reserve easements (similar to WRP) that protect and restore wetlands, and agricultural land easements (similar to FPP and GRP) that prevent non-agricultural uses on productive farm or grasslands. The Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP), Chesapeake Bay Watershed program, Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI), and Great Lakes Basin program are repealed by both bills and consolidated into the new RCPP. RCPP uses partnership agreements with state and local governments, Indian tribes, farmer cooperatives, and other conservation organizations to leverage Federal funding and further conservation on a regional or watershed scale.

The most contentious provision in Title II was the Senate-passed bill’s inclusion of the federally funded portion of crop insurance premiums to the list of program benefits that could be lost if a producer is found to produce an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land without implementing an approved conservation plan or qualifying exemption, or converts a wetland to crop production. This prerequisite, referred to as conservation compliance, has existed since the 1985 Farm Bill and currently affects most USDA farm program benefits, but has excluded crop insurance since 1996. The House-passed bill offered no comparable provision; however, the conference agreement includes the majority of the Senate-passed provision, with some changes.

**Title III—Trade**

Title III of the farm bill deals with statutes concerning U.S. international food aid and agricultural export programs. The farm bill conference agreement reauthorizes all of the international food aid programs, including the largest, Food for Peace Title II (emergency and nonemergency food aid). In addition, the conference agreement amends current food aid law to place greater emphasis
on improving the quality of food aid products (i.e., enhancing their nutritional quality) and ensuring that sales of agricultural commodity donations do not disrupt local markets. In this regard, an annual report to Congress is required to address how funds are allocated to and used by eligible organizations as well as the rate of return on aid funds—defined as the sum of the proceeds from monetization of aid commodities relative to the total cost of procuring and shipping the commodities to the recipient country's local market. Special attention is to be given when the rate of return is below 70%.

The conference agreement repeals the specified, annual dollar amounts for nonemergency food aid (i.e., the "safe box") required in current law. Instead, the conference agreement provides that not less than 20% nor more than 30% of funds be made available to carry out nonemergency food aid programs, subject to the requirement that a minimum of $350 million be provided for nonemergency food aid each fiscal year. The conference agreement creates a new local and regional purchase program in place of the expired local and regional procurement (LRP) pilot program of the 2008 Farm Bill and raises the authorized appropriations for LRP to $60 million annually for FY 2014 through FY 2018.

The conference agreement reauthorizes funding for the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) Export Credit Guarantee program and three other agricultural export market promotion programs through FY 2018. The value of U.S. agricultural exports that can benefit from export credit guarantees will remain at $5.5 billion annually. To address differences that have arisen over how the United States might comply with the WTO cotton case won by Brazil, conferees grant flexibility to the Secretary of Agriculture to make changes to the credit guarantee program to meet the terms agreed upon by both countries. This program is also amended in three ways to address in part Brazil’s criticism of how it is administered. The agreement also reauthorizes CCC funding of $200 million annually for the Market Access Program (MAP), which finances promotional activities for both generic and branded U.S. agricultural products, and CCC funding of $34.5 million annually for the Foreign Market Development Program (FMDP), a generic commodity promotion program.

The conference agreement requires the Secretary, in consultation with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees and House and Senate Appropriations Committees, to propose a plan to reorganize the international trade functions of USDA, to report to the Congressional committees on the plan 180 days after the farm bill’s enactment, and to implement the reorganization plan not later than one year after the report is submitted. The agreement directs the Secretary to include in the plan the establishment of the position of an Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs within USDA, who will be responsible for serving as a multi coordinator of sanitary and phytosanitary matters and addressing agricultural non-tariff trade barriers.

**Title IV—Nutrition**

The Nutrition title in the conference report reconciles the House-passed bill (H.R. 2642, as combined with H.R. 3102, Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act) and the Senate-passed bill (S.
The conference report reauthorizes SNAP and related programs for five years, and CBO estimates that the Nutrition title in the conference agreement would reduce spending by $8.0 billion over 10 years (FY 2014–FY 2023). The SNAP provisions alone are estimated to reduce spending by slightly more than $8.6 billion over 10 years. Certain other Nutrition provisions are estimated to increase spending, which together result in the total estimated reduction of $8.0 billion.

Farm bill conferees were faced with significant differences in the SNAP provisions in the Senate and House-passed bills. Over the 10 year budget window (FY 2014–FY 2023), CBO estimated that the Senate’s Nutrition title would have reduced spending by approximately $4 billion and the 14 The Nutrition summary and side-by-side were written by Randy Alison Aussenberg, Analyst in Nutrition Assistance House’s Nutrition title would have reduced spending by approximately $39 billion. The House bill would have reauthorized SNAP and related programs for three years, while the Senate would have reauthorized the programs for five years.

Although the Nutrition title of the conference report contains a number of provisions that change aspects of SNAP and related nutrition programs, conferees largely retained the provisions in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and other nutrition program authorizing statutes. For example, most eligibility and benefit calculation rules in SNAP will not change under the conference agreement. While various changes in the Nutrition title are estimated to reduce or increase spending on the nutrition programs, most provisions are estimated to have little or no budgetary impact.

The budgetary impact of the conference agreement’s Nutrition title (as compared to the Senate and House bills) is largely the result of changes to SNAP eligibility and benefit calculation rules. In particular, it is the result of the conference agreement excluding two House SNAP provisions that were estimated to make the bill’s greatest reductions in SNAP spending (ending broad-based categorical eligibility and ending the availability of labor-market based waivers from the time limit for certain able-bodied adults). Major issues that have potential to impact households’ eligibility and benefit amounts include the following.

- The conference agreement amends how Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) payments are treated in the calculation of SNAP benefits. Both the Senate and House had included such changes, with the House version of this change estimated to affect a greater share of participants. The conference agreement, for the most part, includes the House version. According to information from June 2012, this change to benefit calculation is expected to reduce household benefit amounts in approximately 17 states.

- The House and Senate had both proposed to disqualify certain ex-offenders from receiving SNAP benefits. The conference agreement modifies that policy by requiring the disqualification of only such offenders as are not complying with the terms of their sentence.

- The conference agreement includes policies related to the SNAP Employment and Training (E&T) program, including a pilot project authority and related funding ($200 million over
FY 2014 and FY 2015) for states to implement and USDA to evaluate a variety of work programs for SNAP participants. The agreement includes the House bill’s provisions that would expand reporting measures for all E&T programs. The conference agreement does not include the House’s expansion of the time limit for able-bodied adults without dependents or 15 the House’s work-related policies that may incentivize states to reduce their caseloads.

- The conference agreement does not include any changes to broad-based categorical eligibility. The House bill would have eliminated broad-based categorical eligibility, which would have impacted the eligibility of SNAP participants in 43 states.
- The conference agreement does not include the House provision to give states the option to administer drug testing as part of their eligibility determination processes.

Since SNAP provides benefits redeemable for SNAP-eligible foods at SNAP-eligible retailers, much of SNAP law pertains to retailer authorization and benefit issuance and redemption. The conference agreement includes the retailer and redemption provisions that had been included in both the House and Senate bills. This includes requiring stores to stock more fresh foods, requiring retailers to pay for their electronic benefit transfer (EBT) machines, and providing additional funding for combating trafficking (the sale of SNAP benefits). The conference agreement also includes $100 million in mandatory funding (over 10 years) for Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive grants, a program similar to that in the Senate bill, which would support organizations that offer bonus incentives for SNAP purchases of fruits and vegetables.

The conference agreement increases funding for the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), the program that provides USDA foods and Federal support to emergency feeding organizations (e.g., food banks and food pantries). Taking into account CBO’s estimates of inflation, the conference agreement is estimated to provide an additional $205 million over 10 years, $125 million of which is provided in the first 5 years. (The Senate bill would have increased funding by $54 million over 10 years, and the House would have increased funding by $333 million over 10 years.)

The conference agreement includes many other changes to SNAP and related program policy. These changes include amendments to the nutrition programs operated by tribes and territories, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), and the distribution of USDA foods to schools. The 2010 child nutrition reauthorization (Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, P.L. 111–296) has already reauthorized WIC and the child nutrition programs through FY 2015, but the 2013 Farm Bills do include related policies, such as farm-to-school efforts.

**Title V—Credit**

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (also known as the ConAct) is the permanent statute that authorizes USDA agricultural credit and rural development programs. USDA serves as a lender of last resort by providing direct and guaranteed loans to
farmers and ranchers who are denied direct credit by commercial lenders but have the wherewithal to repay the loan.

The conference agreement makes relatively small policy changes to USDA’s credit programs. It gives USDA discretion to recognize alternative legal entities to qualify for farm loans and allow alternatives to meet a three-year farming experience requirement. It increases the maximum size of down-payment loans, and eliminates term limits on guaranteed operating loans (by removing a maximum number of years that an individual can remain eligible). It increases the percentage of a conservation loan that can be guaranteed, adds another lending priority for beginning farmers, and facilitates loans for the purchase of highly fractionated land in Indian reservations, among other changes.

The Senate bill would have updated and modernized the ConAct’s statutory language and reorganized the various programs into separate subtitles (Subtitle A for farm loans; Subtitle B for rural development; Subtitle C for general provisions). The House bill, like the conference agreement, did not reorganize the ConAct.

For the Farm Credit Act, which governs the Farm Credit System, the conference agreement adopts a Senate provision that instructs the system’s regulator (the Farm Credit Administration) to improve the disclosure of compensation packages for senior officers in the Farm Credit System.

Title VI—Rural Development

Like the Credit title discussed above, the Rural Development title in the Senate-passed 2013 Farm Bill (S. 954) proposed a restructuring of the ConAct, which provides permanent authority for USDA to carry out many of the rural loan and grant programs in its portfolio. The Senate provision would have consolidated various programs, established criteria for which rural communities receive priority in making loan and grant awards, and modified the definitions of “rural” and “rural area.” This proposed reorganization of the ConAct was not included in the conference agreement, although one aspect of the proposed restructuring was retained: the consolidation of two rural business programs into a single business development platform, which was authorized for annual appropriations of $65 million through FY 2018. The conference agreement increases the mandatory spending authorization of the Value-Added Agricultural Product Grants to $63 million and retains the program’s $40 million in annual discretionary appropriations. The conference agreement also adopted the Senate provision providing $150 million in mandatory spending for pending rural development loans and grants and the Senate provision to fund the Microentrepreneur Assistance Program at $3 million annually in mandatory spending and $40 million in discretionary appropriations.

The conference agreement adopted the House provision to amend the water and waste water direct and guaranteed loan program to encourage financing by private or cooperative lenders to the maximum extent possible. The conferees also adopted the House provision that provides up to 5% of the Community Facilities appropriation for technical assistance to help smaller communities develop their applications to the program, and to use loan guarantees to the maximum extent possible. The conference agreement also adopted the House provisions directing the Secretary of Agriculture
to begin collecting data on the economic effects of the projects that USDA Rural Development funds, and directing the Secretary to develop simplified applications for funding.

The conference agreement retains the definition of “rural” and “rural area” under current law for purposes of program eligibility. The Senate bill had proposed modifications to the 2008 Farm Bill permitting communities that might otherwise be ineligible for USDA Rural Development funding to petition USDA to designate their communities as “rural in character,” thereby making them eligible for program support. While the provision under current law is retained, the modifications to the provision were not adopted by the conferees. The conference agreement does amend the definition of rural area in the 1949 Housing Act so that areas deemed rural between 2000 and 2010 would retain that designation until USDA receives data from the 2020 decennial census. That provision also raises the population threshold for eligibility from 25,000 to 35,000.

The conference agreement adopted the Senate provision authorizing USDA to prioritize otherwise eligible applications that support multi-jurisdictional strategic economic and community development. The provision reserves 20% of a fiscal year’s appropriation for community facilities, water and waste water projects, and rural business development for such strategic development projects. The conference agreement also adopted the Senate provision authorizing a new Rural Energy Savings Program, which would provide 0% interest rate loans to eligible borrowers to implement energy efficiency measures.

Included in the conference agreement (as in both bills) is reauthorization of funding for programs under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, including the Access to Broadband Telecommunications Services in Rural Areas Program and the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program. The conference agreement largely adopted the Senate provisions authorizing access to broadband telecommunications service to rural areas, including authorized appropriations of $10 million annually FY 2014–FY 2018 for a new Rural Gigabit Network Pilot program for “ultra-high speed” broadband connectivity. The conferees did not adopt the Senate provision that would have authorized a new grant program for rural broadband in addition to the existing loan program.

The conference agreement adopted the Senate provision reauthorizing the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority at its current authorized appropriation of $30 million annually, rather than the House measure that authorized $2 million in appropriations. The conference agreement, as in both bills, also reauthorized the three regional authorities established in the 2008 Farm Bill.

**Title VII—Research**

USDA is authorized under various laws to conduct agricultural research at the Federal level, and provides support for cooperative research, extension, and post-secondary agricultural education programs in the states. The conference agreement reauthorizes funding for these activities through FY 2018, subject to annual appropriations, and amends authority so that only competitive grants can be awarded under certain programs.

Mandatory spending for the research title is increased by $1.145 billion over 10 years compared with projected baseline spending.
Funding is increased for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative ($745 million over 10 years) and the Organic Agricultural Research and Extension Initiative ($100 million). Also, mandatory funding is continued for the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program ($100 million).

As in the Senate bill, the conference agreement provides mandatory funding of $200 million to establish the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research, a nonprofit corporation designed to supplement USDA’s basic and applied research activities. It will solicit and accept private donations to award grants for collaborative public/private partnerships with scientists at USDA and in academia, nonprofits, and the private sector.

Title VIII—Forestry

General forestry legislation is within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committees, and past farm bills have included provisions addressing forestry assistance, especially on private lands. The 2014 Farm Bill conference agreement generally repeals, reauthorizes, and modifies existing programs and provisions under two main authorities: the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act (CFAA), as amended, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (HFRA), as amended.

Many Federal forestry assistance programs are permanently authorized, and thus do not require reauthorization in the farm bill. However, the conference agreement does reauthorize several forestry assistance programs through FY 2018. The conference agreement also repeals programs that have expired or have never received appropriations. Both the House- and Senate-passed bills included similar reauthorizations and repeals.

The conference agreement also includes provisions that address the management of the National Forest System. For example, it permanently reauthorizes stewardship contracting and extends the good neighbor authority nationwide. Both the House and the Senate bills included similar provisions, although the House bill would have reauthorized stewardship contracting only through FY 2018. The conference agreement also adopts a Senate provision authorizing the designation of treatment areas within the National Forest System that are of deteriorating forest health due to insect or disease infestation, and allowing for expedited project planning within those designated areas. However, the conference agreement did not include House provisions requiring the designation of critical areas within the National Forest System and authorizing expedited project planning for projects up to 10,000 acres. The conference agreement does include provisions from the House bill to modify the existing public notice, comment, and appeals process for land and resource management plans.

Title IX—Energy

USDA renewable energy programs have been used to incentivize research, development, and adoption of renewable energy projects, including solar, wind, and anaerobic digesters. However, the primary focus of USDA renewable energy programs has been to promote U.S. biofuels production and use. Cornstarch-based ethanol dominates the U.S. biofuels industry. The 2008 Farm Bill attempted to refocus U.S. biofuels policy initiatives in favor of non-
corn feedstocks, especially the development of the cellulosic biofuels industry. The most critical programs to this end are the Bioenergy Program for Advanced Biofuels, which pays producers for production of eligible advanced biofuels; the Biorefinery Assistance Program, which assists in the development of new and emerging technologies for advanced biofuels; the Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP), which assists farmers in developing nontraditional crops for use as feedstocks for the eventual production of cellulosic biofuels; and the Renewable Energy for America Program (REAP), which has funded a variety of biofuels-related projects, including the installation of blender pumps to help circumvent the emerging “blend wall” that could potentially circumscribe domestic ethanol consumption near current levels of about 13 billion gallons.

All of the major farm bill energy programs expired at the end of FY 2013 and lacked baseline funding going forward. The conference agreement extends most of the renewable energy provisions of the farm bill, with the exception of the Rural Energy Self-Sufficiency Initiative, the Forest Biomass for Energy Program, the Biofuels Infrastructure Study, and the Renewable Fertilizer Study, which are either omitted or explicitly repealed. In addition, the conference agreement adds a new reporting requirement on energy use and efficiency at USDA facilities.

Over the five-year reauthorization period (FY 2014–FY 2018), the conference agreement contains a total of $694 million in new mandatory funding and authorizes $765 million to be appropriated for the various farm bill renewable energy programs. This contrasts with the House- and Senate passed farm bills. The Senate bill (S. 954) contained a total of $880 million in new mandatory funding and authorized $1.140 billion to be appropriated for the various farm bill renewable energy programs. The House bill (H.R. 2642) contained no mandatory funding for these programs and authorized $1.405 billion over the five years, subject to annual appropriations. In addition, the House bill eliminated all support for the collection, harvest, storage, and transportation (CHST) component of BCAP, severely limiting its potential effectiveness as an incentive to produce cellulosic feedstocks. BCAP funding for CHST is retained in the conference agreement.

**Title X—Horticulture**

The conference agreement adopts many of the horticulture provisions in the Senate (S. 954) and House (H.R. 2642) farm bills. The final bill reauthorizes many of the existing farm bill provisions supporting farming operations in the specialty crop and certified organic sectors. Many Title X provisions fall into the categories of marketing and promotion; organic certification; data and information collection; pest and disease control; food safety and quality standards; and local foods. CBO estimates a total increase in mandatory spending of $338 million (FY 2014–FY 2018) for Title X in the conference agreement. However, provisions affecting the specialty crop and certified organic sectors are not limited to the Horticulture title, but are contained within several other titles of the farm bill. These include programs in the research, nutrition, and trade titles, among others. CBO’s cost estimate for specialty crop provisions in Title X does not include cost estimates for provisions in other titles. CBO estimates for research programs benefitting
specialty crop and organic producers, for example, are estimated to contribute another $418 million increase in mandatory spending (FY 2014–FY 2018).

The conference agreement adopted nearly all the programs reauthorized in both the House and Senate bills, and in some cases provides for increased funding for several key programs benefitting specialty crop producers. These include the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, plant pest and disease programs, USDA’s Market News for specialty crops, the Specialty Crop Research Initiative (SCRI), and also the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (Snack Program) and Section 32 purchases for fruits and vegetables under the Nutrition title. The final bill also reauthorized most programs benefitting certified organic agriculture producers, including continued support for USDA’s National Organic Program (NOP) and development of crop insurance mechanisms for organic producers, Organic Production and Market Data Initiatives (ODI), and research programs such as the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative (OREI) and the Organic Transitions Program (ORG) under the Integrated Research, Education, and Extension Competitive Grants Program. Both bills would give USDA authority to consider an application for a research and promotion order (or “checkoff” program) for the organic sector.

Reauthorization of each of these provisions was in both the House and Senate bills. One exception is that the House bill would have repealed the National Organic Certification Cost Share Program (NOCCSP), which was not part of the Senate bill, but was included in the final agreement.

Programs in other farm bill titles benefitting specialty crop and certified organic producers include the Value-Added Producer Grant Program, Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops (TASC), the Market Access Program (MAP), and most conservation programs (including assistance specifically for organic producers), among other programs, within the crop insurance, credit, and miscellaneous titles. Horticulture and other titles in the conference agreement, which were for the most part included in both the House- and Senate-passed bills, also include provisions that would expand opportunities for local food systems and also beginning farmers and ranchers. Other provisions supporting local food producers are within the research, nutrition, and rural development titles, among others.

The House-passed bill included other provisions that were not in the Senate bill. These provisions would have provided exemptions from certain regulatory requirements under some laws, such as the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. The conference agreement included aspects of some of these provisions, albeit in modified form, but did not adopt the provisions as proposed by the House bill.

**Title XI—Crop Insurance**

The crop insurance title enhances the existing Federal Crop Insurance Program, which is permanently authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act. Crop insurance is designed generally to cover losses from natural disasters, while Title I programs (“farm programs”) make payments to farmers of program crops when prices
fall below statutory minimums or when crop revenue is low relative to recent levels.

The Federal Crop Insurance Program makes available subsidized crop insurance to producers who purchase a policy to protect against losses in yield, crop revenue, or whole farm revenue. More than 100 crops are insurable. The conference agreement increases funding for crop insurance relative to baseline levels by an additional $5.7 billion over 10 years.

Most of the funding increase stems from two new insurance products, one for cotton and one for other crops. With cotton not covered by the counter-cyclical price or revenue programs established in Title I, a new crop insurance policy called Stacked Income Protection Plan (STAX) is made available for cotton producers. The STAX policy indemnifies losses in county revenue of greater than 10% of expected revenue but not more than the deductible level (e.g., 25%) selected by the producer for the underlying individual policy (or not more than 30% if used as stand-alone policy). Similarly, for other crops, the conference agreement (as in both the House- and Senate-passed bills) makes available an additional policy (i.e., not stand-alone) called Supplemental Coverage Option (SCO), based on expected county yields or revenue, to cover part of the deductible under the producer’s underlying policy (referred to as a farmer’s out-of-pocket loss or “shallow loss”). The farmer subsidy as a share of the policy premium is set at 80% for STAX and 65% for SCO.

Additional crop insurance changes in both bills, and adopted by the conferees, are designed to expand or improve crop insurance for other commodities, including specialty crops. Provisions revise the value of crop insurance for organic crops to reflect prices of organic (not conventional) crops. USDA is required to conduct more research on whole farm revenue insurance with higher coverage levels than currently available. Studies or policies are also required on insuring (1) specialty crop producers for food safety and contamination-related losses, (2) swine producers for a catastrophic disease event, (3) producers of catfish against reduction in the margin between the market prices and production costs, (4) commercial poultry production against business disruptions caused by integrator bankruptcy, (5) poultry producers for a catastrophic event, (6) producers of biomass sorghum or sweet sorghum grown as feedstock for renewable energy, and (7) alfalfa producers. A peanut revenue insurance product and rice margin insurance also are mandated. Another provision provides funding for private-sector index weather insurance, which insures against specific weather events and not actual loss.

For conservation purposes, a provision in Title XI reduces crop insurance subsidies and noninsured crop disaster assistance for the first four years of planting on native sod acreage in Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. In Title II, crop insurance premium subsidies are available only if producers are in compliance with wetland conservation requirements and conservation requirements for highly erodible land, as originally adopted by the Senate.

A controversial item not included in the conference agreement was the reduction of premium subsidies for high income farmers, a provision that was included in the Senate bill but not the House bill. In the 2012 Farm Bill passed by the Senate in the 112th Con-
gress, an amendment was adopted during floor debate to reduce crop insurance premium subsidies by 15 percentage points for producers with average adjusted gross income greater than $750,000. In 2013, the Senate Agriculture Committee-reported version of S. 954 did not include the provision, but an amendment to S. 954 requiring the subsidy reduction was adopted on the Senate floor in June 2013 by a vote of 59–33.

**Title XII—Miscellaneous**

The Miscellaneous title contains four sections: livestock; socially disadvantaged and limited resource producers; other miscellaneous, and a fourth section added by the conferees on oil heat efficiency, research, and jobs training. Animal health-related provisions in the livestock section of the conference agreement include provisions that renew the trichinae certification and aquatic animal health programs that were established in the 2008 Farm Bill; establish an animal health laboratory network; and require USDA to continue to administer the avian influenza surveillance program through the National Poultry Improvement Plan. The section also includes a Sense of Congress statement on the priority of feral swine eradication.

The conference agreement establishes a competitive production and marketing grant program for the sheep industry through the National Sheep Industry Improvement Center. Another provision confirms the transfer of catfish inspection authority to USDA from FDA (originally in the 2008 Farm Bill) and directs USDA to finalize the rules on catfish inspection, and for USDA and FDA to execute a memorandum of understanding to improve interagency cooperation on inspection. Lastly, USDA is to conduct an economic analysis of its country-of-origin labeling (COOL) rule (78 Federal Register 31367, May 24, 2013) within 6 months of the enactment of the farm bill.

Some livestock industry groups pushed for a provision to repeal or modify the COOL law, but such a provision was not included in the conference agreement. The conference agreement extends authority for outreach and technical assistance programs for socially disadvantaged farmer and ranchers, and adds military veteran farmers and ranchers as a qualifying group. The agreement creates a research center to develop policy recommendations for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, reauthorizes funding for the USDA Office of Advocacy and Outreach for socially disadvantaged and veteran farmers and ranchers, and includes a provision to increase transparency by automatically providing receipts for service or denial of service.

Provisions in the other miscellaneous section of the conference agreement preserve farm bill benefits for participants in the High Plains Water Study, make available higher coverage levels under the Noninsured Crop Assistance Programs, prohibit attendance at animal-fighting events and exempt small dealers and exhibitors from license requirements under the Animal Welfare act. The agreement includes grants to promote the U.S. maple syrup industry, and grants for technological training for farm workers. It also creates a military veterans agricultural liaison within USDA to advocate for and to provide information to veterans, and establishes
an Office of Tribal Relations to coordinate USDA activities with Native American tribes.

The Miscellaneous title contains two provisions related to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The first establishes a standing agriculture-related subcommittee under the EPA’s Science Advisory Board to provide advice on matters of significant impact on agricultural entities. The second provides National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit exemptions for certain silviculture activities. A provision amending the EPA’s spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule was excluded; as well as a provision prohibiting EPA from disclosing producer information.

The section also includes provisions to establish a Pima Cotton Trust Fund and an Agriculture Wool Apparel Manufacturers Trust Fund for users of pima cotton and wool, and funding for wool research and promotion. The Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund provision from the Senate bill was moved to the research title.

The conference agreement added a provision not found in either the House or Senate bill to provide mandatory funding in 2014 for Payments in Lieu of Taxes, which provides payments to local governments based on the presence of non-taxable Federal lands. Also, the fourth section of the miscellaneous title includes new provisions on oilheat efficiency, renewable fuels research, and jobs training.

Sixteen provisions that were in either the House or Senate bill are not included in the conference agreement. One particularly controversial issue that was deleted in conference was the interstate commerce provision originally in the House bill that would have prohibited states from imposing production or manufacturing standards on agricultural products from other states. Of interest to the livestock and poultry industry, provisions repealing marketing and competition rules proposed by USDA (the GIPSA rule) were excluded. Some of the other provisions not included were flood protection for the Missouri River basin and the Wallkill River and Black Dirt region; prohibitions on closing Farm Service Agency (FSA) offices with high workloads; a prohibition on FSA employees keeping GSA-leased cars overnight; and provisions on the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay also were excluded from the conference agreement.

Other Laws; Legislative Matters

Appropriations

P.L. 113–2, (H.R. 152)

Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013

H.R. 152 was introduced on January 4, 2013 by Representative Harold Rogers and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the committee concerned. On January 15, 2013, the bill passed the House under suspension of the rules by a recorded vote of 241 yeas to 180 nays. On January 28, 2013, the bill passed the Senate, under the order of 1/24/13, having achieved 60 votes in the affirmative, without amendment by Yea-Nay Vote. 62 to 36. On January 29, 2013, the bill was presented to and signed by the President into Public Law 113–2.
Division A of the Act makes supplemental appropriations for FY 2013 to specified Federal agencies and programs for the expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Sandy. Title I makes supplemental appropriations to the Department of Agriculture (USDA) for the Commodity Assistance Program, for the emergency food assistance program. Title IX requires each Federal agency to submit to the Office of the Management and Budget, the General Accountability Office, the respective Inspector General, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by March 31, 2013, internal control plans for funds provided by this Division. The Act also requires the GAO to review the design of such plans. Title X makes supplemental appropriations to USDA for the Emergency Conservation Program and directs USDA's Office of Inspector General to use unobligated disaster assistance oversight funds provided under the Disaster Relief and Recovery Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 for continued oversight of USDA disaster- and emergency-related activities.

Division B of the Act amends the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President, acting through the FEMA Administrator, to approve public assistance projects for major disasters or emergencies under alternative procedures with goals of (1) reducing the costs to the Federal Government of providing such assistance; (2) increasing flexibility in the administration of assistance; (3) expediting the provision of assistance to a state, tribal or local government, or owner or operator of a private nonprofit facility; and (4) providing financial incentives and disincentives for the timely and cost-effective completion of projects. Requires such alternative procedures, with respect to grants for facility repair, restoration, or replacement, to allow: (1) such grants to be made on the basis of fixed estimates if the state, tribal, or local government or the owner or operator of the private nonprofit facility agrees to be responsible for any actual costs that exceed the estimate; (2) a grantee to elect to receive an in-lieu contribution, without reduction, on the basis of estimates of the cost to repair, restore, reconstruct, or replace a facility and management expenses; (3) consolidating state, local, or tribal facilities as a single project; and (4) the Administrator to permit a grantee, when completed project costs are less than the estimated costs, to use excess funds for activities that reduce the risk of future damage, hardship, or suffering from a major disaster and for other activities to improve future public assistance operations or planning. Additionally, the Act requires such alternative procedures, with respect to grants for debris removal, to allow: (1) such grants to be made on the basis of fixed estimates to provide financial incentives and disincentives for the timely or cost-effective completion if the grantee agrees to be responsible for any actual costs that exceed the estimate; (2) use of a sliding scale for determining the Federal share for removal of debris and wreckage based on the time it takes to complete; (3) use of program income from recycled debris without offset to the grant amount; (4) reimbursement of wages for grantee employees and extra hires performing or administering debris and wreckage removal; (5) incentives to a state, local, or tribal government to have a debris management plan approved by the Administrator and to have pre-qualified contractors before the date of declaration of the major disaster; and (6) the Administrator to
permit a grantee, when actual project costs are less than estimated costs, to use the excess funds for debris management planning, acquisition of debris management equipment for current or future use, and other activities to improve future debris removal operations.

P.L. 113–6, (H.R. 933)

Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013

H.R. 933 was introduced on March 4, 2013 by Representative Harold Rogers and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, in addition to the Committee on Budget. On March 6, 2013, the bill passed the House by a recorded vote of 267 yeas to 151 nays. On March 20, 2013, the bill passed the Senate with an amendment to the Title by a yea to nay vote of 73 to 26. On March 21, 2013, the House agreed to the Senate amendments with a vote of 318 yeas to 109 nays. On March 22, 2013, the bill was presented to and signed by the President into Public Law 113–6.

H.R. 933 appropriates FY 2013 funds for the following Department of Agriculture (USDA) programs and services: Office of the Secretary of Agriculture; Office of the Chief Economist; National Appeals Division; Office of the Budget and Program Analysis; Office of the Chief Information Officer; Office of the Chief Financial Officer; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights; Office of Civil Rights; agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments; hazardous materials management; Office of the Inspector General; Office of the General Counsel; Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics; Economic Research Station; National Agricultural Statistics Service; Agricultural Research Service; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; Native American Institutions Endowment Fund; extension and integrated activities; Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Agricultural Marketing Service; Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety; Food Safety and Inspection Service; Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services; Farm Service Agency; Risk Management Agency; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund; and Commodity Credit Corporation Fund.

Title II: Conservation Programs—Appropriates funds for the following: (1) Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, and (2) Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Title III: Rural Development Programs—Appropriates funds for the following: (1) Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, (2) rural development salaries and expenses, (3) Rural Housing Service, (4) Rural Business—Cooperative Service, (5) Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account, and (6) Rural Utilities Service.

Title IV: Domestic Food Programs—Appropriates funds for the following: (1) Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services; and (2) Food and Nutrition Service.

Title V: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs—Appropriates funds for the following: (1) Foreign Agricultural Service, (2) Food for Peace Act (P.L. 480) program title I and title II grants, (3) McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants, and (4) Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) export loans.

Title VI: Related Agency and Food
and Drug Administration—Appropriates funds for the following: (1) Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and (2) Farm Credit Administration.

The Act excludes from such rescission: amounts designated by Congress for OCO/GWOT or for disaster relief; or the amount made available by division F of this Act for a specified limitation on administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting eligibility re-determinations. Also requires the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to report to the Congressional appropriations committees within 30 days after enactment of this Act on the account and amount of each such rescission.

P.L. 113–46, (H.R. 2775)

Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014

H.R. 2775 was introduced by Representative Diane Black on July 22, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means. On September 12, 2013 the bill passed the House by a recorded vote of 235 yeas to 191 nays. On October 16, 2013 a complete substitute amendment converting the measure into the Continuing Appropriations Act was adopted by the Senate by a recorded vote of 81 yeas to 18 nays. On that same date the House agreed to the Senate amendments by a recorded vote of 285 yeas to 144 nays. On October 17, 2013 the President signed the bill into Public Law 113–46.


The Act also includes the same prohibition from the FY 2012 (P.L. 112–55) and FY 2013 (P.L. 113–6) appropriations acts that prevents USDA from using appropriated funds to finalize or implement certain provisions of a Grain Inspection and Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) rule.

Continues funding through January 15, 2014, at the FY 2013 level for entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in FY 2013 appropriations Acts, as well as for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

Amends the Food for Peace Act to extend through January 15, 2014, authority for agreements to finance sales or to provide other assistance.

Continues through January 15, 2014, the authority of the Forest Service to enter into up to 28 contracts with private persons (of which Region One of the Forest Service shall have authority to enter into nine) to perform services to achieve land management goals for National Forests that meet local and rural community needs; and to apply the value of timber or other forest products removed as an offset against the cost of services received under a contract.

P.L. 113–67 (H.J. Res. 59)

Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014

H.J. Res. 59 was introduced by Representatives Harold Rogers on September 10, 2014 and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Budget. It became the vehicle for the budget agree-
ment negotiated by the chairs of the House and Senate Budget Committees and includes the Bipartisan Budget Act and the Pathway for the SGR Reform Act of 2013. The Act was signed into Public Law 113–67 on December 26, 2013.

Included in the Act is a provision that amended the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to allow the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture to collect user fees for conservation planning technical assistance. Limits such fees to $150 for each conservation plan for which technical assistance is provided. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to waive such fees in certain instances, including for beginning farmers and ranchers who have limited resources or who are socially disadvantaged.

P.L. 113–76 (H.R. 3547)

Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014

H.R. 3547 was introduced by Representative Lamar Smith and referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology on November 20, 2013. It became the vehicle for Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014. The House suspended the rules and passed H.R. 3547 with 376 yeas and 5 nays on December 2, 2013. The Senate passed the bill by unanimous consent on December 12, 2013. The House agreed to the Senate amendment to the title and text with 359 yeas and 67 nays on January 15, 2014. The Senate concurred in the House amendment to the Senate amendment on January 16, 2014 with 72 yeas and 26 nays. It was signed into Public Law 113–76 on January 17, 2014.


The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 includes funding for the following programs and services: Office of the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary); Office of the Chief Economist; National Appeals Division; Office of Budget and Program Analysis; Office of the Chief Information Officer; Office of the Chief Financial Officer; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights; Office of Civil Rights; agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments; hazardous materials management; Office of Inspector General; Office of the General Counsel; Office of Ethics; Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics; Economic Re-
search Service; National Agricultural Statistics Service; Agricultural Research Service; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; Native American Institutions Endowment Fund; extension and integrated activities; Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Agricultural Marketing Service; Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety; Food Safety and Inspection Service; Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services; Farm Service Agency; Risk Management Agency; Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund; Commodity Credit Corporation Fund; Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment; Natural Resources Conservation Service, including the watershed rehabilitation program; Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development; rural development salaries and expenses; Rural Housing Service; Rural Business-Cooperative Service; Rural Utilities Service; Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services; Food and Nutrition Service; the Foreign Agricultural Service; Food for Peace Act (P.L. 480) program title I and title II grants; Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) export loans; McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants; Food and Drug Administration (FDA); Farm Credit Administration; and Commodities Futures Trading Commission.

Specifies certain uses and limits on or prohibitions against the use of funds appropriated by this Act.

Authorizes the Secretary to transfer unobligated balances to the Working Capital Fund for plant and capital equipment acquisition, which shall remain available until expended.

Prohibits appropriations under this Act from remaining available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly provided for.

Limits negotiated indirect costs on cooperative agreements between USDA and nonprofit organizations to 10%.

Makes USDA appropriations for direct and guaranteed loans available for: (1) the Rural Development Loan Fund program account, (2) the Rural Electrification and Telecommunication Loans program account, and (3) the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account.

Prohibits funds made available to USDA under this Act from being used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades.

Makes funds available in the current fiscal year for agricultural management assistance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act and for specified conservation programs under the Food Security Act of 1985 until expended for current fiscal year obligations.

Makes eligible for economic development and job creation assistance under the Rural Electrification Act in the same manner as a borrower under such Act any former Rural Utilities Service borrower that has repaid or prepaid an insured, direct, or guaranteed loan under such Act, or any not-for-profit utility that is eligible to receive an insured or direct loan under such Act.

Prohibits, regarding the specialty crop research initiative, funds from being used to prohibit the provision of certain in-kind support from non-Federal sources.
Makes unobligated balances for salaries and expenses for the Farm Service Agency and the Rural Development mission area under this Act available for information technology expenses through September 30, 2015.

Authorizes the Secretary to permit a state agency to use funds provided in this Act to exceed a specified maximum amount of liquid infant formula when issuing liquid infant formula to participants.

Prohibits first-class travel by employees of agencies funded under this Act.

States that with regard to certain programs established or amended by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to be carried out using CCC funds: (1) such funds shall be available for salaries and administrative expenses without regard to certain allotment and fund transfer limits, and (2) the use of such funds shall not be considered to be a fund transfer or allotment for purposes of applying such limits.

Limits funds made available in FY 2014 or preceding fiscal years under P.L. 480 to reimburse the CCC for the release of certain commodities under the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act.

Limits funds available for USDA advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces.

Prohibits funds under this Act from being used to pay indirect costs charged against any agricultural research, education, or extension grant awards issued by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture that exceed 30% of total Federal funds provided under each award.

Extends the FY 2013 funding level for supplemental nutrition assistance (SNAP, formerly known as the food stamp program) employment and training programs to FY 2014.

Prohibits the use of any Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) funds for the watershed rehabilitation program, or more than $70 million for the environmental quality incentives program.

Limits funds for the following domestic food assistance categories under the Act of August 24, 1935: (1) child nutrition program entitlement commodities, (2) state option contracts, and (3) defective commodity removal. Limits funds for the fresh fruit and vegetable program until October 1, 2014. Rescinds specified unobligated balances available in FY 2014 for domestic food assistance.

Prohibits the use of funds for user fee proposals that fail to provide certain budget impact information.

Prohibits, without Congressional notification, funds available under this Act or under previous appropriations Acts from being used through a reprogramming of funds to: (1) eliminate or create a new program, (2) relocate or reorganize an office or employees, (3) privatize Federal employee functions, or (4) increase funds or personnel for any project for which funds have been denied or restricted.

Prohibits, without Congressional notification, funds available under this Act or under previous appropriations Acts from being used through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10%, whichever is less: (1) to augment an existing program, (2) to reduce by 10% funding or personnel for any existing program, or (3) that results from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs.
Authorizes the Secretary to assess a one-time fee for any guaranteed business and industry loan that does not exceed 3% of the guaranteed principal portion of the loan.

Prohibits the use of USDA, FDA, Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), or Farm Credit Administration (FCA) funds from being used to transmit to any non-USDA, non-Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), non-CFTC, or non-FCA employees questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

Prohibits the use of funds under this Act by any executive branch entity to produce a prepackaged news story for U.S. broadcast or distribution unless it contains audio or text notice that it was produced or funded by such executive entity.

Requires USDA agencies to reimburse each other for employees detailed for longer than 30 days.

Prohibits specified nonrecourse marketing assistance loans for mohair.

 Cancels a specified amount of unobligated balances in the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Resource Conservation and Development Account. (States that no amounts may be cancelled from those designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 [Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act], as amended.)

Appropriates funds for direct reimbursement payments for geographically disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

Appropriates funds for a pilot program to demonstrate the use of new technologies that increase the rate of growth of re-forested hardwood trees on private nonindustrial forests lands, enrolling lands on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico that were damaged by Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

Directs the Secretary, the FDA Commissioner, and the FCA Chairman to submit to Congress a spending plan by program, project, and activity for the funds made available under this Act.

Rescinds specified funds from unobligated balances available to USDA under the “Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments” account.

States that no amount may be rescinded from funds to the General Services Administration (GSA) for rent and funds for payments to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for building security activities.

Makes specified funds available for agricultural commodity assistance to recipient nations only if adequate controls are in place to ensure that emergency food aid is received by the intended beneficiaries and not otherwise diverted.

Rescinds specified funds from unobligated funds available to USDA for single family rural housing guaranteed loans for FY 2007–FY 2010.

Rescinds specified CCC funds from unobligated balances for the bioenergy program for advanced biofuels.

Directs the Secretary to expand the pilot program for packaging direct loans for single family rural housing to states and communities not served by such pilot program.
Limits funds available for administration of the plan for repair or replacement of bulk fuel storage tanks in Alaska that are not in compliance with applicable Federal or state law.

Prohibits the use of funds made available by this Act to reclassify any area eligible for rural housing programs on September 30, 2013, as ineligible for such programs.

Authorizes funds received by the Secretary in the global settlement of any Federal litigation concerning Federal mortgage loans during FY 2012 to be obligated and expended by the Rural Housing Service for costs associated with servicing single family housing loans guaranteed by the Service.

Appropriates funds to implement non-renewable agreements on eligible lands, including flooded agricultural lands.

Designates the Federal building located at 64 Nowelo Street, Hilo, Hawaii, as the Daniel K. Inouye United States Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center.

Rescinds specified CCC funds from unobligated balances for biorefinery assistance.

Authorizes the Secretary to increase the program level by up to 25% for certain loans and loan guarantees that do not require budget authority. Requires Congressional notification prior to implementing any such increase.

Obligates specified funds for an assessment of the existing and prospective scope of domestic hunger and food insecurity.

Directs the Secretary to enter into an agreement with a tax-exempt private-sector organization that has recognized expertise in domestic hunger affairs to conduct this assessment.

Establishes the National Commission on Hunger which shall: (1) provide policy recommendations to Congress and the Secretary regarding programs and funds to combat domestic hunger and food insecurity; and (2) develop recommendations to encourage public-private partnerships, faith-based sector engagement, and community initiatives to reduce the need for government nutrition assistance programs, while protecting the safety net for the most vulnerable members of society.

Limits the amount of funds that may be used to write, prepare, or publish a final or an interim rule to implement “Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI, of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act.”

Prohibits funds under this Act from being used to inspect horses for slaughter purposes.

Directs the Secretary to set aside specified additional funds for Rural Economic Area Partnership (REAP) Zones.

Makes certain sequestered fees for FDA available until expended for the same purpose for which such funds were originally appropriated.

Makes additional Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service funds available until September 30, 2015, for one-time control and management and activities related to citrus greening.

Declares that certain credit card refunds or rebates transferred to the Working Capital Fund: (1) shall not be made available for obligation without Congressional notification and approval; but (2) shall be available for obligation only for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, administrative, and information technology services of primary ben-
efit to USDA agencies. Extends specified CCC conservation programs through FY 2015.

**P.L. 113–164 (H.J. Res. 124)**

**Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015**

H.J. Res. 124 was introduced by Representative Harold Rogers and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Budget. On September 17th, the resolution passed by the House by a recorded vote with 319 yeas to 108 nays. The resolution passed by the Senate without amendments with 78 yeas to 22 nays. On September 19, 2014, the President signed the resolution to become Public Law 113–164.

The Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 provides continuing FY 2015 appropriations to Federal agencies until December 11, 2014, or enactment of specified appropriations legislation. The joint resolution also authorizes the Secretary of Defense (DOD) to provide assistance in Syria. It also extends the operating authority of the Export-Import Bank, provides funding to respond to the outbreak of the Ebola virus in Africa, provides U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement with funding flexibility, and extends the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

More specifically, Section 101 appropriates funds to Federal agencies for continuing projects and activities at the rate and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable divisions of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014:

- the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014;
- the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014; and

The bill reduces the rate of operations provided in this section by 0.0554%.

Also of note, Section 216 provides funding for the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA’s) Commodity Assistance Program.
P.L. 113–202 (H.J. Res. 130)
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.
H.J. Res. 130 was introduced by Representative Harold Rogers on December 10, 2014 and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. On December 11, 2014 the bill passed the House under Unanimous Consent. On December 11, 2014 the Senate agreed to the joint resolution by a voice vote. On December 12, 2014 the President signed the bill into law.

P.L. 113–203 (H.J. Res. 131)
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.
H.J. Res. 131 was introduced by Representative Harold Rogers on December 12, 2014 and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. On December 12, 2014 the bill passed the House under Unanimous Consent. On December 13, 2014 the Senate agreed to the joint resolution by a voice vote. On December 13, 2014 the President signed the bill into law.

P.L. 113–__ (H.R. 83)
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015
H.R. 83 was introduced by Representative Donna Christensen on January 3, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. On September 15th, 2014 the bill passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. On December 11, 2014 a complete substitute amendment converting the measure into the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015 was adopted by the House by a vote of 219 yeas to 206 nays and 10 not voting. On December 13, 2014 the Senate agreed to the bill by a recorded vote of 56 yeas to 40 nays and 4 not voting. On December 16, 2014 the President signed the bill into law.

The Agriculture Appropriations bill included in the Omnibus provides $20.6 billion in discretionary funding—$305 million below the Fiscal Year 2014 enacted level—while cutting back lower-priority programs and rescinding unused funds.

The bill provides $2.7 billion for agriculture research programs, including the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Funding is targeted to help stop and mitigate devastating crop diseases, improve food safety and water quality, and help address issues related to drought, invasive species, and herbicide resistance. Within this amount, the bill includes $325 million for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative for competitive agricultural research grants, $45 million to begin to rehabilitate the high-priority ARS facilities, and funding to maintain important investments in the nation’s land-grant colleges and universities.

The legislation includes $871.3 million—a $49.5 million increase above the Fiscal Year 2014 enacted level—for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). This funding will support programs to control or eradicate plant and animal pests and diseases that can cripple U.S. producers and entire agricultural industries. This also includes increases to fight citrus greening and an epidemic porcine virus.
The legislation provides $1.5 billion for FSA, which is $22 million above the Fiscal Year 2014 enacted level and $66 million above the President’s request. This funding will support more than $6 billion in loan authorizations for farm, conservation, and emergency loan programs for American farmers and ranchers.

The bill provides a total of $2.4 billion for rural development programs, which is $173 million above the President’s request. These development programs help create an environment for economic growth by investing in basic infrastructure, providing loans for rural businesses and industries, and helping to balance the playing field for buyers in rural housing markets.

The legislation includes more than $1 billion for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $5.8 million above the Fiscal Year 2014 enacted level. These mandatory inspection activities help ensure the safety and productivity of the country’s $186 billion meat and poultry industry, and keep safe food on American tables. The funding provided will maintain more than 7,800 frontline inspection personnel for meat, poultry, and egg products at more than 6,400 facilities across the country.

The legislation also restricts the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) from implementing certain regulations that would allow harmful government interference in the private market for the livestock and poultry industry.

The FDA receives a total of almost $2.6 billion in discretionary funding in the bill, an increase of $37 million over the Fiscal Year 2014 enacted level. Total funding for the FDA, including revenue from user fees, is $4.5 billion. Within this total, food safety activities are increased by $27.5 million, and various drug safety activities—including additional funds for foreign drug inspections, pharmacy compounding, and counterfeit drugs—are increased by over $20 million.

CFTC is funded at $250 million, which is $30 million below the President’s budget request. The legislation also promotes transparency, with a directive requiring a vote by the full Commission—instead of just staff—on financial regulations that greatly increase regulatory burdens for ranchers, farmers, and job creators.

The bill provides $859 million for the Natural Resources Conservation Service to help farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners conserve and protect their land. This includes $12 million for dam rehabilitation to help rural communities ensure their small watershed projects meet current safety standards.

The legislation contains discretionary funding, as well as mandatory funding required by law, for food and nutrition programs within the Department of Agriculture. This includes the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and Child Nutrition programs.

The legislation contains $1.5 billion for the Food for Peace program, which provides emergency food aid to those in need, and bolsters U.S. security interests abroad—including in Iraq and Ebola-affected West-Africa. This is $66 million above the President’s request. In addition, the bill provides $192 million, $7 million above the President’s request, for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education Program to support food security overseas.
2. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate

**H.R. 634, Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013**

H.R. 634 was introduced on February 13, 2013 by Representative Michael G. Grimm, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services. On March 20, 2013, the Committee on Agriculture ordered reported the bill by a voice vote. On May 7, 2013, the Committee on Financial Services ordered reported the bill by a recorded vote of 59 yeas to 0 nays. Both Committees reported the bill on June 12, 2013, H. Rept. 113–105, Part 1 and 2. On that same date, the bill passed the House, as amended, under suspension of the rules by a recorded vote of 411 yeas to 12 nays. On June 13, 2013, the measure was received by the Senate and referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013 amends section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) as added by Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111–203) (the Dodd-Frank Act) to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for swap transactions involving end-users that qualify for the clearing exception under 2(h)(7)(A). The bill includes mirroring provisions to Section 15f(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to security-based swap transactions. (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)

**H.R. 742, Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013**

H.R. 742 was introduced by Representative Eric A. “Rick” Crawford on February 15, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services. On June 12, 2013, the Committee on Agriculture reported 113–106, Part 1, which was followed by the Committee on Financial Service’s Part 2. On June 12, 2013, the House agreed to pass the bill on a motion to suspend the rules with a vote of 420 yeas and 2 nays. On June 13, 2013, the bill was received in the Senate and referred to and read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

The Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013 strikes the indemnification requirements found in Sections 725, 728, and 763 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111–203) (the Dodd-Frank Act) related to swap data gathered by swap data repositories (SDRs) and derivatives clearing organizations (DCOs). The bill does maintain, however, that before an SDR, DCO, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), or the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) shares information with domestic or international regulators, they have to receive a written agreement stating that the regulator will abide by certain confidentiality agreements. (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)
**H.R. 803, Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act (SKILLS Act)**

H.R. 803 was introduced by Representative Virginia Foxx on February 25, 2013 and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the House Committees on Education and the Workforce; Judiciary, Veterans’ Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure. On March 12, 2013, the House Committee on Agriculture discharged the bill. On March 15, 2013, the House voted on H.R. 803 with a passage of 215 yeas and 202 nays. On March 18, 2013, the measure was received by the Senate and read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

The Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act or SKILLS Act amends the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) to revise requirements and reauthorize appropriations for: (1) WIA title I, workforce investment systems for job training and employment services; and (2) WIA title II, adult education and family literacy education programs.

**H.R. 935, Reducing Regulatory Burden Act of 2013**

The Reducing Regulatory Burden Act was introduced by Representative Bob Gibbs on March 4, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 13, 2013, the Committee on Agriculture ordered the bill to be reported by a voice vote. On October 29, 2013, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered the bill to be reported by a voice vote. On June 2, 2014, it was reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in H. Rept. 113–467, Part 1; reported by the Committee on Agriculture in H. Rept. 113–467, Part 2; and placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 346. On July 31, 2014 the House passed the bill by a recorded vote of 267 yeas and 161 nays. On August 1, the bill was received in the Senate and Read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

The measure amends the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (known as the Clean Water Act [CWA]) to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or a state from requiring a permit under the CWA for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under FIFRA, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.

Exempts from such prohibition the following discharges containing a pesticide or pesticide residue: (1) a discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of FIFRA that is relevant to protecting water quality, if the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation or the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue contained in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation; (2) storm water discharges regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES); and (3) discharges regulated under NPDES of manufacturing or industrial effluent or treatment works effluent and discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling.

H.R. 992, Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act

H.R. 992 was introduced by Representative Randy Hultgren on March 6, 2013 and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the House Committee on Financial Services on September 25, 2013. On October 30, 2013, the House voted on H.R. 992 with a passage of 292 yeas and 122 nays. On October 31, 2013, the measure was received by the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act amends the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act limits the application of Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111–203) (Dodd-Frank Act) so that it does not apply to equity or commodity swaps traded by a financial institution. However, the section would continue to apply to certain structured finance swaps that are based on an asset-backed security and force those particular swaps to be traded in a separately capitalized entity outside of the banking entity. (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)

H.R. 1038, Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013

H.R. 1038 was introduced by Representative Doug LaMalfa on March 11, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 14, 2013, Committee hearings were held and on March 20, 2013, a mark-up session was held with a report to record the voice vote of passage. On June 12, 2013, H.R. 1038 was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 76 and on that same date, Mr. LaMalfa moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill. It was passed in the House with a unanimous vote of 423 yeas to 0 nays. On June 13, 2013, the bill was received and read in the Senate and then referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013 would preserve the ability of government-owned utilities, classified in the bill as “utility special entities,” to have uninterrupted and cost-effective access to the customized, non-financial commodity swaps that utility special entities have used for years. In effect, the counterparties of utility special entities would now be subject to the much higher $8 billion de minimis swap dealer registration threshold. Importantly, the bill does not include an exemption for interest rate, credit, equities, currency asset classes, or agriculture commodities, other than commodities used for electric energy or natural gas production or generation. Instead, the legislation creates a new category of swap known as the “utility operations-related swap” and provides relief to counterparties of utility special entities only when those specific types of swaps are used. To ensure transparency, the bill still requires all special entity swap transactions to be reported to the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)
H.R. 1256, Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act

H.R. 1256 was introduced by Representative Scott Garrett on March 19, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Financial Services. On June 10, 2013, the Committee on Financial Services filed Part 1 of H. Rept. 113–103, and the Committee on Agriculture reported Part 2 of H. Rept. 113–103. On June 12, 2013, the House voted on H.R. 1256 with a passage of 301 yeas to 124 nays. On June 13, 2013, the bill was received and read in the Senate then referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

The Swap Jurisdiction Certainty would require a joint rule-making from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) on cross-border swaps regulation pursuant to Section 722(d) of Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111–203) (the Dodd-Frank Act), and would presume that all G20 nations would be granted substituted compliance to regulate institutions operating within their borders unless the CFTC and SEC jointly determine otherwise. (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)

H.R. 1341, Financial Competitive Act of 2013

H.R. 1341 was introduced by Representative Stephen Lee Fincher on March 21, 2013 and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture and also the Committee on Financial Services. On June 28, 2013, the Committee on Financial Services reported Part 1 of H. Rept. 113–134. On the same date, the House Committee on Agriculture discharged H.R. 1341. On July 8, 2013, the House voted on a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended Agreed to by the Yeas and Nays. The motion passed with a passage of 353 yeas and 24 nays. On July 9, 2013, the bill was received and read in the Senate, then referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Financial Competitive Act of 2013 directs the Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC) to study and report to Congress on the likely effects that differences between the United States and other jurisdictions in implementing the derivatives credit valuation adjustment capital requirement would have upon: (1) U.S. financial institutions that conduct derivatives transactions and participate in derivatives markets, (2) end users of derivatives, and (3) international derivatives markets.

Additionally, it requires the study to recommend steps Congress and the constituent agencies of the FSOC should take to: (1) minimize any expected negative effects on U.S. financial institutions, derivatives markets, and end users; (2) encourage greater international consistency in implementation of internationally agreed capital, liquidity, and other prudential standards; and (3) ensure that the FSOC fulfills its statutory mandate to identify risks and respond to emerging threats to financial stability.

H.R. 1526, Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act

H.R. 1526 was introduced by Representative Doc Hastings on April 12, 2013 and referred to the House Committee on Natural
Resources and also the House Committee on Agriculture. On September 17, 2013, the Committee on Natural Resources reported Part 1 of H. Rept. 113–213. On September 20, 2013, the House voted on H.R. 1526 with a passage of 244 yeas to 173 nays. On September 23, 2013, the bill was referred to, received in, and read twice in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act directs the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) to establish at least one Forest Reserve Revenue Area (Area) within each unit of the National Forest System (NFS) designated for sustainable forest management for the production of National Forest materials (the sale of trees, portions of trees, or forest products from NFS lands) and forest reserve revenues (to be derived from the sale of such materials in such an Area).

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to NFS land, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands, to implement a hazardous fuel reduction project or forest health project in at-risk forests in a manner that focuses on surface, ladder, and canopy fuels reduction activities.

Bars the Secretary of Agriculture from conducting any prescribed fire (except as part of wildfire suppression activities) in the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri under the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project until the following report is submitted to Congress.

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct land exchanges involving the transferred lands, other than those excluded from the O&C Trust, in order to create larger contiguous blocks of land under the Secretary's management.

Requires the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an Old Growth Review Panel to define old growth as it applies to the ecologically, geographically, and climatologically unique Oregon and California Railroad Grant lands and O&C Region Public Domain lands managed by the O&C Trust or the Forest Service only (but not to tribal lands).

Provides for a three-year transition period which shall commence after the appointment of the Board.

Directs the Secretary of the Interior to transfer administrative jurisdiction over the Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant lands excluded from the transfer under this subtitle to the Secretary of Agriculture for inclusion in the NFS.

Permits Coos County to recommend land exchanges to the Secretary of Agriculture and carry them out.

Prohibits the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from acquiring by condemnation any land or interest within the boundaries of the river segments or wilderness designated by this subtitle.

Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the community forest demonstration area of a state, consisting of National Forest System (NFS) land, at the request of an advisory committee appointed by a governor to manage such land in that state. Conditions establishment of an area upon: (1) inclusion of at least 200,000 acres of NFS land; (2) a state forest practices law applicable to state or privately owned forest land, or established silvicultural best management practices or other regulations for forest
management practices related to clean water, soil quality, wildlife, or forest health; and (3) a revenue-sharing agreement between a county and the state governor requiring the county, in using certain revenues received from the area, to continue to meet obligations for the use of such revenues for the benefit of public schools and roads.

Directs the Secretary of Agriculture, during February 2015, to distribute to each beneficiary county a payment equal to the amount distributed to the county for FY 2010 under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

**H.R. 2166, Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act of 2013**

The Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act of 2013 was introduced by Representative Joseph Heck on May 23, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On June 12, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill by unanimous consent. The Committee on Agriculture discharged the bill. On January 27, 2014, the House voted on a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended Agreed to by the Yeas and Nays. The motion passed with a passage of 394 yeas and 0 nays. On January 28, 2014 the bill was received and read in the Senate, then referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The measure directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) to implement a process to provide eligible organizations and individuals expedited access to Federal lands to conduct good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions.

Sets forth procedures for the approval or denial of requests made by eligible organizations or individuals to carry out a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission.

Requires the Secretaries to develop search-and-recovery focused partnerships with search-and-recovery organizations to: (1) coordinate good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions on such lands, and (2) expedite and accelerate mission efforts for missing individuals on such lands.

**H.R. 2954, The Public Access and Lands Improvement Act**

H.R. 2954, The Public Access and Lands Improvement Act, was introduced by Representative Jeff Miller on August 1, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On December 16, 2013, the Committee on Natural Resources reported H. Rept. 113–296. On February 6, 2014, the House passed H.R. 2954 by recorded vote with 220 yeas and 194 nays. On February 10, 2014, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The Public Access and Lands Improvement Act is a package of ten bills that promote access to public lands, encourage transparent land management, and foster local economic development projects. Title IX of the bill, the Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act, falls within the Committee on Agriculture's jurisdiction. This section directs the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a timber salvage plan for National Forest Service lands burned in the 2013 Rim Fire in California. It further provides that the project is not subject to administrative or judicial review, or temporary restraining orders or preliminary injunctions based on environmental impacts in cases
where there has not been a final decision. Furthermore, the pilot program is deemed to be in compliance with the NEPA, the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the Endangered Species act of 1973. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 3188 under “5. Bills Reported by Other Committees within the Committee on Agriculture’s jurisdiction but not considered.”)

H.R. 3102, Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013

H.R. 3102 was introduced by Chairman Lucas on September 16, 2013. On September 19, 2013, the House voted on H.R. 3102 with a passage of 217 yeas and 210 nays. On September 23, 2013, the bill was received in the Senate.

The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, encourages and enables work participation, makes common-sense reforms, closes program loopholes and cracks down on waste, fraud and abuse in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) saving the American taxpayer nearly $40 billion. This bill strengthens program integrity and accountability while better targeting the Federal nutrition programs to serve those in need of assistance.

Prevents States from Waiving Work Requirements on Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents: The bill removes the ability of states to get a waiver for the work requirement for able-bodied adults without dependents. Currently, 40 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands have waivers from the work requirement in effect. Eliminating these waivers will ensure that the nearly 4 million able-bodied adults with dependents who receive food stamps are required to engage in work activities. This population of food stamp recipients has grown dramatically in recent years from 6.6% of the recipient population in 2007 to 9.7% in 2010. This provision saves almost $20 billion over ten years.

Allows States the Option to Impose TANF-Type Work Requirements on Able-Bodied Parents: Empowers states, through a pilot program, to engage all able-bodied individuals (except those responsible for the care of a child under the age of one, or under the age of six if no child care is available) in TANF-type work and job training as part of receiving food stamps. The bill allows only those states that adopt these work requirements to access the 50% Federal match for state employment and training expenses.

Eliminates Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility: Ensures all households meet the asset and income tests stated in SNAP law before they can receive benefits by restricting categorical eligibility to only those households receiving cash assistance from Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or other state general assistance programs. Receiving a TANF-funded brochure or referral to an “800” number hotline would no longer automatically make a household eligible for SNAP.

Closes the “Heat and Eat” Loophole: Some states are sending $1 and $5 LIHEAP payments to low-income households, triggering a SNAP income deduction that results in higher SNAP benefits for those individuals. This legislation stops states from sending nomi-
nal LIHEAP payments below $20 for the sole purpose of increasing their SNAP benefits. (Saves $8.7 billion).

Eliminates State Performance Bonuses: Ends the bonuses USDA awards to states for administering SNAP, and saves taxpayers nearly half a billion dollars without affecting SNAP recipients' benefits.

Prohibits Government-Sponsored Recruitment Activities: The USDA has been engaged in recruitment efforts to encourage participation in SNAP. This bill prevents the Department from advertising and promoting SNAP through television, radio, and billboard advertisements and prohibits USDA from entering into agreements with foreign governments designed to promote SNAP benefits.

Ends Eligibility for Traditional College Students, Lottery Winners, and Illegal Immigrants: SNAP recipients with substantial lottery or gambling winnings will lose benefits immediately after receiving winnings. College students are restricted to those participating in technical and vocational education programs, trade studies, remedial course work, or basic adult literacy. States will be required to use an immigration status verification system to verify an applicant’s immigration status.

Denies Benefits for Illegal Drug Abusers: Allows states to conduct drug testing on SNAP applicants at state expense as a condition for receiving benefits.

Permanently Denies Benefits for Violent Criminals: Ends eligibility for SNAP benefits for convicted murderers, pedophiles and rapists after enacted into law.

Strengthen Program Integrity and Accountability: Requires participating retailers to stock more staple foods like fruits and vegetables. Includes provisions, and increases funding, to further monitor and prevent fraud in retail stores. Discourages fraudulent use of electronic benefit cards by requiring states to expunge EBT balances that are more than 60 days old. Permits state law enforcement officials to investigate retailer fraud in addition to recipient fraud.

Three-Year Reauthorization: The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act is a three year bill. This will ensure that nutrition programs are on a different authorization schedule from farm programs and allow Congress to evaluate and potentially further reform the nutrition programs in 2017.

Increases Assistance for Food Banks: Food banks have been successful in effectively utilizing government dollars and securing private sector donations in order to feed hungry Americans. Funding for TEFAP is increased by $20 million per year with an additional $50 million increase in FY 2014 and FY 2015. (Increases funding for food banks by $333 million).

Supports the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, ensures seniors and low-income families have access to farmers markets through the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program, continues current funding for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program and allows schools to utilize all forms including fresh, frozen, canned and dried produce for students, maintains current funding for the DOD Fresh Program, reauthorizes the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations and supports grants for Community Food Projects. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 2642 under “1. Bills Enacted into Law.”)
**H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act**

The Water Rights Protection Act was introduced by Representative Scott Tipton on September 26, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On November 14, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 19 yeas to 14 nays. On March 13, 2014, the bill passed the House under a rule with 238 yeas to 174 nays. On March 24, 2014 the bill was received in the Senate and Read twice and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The measure prohibits the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) from: (1) conditioning the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on the transfer or relinquishment of any water right directly to the United States, in whole or in part, granted under state law, by Federal or state adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact and such Secretaries; and (2) requiring any water user to apply for a water right in the name of the United States under state law as a condition of such a land use or occupancy agreement.

**H.R. 3590, Sportsmen’s Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act (SHARE Act)**

The SHARE Act was introduced by Representative Robert E. Latta on November 21, 2013 and referred to the House Natural Resources Committee and in addition to the House Agriculture, House Judiciary, House Transportation and Infrastructure, and House Energy and Commerce Committees. On February 5, 2014, the House voted under a rule and passed the bill, as amended. The bill was agreed to by the Yeas and Nays. The motion passed with a passage of 268 yeas and 154 nays. On February 5, 2014 the bill was received and read in the Senate. Placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under Read the First Time. On February 10, 2014 it was read the second time. Placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. Calendar No. 305.

The Sportsmen’s Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Act, or the SHARE Act, requires the Secretary of the Interior to report to Congress, not later than 12 months after enactment of this Act, an assessment of its expected economic impacts, including a review of expected increases in recreational hunting, fishing, shooting, and conservation activities.

The SHARE Act includes the following provisions: Hunting, Fishing and Recreational Shooting Protection Act; Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act; Public Lands Filming; Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act; Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act; Access to Water Resources Development Projects Act; Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee; Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act; and the Hunter and Farmer Protection Act.

The provision relevant to the Committee on Agriculture is the Hunter and Farmer Protection Act. It permits the taking of migratory game birds on or over land that is not otherwise a baited area or contains a standing crop that is the result of a normal agricultural practice.
H.R. 3695, To provide a temporary extension of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 and amendments made by that Act, as previously extended and amended and with certain additional modifications and exceptions, to suspend permanent price support authorities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3695 was introduced by Chairman Frank D. Lucas on December 11, 2013. On December 12, 2013 the bill passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote.

H.R. 3695 extends the authorities of the 2008 Farm Bill from September 30, 2013 until January 31, 2014. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 2642 under “1. Bills Enacted into Law.”)

H.R. 4360, To designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the “Jason Crisp Forest Service Building”.

H.R. 4360 was introduced by Representative Mark Meadows on April 1, 2014. On June 18, 2014 the bill passed the House under suspension of the rules by a voice vote.

H.R. 4413, Customer Protection and End User Relief Act

The Customer Protection and End User Relief Act was introduced by Representative Frank Lucas and referred to the Committee on Agriculture on April 7, 2014. The bill was ordered to be reported by voice vote by the Committee on Agriculture on April 9, 2014. On June 5, 2014, it was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, H. Rept. 113–469 and was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 348. On June 24, the bill was considered under a rule and passed the House with 265 yeas and 144 nays. On June 25, it was received in the Senate and Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 4413 reauthorizes and improves the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). In doing so, the bill seeks to protect consumers by preventing failure of financial institutions and making the CFTC more efficient. The bill also reduces the regulatory burden on farmers because many of them hedge on the market and are subject to the CFTC consumer protection rule.

H.R. 5471, To amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5471 was introduced by Representative Gwen Moore on September 9, 2014 and was referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On December 2, 2014 the House considered the bill under suspension of the rules and passed the bill by a voice vote.

H.R. 5714, Pest Management Records Modernization Act

H.R. 5714 was introduced by Representative Kurt Schrader on November 14, 2014 and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On December 2, 2014 the bill was considered under suspension of the rules and passed the House by a voice vote.
H.R. 5810, To amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act.

H.R. 5810 was introduced by Representative Lynn Westmoreland on December 8, 2014 and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. The bill was on considered under suspension of the rules on December 10, 2014 and passed the House by a voice vote.

The Cotton Futures Act of 1916 does not permit a cotton futures contract to be traded on a U.S.-based futures exchange unless it is classed by a USDA inspector. H.R. 5810 amends current law to remove this requirement for contracts that are tendered in a foreign jurisdiction with foreign produced cotton. It makes no changes to the delivery, classing, or any other aspect of the benchmark U.S. No. 2 Cotton Contract. All domestically produced cotton will still be classed by USDA inspectors. This legislation will allow for the creation of a new global cotton contract and will enable cotton merchants and others to hedge the risks associated with the global cotton trade.

Other Bills of Interest: Several bills acted on by other committees, but not acted on by the Committee on Agriculture contain provisions relating to matters within the Committee's jurisdiction. The following are abbreviated summaries of these bills, including some of the relevant provisions.

H.R. 4, Jobs for America Act

H.R. 4 was introduced by Representative Dave Camp on September 15, 2014 and was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, House Budget Committee, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, House Rules Committee, House Judiciary Committee, House Financial Services Committee, House Agriculture Committee, House Natural Resources Committee, and House Small Business Committee.


H.R. 1960 was introduced by Representative Howard P. “Buck” McKeon on May 14, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On June 7, 2013, the Committee on Armed Services reported on H. Rept. 113–2 as amended. On June 11, 2013, the Committee on Armed Services filed Part 2 of H. Rept. 113–102 as a supplement report. On June 14, 2013, the House voted on H.R. 1960 with a passage of 315 yea to 108 nays. On July 8, 2013, the bill was received and read in the Senate, then placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under General Order—Calendar No. 126.


The bill provides an alternative deadline for required annual DOD reports on proposed budgets for activities relating to operational energy strategy and permits recipients of funds under inter-agency conservation cooperation agreements or under the Sikes Act (conservation programs on Federal lands) to use such funds for matching funds or cost-sharing requirements of conservation pro-
grams of the Departments of Agriculture or the Interior. Terminates the cooperative agreement authority on October 1, 2019, while allowing agreements entered into before such date to continue through their full term.

Reauthorizes the Sikes Act through FY 2019.

Amends the Sikes Act to authorize lump-sum payments under cooperative agreements for land management related to DOD military readiness activities. Allows such agreements to be used to acquire property and services for the direct benefit or use of the government. Provides limitations on funds used for conservation or rehabilitation of natural resources in an area that is not on a military installation. Requires the DOD Inspector General to annually audit each such project. Terminates this section on October 1, 2019, while allowing agreements entered into before such date to continue through their full term.

Prohibits the Secretary from contracting for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery unless such activity is specifically authorized by law.

Prohibits DOD funds from being used to purchase or produce biofuels until the earlier of the date on which: (1) the cost of the biofuels is equal to the cost of conventional fuels purchased by DOD, or (2) the Budget Control Act of 2011 and its sequestration are no longer in effect.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to: (1) acquire certain real property at Naval Base Ventura County, California, for the leasing of military family housing; (2) convey to such County the former Oxnard Air Force Base, to be used for public purposes; and (3) convey to the Philadelphia Regional Port Authority a portion of real property at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

Directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the state of Utah all U.S. rights and interests to certain lands within Camp Williams, Utah, to be used for Utah National Guard training purposes.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to the state of Utah the Air National Guard radar site on Francis Peak, Utah, to be used to support emergency public safety communications for northern Utah.

Expresses the sense of Congress regarding the need for the conveyance of certain portions of the former Fort Monroe in Hampton, Virginia. Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey to the commonwealth of Virginia certain real property at the Fort.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey to Derry Township, Pennsylvania, all U.S. rights and interests to the Mifflin County Army Reserve Center in Lewistown, Pennsylvania, to be used for a regional police headquarters or other public purposes.


H.R. 4435 authorizes appropriations for the Department of Defense for Fiscal Year 2015. It includes funding for procurement, the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, research, operation, active and reserve military personnel, Working Capital Funds, the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund, chemical agents and munitions destruction, counter-drug activities, the Defense Inspector General, the Defense Health Program, the Armed Forces Retirement Home, chemical demilitarization, the NATO Security Investment Program, guard and reserve forces, and base closure and realignment activities.

H.R. 4800, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015

H.R. 4800 was introduced by Representative Robert Aderholt on June 4, 2014. The House Committee on Appropriations reported an original measure, H. Rept. 113–468. The bill was debated on June 11th. On the same day, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union rises leaving H.R. 4800 as unfinished business. H.R. 4800 funds important agricultural and food programs and services, including food safety, animal and plant health programs, rural development and farm services, marketplace oversight, and nutrition programs.

The bill totals $19.5 billion in discretionary funding, which is $1.3 billion below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level and approximately equal to the current level caused by automatic sequestration spending cuts. This total is $516 million below the President's request for these programs. The agencies and programs in this bill will receive a total of $139.4 billion in both discretionary and mandatory funding—$2.6 billion below the President's request and $52 million below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level.

The bill provides $2.5 billion for agriculture research programs, including the Agricultural Research Service and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture. This is approximately equal to the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted funding level. This funding will support research to help stop and mitigate devastating crop diseases and improve food safety and water quality. The bill also maintains responsible investments in the nation's land-grant colleges and universities.

The legislation includes $803.5 million—approximately equal to the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level—for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. This funding will provide support for programs to help control or eradicate plant and animal pests and diseases that can be crippling to U.S. producers and entire agricultural industries.

The bill provides $823 million—$2.3 million below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level—for the Natural Resources Conservation Service to help farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners conserve and protect their land. This includes $12 million in conservation funding for dam rehabilitation to help small communities ensure their small watershed projects meet current safety standards.

The legislation provides $1.5 billion for FSA, which is equal to the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level. This funding will support the
various farm, conservation, loan, and emergency programs for American farmers and ranchers.

The bill provides a total of $2.2 billion for rural development programs, which is equal to the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level. These programs help create an environment for economic growth by supporting basic rural infrastructure, providing loans to increase opportunities for rural businesses and industries, and helping balance the playing field in local rural housing markets.

The legislation includes $52 million—$3.1 million below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level—for the rural business and industry loan program. This funding will support $741 million in loans to help small businesses in rural areas, many of which face unique challenges due to local economic conditions.

The legislation includes responsible investments in basic rural infrastructure needs. This includes $1.2 billion for rural water and waste program loans and $448 million for grants, $5.2 billion for rural electric and telephone infrastructure loans, and $24 million for Distance Learning and Telemedicine grants, which address educational and health needs in rural communities.

The bill provides a total of $24 billion in loan authority for the Single Family Housing guaranteed loan program (equal to the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level and the President’s request), and $820 million in direct loans ($80 million below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level). These loans provide low-income rural families—many of whom would have few loan options for purchasing a home because of their geographical location—with home loan assistance. In addition, $1 billion—$128 million above last year’s level—is provided for rental assistance to provide affordable rental housing for low-income families and the elderly in rural communities.

The legislation includes $999 million for food safety and inspection programs—which is $31 million below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level. These mandatory inspection activities help ensure the safety and productivity of the country’s $832 billion meat and poultry industry, and keep safe, healthy food on American tables. The funding provided will maintain more than 8,000 frontline inspection personnel for meat, poultry, and egg products at more than 6,200 facilities across the country.

The FDA receives a total of almost $2.5 billion in discretionary funding in the bill, an increase of $24 million above the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level. Total funding for the FDA, including revenue from user fees, is $4.3 billion. Within this total, food safety activities are increased by $27 million, and drug safety activities are increased by $2.5 million.

Included in the bill is $195 million for the CFTC, the agency’s current operating level, which is a cut of $10 million below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level and $120 million below the President’s budget request.

The legislation contains discretionary funding, as well as mandatory funding required by law, for food and nutrition programs within the Department of Agriculture. This includes funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and the Child Nutrition programs.

The legislation contains $1.15 billion for “Food for Peace” grants, also known as the P.L. 480—Title II program. This is $284 million
below the Fiscal Year 2013 enacted level. The bill does not reflect the President's budget request to move this program to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

**H.R. 5405, Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act**

H.R. 5405 was introduced by Representative Michael Fitzpatrick on September 8, 2014 and referred to the Financial Services Committee and in addition to the Agriculture Committee. On September 16, 2014, the bill was considered under suspension of the rules and passed the House by a vote of 320 yeas to 102 nays.

Title I of H.R. 5405 amends section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) as added by Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111–203) (the Dodd-Frank Act) to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for swap transactions involving end-users that qualify for the clearing exception under 2(h)(7)(A). The bill includes mirroring provisions to Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to security-based swap transactions. (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14, 2013: Hearing to Examine Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight; as well as the discussion about H.R. 634, Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013.”)

**H.R. 5461, To clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, and for other purposes**

H.R. 5461 was introduced by Representative Andy Barr on September 15, 2014 and was referred to the Financial Services Committee, and in addition to the Agriculture Committee. The bill was considered under the suspension of rules on September 15, 2014 and passed the House by a vote of 327 yeas to 97 nays. The bill would amend the Dodd-Frank Act to give the Federal Reserve flexibility to set capital standards for insurance companies.

This title clarifies Congressional intent and provides an explicit exemption from margin requirements for non-financial end-users that qualify for the clearing exception, including cooperatives that are provided a clearing exemption by CFTC regulations. Over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives enable businesses across the country to manage the risks associated with their day-to-day operations. Consumers, in turn, benefit from companies' prudent risk management activities through lower volatility in the prices of day-to-day goods and services such as food, electricity, and transportation. For this reason, Congress provided an explicit exemption from clearing and margin for end-users in Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. These exemptions are aimed at ensuring end-users do not have to divert precious working capital to margin requirements, keeping those dollars at work in the economy. While the CFTC has upheld Congressional intent in its margin proposal by exempting non-financial end-users, the banking regulators have proposed to require non-financial end-users to post margin when they trade with swap dealers that are banks, a problem that this bill addresses.
3. House Resolutions Considered in the House

H. Res. 379, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance.

H. Res. 379 was introduced by Representative Paul Ryan on October 11, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On that same date, the resolution was considered and passed by the House by a voice vote.

The resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the House managers of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 should: (1) agree to provisions regarding a premium subsidy limitation based on average adjusted gross income in excess of $750,000, (2) agree to provisions for a crop insurance study and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation, and (3) not agree to provisions regarding a delayed effective date.

4. Bills Reported by the Committee on Agriculture But Not Considered

None.

5. Bills Reported by Other Committees Within the Committee on Agriculture’s Jurisdiction But Not Considered

H.R. 657, Grazing Improvement Act

The Grazing Improvement Act was introduced by Representative Raúl R. Labrador on February 13, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On June 12, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported H.R. 657, amended, by a recorded vote of 27 yeas to 15 nays. On July 9, 2013 the bill was reported, amended, to the House by the Committee on Natural Resources, H. Rept. 113–145, Part 1. On that same date the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from further consideration.

The measure amends the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to double from 10 to 20 years the period of a term for grazing permits and leases for domestic livestock grazing on public lands or lands within National Forests in 16 contiguous western states. Permits the issuance of permits and leases for a period shorter than 20 years (under current law, shorter than 10 years), including where the Secretary concerned determines that the initial environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) regarding a grazing allotment, permit, or lease has not been completed.

Permits only applicants, permittees, and lessees whose interest in grazing livestock is directly affected by a final grazing decision to appeal such decision to an administrative law judge.

Directs that grazing permits or leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior respecting lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and grazing permits issued by the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) respecting National Forest System lands that expire, are transferred, or are waived after this Act’s enactment be renewed or reissued, as appropriate, under the Act, the
Granger-Thye Act, the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or the California Desert Protection Act of 1994.

Excludes the renewal, reissuance, or transfer of a grazing permit or lease by the Secretary concerned from the NEPA requirement to prepare an environmental analysis if: (1) such decision continues to renew, reissue, or transfer current grazing management of the allotment; (2) monitoring indicates that such management meets objectives contained in the land use and resource management plan of the allotment; or (3) the decision is consistent with the policy of the Department of the Interior or USDA regarding extraordinary circumstances.

Gives the Secretary concerned the sole discretion to determine the priority and timing for completing each required environmental analysis regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of such authorization and available funding.

Makes NEPA inapplicable to domestic livestock crossing and trailing authorizations, transfers of grazing preference, and range improvements.

_H.R. 1825, Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act_

The Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act was introduced by Representative Dan Benishek on May 3, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On June 12, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 28 yeas to 15 nays. On January 31, 2014, the bill was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources. H. Rept. 113–337, Part 1. On January 31, 2014, the Committee on Agriculture discharged the bill, and it was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 250.

The bill requires Federal public land management officials to facilitate the use of, and access to, Federal public lands, including National Monuments, Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, or lands administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable and primitive or semi-primitive areas, for fishing, sport hunting, and recreational shooting, except as limited by: (1) statutory authority that authorizes or withholds action for reasons of national security, public safety, or resource conservation; (2) any other Federal statute that specifically precludes recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting on specific Federal public lands or waters; and (3) discretionary limitations on recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting determined to be necessary and reasonable.

Requires Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Forest Service lands, excluding lands on the Outer Continental Shelf, to be open to recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting unless the managing agency acts to close such lands to such activity for purposes of resource conservation, public safety, energy production, water supply facilities, or national security.

Requires the heads of Federal agencies to use their authorities to: (1) lease their lands or permit use of their lands for shooting ranges, and (2) designate specific lands for recreational shooting activities.
Sets forth requirements for a permanent or temporary withdrawal, change of classification, or change of management status that effectively closes or significantly restricts 640 or more contiguous acres of Federal public lands for fishing or hunting or related activities.

**H.R. 2278, Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act (SAFE Act)**

The Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act was introduced by Representative Trey Gowdy on June 6, 2013 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Agriculture, and Natural Resources. On June 18, 2013 the Committee on Judiciary ordered reported by bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 20 yeas to 15 nays. On December 16, 2014 the bill was reported, amended, by the House by the Committee on the Judiciary, H. Rept. 113–678, Part 1. On that same date the Committees on Homeland Security, Agriculture, and Natural Resources were discharged from further consideration.

The measure prohibits the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) from prohibiting or restricting U.S. Customs and Border Protection efforts, on land under their respective jurisdictions located within 100 miles of an international land border, to: (1) execute search and rescue operations, and (2) prevent unlawful entries into the United States through the international land borders.

The bill also grants the U.S. Customs and Border Protection access to such lands to conduct: (1) road and barrier construction and maintenance, (2) vehicular patrols, (3) surveillance equipment activities, and (4) deployment of temporary tactical infrastructure.

**H.R. 2798, Require annual fees for commercial filming on Federal lands for film crews**

H.R. 2798 was introduced by Representative Robert Latta on July 23, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On November 14, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered the bill reported by a recorded vote of 19 yeas to 15 nays. On January 29, 2014, the bill was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources. H. Rept. 113–335, Part 1. Also, on January 29, 2014 the Committee on Agriculture discharged the bill and it was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 248.

The measure directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) with respect to lands under the respective jurisdiction, for any film crew of five persons or fewer, to require a permit and assess an annual fee of $200 for commercial filming activities or similar projects on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary. Makes such a permit valid for such activities or projects that occur in areas designated for public use during public hours on all Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary for a 12 month period.

Prohibits the Secretary, for persons holding such a permit, from assessing any additional fee for commercial filming activities and similar projects that occur in those areas during those hours.

Bars the Secretary from prohibiting, as a motorized vehicle or under any other purposes, the use of cameras or related equipment
used for commercial filming activities or similar projects in accordance with this Act on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary. Requires the Secretary to recover (under current law, collect) costs incurred as a result of filming activities or similar projects, including but not limited to, administrative and personnel costs.

H.R. 2799, Sportsmen’s Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act (SHARE Act)

The Sportsmen’s Heritage and Recreational Enhancement (SHARE) Act was introduced by Representative Robert Latta on July 23, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On October 30, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a voice vote. On January 29, 2014 the bill was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources, H. Rept. 113–396, Part 1. On January 29, 2014 the House Agriculture Committee discharged the bill and it was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 249.

The measure amends the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to establish the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee to advise the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture (USDA) on wildlife and habitat conservation, hunting, and recreational shooting.

H.R. 3188, Yosemite Rim Fire Emergency Salvage

The Yosemite Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act was introduced by Representative Tom McClintock on September 26, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources. On November 14, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 16 yeas to 15 nays. On April 1, 2014 the bill was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources, H. Rept. 113–394, Part 1. On April 1, 2014, the bill was discharged by the Committee on Agriculture and placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 293.

The measure directs the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA), with respect to affected Stanislaus National Forest lands, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to affected Yosemite National Park and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands, as part of the restoration and rehabilitation activities undertaken on the lands within the Forest, Park, and the BLM lands adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California, to promptly plan and implement salvage timber sales of dead, damaged, or downed timber resulting from the wildfire.

Requires such salvage timber sales to proceed immediately and to completion.

Declares that such sales shall not be subject to administrative or judicial review in any U.S. court. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 2954 under “2. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate.”)

H.R. 4466, Financial Regulatory Clarity Act of 2014

The Financial Regulatory Clarity Act of 2014 was introduced by Representative Shelley Moore Capito and referred to the Com-
committee on Financial Services and Committee on Agriculture on April 10, 2014. On May 22, 2014, it was ordered to be reported by the Committee on Financial Services with 34 yeas and 25 nays.

This Act requires financial regulators to determine whether new regulations or orders are inconsistent with existing Federal regulations. The bill includes provisions regarding the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of Comptroller of the Currency, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, National Credit Union Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

6. Bills Ordered Reported by the Committee on Agriculture

H. Con. Res 86, Celebrating the 100th anniversary enactment of the Smith-Lever Act, which established the nationwide Cooperative Extension System

H. Con. Res 86 was introduced by Representative Austin Scott on February 25, 2014 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 13, 2014 the Committee on Agriculture ordered the bill reported by a voice vote.

The resolution recognizes the significance of the Smith-Lever Act, which established the Cooperative Extension System. It honors the university faculty and local educators who provide educational programs to help people, families, youth, businesses, and communities solve problems, develop skills, and build a better future. It also thanks the volunteers who promote excellence for 4-H Clubs, the Master Gardeners program, the Family and Consumer Sciences program, and other Cooperative Extension System programs. Finally, the resolution encourages continued collaboration and cooperation among Federal, state, and local governments to assure the sustainability of the Cooperative Extension System.

H.R. 677, Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act

The Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act was introduced by Representative Steve Stivers on February 13, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 20, 2013 the Committee on Agriculture ordered the bill reported, amended, by a voice vote. On May 7, 2013 the Committee on Financial Services ordered the bill reported by a recorded vote of 50 yeas to 10 nays.

Inter-affiliate swaps are swaps that are executed between entities that are under common corporate ownership. H.R. 677 amends the Commodity Exchange Act to provide an exemption for inter-affiliate swaps from the clearing and execution requirements, margin and capital requirements, real time reporting requirements and from consideration with regard to whether entities are swap dealers or major swap participants under Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111–203) (the Dodd-Frank Act). H.R. 677 does provide, however, that inter-affiliate swaps must be reported to a swap data repository, and therefore be transparent to regulators. The bill provides mirroring exemptions for inter-affiliate security-based swaps under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. (Note: See also the discussion of the
March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”

H.R. 1003, To improve consideration by the CFTC of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders.

H.R. 1003 was introduced by Representative K. Michael Conaway on March 14, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 20, 2013 the Committee on Agriculture ordered reported the bill by a voice vote.

Using Executive Order 13563 as a guide, H.R. 1003 would raise the legal standard for cost-benefit analysis the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) is required to perform by amending Section 15(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act to require the Commission to: (1) “assess” the costs and benefits, both qualitative and quantitative of Commission actions; (2) work through the Office of the Chief Economist in performing the analyses; (3) evaluate the impact on liquidity in the futures and swaps markets; (4) evaluate alternatives to direct regulation; (5) evaluate the degree and nature of the risks posed by various activities within the scope of its jurisdiction; (6) evaluate whether the regulation, consistent with its objectives, is tailored to impose the least burden on society and market participants; (7) evaluate whether the regulation is inconsistent, incompatible or duplicative of other Federal regulations; and (8) evaluate whether, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those approaches maximize the net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, distributive impacts and equity). (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)

7. Bills Ordered Reported But Not Reported by Other Committees Within the Committee on Agriculture’s Jurisdiction

None.

8. Bills Defeated

H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act

H.R. 1947 was introduced by Chairman Lucas on May 13, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On May 15, 2013 the bill was ordered reported, amended, by a recorded vote of 36 yeas to 10 nays. On May 29, 2013, the Committee on Agriculture reported the bill, H. Rept. 113–92, Part 1 to the House and the bill was sequentially referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary until June 10, 2013. On June 10, 2013 the Committee on Foreign Affairs was discharged. On that same date, the Committee on the Judiciary reported the bill to the House, H. Rept. 113–92, Part 2. The Committee on Agriculture filed a supplement report on June 12, 2013, H. Rept. 113–92, Part 3. On June 20, 2013, the bill failed passage by a recorded vote of 195 yeas to 234 nays.

The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (FARRM) is the product of nearly three years of deliberations, including 46 House hearings and audits, a joint deficit reduction proposal developed between leaders of the House and Senate Commit-
tees on Agriculture, and, ultimately, Committee consideration and passage on an overwhelming and bipartisan basis. As measured by the length of the Committee’s consideration and by the depth of its evaluation, having fully examined the purpose and effectiveness of each and every authority under the jurisdiction of the Committee, FARRM is the product of extensive analysis and research.

If enacted into law, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that FARRM will yield taxpayers nearly $40 billion in deficit reduction. FARRM proposes to achieve these substantial budget savings through significant reform. FARRM repeals or consolidates more than 100 programs, saves $20.5 billion from SNAP by curbing abuse, eliminates Direct Payments and reforms commodity policy at a savings of more than $14 billion, saves another $6.9 billion by consolidating 23 conservation programs into 13, and brings about long overdue regulatory relief for farmers and ranchers. The Committee believes that if all committees of Congress and all functions of government underwent the review, reform, and reductions that this Committee has imposed upon policies under its jurisdiction, the United States would be well on its way to a smaller government and a balanced budget.

Highlights include:

- Nearly $40 billion in mandatory funds are cut from farm bill spending, including the immediate ten year sequestration of $6 billion.
- After a series of 11 audit hearings, the Committee found the need to eliminate or consolidate over 100 programs.
- Billions of dollars in authorization of appropriations are reduced.
- Direct payments that went to farmers regardless of market conditions are eliminated.
- A new Title I safety net is designed to offer producers a choice in how best to manage risk while also reforming the outdated notion of paying farmers even if they no longer farm.
- Conservation programs are consolidated from 23 programs to 13 programs in an effort to streamline these very valuable conservation tools.
- The first reforms to SNAP since the welfare reforms of 1996, saving more than $20 billion.
- Several regulatory relief measures are included to help mitigate some of the most onerous regulatory pressures plaguing our nation’s farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

**Title I—Commodities**

*Repeals Four Current Commodity Programs*

Direct Payments, Counter-Cyclical Payments (CCPs), the Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program, and the Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments (SURE) are repealed.

*Streamlines and Reforms Commodity Policy*

U.S. agriculture is diverse and dynamic with unique perils and risk management needs that differ by crop and region. A Washington-style command-and-control, commodity policy does not respect the diversity of American agriculture.
FARRM respects the private sector and offers producers a choice in risk management tools. It allows a one-time election for producers to choose between two options on a crop-by-crop and farm-by-farm basis. Under either option, the risk management tool provided is only there for producers when they suffer a significant loss.

Price Loss Coverage (PLC) is a risk management tool that addresses deep, multiple-year price declines:

- PLC will complement Federal crop insurance, which is not designed to cover multiple-year price declines.
- PLC uses modern yields and an index of below cost-of-production prices to establish a market-oriented, price-based risk management tool for producers.
- PLC limits budget exposure by only addressing deep, multiple-year price losses, and prevents the need for costly and unbudgeted bailouts when markets collapse.

Revenue Loss Coverage (RLC) is a risk management tool that addresses revenue losses:

- RLC requires a producer to experience at least a 15 percent loss, helping ensure that all risk is not removed from farming and that no growers are guaranteed profits.
- RLC offers coverage based on county-wide losses to ensure that a government program is not set up to duplicate, for free, what farmers should pay for under crop insurance.
- RLC uses yield plugs and an index of below cost-of-production prices as a benchmark in establishing this revenue-based risk management tool for producers.

FARRM provides full planting flexibility to ensure that producers plant for market and agronomic conditions. FARRM’s PLC and RLC apply to planted acres up to total base acres on a farm.

Cotton producers are ineligible for PLC or RLC, but may purchase an area-wide, group-risk crop insurance policy, known generally as STAX. A transition is provided for producers while STAX is being implemented.

**Marketing Loans**

Producers remain eligible for marketing loans under the same repayment terms except in the case of cotton. For cotton, loan rates may be reduced from current levels.

**Sugar**

Sugar policy is reauthorized to operate at no cost to the taxpayer.

**Dairy**


FARRM offers producers new, voluntary, basic-level margin coverage along with the opportunity to buy supplemental coverage, if they choose. By participating in the Dairy Producer Margin Protection Program, producers agree to manage supply of dairy products through participation in a Dairy Market Stabilization Program.
Revenue generated from the market stabilization program will be used by USDA to fund purchases of surplus dairy products for donation to food banks and schools meals.

FARRM reauthorizes the Dairy Forward Pricing, the Dairy Indemnity Program, and Dairy Promotion and Research.

Livestock

Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance is reauthorized for livestock producers. Livestock Indemnity Program (LIP), Livestock Forage Program (LFP), Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honey Bees, and Farm-raised Fish (ELAP), and the Tree Assistance Program (TAP) are all generally reauthorized.

An additional month of support is provided in the Livestock Forage Program for those who qualify. In addition, enhanced support is provided for livestock producers who have been in exceptional drought—the highest level—for a prolonged period.

Title II—Conservation

FARRM streamlines and consolidates 23 programs into 13. This not only saves the American taxpayer over $6 billion, but also improves conservation delivery by simplifying the numerous programs available to producers.

In the past, Congress has taken a piecemeal approach to creating our conservation policies. Since 1985, Congress has addressed natural resource concerns by creating more than 20 farm bill conservation programs; some with regional goals and many of them have overlapping functions. FARRM reverses this trend by looking at conservation programs in a more comprehensive way.

The Conservation Title still provides farmers, ranchers, foresters, and landowners with voluntary, incentive-based financial and technical assistance for conservation practices. Through these programs, producers protect and restore water quality and quantity, air quality, wildlife habitat, and meet regulatory requirements while providing a safe, secure, and affordable food supply.

Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

Improves and Focuses the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

Maximum enrollment of CRP is gradually reduced to 24 million acres allowing enrollment to focus on the most environmentally sensitive lands.

Landowners will be able to better manage their enrolled acres with added flexibility for haying and grazing. Additionally, two million acres are reserved for working grassland contracts.

To ensure that environmental benefits are maintained, expiring acres will receive priority consideration for working grassland contracts and Conservation Stewardship Program contracts, and producers will be given the ability to enter into contracts of working land programs before their CRP contracts expire.

Beginning farmers or ranchers will be afforded greater access to productive land with the continuation of the Transition Incentives Program (TIP).
FARRM prioritizes the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) by maintaining current funding. With the regulatory pressures farmers and ranchers face, it is important to continue this cost share program. EQIP provides cost share incentives to producers to meet or avoid the need for national, state, or local regulation. EQIP will provide additional incentives for wildlife by absorbing the functions of the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP). The program maintains the Conservation Innovation Grant (CIG) subprogram to promote new and innovative conservation practices.

Additionally, EQIP will maintain priorities for beginning farmers or ranchers and socially disadvantaged producers while including for the first time a priority for veteran farmers. Producers under these priorities would also be eligible to cover up to 50 percent of up-front project costs.

Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

CSP encourages producers to adopt new conservation measures, while maintaining current practices to protect natural resources. Changes allow more flexibility for local identification of natural resource concerns. Enrollment is limited to 8.695 million acres per year.

Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program

 Owners and operators of private land are able to realize a benefit by creating wildlife habitats and opening their land to hunting and fishing activities. This is program is reauthorized for the life of the bill.

Easements

Agriculture Conservation Easement Program (ACEP)

ACEP consolidates existing easement programs into one program for streamlined and flexible administration. Under ACEP, land can be enrolled into an Agriculture Lands Easement to protect working grassland or farmland, or can be enrolled into a Wetlands Easement to protect and enhance water quality and wildlife habitat.

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

RCP consolidates four programs into one targeted initiative that leverages USDA funding and resources by partnering with private organizations or working directly with producers to address natural resource concerns. Targeted conservation initiatives are developed on the local level and selected by USDA through a competitive, merit based application process. Additionally, USDA may designate Critical Conservation Areas to target conservation programs in regions under significant regulatory pressure.
Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program

The Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program provides technical and financial assistance for planning, design, and implementation of projects for the purposes of rehabilitate aging watershed dam projects (including upgrading or removing dams) in communities to address flood prevention as well as flood-related health and safety concerns.

Grassroots Source Water Protection Program

This program encourages each state to use technical assistance for the purpose of allowing State rural water associations to address regulatory requirements and promote conservation practices with the intent of protecting and improving the quality of the nation’s drinking water.

Title III—Trade

The U.S. agricultural industry is highly dependent on exports, with nearly a third of all cash receipts generated from international markets. FARRM ensures that our producers are able to capitalize on these opportunities by making strategic investments in programs designed to address foreign barriers to U.S. exports and ensuring USDA places a renewed focus on solving trade issues through the Foreign Agricultural Service. Increased margins for U.S. farm output translates to greater capital flows back to rural America, supporting farms and their rural communities. The bill also reauthorizes food aid programs with specific changes to administrative provisions to ensure greater transparency and accountability.

Trade Programs

Market Access Program (MAP)

MAP is reauthorized to provide assistance on a cost-share basis, targeting small businesses, farmer cooperatives, and nonprofit trade organizations. Private contributions are estimated at 60% of total annual spending on trade promotion and market development.

Foreign Market Development Program (FMD)

The reauthorized FMD program partially reimburses participants for approved overseas trade promotion activities which address long-term foreign market import constraints, and identifying new markets or uses for U.S. commodities. Preference is given to nonprofit U.S. agricultural and trade groups that represent an entire industry.

Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops (TASC)

Specialty crop exports face a variety of non-tariff trade barriers which can close access to key markets without notice. The TASC program is reauthorized, and additional authority is provided to ensure that USDA can respond to technical barriers to trade with resources made available through the program.
Export Credits (GSM–102)

The GSM–102 program is reauthorized and preserves USDA’s authority to adjust the length of tenor and the fees required to cover the costs of the program. Export guarantees made available under GSM–102 assist in financing exports of U.S. agricultural commodities in markets where credit might not otherwise be available.

Additional Provisions

Authority is extended for the Emerging Markets Program (EMP) which promotes U.S. exports establish in emerging markets and is limited to generic rather than branded products. Also extended is the Global Crop Diversity Trust which supports the storage of germplasm in seed banks around the world.

Food Aid Programs

The U.S. contributes nearly half of all in-kind food aid in the world and is the single largest donor of food aid. The bill reauthorizes food aid and development programs, and strengthens monitoring and reporting requirements to ensure transparency and accountability. The bill also provides resources to build resilience in recipient communities to mitigate and prevent food crises and reduce the future need for emergency aid. FARRM reflects the current budget environment and in support of efforts to reduce the Federal deficit $144 million in mandatory spending is not reauthorized.

Food for Peace

The Food for Peace Act is reauthorized to continue providing critical humanitarian and development assistance in developing countries. FARRM ensures the timely delivery of food aid through funding for the pre-positioning of commodities. To eliminate price disruptions for local farmers and markets in developing economies through monetization, further clarification on market value and price is given to USDA and USAID.

In recognition of the need to balance the dual roles of food aid, the minimum level of development funding is reauthorized at $400 million. Cash assistance to support development programs is reduced in recognition of budget constraints. Funding is included for the development and testing of new, fortified food aid products and to ensure the highest standards of food aid quality.

Specific funding for oversight, monitoring and evaluation of Food for Peace programs is continued at $10 million per fiscal year to ensure proper management of food aid and development programs, including $8 million for the Famine Early Warning System network.

A detailed report describing all efforts taken by the Administrator of USAID for monitoring and evaluation is required for a precise accounting of these funds.

The bill also reauthorizes the Food for Progress program, the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, and the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program.
Title IV—Nutrition

FARRM makes common-sense reforms, closes program loopholes, and cracks down on waste, fraud, and abuse saving the American taxpayer over $20 billion. The legislation strengthens program integrity and accountability while better targeting the Federal nutrition programs to serve those in need of assistance.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

Makes Common-Sense Reforms to Program Eligibility

Ensures all households meet the asset and income tests stated in SNAP law before they can receive benefits. Updates financial resource limits to more accurately reflect low-income households, and restricts categorical eligibility to only those households receiving cash assistance from Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or other state general assistance programs. Receiving a TANF-funded brochure or referral to an “800” number hotline would no longer automatically make a household eligible for SNAP.

Closes Program Loopholes

Closes a loophole in SNAP related to how Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) payments interact with SNAP benefit calculation. Some states are sending $1 or $5 LIHEAP payments to low-income households, triggering a SNAP income deduction that results in higher SNAP benefits for those households. This legislation stops states from sending nominal LIHEAP payments below $20 for the sole purpose of increasing their SNAP benefits. This provision will not affect any households receiving traditional LIHEAP assistance or any household that can demonstrate a utility cost.

Eliminates State Performance Bonuses

Ends the bonuses USDA awards to states for administering SNAP, and saves taxpayers nearly half a billion dollars without affecting SNAP recipient benefits.

Cracks Down on Waste, Fraud and Abuse

Ends SNAP Benefits for Lottery Winners

SNAP recipients with substantial lottery or gambling winnings will lose benefits immediately after receiving winnings. Winners will be prevented from receiving any benefits if they do not meet the financial requirements of SNAP.

Prevents Traditional College Students from Receiving SNAP

Restricts SNAP eligibility for traditional college students to those participating in technical and vocational education programs, trade studies, remedial course work, or basic adult literacy.

Prevents Fraudulent Benefit Payments

Requires states to verify benefits are not being paid to deceased individuals and that beneficiaries are not receiving payments in more than one state.
Stops Fraudulent “Dumping” for Cash

Prevents SNAP benefits from being used to pay for substantial bottle deposits. This prevents beneficiaries from purchasing items which require a substantial bottle deposit, such as $5 specialty milk bottles, dumping the milk, and returning the bottle for a cash refund of the deposit.

Prohibits Medical Marijuana as an Income Deduction

Prohibits states from allowing medical marijuana to be treated as a medical expense for purposes of income deductions when calculating SNAP benefits.

Prohibits Government-Sponsored Recruitment Activities

Prevents USDA from advertising the SNAP program. Stops promotion of the program through television, radio and billboard advertisements and prohibits USDA from entering into agreements with foreign governments designed to promote SNAP benefits.

Strengthens Program Integrity and Accountability

Demands Outcomes from the SNAP Employment and Training Program

Requires states to report outcomes on their respective E&T program to provide more accountability of how SNAP participants are gaining skills, training, work or experience that leads to employment.

Improves the Quality of Participating Retail Stores

Requires participating retailers to stock more staple foods like fruits and vegetables. Includes provisions to further monitor and prevent fraud at retail stores. Allows more service options for homebound elderly or disabled SNAP recipients.

Ensures Illegal Immigrants Do Not Receive SNAP Benefits

Requires states to use an immigration status verification system to verify an applicant’s immigration status.

Increases Oversight of the Restaurant Meals Program

Requires states to submit a plan to USDA if they are choosing to implement a Restaurant Meals Program to serve homeless, elderly and disabled populations. The plan must demonstrate a need for such a program along with effective control measures.

Additional Nutrition Programs

Increases Assistance for Food Banks

Food banks have been successful in effectively utilizing government dollars and securing private sector donations in order to feed hungry Americans. However, local food banks have been struggling to provide enough food to needy families in the current economic climate. Increasing funding for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) will help food banks supplement the diets of low-income individuals.
Supports the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)

Continues support for CSFP, and transitions the program to serve only senior citizen populations while allowing the small percentage of women and children currently enrolled in CSFP to continue to receive services until they have exceeded the age of eligibility. This better targets the program to seniors who utilize CSFP the most. Women and children will all continue to be served by the WIC program, which is more suited to their dietary needs.

Ensures Seniors and Low-Income Families Have Access to Farmers Markets

Expands the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program to not only benefit senior citizen populations, but also provides low-income families access to fruits and vegetables through coupons that can be exchanged for eligible foods at farmers’ markets and community-supported agriculture programs.

Promotes Fruits and Vegetables to School Children

Continues current funding for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program and helps the dollars go further by allowing elementary schools with a high proportion of low-income students to purchase fresh, frozen, canned, and dried produce to be made available to students throughout the day. Maintains current funding for the DOD Fresh Program that distributes fresh fruits and vegetables to schools and service institutions, and creates a pilot program to allow up to five states to use their allocation to source local produce.

Continues Food Distribution on Indian Reservations

Reauthorizes funding for the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR), which provides food assistance to Indian Tribal Organizations (ITOs).

Supports Community Food Projects

Supports grants for eligible nonprofit organizations seeking and developing innovative ways to improve community access to healthy foods.

Title V—Credit

FARRM reauthorizes credit programs ensuring adequate credit in rural America, updating farm ownership loans, promoting enhanced conservation practices, and better meeting the lending needs of beginning farmers, ranchers, and Native Americans.

Promotes Family Farms

FARRM recognizes the need to provide flexibility for farm operating loans in response to modern legal entities created for estate succession planning. This flexibility allows the Secretary to permit farmers to obtain farm ownership loans through these modern legal entities.
Improves Credit Availability for Conservation Loan and Loan Guarantee Program

In response to establishing enhanced conservation practices, FARRM provides additional access to borrowers by increasing the Loan Guarantee Amount from 75 percent to 90 percent.

Maintains Producer Competitiveness for Land Purchases

FARRM updates the maximum loan value from $500,000 to $667,000 ensuring farmers and ranchers can continue to be competitive for land purchases in areas with high real estate values.

Enhances Beginning Farmer and Rancher Provisions

In addition to those provisions outlined above, to support beginning farmers and ranchers, reauthorizations along with enhancements to current programs include:

- Reauthorizes the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Individual Development Accounts Pilot Program which authorizes matching-funds for savings accounts to meet farming-related expenses.
- Reserves Loan Fund Set-Asides, which is a portion of the guaranteed farm ownership loan and direct operating loan funds, for beginning farmers and ranchers.
- Provides priority for joint financing participation loans and down payment loans within direct farm ownership loans. By providing priority to applicants USDA can maximize the number of borrowers served for a given level of appropriations.
- Removes median farm size limitation by replacing “median” with “average”. This clarification, allows more qualified applicants to receive beginning farmer ownership loans, while excluding those who already own a substantial piece of land.
- Provides the Secretary with discretion in defining the experience necessary to qualify a beginning farmer or rancher for a farm ownership loan. This modification ensures that qualified farmers can adequately address their lending needs.

Title VI—Rural Development

FARRM reauthorizes the initiatives while eliminating duplicative or wasteful authorities. Thirteen programs are eliminated and funding levels are reduced by more than $1.5 billion over five years, a 50 percent reduction in authorizations. This authorized level of funding ensures that available appropriations can be focused on the programs that have the greatest impact on rural communities. In addition, $100 million in mandatory money is not reauthorized.

Provisions are included to ensure USDA tracks the success of these investments for further streamlining and reform. FARRM requires USDA to develop simplified application forms for rural development programs to reduce administrative burdens and make the programs more accessible to small, rural communities.

Rural development programs are intended to assist communities through loans and grants to build critical infrastructure and provide access to credit. Through these programs small, rural communities can access funds to build or update water systems, build
broadband infrastructure, and finance other critical community facilities. Small businesses are able to access credit through loans, grants, and loan guarantees to finance new enterprises or expand their current business.

**Water and Wastewater Programs**

Programs which assist rural communities in addressing critical water and wastewater needs are reauthorized, including assistance through loans and grants for municipal systems and household wells. Resources for technical assistance are provided to help communities focus on core needs and plan the appropriate remedies. Programs include the Water, Waste Disposal and Wastewater Facility Grants, the Circuit Rider Program, Imminent Community Water Assistance Grants, and grants to finance individual wells. The bill also requires USDA to maximize the use of loan guarantees in water and wastewater projects.

**Business Loans and Grants**

Several key programs are reauthorized which provide either grants, loans, or a combination of both to small businesses. Two distinct relending programs are reauthorized to assist small businesses start or expand their operations. The Intermediary Relending Program provides access to credit for loans up to $250,000 in medium or small towns. The Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program provides small loans of $50,000 or less to relending organizations to assist small and very small businesses with fewer than 10 employees.

Rural Cooperative Development Grants are extended to assist in the development of new cooperatives and improve the operations of existing cooperatives. Value-Added Producer grants are reauthorized with $50 million in mandatory funding. These grants benefit producers and cooperatives that process agricultural commodities to capture increased margins directly. Priority is given to beginning farmers and ranchers under this program.

Funding set aside for locally and regionally produced agricultural food products is capped at 7% of the program, ensuring that other viable business ventures can compete for scarce funding under the Business and Industry Loan Program, and assistance is provided for main street businesses to allow certain types of collateral for USDA loans.

**Broadband Infrastructure**

The Broadband Loan Program is reauthorized to provide access to broadband service in rural America. Specific provisions are added to increase transparency in the program to ensure investments focus on areas without broadband service. Additional emphasis is placed on projects which will serve both businesses and homes to maximize the economic impact of each project.

The Distance Learning and Telemedicine program is also reauthorized to provide funding for schools and hospitals. These projects allow small communities to access education and health services which would otherwise not be available.
Community Facilities

The bill reauthorizes several essential community facilities loans and grants which provide direct assistance to small, rural communities. These funds are made available to develop essential public facilities such as hospitals, fire stations, public safety services, and specific infrastructure projects.

Regional Authorities

The Northern Great Plains and the Delta Regional Authorities are both reauthorized. These regional commissions are intended to coordinate investments across several states including business, infrastructure, and education ventures.

Rural Transportation

The bill requires USDA to update a previous study on rural transportation issues to provide policy makers with current data on the state of transportation systems which move commodities and processed goods throughout rural America.

Title VII—Research, Extension and Related Programs

FARRM continues and enhances critical research ideas while leveraging public and private dollars. The legislation acknowledges the economic hardship facing our nation. Highlights include:

- Repeals authority for non-competitive grants under numerous grant programs;
- Extends the authorization of appropriations for 47 research, extension, and education programs;
- Repeals 76 research and extension programs and reports;
- Lets expire 5 additional research and extension programs;
- Reduces or eliminates authorized funding levels by $500 Million; and
- Replaces 12 “such sums as necessary” authorization limits and includes levels consistent with actual appropriations.

Past support for agricultural research and education has resulted in Americans enjoying the most abundant, safest, and most affordable food supply in the world.

Although agricultural research and extension have been highly successful, many food and agricultural challenges continue to face our nation’s producers, processors, and consumers. As the United States becomes more dependent on the global economy, it is imperative to address issues of productivity to meet increasing world demands and competitiveness to assure a higher percentage of market share. Domestically other critical social, economic and natural resource issues must also be solved.

Intramural Research Programs

FARRM extends authority for intramural research programs carried out by the Agricultural Research Service; Economic Research Service, National Agricultural Statistics Service and the Forest Service.
Extramural Research Programs

Authority for extramural research grants and formula funds programs administered by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture are extended.

Land-Grant Universities

University research for agricultural activities is reauthorized for 1862, 1890 and 1994 Land-Grant colleges and universities.

Capacity Grants for Non-Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture (NLGCA)

Competitive grants to NLGCA institutions are reauthorized in order to maintain and expand research and outreach in regards to agriculture, renewable resources and production practices.

National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education and Economics (NAREEE) Advisory Board

The NAREEE advisory board is reauthorized while enhancing the involvement and consultation of other agricultural industry interests on agricultural priorities.

Agriculture and Food Research Initiative

AFRI continues critical agriculture research by providing competitive grants through integrated research and extension activities.

Increased Transparency for Budget Submission

Enhances accountability and transparency of USDA administered research, extension and education funding by mandating that the annual Presidential Budget Submission include sufficient information for the Congress to thoroughly evaluate and approve future spending plans. With regard to extramural competitive grants programs, USDA will be barred from obligating appropriated funds unless a comprehensive spending plan is submitted with the President’s budget and approved by Congress.

Addresses the Shortage of Veterinarians

FARRM includes the Veterinarian Services Investment Act. Several similar pieces of legislation have been introduced in the House and Senate. This act requires an entity to develop programs to relieve shortages, support private practices, and support those practices that successfully complete a specified service requirement. This bill has previously passed the House of Representatives.

Specified Initiatives

FARRM would reauthorize commodity specific research programs such as Specialty Crop Research Initiative, Organic Research and Extension Initiative, Sustainable Agriculture Research and Extension, the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program, and Competitive Grants Program for Hispanic Agricultural Workers and Youth.

Title VIII—Forestry

FARRM promotes the health of America’s national, state, and private forests while eliminating five expired programs. The for-
entry title also places caps on the authorization levels of several existing programs.

**Continuing Forest Conservation Programs**

The Forest Legacy Program and the Community Open Space Program, which help preserve forested lands facing conversion to other uses, are continued with reduced authorization levels. The Healthy Forest Reserve Program, which helps landowners promote habitat for wildlife, is reauthorized.

**Combating Invasive Species and Natural Disasters**

FARRM provides authority for the Forest Service to accelerate its treatment of National Forests affected by pine bark beetle infestation and natural disasters. This authority streamlines the approval process for the Forest Service in selecting afflicted areas that need treatment within our National Forests.

**Protecting Forest Jobs**

FARRM reauthorizes the Office of International Forestry, which is designed to help facilitate the development of foreign markets for domestically produced wood products. The strategic plan for the Forest Inventory is updated to reflect the needs of rural communities across America. The Rural Revitalization Technologies program is reauthorized in order to provide grants and technical assistance to forested rural communities.

**Improving Forest Health**

The Forest Stewardship Contracting program is extended for an additional five years, allowing the Forest Service to engage in needed restoration work on our National Forests.

**Title IX—Energy**

FARRM helps diversify our nation’s energy supply and creates new economic opportunities in rural America by promoting the development of advanced biofuels and renewable energy.

FARRM eliminates mandatory funding and reauthorizes programs at reduced discretionary funding levels that will save taxpayers more than $500 million. FARRM streamlines current programs, enhances program integrity, and eliminates four programs that have outlived their usefulness.

**Rural Energy for America (REAP)**

REAP provides financial assistance to farmers and ranchers or small rural businesses for renewable energy systems such as anaerobic digesters, solar or wind projects, and energy efficiency measures; as well as grants for energy audits.

The title creates a tiered, streamlined, and efficient application process for farmers and rural businesses applying for smaller or less costly projects to install renewable or energy efficient systems. In an effort to target funding, the authority for feasibility studies is eliminated and a new definition for renewable energy systems is created to clarify Congressional intent by eliminating funding for ethanol blender pumps.
Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP)

BCAP was created to assist landowners in the establishment of dedicated energy crops. The title prioritizes funding for the establishment of dedicated energy crops by eliminating controversial Collection, Harvest, Storage, and Transportation (CHST) payments.

Biorefinery Assistance Program (BAP)

BAP provides loan guarantees for the construction or retrofitting of biorefineries that will enable the commercial-scale production of advanced biofuels. The provision eliminates grant authority for demonstration facilities.

Biobased Markets Program

Amends the definition of “biobased product” to include a definition of “forest product” for USDA’s BioPreferred program. This definition allows certain domestic forest products with mature markets to be eligible under Federal procurement guidelines for renewable products. Materials eligible under this amended definition would include items such as pulp, paper, and wood pellets.

Biodiesel Fuel Education Program

The Biodiesel Fuel Education Program provides competitive grants to nonprofit entities to provide information and outreach on the benefits of biodiesel fuel use.

FARRM reauthorizes the Bioenergy Program for Advanced Biofuels, the Repowering Assistance Program, the Biomass Research and Development Program, the Feedstock Flexibility Program, and the Community Wood Energy Program.


Title X—Horticulture

FARRM continues and improves popular and successful programs that recognize the diversity of U.S. specialty crops and organic agriculture, including fruits, vegetables, nuts, horticulture, and nursery crops.

Supports Farmers Markets and Local Economies

The Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program continues the authorization of competitive grants to improve direct producer-to-consumer market opportunities, including the development of local food system infrastructure.

Continues the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program

FARRM reauthorizes the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, which has been successful in enhancing the competitiveness of specialty crops through grants awarded to states to support research, product quality enhancement, food safety, and other projects important to the specialty crop industry.
FARRM reauthorizes and consolidates two very effective programs, the Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention Program and the National Clean Plant Network. Detecting and responding to a plant pest or disease in the early stages of an introduction is a significant cost savings for taxpayers, and can help minimize the potentially devastating impact on agriculture.

**Supports Organic Agriculture**

FARRM reauthorizes two important programs supporting the organic industry, the Organic Production and Market Data Initiatives Program and the National Organic Program, as well as enhances investigation and enforcement tools. The National Organic Program maintains its authorization to better support its regulatory functions in ensuring consumers are presented with consistent, uniform standards.

**Regulatory Relief**

Provides Regulatory Relief

FARRM includes two provisions that seek to mitigate some of the most onerous regulatory pressures plaguing our nation’s farmers, ranchers, and rural communities. Both of these measures provide no additional cost to taxpayers, but provide significant benefits in job creation and regulatory relief.

H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act

FARRM includes H.R. 935, which eliminates a costly and duplicative permitting requirement for pesticide applications.

Although the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has a comprehensive regulatory program in place under the authority of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), a misguided judicial decision has resulted in the EPA requiring additional permits under the Clean Water Act (CWA). This duplicative mandate imposes significant public health risks and provides no quantifiable environmental benefit.

H.R. 935 was introduced as H.R. 872 during the 112th Congress and passed the House of Representatives with an overwhelming vote of 292–130 on March 31, 2011.

**Biological Opinions**

FARRM would impose a temporary stay on the EPA from initiating a modification or cancellation of a pesticide registration based on the Biological Opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (hereinafter referred to as the Services) until an unbiased, external scientific peer review of these Biological Opinions can be conducted and the scientific questions challenging the validity of these consultations can be resolved.

**Title XI—Crop Insurance**

Crop Insurance is the cornerstone of risk management for most farmers. FARRM recognizes the $12 billion in cuts that crop insurance has already contributed toward deficit reduction over the past five years and the increased importance of crop insurance given the large reductions in the commodity title. FARRM makes improve-
ments to crop insurance to better serve all producers of all crops in all regions.

Supplemental Coverage Option (SCO)

FARRM authorizes producers to purchase the Supplemental Coverage Option (SCO), an area-wide group-risk policy, designed to address a portion of losses not covered by individual crop insurance policies.

Enhanced Risk Management for Beginning Farmers and Ranchers

For the initial five years of production, beginning farmers and ranchers will benefit from a 10 percentage point crop insurance premium reduction and will see improved production histories where natural disasters have depressed current Actual Production History (APH) yields.

Expands Risk Management for Specialty Crops and under-served Commodities

FARRM provides authority for the development of improved risk management tools for under-served crops and regions.

Improved Actual Production History in the Event of Multiple Year Disasters

FARRM addresses problems with declining APH yields due to multiple year disasters by providing a transitional yield that reflects a producer's production capability on that land.

Increased Flexibility

FARRM authorizes continuation of insuring by Enterprise Units as provided under the 2008 Farm Bill, with improvements.

Program Integrity

FARRM requires that the Farm Service Agency (FSA) and the Risk Management Agency (RMA) share information and encourages correction of errors in order to ensure accuracy of reported information.

Title XII—Miscellaneous

Animal Health and Livestock Industry Promotion

FARRM reauthorizes several initiatives to help promote the livestock industry, as well as improve animal health.

National Sheep Industry Improvement Center (NSIIC)

FARRM reauthorizes the NSIIC through 2018. The Center was created to assist our sheep and goat producers by strengthening and enhancing the production and marketing of sheep and goat products.

Trichinae Certification Program

FARRM reauthorizes the Trichinae Certification Program though 2018. The initiative is a pre-harvest pork safety program that uses management practices to minimize the risk of exposure of swine to the parasite *Trichinella spiralis*. 
National Aquatic Animal Health Plan

FARRM reauthorizes the National Aquatic Animal Health Plan through 2018. The authority allows the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements for the purposes of detecting, controlling, or eradicating diseases in aquaculture species.

(Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 935 under “7. Bill Ordered Reported but Not Reported by other Committees within the Committee on Agriculture jurisdiction” and for further action, see also the discussion of H.R. 2642 under “1. Bills Enacted into Law.”)

H. Res. 378, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar.

H. Res. 378 was introduced by Representative Joseph R. Pitts on October 11, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means. On October 11, 2013 the measure was considered in the House as unfinished business. On October 12, 2013 the measure failed passage by a recorded vote of 192 yeas to 212 yeas with 1 present.

H. Res. 378 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the House managers of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013) should advance provisions to repeal the Administration of Tariff Rate Quotas language as added by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, and thus restore the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) to manage sugar supplies to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices.

9. Bills Acted on by the Committee Included in the Other Laws Enacted

None.

10. Bills Vetoed

None.

11. Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted

None.

Other Bills of Interest: Several bills acted on by other committees, but not acted on by the Committee on Agriculture contain provisions relating to matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction. The following are abbreviated summaries of these bills, including some of the relevant provisions.


H. Con. Res. 25 was introduced by Representative Paul Ryan on March 15, 2013 and referred to the House Committee on The Budget. On March 21, 2013, the House voted on H. Con. Res 25 with a passage of 221 yeas and 207 nays. On October 16, 2013, the Sen-
ate agreed to the resolution with an amendment by Unanimous Consent. On the same day, the Senate insisted on its amendment and requested a conference on S. Con. Res. 8.

The resolutions lists recommended budgetary levels and amounts for FY 2013–FY 2023 with respect to: (1) Federal revenues, (2) new budget authority, (3) budget outlays, (4) deficits, (5) public debt, and (6) debt held by the public. Additionally, the resolution lists the appropriate levels of new budget authority, outlays, and administrative expenses for the Social Security Administration (SSA), including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, U.S. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses, and specified major functional categories for FY 2013–FY 2023 and sets forth reconciliation instructions for the Senate Committee on Finance. (Note: See also the discussion of H.J. Res. 59 under the “1. Bills Enacted into Law.”)

12. Concurrent Resolutions Approved

H. Con. Res. 96, Establishing the budget for the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for Fiscal Years 2016 through 2024.

H. Con. Res. 96 was introduced by Representative Paul Ryan on April 4, 2014. The House Committee on the Budget reported the bill on April 4, 2014, in H. Rept. 113–403. On April 10, 2014, it was passed by a recorded vote with 219 yeas and 205 nays. It was received by the Senate Committee on the Budget and discharged pursuant to Section 300 of the Congressional Budget Act on April 11, 2014. It was placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders, Calendar No. 365.

Sets forth the Congressional budget for the Federal Government for FY 2015, including the appropriate budgetary levels for FY 2016–FY 2024.

Lists recommended budgetary levels and amounts for FY 2015–FY 2024 with respect to: Federal revenues, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits (on-budget), debt subject to limit, and debt held by the public.

Lists the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for specified major functional categories for FY 2015–FY 2024.

Lists recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels and amounts for FY 2030, FY 2035, and FY 2040 as a percent of the Federal gross domestic product (GDP) with respect to: Federal revenues, budget outlays, deficits, and debt.

Authorizes a certain reserve fund to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (2010 health care laws).

Authorizes certain deficit-neutral reserve funds: to reform the 2010 health care laws, to repeal all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in them, for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program, to reform the tax code, to implement a trade agreement, for revenue measures that would not increase the deficit for FY 2015–FY 2024, for rural counties and schools for transportation by maintaining the solvency of the Highway Trust
Fund, and to reform policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.

Establishes means-tested direct spending: at 6.8% for the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10 year period preceding FY 2015, and at 5.4% under current law for the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10 year period beginning with FY 2015.

Proposes the following reforms for means-tested directed spending: assuming the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible state allotment tailored to meet each state’s needs, indexed for inflation and population growth; assuming the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) into such a state allotment; and increasing the allotment based on the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth.

Establishes at 5.7% for non-means-tested direct spending for such average rate of growth and at 5.4% under current law for such estimated average rate growth.

Proposes reforms for non-means-tested direct spending: (1) with respect to Medicare, by advancing specified policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions; and (2) by calling for Federal employees, including Members of Congress and Congressional staff, to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

Prohibits House legislation that would require advance appropriations, except certain FY 2016 programs, projects, activities, or accounts.

Declares that, if a committee other than the Committee on Appropriations reports legislation that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays) for any fiscal year and also authorizes appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of that measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending to the Committee on Appropriations for FY 2015 by the amount of the new budget authority and outlays provided for in legislation making appropriations for the same purpose.

Authorizes the chair to adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for veterans programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (OCO/GWOT), or committee allocation to the Committee on Appropriations specified in the report of this budget resolution to conform with the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act) (as adjusted by the Budget Control Act of 2011).

Makes it out of order in the House to consider legislation reported out of committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) if it has the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of $5 billion for any of the four consecutive 10 fiscal year periods beginning with FY 2025.

Requires the report or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on this budget resolution to include in its allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration (SSA) and of the Postal Service.
Authorizes the chair to adjust allocations and aggregates for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, but does not cause a net increase in the deficit for FY 2015–FY 2024.

Requires any estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) for a measure under the Federal Credit Reform Act (FCRA) to also provide, as a supplement, and to the extent practicable, upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

Requires, whenever the Director prepares an estimate of the costs incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and determines that such legislation has a cost related to a housing or residential mortgage program under the FCRA, the Director to also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of the measure that result in such cost.

Authorizes the chair to use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

Counts legislation that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year in which the transfer occurs.

Provides a separate allocation in the House to the Committee on Appropriations for OCO/GWOT for FY 2015.

D. OVERSIGHT

The Committee on Agriculture and its Subcommittees were active in their oversight functions, holding a number of oversight hearings and activities during the 113th Congress. The hearings related to the application, administration, and effectiveness of laws that lie within the Committee’s jurisdiction as well as the organization and operation of the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies having responsibility for the administration of such laws. The hearings often result in recommendations for improvements in the administration of the laws, regulations and policies in effect in the Executive Branch as they relate to the Committee’s jurisdiction. Information gathered at these hearings was useful in preparing legislation for consideration in the House of Representatives.

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

In keeping with the objective of the Oversight Plan as submitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and House Administration, and Rule XI, clause 2 of the House of Representative-
tives, the Committee and its subcommittees conducted the following chronological oversight hearings during the first session of the 113th Congress (Note: To see a copy of the Oversight Plan as submitted, see “I. Summary of Organization, Jurisdiction, and Oversight Plan of the Committee on Agriculture.”):

1. Oversight Hearings

**March 5, 2013:** Hearing To Review the State of the Rural Economy. Full Committee. Hearing Serial No. 113–1.

The purpose of this public hearing was to review the state of the rural economy with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Secretary (USDA) Thomas J. Vilsack. In light of the March 1 effective date for the sequester, the primary topic of discussion was how USDA planned to implement the across-the-board spending cuts and what impact they would have on the agriculture sector. Members of the Committee asked the Secretary about his recent remarks that the sequester would cause meat inspector furloughs. Chairman Lucas also questioned if USDA, in preparation for the impact on food production and inspections, had made any requests to the House Appropriations Committee for flexibility or additional funds as it develops a Continuing Resolution for the remainder of FY 2013.


The purpose of this hearing, held by the Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, was to examine how the U.S. Forest Service is managing the National Forest System (NFS) and how this management impacts rural communities. The NFS spans 193 million acres in 712 counties across 41 states. One issue discussed was the harvest timber decline in recent years. The harvests reached an all time low of 1.7 billion board feet in 2002. It was noted that a recent USDA report highlighted increasing annual timber harvests and other restoration activities as one of the agency's goals. Members asked Tom Tidwell, the Forest Service Chief, about how the agency's efforts were faring and how sequestration could affect those goals. Members also examined other issues that impact the NFS such as fire threats, invasive species, and the possible closure of recreation sites as a result of sequestration. Witnesses on the second panel highlighted that more aggressive management practices are necessary to improve forest management and rural job creation.


The purpose of this hearing was to examine specialty crop priorities for the 2013 Farm Bill. The Subcommittee heard from growers and representatives of the specialty crop community on the effectiveness of the current programs within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction.


This hearing was the first in a series of hearings being held in advance of writing legislation to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). The agency's statutory author-
ization expires at the end of the fiscal year. Members of the Com-
mittee heard perspectives from the futures and swaps market, in-
cluding the two largest derivatives exchanges, a futures commis-
sion merchant whose customers are farmers and ranchers, and in-
dustry trade associations who represent hundreds of companies.
The purpose of the hearing was to begin to allow members to de-
velop a greater understanding of the regulatory challenges faced by
individuals involved in the derivative marketplace.

July 23, 2013: The Future of the CFTC: Commission Perspec-
tives. Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Man-
The purpose of this hearing was to continue the process of gath-
ering information and perspectives on the future of the Commodity
Futures Trading Commission in advance of writing legislation to
reauthorize the regulatory agency. The statutory authorization ex-
pires at the end of Fiscal Year 2013. This was the second hearing
on the future of the CFTC.

Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Manage-
The purpose of this hearing was to examine the impact of the
Commodity Futures Trading Commission’s actions on end-users.
These are businesses that provide our daily goods and services, and
rely upon derivatives contracts to manage the risks associated with
their operations. Since the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act, some
end-users have shared concerns that the CFTC’s rulemaking would
ultimately lead to higher costs for consumers. This is the third
hearing in a series of hearings on the CFTC.

October 2, 2013: The Future of the CFTC: Perspectives on Cus-
tomer Protections. Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities
The purpose of this hearing was to explore ways to improve cus-
tomer protections and understand how best to avoid or prevent the
collapse of another futures commission merchant that dispropor-
tionately impacts farmers and ranchers in light of the failures at
MF Global and PFGBest in advance to writing legislation that
would reauthorize the CFTC. This was the final hearing in the se-
ries on the future of the CFTC.

March 4, 2014: Hearing to review the Smith-Lever Act on its
100th Anniversary. Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Bio-
technology, and Foreign Agriculture. Hearing Serial No. 113–9.
In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act established the nationwide coopera-
tive extension service, a partnership between land-grant colleges
and universities and the USDA. The purpose of this hearing was
to review the role of the extension service in providing research,
education, and assistance to farmers and rural communities. The
panel of witnesses spoke about the role of land-grant institutions,
the benefits and successes of extension education and research, the
opportunities that extension service provides to youth, and re-
sources that extension provides to farmers.

March 26, 2014: Hearing to review the impact of the Endangered
Species Act and related litigation on the National Forest System
management. Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Fore-
The Endangered Species Act (ESA) was first enacted in 1973 to preserve and protect certain domestic species. While it has been successful, a recent Congressional Working Group reviewed the law and uncovered some weaknesses. The purpose of this hearing was to review one of those weaknesses—the cost of litigation under the Act—in order to strengthen and reform the law. Because the Forest Service must comply with the ESA in all of its forest management activities, it is often sued under the citizen enforcement provision of the ESA. The panel of witnesses discussed the cost to the Forest Service of defending claims brought under the Endangered Species Act as well as the impact of threatened litigation and ESA compliance for private landowners.

April 3, 2014: Hearing to review the state of the rural economy. Full Committee. Hearing Serial No. 113–11.

The purpose of this hearing was to examine the state of the rural economy. The sole witness, Secretary of Agriculture Tim Vilsack, discussed farm income, exports, conservation activities, and agricultural labor. Members of the Committee asked Secretary Vilsack questions regarding the implementation of the Agricultural Act of 2014. Secretary Vilsack noted that the USDA identified 450 steps that are necessary to implement the Farm Bill, and the USDA is in the process of implementing those steps, prioritizing programs like the livestock disaster relief program.


The purpose of this hearing was to review the health of America's bee population, which are crucial to production of approximately 30% of the crops in the country. Both the 2008 and 2014 Farm Bills included funding to research and better understand issues affecting pollinators. The Committee heard from witnesses who spoke about factors affecting the recent loss of pollinators, including Colony Collapse Disorder (CCD), habitat loss, misuse of pesticides, genetics, pests, diseases, and beekeeping management practices. Honeybee health is complex and researchers are continuing to examine this problem because pollinator loss can significantly affect food production and prices for consumers.


The purpose of this hearing was to examine factors affecting the U.S. livestock industry and create a framework for improving policy. Members and witnesses discussed a number of issues the industry faces, including mandatory country-of-origin labeling (COOL) for meat products, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) rules, affects of RFS on livestock feed costs, and other regulatory actions. Additionally, the Committee discussed drought, trade, and animal diseases.


The Subcommittee received testimony from Under Secretary of Natural Resources Robert Bonnie and agricultural stakeholders
about potential effects of the Interpretive Rule signed by USDA, EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in March 2014. The stated purpose of the rule is to clarify what responsibilities each of the three agencies have in monitoring water health under the Clean Water Act.


The purpose of this hearing was to discuss the availability of credit in rural America and review trends and potential risks. The Farm Credit Administration discussed the current conditions and continued oversight of the Farm Credit System (FCS) and Farmer Mac; USDA’s Farm Service Agency (FSA) discussed the current condition of their lending programs; and the Federal Reserve discussed current and future credit conditions in rural America. Additionally, Members heard from representatives of FCS, Farmer Mac, and the banking community to discuss current trends and risks, and the strengths of their lending portfolios to meet the needs of rural America.

**July 9, 2014: Hearing to consider the societal benefits of biotechnology.** Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture. Hearing Serial No. 113–16.

In the agricultural community, we have all heard the agronomic and environmental benefits of agricultural biotechnology. Unfortunately, many observers have criticized the industry for their lack of effectiveness in relaying how the technology directly benefits the consumer. Witnesses stressed the consumer impact associated with agriculture biotechnology and the role this industry will play in the future. Agricultural biotechnology has played a critical role in meeting a number of consumer and societal needs in the past. Over the past 25 years, research in agricultural biotechnology has made great advancements in addressing consumer and environmental needs such as requiring less water, land, and fewer chemical applications than conventional crops, and they are better able to survive drought, weeds, and insects while keeping food affordable for the consumer. While cautioning against unreasonable and unscientific regulation of this technology, witnesses argued that looking forward with the use of this technology, we can fight diseases, increase available food sources, and reduce overall environmental impact.


The purpose of this public hearing was to evaluate implementation of Title I, the Commodity Title, and Title XI, the Crop Insurance Title, of the Agricultural Act of 2014, also known as the farm bill. The sole witness, USDA Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service (FFAS) Under Secretary Michael Scuse provided an update on the farm bill implementation progress made by the three agencies under the FFAS mission area—the Farm Service Agency (FSA), the Risk Management Agency (RMA), and the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS). Members of the Committee questioned the Under Secretary on the timing and availability of Title I and Title XI provisions.

The purpose of the hearing was to examine the role of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in relation to other Federal assistance programs, such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program and School Meals. SNAP is a program that has seen considerable growth in recent years. Since 2008, the cost of the program has more than doubled. Members and witnesses discussed factors leading to the growth of SNAP.


The purpose of this hearing was to examine the various challenges faced by rural telecommunications companies’ efforts to deploy broadband service to rural communities. Witnesses from the USDA Rural Utilities Service and the communications sector offered perspectives on the costs and barriers to broadband deployment. Members and witnesses reviewed the need for coordination among the various agencies responsible for oversight and funding of rural broadband networks.


The Focus of the Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture was the growing concern of the Department of Labor’s (DOL) use of the so-called “Hot Goods” Provision under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA). The original purpose of this provision was to protect workers from poor working conditions and negligent employers. Yet, this law was not intended for use with regards to fresh fruits and vegetables, which perish more easily than a manufactured good. The issue discussed by the Subcommittee was the Department of Labor’s use of their authority to protect laborers from poor working conditions and negligent employers when applying the hot goods provision to perishable agricultural commodities. In these cases, producers are liable, not only for civil fines and back wages to workers, but the fines and penalties pale in comparison to the economic damages brought about by the Department of Labor destroying their crops. The Department does not set fire to these crops, but they create a scenario where the crops naturally perish or lose substantial economic value in the marketplace, potentially making them unmarketable. By examining the Department’s actions, the Subcommittee intended to gain a greater understanding of the use of this authority, and the avenues for remedy, as well as educating the Department as to the impact of their actions in the case of perishable agricultural commodities.


The Subcommittee held a hearing in response to the U.S. Forest Service’s proposal to manage groundwater resources on National
Forest System land. The agency issued the proposal in May 2014. The Subcommittee heard from the Forest Service Chief about the agency's reasoning behind the proposal as well as concerns from stakeholder groups about the legal justification for putting forth the proposal.

**September 17, 2014:** Hearing to review the implementation of Section 4022 of the Agricultural Act of 2014: Pilot projects to reduce dependency and increase work requirements and work efforts under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Full Committee. Hearing Serial No. 113–22.

The purpose of this hearing was to review the implementation status of Section 4022 of the Agricultural Act of 2014. On August 25, 2014, USDA announced $200 million for up to 10 pilots projects focused on reducing dependency and work effort under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The Committee heard from the Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, on the status and timeline of the implementation USDA has done thus far, as well as additional information on how these pilots will be implemented over the next three years. The Members and Secretary discussed various components of the Request for Applications (RFA) to states and Request for Proposals (RFP) for evaluators and the variety of methods they hope to see tested in the pilot projects. Additionally, several Members discussed the implementation of various provisions contained within the Agricultural Act of 2014.

**September 18, 2014:** Hearing to review the benefits of promoting soil health in agriculture and rural America. Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry. Hearing Serial No. 113–23.

Members of the Subcommittee heard from NRCS and a panel of agriculture producers about the importance of soil health. The topic is of importance as farmers and ranchers must feed a growing population while utilizing fewer acres of land across the country.

2. Legislative Hearings

**March 14, 2013:** Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. Full Committee. Hearing Serial No. 112–03.

The purpose of this hearing was to review seven legislative proposals amending Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The proposals are the culmination of the committee’s oversight efforts of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) as it writes rules for Dodd-Frank, and the committee examined these proposals to ensure that Dodd-Frank is implemented in a way that does not disrupt markets or harm the economy.

All of the following are bills reviewed during the hearing: (1) H.R. 634, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act, ensures that end-users can continue to use derivatives to manage business risks without being subject to costly margin requirements; (2) H.R. 677, the Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act, ensures that transactions between affiliates within a single corporate group are not regulated as swaps; (3) H.R. 742, the Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013, would allow data sharing between U.S. and international regulators and swap data repositories without adding an unnecessary layer of legal bureaucracy; (4) H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improve-
-development Act, amends Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act to limit the
swap desk push-out requirement so that it does not apply to equity
or commodity swaps; (5) H.R. 1003 would require the CFTC to as-
sess the costs and benefits of its actions; and (6) H.R. 1038, the
Public Power Risk Management Act, would allow producers, utility
companies, and other non-financial entities to continue entering
into energy swaps with government-owned utilities without danger
of being required to register with the CFTC as a swap dealer.
Additionally, the Committee also examined one draft proposal,
the Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act, which would direct the CFTC
and the Securities and Exchange Commission to adopt a joint rule
on how they will regulate cross-border swaps transactions as part
of the new requirements created in the Dodd-Frank Act. (Note: See
also the discussion of H.R. 634, H.R. 742, H.R. 992, H.R. 1038 and
H.R. 1256 under “2. Bills Acted on by the House but not the Sen-
ate”; and the discussion of H.R. 677 and H.R. 1003 under “6. Bills
Ordered Reported by the Committee on Agriculture.”)

E. PRINTED HEARINGS

113–1 Hearing To Review the State of the Rural Economy—Full Committee, March 5, 2013.
113–3 Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act—Full Committee, March 14, 2013.
113–4 Hearing To Review Horticulture Priorities for the 2013 Farm Bill—Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, April 24, 2013.
113–7 The Future of the CFTC: End-User Perspectives—Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, July 24, 2013.
113–8 The Future of the CFTC: Perspectives on Customer Protections—Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, October 2, 2013.


113–16 Hearing To Consider the Societal Benefits of Biotechnology—Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, July 9, 2014.


113–18 Hearing To Examine the Role of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in Relation to Other Federal Assistance Programs—Department Operations, Oversight, and Nutrition, July 24, 2014.


113–20 Hearing To Review the Impact of Enforcement Activities by the Department of Labor on Specialty Crop Growers—Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, July 30, 2014.


F. MEETINGS NOT PRINTED

January 23, 2013—Full Committee open business meeting. Organizational meeting for the 113th Congress. Approval by voice vote of the Committee Rules.
February 13, 2013—Full Committee open business meeting. Approval by voice vote of the Oversight Plan for the 113th Congress and other organizational matters.

February 26, 2013—Full Committee open business meeting. Approval by voice vote of the Budget Views and Estimates Letter for FY 2014, offering budget recommendations of the Committee on Agriculture for the agencies and programs under its jurisdiction.


May 15, 2013—Full Committee open business meeting. Approval of H.R. 1947, the Federal Agricultural Reform and Risk Management Act, by a recorded vote of 35 yeas to 10 nays.

October 30, 2013—House-Senate Conference Meeting on H.R. 2642, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013. Open conference committee meeting to resolve the differences.


April 9, 2014—Full Committee open business meeting to consider H.R. 4413, the Customer Protection and End User Relief Act. Approval by voice vote of H.R. 4413.

G. COMMITTEE PRINTS

Committee on Agriculture Rules. Print. No. 113–1.

H. WATERSHEDS

None.

III. APPENDIX

A. EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Note: In April 2013 the Parliamentarian’s office altered its procedures concerning the referral of Executive Communications. In prior Congresses the Communications concerning pesticide tolerances submitted from the Environmental Protection Agency were referred to the Committee on Agriculture; however, beginning in August 2013 this type of Communication was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Parliamentarian’s office was notified of this discrepancy on November 24, 2014. The following is a list of the Executive Communication’s numbers along with the date of publication in the Congressional Record ((entries marked with an asterisk (*) are for Communications concerning an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance (when in reference to a pesticide) which were also historically referred to the Committee on Agriculture):
August 2, 2013: 2572, 2573, 2583, 2585, 2588, 2598, 2606, 2607, 2609, 2610, 2619, 2621, 2640, 2645, 2650, 2654, 2659, 2660, 2666, 2668, 2673, 2685, 2687, 2692, 2695.

September 10, 2013: 2776, 2777.
September 11, 2013: 2814.
September 16, 2013: 2895.
September 19, 2013: 3030.
September 20, 2013: 3039, 3041.
September 27, 2013: 3128.
September 28, 2013: 3139.
October 30, 2013: 3473, 3474, 3475.
November 14, 2013: 3654, 3655.
November 18, 2013: 3698, 3700.
November 19, 2013: 3746.
November 22, 2013: 3885.
December 4, 2013: 3982, 3986, 3989.
December 16, 2013: 4179.
December 19, 2013: 4205.
December 23, 2013: 4318, 4319, 4320, 4321.
January 10, 2014: 4437.
February 6, 2014: 4704.
February 11, 2014: 4758.
February 26, 2014: 4817, 4823, 4824.
February 28, 2014: 4860.
March 5, 2014: 4893, 4894, 4895, 4898.
March 6, 2014: 4919.
March 11, 2014: 4951.
March 14, 2014: 4999, 5000, 5001.
April 1, 2014: 5139.
April 7, 2014: 5223,* 5224, 5237, 5238, 5240, 5243.
April 9, 2014: 5337, 5338, 5340, 5341,* 5342, 5343.
April 10, 2014: 5382.
May 7, 2014: 5581.
May 21, 2014: 5730, 5733.
July 11, 2014: 6354.
July 14, 2014: 6386, 6387, 6388,* 6389.
July 31, 2014: 6734, 6740.
September 15, 2014: 7068.
September 17, 2014: 7205, 7206, 7210.
September 18, 2014: 7273, 7277, 7287.
November 12, 2014: 7465, 7470, 7484.
November 19, 2014: 7776, 7777, 7783.
November 20, 2014: 7891, 7898.
December 12, 2014: 8307, 8317.

Further note: The entries marked with a double asterisk (**) are for Communications concerning fisheries submitted by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In prior Congresses Communications concerning fisheries (non-aquaculture) submitted from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration were referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. However, beginning June 2014 six (6) Communications of this type were referred to the Committee on Agriculture.
E.C. 6—Jan. 14, 2013: A letter from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Farmer Mac Capital Planning (RIN: 3052–AC80) received January 3, 2013.


E.C. 179—Feb. 4, 2013: A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Doc. No.: FSIS–2012–0039] (RIN: 0583–AD05) received January 22, 2013.


E.C. 199—Feb. 5, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of Sulfur Emissions


E.C. 309—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Decreased Assessment

E.C. 310—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Countries in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0026; FV12–923–1 IR] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 311—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 1 (Scotch) and Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2012–2013 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–11–0088; FV12–985–1 A IR] received February 14, 2013.


E.C. 313—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, CA; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0035; FV12–987–1 IR] received February 14, 2013.


E.C. 606—Mar. 6, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Change to Administrative Rules Regarding the Transfer and Storage of Excess Spearmint Oil [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0014; FV12–985–2 FR] received February 22, 2013.


E.C. 863—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Maximum Interest Rates on Guaranteed Farm Loans (RIN: 0560–AH66) received March 18, 2013.

E.C. 864—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Selection and Functions of Farm Service Agency State and Country Committees (RIN: 0560–AG90) received March 18, 2013.


E.C. 1222—Apr. 24, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s

E.C. 1223—Apr. 24, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560–AI06) received April 15, 2013.


E.C. 1263—Apr. 25, 2013: A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Ingredients and Sources of Radiation Listed and Approved for Use in the Production of Meat and Poultry Products [Doc. No.: FSIS–2011–0018] (RIN: 0583–AD47) received April 8, 2013.


E.C. 1310—Apr. 26, 2013: A letter from the Board Chair and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; GAAP References and other Conforming Amendments (RIN: 3052–AC75) received April 17, 2013.


E.C. 1465—May 14, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—United States Standards for Wheat (RIN: 0580–AB12) received May 1, 2013.


E.C. 1468—May 14, 2013: A letter from the Administrator Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Community Programs Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0575–AC92) received May 7, 2013.

E.C. 1470—May 14, 2013: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Liquidity and Funding (RIN: 3052–AC54) received May 1, 2013.

E.C. 1534—May 20, 2013: A letter from the PRAB Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program: Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program (RIN: 0584–AE07) received April 24, 2013.

E.C. 1596—May 23, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Horse Protection Act; Requiring Horse Industry Organizations to Assess and Enforce Minimum Penalties for Violations; Correction [Doc. No.: APHIS–2011–0030] (RIN: 0579–AD43) received May 9, 2013.

E.C. 1691—Jun. 4, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s “Major” final rule—Core Principles and Other Requirements for Swap Execution Facilities (RIN Number: 3038–AD18) received June 3, 2013.


E.C. 1694—Jun. 4, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Lamb Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to the Order To Raise the Assessment Rate [No.: AMS–LS–11–0038] received May 28, 2013.


E.C. 1701—Jun. 5, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Relaxing Size and Grade Requirements on Valencia and Other Late Type Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0009; FV13–905–2 IR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1702—Jun. 5, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final
rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0026; FV12–923–1 FIR] received May 28, 2013.


E.C. 1711—Jun. 6, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Change in Reporting and Assessment Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0071; FV13–955–1 IR] received May 28, 2013.


E.C. 1803—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Termination of Proceeding on Proposed Amendments to Tentative Mar-


E.C. 1811—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0035; FV12–987–1 FIR] received May 28, 2013.


E.C. 1865—Jun. 14, 2013: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Unincorporated Business Entities (RIN: 3052–AC65) received June 7, 2013.

E.C. 1876—Jun. 17, 2013: A letter from the Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Development Utilities Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Community Connect Broadband Grant Program (RIN: 0572–AC30) received June 4, 2013.

E.C. 1893—Jun. 18, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Dual and Multiple Associations of Persons Associated With Swap Dealers, Major Swap Participants and Other Commission Registrants (RIN: 3038–AD66) received June 3, 2013.

E.C. 1894—Jun. 18, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Process for a Designated Contract Market or Swap Execution Facility to Make a Swap Available to Trade under Section 2(h)(8) of the Commodity Exchange Act; Swap Transaction Compliance and Implementation Schedule; Trade Execution Requirement under Section 2(h) of the CEA (RIN: 3038–AD18) received June 12, 2013.

E.C. 1895—Jun. 18, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—National Organic Program (NOP); Amendments to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Crops and Processing) [Doc. No.: AMS–NOP–12–0016; NOP–12–07FR] (RIN: 0581–AD27) received June 10, 2013.


E.C. 2235—Jul. 15, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Lacey Act Implementation Plan: Definitions for


E.C. 2451—Aug. 1, 2013: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052–AC76) received July 30, 2013.


E.C. 2833—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California and Imported Kiwifruit; Relaxation of Minimum Grade Requirement [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0032; FV13–920–1 IR] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2834—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0076; FV13–932–1 FIR] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2835—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Nominations of Foreign Producers and Election of Officers [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0041] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2836—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Revising Reporting Requirements and New Information Collection [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0052; FV12–905–2 PR] received August 5, 2013.


E.C. 2838—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the General Cull and Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0001; FV13–948–1 PR] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2839—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—User Fees for 2013 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS–CN–12–0074] (RIN: 0581–AD30) received August 5, 2013.


E.C. 2864—Sep. 16, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Sugar Program; Feedstock Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers (RIN: 0560–AH86) received August 22, 2013.

E.C. 2865—Sep. 16, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Definition of a Ski Area (RIN: 0596–AD12) received August 9, 2013.

E.C. 2965—Sep. 17, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Harmonization of Compliance Obligations for Registered Investment Companies Required to Register as Commodity Pool Operators (RIN: 3038–AD75) received September 3, 2013.


E.C. 3353—Oct. 23, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s
final rule—National Environmental Policy Act: Categorical Exclusions for Soil and Water Restoration Activities (RIN: 0596–AD01) received September 19, 2013.


E.C. 3440—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Change in Minimum Grade Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0067; FV13–915–1 FR] received October 23, 2013.


E.C. 3449—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research and Information Order; Assessment Rate Increase [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0062; FV13–955–1 FIR] received October 23, 2013.


E.C. 3451—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Relaxing Size and Grade Requirements on Valencia and Other Late Type Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0009; FV13–905–2 FIR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3452—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Potato Research and Promotion Plan; Amend the Administrative Committee Structure and Delete the Board’s Mailing Address [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0027] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3453—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0053; FV13–987–1 IR] received October 23, 2013.


E.C. 3727—Nov. 19, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s “Major” final rule—Enhancing Protections Afforded Customers and Customer Funds Held by Futures Commission Merchants and Derivatives Clearing Organizations (RIN: 3038–AD88) received November 18, 2013.

E.C. 3728—Nov. 19, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Farm Loan Programs; Clarification and Improvement (RIN: 0560–AI14) received November 12, 2013.


E.C. 3730—Nov. 19, 2013: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Farmer Mac Capital Planning (RIN: 3052–AC80) received November 12, 2013.

E.C. 3767—Nov. 19, 2013: A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual reports that appear on pages 119–146 of the June 2013 “Treasury Bulletin”, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce.

E.C. 3783—Nov. 21, 2013: A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants; Clerical or Ministerial Employees (RIN: 3038–AE00) received November 15, 2013.

E.C. 3784—Nov. 21, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Protection of Collateral of Counterparties to Unsecured Swaps; Treatment of Securities in a Portfolio Margining Account in a Commodity Broker Bankruptcy (RIN: 3038–AD28) received November 15, 2013.

E.C. 3785—Nov. 21, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Ownership and Control Reports, Forms 102/102S, and 71 (RIN: 3038–AD31) received November 19, 2013.


E.C. 3787—Nov. 21, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-


E.C. 4471—Jan. 14, 2014: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Releasing Information; General Provi-
sions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052–AC76) January 7, 2014.


E.C. 4941—Mar. 11, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Decreased Assessment Rate for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0072; FV13–948–2 FR] received February 26, 2014.


E.C. 4960—Mar. 12, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties,
California, and in All Counties in Oregon, Except Malheur County; Termination of Marketing Order No. 947 [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0036; FV13–947–1 FR] received February 26, 2014.


E.C. 4962—Mar. 12, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Decreased Assessment Rate for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0072; FV13–948–2 FIR] received February 26, 2014.


E.C. 5209—Apr. 4, 2014: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Farm Storage Facility Loan Program, Security Requirements (RIN: 0560–AI19) received March 19, 2014.


E.C. 5268—Apr. 8, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0002; FV14–932–1 FR] received April 1, 2014.

E.C. 5269—Apr. 8, 2014: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated
Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Vote (RIN: 3052–AD00) received April 3, 2014.

E.C. 5366—Apr. 10, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Primary Peanut-Producing States and Adjustment of Membership [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0042] received April 7, 2014.


E.C. 5459—Apr. 29, 2014: A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s “Major” final rule—Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs, Payment Limitations, and Payment Eligibility (RIN: 0560–AI21) received April 21, 2014.


E.C. 5486—Apr. 30, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulations Issued Under the Export Apple Act; Exempting Bulk Shipments to Canada From Minimum Requirements and Inspection [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0022; FV14–33–1 IR] received April 17, 2014.


E.C. 5595—May 8, 2014: A letter from the Associate Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (RIN: 0524–AA39) received April 23, 2014.


E.C. 5655. A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Tobacco Transition Program Assessments; Final Appeals and Revisions Procedures (RIN: 0560–AH30) received April 28, 2014.


E.C. 5971—Jun. 13, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modification of the Handling Regulations for Yellow Fleshed and White Types of

E.C. 5972**—Jun. 32, 2014: A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Revisions to Dealer Permitting and Reporting Requirements for Species Managed by the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Council [Doc. No.: 120405260–4258–02] (RIN: 0648–BC12) received May 13, 2014.


E.C. 6143—Jun. 25, 2014: A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s report entitled, “2013 Packers and Stockyards Program Annual Report”; to the Committee on Agriculture.

E.C. 6170—Jun. 26, 2014: A letter from the USDA/FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Continuation of Certain Benefit and Loan Programs, Acreage Reporting, Average Adjusted Gross Income, and Payment Limit received June 11, 2014.

E.C. 6171—Jun. 26, 2014: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Scales; Accurate Weights, Repairs, Adjustments or Replacements After Inspection received June 11, 2014.


E.C. 6236—Jul. 7, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Order Amending Mar-

E.C. 6281—Jul. 9, 2014: A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Idaho Roadless Rule received June 17, 2014.


E.C. 6283—Jul. 9, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Idaho Roadless Rule received June 16, 2014.


E.C. 6379—Jul. 14, 2014: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Continuation of Conservation Reserve Program, Including Transition Incentives Program received June 18, 2014.


E.C. 6575—Jul. 24, 2014: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Organization; Disclosure to Shareholders; Disclosure to Investors in System-wide and Consolidated Bank Debt Obligations of the Farm Credit System; Advisory Vote (RIN: 3052–AD00) received June 26, 2014.


E.C. 6713—Jul. 31, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio
Grande Valley in Texas and Imported Oranges; Change in Size Requirements For Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0009; FV14–906–1 FIR] received July 29, 2014.


E.C. 6867—Sep. 8, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0027; FV14–985–3 FIR] received August 8, 2014.

E.C. 6868—Sep. 8, 2014: A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s “Major” final rule—Cotton Transition Assistance Program and General Provisions for Agriculture Risk Coverage and Price Loss Coverage Programs (RIN: 0560–AI22) received August 22, 2014.


E.C. 6922—Sep. 8, 2014: A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Notice, Comment, and Appeal Procedures for National Forest System Projects and Activities and Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process (RIN: 0596–AD18) received August 8, 2014; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.


E.C. 7127—Sep. 16, 2014: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Animal Welfare; Importation of Live Dogs

E.C. 7128—Sep. 16, 2014: A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Nondiscrimination in Programs or Activities Conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture (RIN: 0503–AA52) received August 15, 2015.


E.C. 7186—Sep. 17, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment [Doc. No.: AMS–LPS–13–0079] received September 2, 2014.

E.C. 7241—Sep. 17, 2014: A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2013 annual report on the operation of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.


E.C. 7247—Sep. 18, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modification of the Handling Regulations for Yellow Flesched and White Types of Potatoes [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0026; FV14–946–1 FIR] received September 15, 2014.

E.C. 7248—Sep. 18, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Regulations Issued Under the Export Apple Act; Exempting Bulk Shipments to Canada From Minimum Requirements and Inspection [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0022; FV14–33–1 FIR] received September 15, 2014.

E.C. 7249—Sep. 18, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0057; FV14–987–3 IR] received September 15, 2014.

E.C. 7250—Sep. 18, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0027; FV14–985–3 FIR] received September 8, 2014.

E.C. 7251—Sep. 18, 2014: A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule—At-
Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS); Commercial Blacknose Sharks and Non-Blacknose Small Coastal Sharks (SCS) in the Atlantic Region [Doc. No.: 120706221–2705–02] (RIN: 0648–XD369) received September 18, 2014.


E.C. 7343—Sep. 18, 2014: A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Law Enforcement Support Activities (RIN: 0596–AB61) received September 17, 2014, jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.


E.C. 7424—Nov. 12, 2014: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Exclusion of Utility Operations-Related Swaps with Utility Special Entities from De Minimis Threshold for Swaps with Special Entities (RIN: 3038–AE19) received October 2, 2014.


E.C. 7426—Nov. 12, 2014: A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Standard Requirements; Addition of Terminology to Define Veterinary Biologics Test Results [Doc. No.: APHIS–2013–0034] (RIN: 0579–AD86) received September 22, 2014.


E.C. 7430—Nov. 12, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida and Imported Avocados; Change in Maturity Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0051; FV14–915–1 IR] received October 1, 2014.


E.C. 7432—Nov. 12, 2014: A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's “Major” final rule—Agriculture Risk Coverage and Price Loss Coverage Programs (RIN: 0560–AI24) received October 6, 2014.


E.C. 7435—Nov. 12, 2014: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization; Institution Stockholder Voting Procedures (RIN: 3052–AC85) received September 24, 2014.

E.C. 7436—Nov. 12, 2014: A letter from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2014 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency's current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix, in accordance with section 1206 of the Financial Institutions, Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989.


E.C. 7754—Nov. 19, 2014: A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Electronic Import Inspection Application and Certification of Imported Products and Foreign Establishments; Amend-
ments to Facilitate the Public Health Information System (PHIS) and Other Changes to Import Inspection Regulations [Doc. No.: FSIS–2009–0022] (RIN: 0583–AD39) received October 9, 2014.

E.C. 7817—Nov. 20, 2014: A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Farm Loan Programs; Entity Eligibility (RIN: 0560–AI25) received October 20, 2014.


E.C. 7820—Nov. 20, 2014: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Onions Other Than Bermuda-Granex-Granoc/Creole; Bermuda-Granex-Granoc [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0013] received November 6, 2014.

E.C. 7821—Nov. 20, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quality and Allotment Percentage for Class 1 (Scotch) Spearmint Oil for the 2014–2015 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–13–0087; FV14–985–1A IR] received November 12, 2014.

E.C. 7822—Nov. 20, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0023] received November 12, 2014.


E.C. 7825—Nov. 20, 2014: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards (RIN: 3052–AC93) received November 6, 2014.

E.C. 7826—Nov. 20, 2014: A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Organization; Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; In-
vestment Eligibility (RIN: 3052–AC84) received November 12, 2014.


E.C. 8233—Dec. 11, 2014: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Fruit and Vegetable Program Promotion and Economics Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–14–0047] received December 3, 2014.


E.C. 8302—Dec. 12, 2014: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerance for


B. STATUTORY AND SPECIAL REPORTS


Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Letter from Chairman Darrell E. Issa, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding Congressionally-mandated plans and reports considered outdated or duplicative as required to publish by the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 (P.L. 111–352). Submitted January 15, 2013.


USDA: Copies of recently approved Federal Advisory Committee Charters as required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act: Grain Inspection Advisory Committee; National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods; Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture; Land Variety Protection Advisory Board; Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers. Submitted by USDA, February 14, 2013.

USDA: Report on the status and disposition of cases returned to the agency by the National Appeals Division (NAD) as required by section 14009 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. Submitted by USDA, February 13, 2013.

USDA: Proposed Bye Real Estate and Development land exchange referred to as Submission No. 02/01–13 located on the Hoo-


USDA: Letter from the Secretary of Agriculture notifying the Committee of the Secretary’s intent to utilize the interchange authority under 7 U.S.C. 2257 to transfer $155,584 million from the direct payment program administered by the Farm Service Agency to several FSA administered programs. Submitted by USDA, March 19, 2013.


USDA: Letter from U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food Safety and Inspection Service’s outlining its’ intention to implement a reorganization that would enable the Agency to enhance its efficiency, effectiveness, and economy. Submitted by USDA, April 12, 2012.


USDA: Letter from the Secretary of Agriculture notifying the Committee of intent to use the interchange authority under 7 U.S.C. 2257 to transfer $5.4 million in Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) funding from the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program to the Conservation Security Program. Submitted by the USDA, April 23, 2013.

USDA: Letter from the Secretary of Agriculture notifying the Committee of intent to use the interchange authority under 7 U.S.C. 2257 to transfer $15 million in Rural Development funding from various RD program accounts into Salaries and Expenses. Submitted by the USDA, April 23, 2013.

FCA: Final Rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended. The purpose of the final rule is to strengthen liquidity risk management at Farm Credit Systems banks. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, April 8, 2013.


State of North Dakota: The 63rd Legislative Assembly for the State of North Dakota Concurrent Resolution No 3017 urging the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation to fairly administer water management laws and regulations. Submitted by Secretary of State, State of North Dakota, April 24, 2013.

FCA: The final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 which amends Title 12, Chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, April 19, 2013.
USDA: Letter from David R. Shipman, Administrator, USDA, informing the Committee and Chairman that the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) intends to release a copy of the current list of all individual growers, farmers and processors eligible to vote on the current Federal pistachio marketing order. Submitted by USDA, April 26, 2013.


DOT: Quarterly report discussing the activities taken by the Department of Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control in the administration of the licensing regime set forth with respect to the exportation of agricultural commodities, medicine, and medical devices to Iran and Sudan. Submitted by the United States Department of the Treasury, May 9, 2013.


CBO: The prepared cost estimate for H.R. 1947, the Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Agriculture on May 15, 2013. Submitted by the Congressional Budget Office on May 23, 2013.

DOJ: A response to the issue of dispensing controlled substances by veterinarians at a location other than the registered location. Submitted by Eric J. Akers, Deputy Chief, Congressional and Public Affairs, May 9, 2013.

FCA: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 as
amended. Amends Title 12, Chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, May 21, 2013.


GAO: Accepting the request to work within the scope of its authority to review the Federal Communications Commission reforms. Submitted by Katherine Siggerud, Managing Director, Government Accountability Office, June 6, 2013.


Natural Energy Resources Company: Enclosed PowerPoint presentation providing a summary of how Central Colorado’s Project innovative high altitude, multi-basin, pumped water and energy productivity multiplier concept could quickly serve as Colorado’s primary State Water Plan. Submitted by Dave Miller, President, NERC, June 24, 2013.


USDA: Report on the implementation of concluded appeals to the National Appeals Division from the Risk Management Agency. Submitted by Brandon Willis, USDA, July 1, 2013.

USDA: Letter recommending to move forward with the proposed TNC A960 purchase, a 1,190 parcel of land located in Florida. Submitted by Robert Bonnie, USDA, June 14, 2013.
Farm Credit Administration: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration (FCA). Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, FCA, July 9, 2013.

USDA: Letter recommending to move forward with the proposed Kimball phase II purchase, a tract of land located in Orange County, Indiana. Submitted by Gregory Smith, USDA, July 11, 2013.

USDA: Letter recommending to move forward with the proposed TNC Carter tract purchase, a 90.35 acre piece of land located in Brown County, Indiana. Submitted by Gregory Smith, USDA, July 11, 2013.

USDA: Letter recommending to move forward with the proposed Ozarks purchase, a 120 acre piece of land located in Oregon County, Missouri. Submitted by Gregory Smith, USDA, July 11, 2013.


EPA: Draft proposed rule revising and updating the agricultural Worker Protection Standard, as outlined in Section 25(a)(3) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act requiring the EPA to send such report. Submitted by James J. Jones, EPA, July 24, 2013.


Secretary of the Interior: Official notification that only 60 days worth of funds remain in the FLAME Fund administered by the secretary, under Title V of Division A of P.L. 111–88. Submitted by Sally Jewell, DOI, July 31, 2013.

Embassy of Brazil: Letter regarding the farm bill and its impacts on the Brazil-U.S. Cotton dispute in the World Trade Organization. Submitted by Mauro Vieira, Ambassador, Embassy of Brazil, August 9, 2013.

Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association: Letter opposing veterinary strong opposition to the King Amendment No. 71 regarding the blocking of state laws prohibiting health and welfare of farm animals. Submitted by Barry Kellogg, HSVMA, August 7, 2013.

Promedica: Letter expressing concerns regarding SNAP and supporting the funding the SNAP in the 2013 Farm Bill. Submitted by Randy Oostra, Promedica, August 12, 2013.


USDA: Report that outlines the USDA Forest Service estimate of anticipated wildland fire suppression costs for Fiscal Year 2013 as required by the FLAME Act of 2009. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, September 12, 2013.


CFTC: Letter urging the consideration of innovative legislation permitting continued full funding of the CFTC through a potential government shutdown and or continuing resolution. Submitted by Bart Chilton, U.S. CFTC, September 24, 2013.


Farm Credit Administration: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, FCA, October 15, 2013.


Farm Credit Administration: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board amending Title 12, Chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, FCA, October 25, 2013.


EPA: Letter expressing support for the charter renewal of the EPA Science Advisory Board in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Submitted by Gina McCarthy, EPA, November 1, 2013.


USDA: Letter notifying the Agriculture Committee of their intention to terminate Federal Marketing Order No. 947 which regulates the handling of Irish potatoes grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, and in all counties in Oregon except for Malheur County. Submitted by Annie L. Alonzo, USDA, November 12, 2013.


USDA: Letter outlining the Department of Agriculture’s Forest Service estimate of anticipated wildland fire suppression costs for FY 2014, as required by P.L. 111–88. Submitted by USDA, December 16, 2013.


FCA: Final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act 1971, as amended. The rule amends Title 12, Chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations. Submitted by FCA, December 18, 2013.


NRCS: Report on the final determination of all cases to the agency of the National Appeal Division, as required by section 209 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994. Submitted by NRCS, January 2, 2014.


FCA: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration to The Honorable Rick Crawford, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock, Rural Development, and Credit. Submitted by FCA, January 13, 2014.


DOT: Quarterly Report (April 1–June 30, 2013) discussing activities undertaken by the Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control in the administration of one-year licensing re-
USDA: Report, as directed by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, to the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Education and the Workforce describing the status of each demonstration project and the results of any evaluations of the demonstration projects completed during the previous fiscal year. Submitted by USDA, January 23, 2014.


USDA: Copy of the grower list from the Cherry Industry Administrative Board from December 1, 2011 through January 16, 2014, per the request of the Agricultural Marketing Service. Submitted by USDA, January 27, 2014.


Yavapai County Board of Supervisors: Letter expressing the unanimous support for the Yavapai County Resolution #1856 which requests full funding for the Payment-in-Lieu-of-Taxes Program. Submitted by Rowle P. Simmons, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for the Yavapai County, January 28, 2014.

USDA: Copy of the recently approved Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the Tongrass Advisory Committee. Submitted by Ashlee N. Johnson, Acting Committee Management Officer, USDA, February 6, 2014.


FCA: Advanced notice of proposed rulemaking on ways to address Federal Agricultural Mortgage Board governance and standards of conduct. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, Chairman and CEO, FCA, February 19, 2014.


USDA: 2013 Fiscal Year report to Congress on factors that affect the export of specialty crops. Submitted by Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture, March 5, 2014.


State Department: Report on Actions Taken to Ensure that the Water Deficits Owed by Mexico to the United States Do Not Increase and that Allocations Comply with the Treaty for the Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande of 1944. Submitted by Julia Frifield, Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, March 19, 2014.

USDA: Forest Service has completed the Evergreen Land Exchange referred to as submission 02/03–05. Submitted by Gregory C. Smith, Director of Lands and Realty Management, March 20, 2014.


USDA: AMS releasing a list of all cranberry growers in Oregon under a FOIA request. Submitted by Rex A. Barnes, Associate Administrator, USDA, March 27, 2014.


USDA: Progress report on implementation of the provisions on certain types of fish in the 2014 Farm Bill. Submitted by Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture, April 10, 2014.


USDA: Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the Council of Native American Farming and Ranching. Submitted by Cikena Reid, Committee Management Officer, USDA, April 14, 2014.


USDA: Recommendation to move forward with the proposed TL Wright purchase in Ripley County, Missouri. Submitted by Gregory Smith, Director of Lands and Realty Management, USDA, April 17, 2014.


GAO: Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation: Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs, Payment Limitations, and Payment Eligibility. Submitted by Robert J. Cramer, Managing Associate General Counsel, GAO, April 29, 2014.
USDA: Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the Black Hills National Forest Advisory Board. Submitted by Cikena Reid, Committee Management Officer, USDA, April 30, 2014.


USDA: Office of the Secretary forwarding the proposed Crane Lake land exchange referred to as Submission No. 03/03–20 for thirty day oversight, May 2014.

USDA: AMS copy of the Pesticide Data Program, May 2014.

USDA: Office of the Secretary forwarding Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the National Organic Standards Board, May 1, 2014.

USDA: AMS correspondence regarding FOIA request for kiwifruit growers, May 13, 2014.


USDA: Office of the Secretary presenting the third progress report on implementation of the provisions on certain types of fish in the Agricultural Act of 2014, May 16, 2014.


USDA: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights annual report of civil rights, complaints, resolutions, and actions for FY 2013, June 2, 2014.


USDA: AMS intends to release copy of the list of names and addresses of all growers who were eligible to vote in the continuance referendum for the Federal Marketing Order 916 for fresh California nectarines under FOIA, June 3, 2014.

USDA: Office of the Secretary submitted an annual assessment of the cattle and hog industries as required under the Packers and Stockyards Act, June 4, 2014.
USDA: Office of the Secretary letter recommending moving forward with the proposed Leotis Kirby purchase, June 4, 2014.
FCA: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the FCA, June 4, 2014.
USDA: Office of the Secretary presenting the fourth progress report on implementation of the provisions on certain types of fish in the Agricultural Act of 2014, June 6, 2014.
FCA: Final rule adopted by FCA Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended. The rule amends Title 12, Chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations, June 12, 2014.
USDA: Forest Service’s estimate of anticipated wildland fire suppression costs for FY 2014, July 1, 2014.
Hong Kong: Office of the Commissioner of U.S. Economic and Trade Affairs. Informing that Hong Kong relaxed restrictions on the importing of U.S. beef, and that they are interested in increased effort of importation, July 7, 2014.
USDA: Letter presenting the fifth progress report on implementation of the provisions on certain types of fish in the 2014 Farm Bill, July 8, 2014.
USDA: Letter presenting reports on implementation of concluded appeals to the National Appeals Division, July 14, 2014.
Farm Credit: Letter from the Farm Credit Council addressing the inaccuracies of the testimony of the commercial banks in the hearing on rural farm credit, July 14, 2014.
Fisherman’s Association: Letter requesting that the committee change the name of dogfish to chipfish for marketing purposes, July 16, 2014.
USDA: Letter providing a report on the Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention program, July 18, 2014.
NRCS: Nationwide Survey of land trusts that protect farm and ranch land, June 2013.
University of Nebraska: Impacts of the Federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program, June 2013.
USDA: Office of the Secretary sent a copy of administrative expense reports on programs established under commodity promotion laws, August 5, 2014.
USDA: Letter from Office of the Secretary to Chairman approving Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the Secretary’s Advisory Committee on Animal Health, August 7, 2014.
USDA: Letter from Office of the Secretary to Chairman approving Committee Charter for the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection, August 11, 2014.
USDA: Letter from Office of the Secretary to Chairman presenting the sixth progress report on implementation of provisions on certain types of fish in the 2014 Farm Bill, August 11, 2014.
FCA: Letter from Farm Credit Administration to Chairman addressing Dodd-Frank Act, August 19, 2014.
Department of Education: Letter of thanks from Office of Postsecondary Education to Chairman for addressing program integrity and regulations of Federal Student Aid programs, August 21, 2014.
The Secretary of the Interior Washington: Letter from the Secretary of the Interior Washington to Chairman informing that only 60 days remain until FLAME funds are depleted. Submitted by Sally Jewell, August 15, 2014.
USDA: Copies of Management Challenges within the United States Department of Agriculture provided to USDA Agency Heads. Submitted by USDA, August 2014.
USDA: Letter of thanks from Secretary Vilsack to Chairman Lucas for cosigning the expansion of markets for U.S. dairy products as part of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, August 18, 2014.
USDA: Letter from Office of Secretary to Chairman on the acquisition of the proposed Cassidy purchase. Submitted by Robert Bonnie, August 19, 2014.
Brazos River Bottom Alliance: Letter from chair of BRBA to Chairman regarding the loss of farmland in the State of Texas. Submitted by Kathleen Hubbard and Mary B. Conner, August 21, 2014.
USDA: Letter from Secretary Vilsack to Chairman informing that the Forest Service is within 30 days of depleting all available

EPA: Letter from Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations to Chairman supporting the charter of the National Advisory Committee, August 22, 2014.


USDA: Letter from Office of the Secretary to Chairman providing a copy of recently amended Federal Committee Charter for the National Organic Standards Board. Submitted by Cikena Reid, August 28, 2014.


EPA: Letter from Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations to Chairman acknowledging support of the charter Goon Neighbor Environmental Board. Submitted by Gina McCarthy, September 5, 2014.

USDA: Letter from Secretary Vilsack to Chairman Lucas presenting the seventh progress report on implementation of the provisions on certain types of fish in the Agricultural Act of 2014. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, September 9, 2014.


USDA: In compliance with P.L. 92–463, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, enclosed is a copy of a recently approved Committee Charter for the: Advisory Committee on Agricultural Statistics. Submitted by Cikena Reid, September 11, 2014.

FCA: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the FCA. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, September 12, 2014.

FCA: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the FCA. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, September 12, 2014.

USDA: Copy of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee charter for filing with the Committee on Agriculture. Submitted by Lori C. Williams, September 15, 2014.


USDA: Provide Congress with a report that describes the cropland acreage in each applicable county and State, and the change in cropland acreage from the preceding year beginning with the year 2000 through 2013. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, September 19, 2014.

The Conference for Food Protection: To express its concerns about attempts in Congress to prohibit the FDA from fulfilling its food safety enforcement mission by restricting its ability to address public health issues linked to the sale of raw milk. Submitted by Chairman John M. Luker, September 22, 2014.
USDA: Follow-up to thank letter submitted 7/30/2014 to U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman and Secretary Vilsack, expressing views regarding the country-of-origin labeling dispute, which is being litigated in the WTO. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, September 24, 2014.


USDA: Notification of the review and recommendation of moving forward with the proposed Edwards purchase. Submitted by NRRE Under Secretary Robert Bonnie, September 26, 2014.

Office of the Clerk: Reminder to file on a quarterly basis, with the Clerk of the House, a consolidated report of funds expended relating to travel outside the U.S. by employees or members of that committee. Submitted by Clerk Karen L. Haas, October 1, 2014.

USDA: Copy of the recently approved Federal Advisory Committee Charter for the General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan. Submitted by Cikena Reid, Committee Management Officer, White House Liaison, Office of the Secretary, October 1, 2014.

GPO: Requisitions for printing and binding work submitted by your Congressional organization that have been completed by the Government Printing Office (GPO) through August 2014. Submitted by Lyle L. Green, Director of Official Journal of Government, October 2, 2014.

USDA: Report on energy use and energy efficiency projects at the Washington, District of Columbia, headquarters and the major regional facilities of the USDA. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, October 8, 2014.


USDA: Response to letter submitted July 17, 2014 regarding the report called for under Section 2610 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 related to activities that pertain to the conversation of the lesser prairie chicken. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, October 14, 2014.


FCA: Propose an amendment to the agencies’ regulations regarding loans in areas having special flood hazards. Submitted by Charles R. Rawls, General Counsel, October 16, 2014.

CFTC: The charter for the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission’s reestablishment of the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC). Descriptions of the TAC’s purposes and the subjects it is intended to address are included in the enclosed charter. Submitted by Heather C. Gottry, Deputy General Counsel for General Law and CFTC Committee Management Officer, October 16, 2014.

FCA: Proposed Amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, October 17, 2014.


FCA: Proposed Amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the Code of Federal Regulations as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, October 29, 2014.

USDA: Response to a request that the Agricultural Research Service provide information on the fungus Fusarium oxysporum. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, October 30, 2014.

USHR: A letter to Chairman Frank D. Lucas to acknowledge the receipt of the Committee on Agriculture’s third Quarter report for official foreign travel filed with the Clerk of the House. Submitted by Karen L. Haas, Clerk U.S. House of Representatives, November 3, 2014.


USDA: A letter of thanks to Chairman Frank D. Lucas for the letter received by the chairman and his colleagues regarding the regulation of importation of fresh and frozen beef from Brazil. Submitted by Administrator Kevin Shea, October 22, 2014.


Representative Ralph M. Hall: A letter to the Chairman urging support for H.R. 5603. H.R. 5603 pertains to the preservation of Lake Fannin located in Fannin County, Texas where is it being neglected and subsequently has led to deterioration of the property. Submitted by Ralph M. Hall, November 14, 2014.

FCA: A Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2014 from the Farm Credit Administration. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, November 17, 2014.


USDA: A copy of the recently approved Committee Charter for the Advisory Committee on Minority Farmers. Submitted by Committee Management Officer Cikena Reid, November 19, 2014.

SRI Foundation: A thank you letter to Mr. Tidwell for the Forest Service many years of support of the Passport-in-Time. Submitted by Terry H. Klein, November 20, 2014.


C. MEMORIALS

Memorial No. 31 of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 149 requiring the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration to come up with a nation-wide system for monitoring, labeling, and enforcing the labeling of all whole and processed genetically engineered foods. Submitted May 22, 2013.

Memorial No. 140 of the Legislature of the Territory of Virgin Islands, relative to Resolution No. 1794 urging the Congress adopt H.R. 92. Submitted October 10, 2013.

Memorial No. 168 of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 223 memorializing the Congress to support Congressman GLENN THOMPSON’s efforts to add to the farm bill or his efforts to introduce new legislation known as the Forest Products Fairness Act of 2013. Submitted January 13, 2014.

Memorial No. 183 of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, relative to House Resolution No. 102 requesting that the Congress enact a new food, farm, and jobs bill. Submitted April 9, 2014.

Memorial No. 220 of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 105 asking the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress to give Idaho the flexibility to have control over the foods authorized for purchase with the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Programs (SNAP) benefits. Submitted June 20, 2014.
Memorial No. 221 of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 103 recommending that the Idaho Delegation to Congress work with representatives of other seafood and fish-producing states to acquire sufficient funding for effectual and maintained domestic marketing of American seafood. Submitted June 20, 2014.

Memorial No. 241 of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 7706 requesting that the Rhode Island Commerce Corporation pursue certification as a Federal Urban Promise Zone and Manufacturing Hub; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture. Submitted July 11, 2014.

Memorial No. 307 of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution No. 96 requesting the Rhode Island Commerce Commission pursue certification as a Federal Promise Zone and Manufacturing Hub; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture. Submitted August 4, 2014.

Memorial No. 308 of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution No. 412 requesting the state's Congressional Delegation to initiate and pursue all efforts to have Rhode Island declared a “Promise Zone”; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture. Submitted August 4, 2014.

Memorial No. 317 of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution 412 urging the state's delegation to pursue all efforts to have Rhode Island declared a “Promise Zone”; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture. Submitted September 11, 2014.

D. PETITIONS

Petition No. 21 of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York relative to Resolution No. 186 urging the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 712. Submitted May 23, 2013.

Petition No. 65 of the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, Oklahoma, relative to Resolution 13.077 supporting the Congress to pass legislation recognizing state jurisdiction for the regulation of hydraulic fracturing; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources. Submitted December 19, 2013.

Petition No. 66 of Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, Oklahoma, relative to Resolution 13.078 urging that FracFocus shall provide for the reporting of all chemicals that were intentionally added and used for the purpose of creating a hydraulic fracturing treatment; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture. Submitted December 19, 2013.