

[FULL COMMITTEE PRINT]

114TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
2d Session } 114-xxx

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG  
ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017

XXXX, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. XXXX]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2017.

CONTENTS

Title I—Agricultural Programs .....	Page 4
Title II—Conservation Programs .....	42
Title III—Rural Development Programs .....	45
Title IV—Domestic Food Programs .....	54
Title V—Foreign Assistance and Related Programs .....	60
Title VI—Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration .....	63
Title VII—General Provisions .....	79

OVERVIEW

The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee has jurisdiction over the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), except for the Forest Service, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), and the Farm Credit Administration (FCA). The Subcommittee's responsibility covers a vast and diverse group of agencies responsible for such things as promoting the production of a plentiful food supply; assisting farmers and ranchers across the country with sound production practices; improving the quality of life and vitality of communities in rural

America; assisting indigent populations in the U.S. and abroad with basic nutritional needs; research and development in agriculture to improve productivity and stability; overseeing commodity markets that provide confidence for businesses, traders, investors, and the public; supporting a safe food supply; and safe and effective drugs and medical devices. The activities of these agencies impact every American every day of the year.

The fiscal year 2017 discretionary spending in this bill totals \$21,299,000,000, which is \$451,000,000 below the fiscal year 2016 enacted level and \$281,000,000 below the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017.

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

The Committee does not include funding to begin new programs and, except where specifically noted, does not provide additional funding for pay increases. The Committee identifies savings of almost \$1,000,000,000 at USDA, provides relief for excessive leasing costs at the CFTC, and reins in regulatory overreach at the FDA, USDA, and CFTC.

#### OVERSIGHT AND HEARINGS

Consistent with the Committee on Appropriations Oversight Plan, as approved and transmitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration in January 2015, the Subcommittee began the fiscal year 2017 process committed to maintaining the Committee's focus on comprehensive oversight of federal discretionary spending under the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. In order to thoroughly review the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017 and examine how funds appropriated in previous years had been managed, the Subcommittee held 11 hearings for the mission areas, agencies, and programs of the USDA, the FDA, and the CFTC. The hearings included:

- Commodity Futures Trading Commission—February 10, 2016
- Secretary of Agriculture—February 11, 2016
- USDA Inspector General—February 12, 2016
- USDA Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services—February 24, 2016
- USDA Food Safety—February 24, 2016
- Food and Drug Administration—February 25, 2016
- USDA Natural Resources and the Environment—February 26, 2016
- USDA Marketing and Regulatory Programs—March 3, 2016
- USDA Rural Development—March 15, 2016
- USDA Research, Education, and Economics—March 16, 2016
- USDA Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services—March 17, 2016

As stewards of the taxpayer's dollar, the Subcommittee is responsible for ensuring that the funds under its jurisdiction are wisely invested and properly used. As such, the Subcommittee established four objectives to guide its hearings, oversight activities, and the development of its bill and report recommendations for fiscal year

2017. These objectives include increasing oversight, efficiency, and the need for effective outcomes; keeping rural America vibrant; supporting American farmers, ranchers, and producers; and protecting the health of people, plants, and animals.

Through its oversight activities, the Subcommittee can accomplish the goal of improving the management of agencies and programs by identifying and reducing waste, fraud, and abuse. It is joined in this effort by USDA's Inspector General, CFTC's Inspector General, and the Inspector General's Office of the Department of Health and Human Services. During the hearing with USDA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), the Subcommittee focused on USDA financial statements, improper payments, and how well USDA's agencies are managing their programs.

The Subcommittee questioned the Secretary of Agriculture about spending reductions included in USDA's budget request that are proposed for some of USDA's most popular and successful programs, such as crop insurance, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) pest and disease programs, and Rural Development loan and grant programs. The Subcommittee also discussed ways in which USDA can assist U.S. producers struggling to recover from citrus greening, highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) and declining market prices.

When it convened to review CFTC's increased budget request, the Subcommittee questioned the need for a 123 percent increase since the Financial Crisis of 2008 and continued to identify wasteful spending in the agency's excessive leasing costs. The Subcommittee made clear that it does not tolerate fraud, waste, or abuse in any program, knowing that these actions undermine support for all programs. The Subcommittee also examined the CFTC's regulations regarding the Swap Dealer de Minimis level.

When the Subcommittee heard from the FDA, it focused on preventing burdensome regulations for producers and the American people, in addition to ongoing discussions of how the FDA is implementing the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA), the motivation for the generic drug labeling rule, and regulation of tobacco products. The FDA regulates over 20 percent of every consumer dollar spent on products in the U.S., and so the Subcommittee reminded the FDA to be aware of the comprehensive economic impact of their regulatory decisions.

The Subcommittee heard from USDA's Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services mission area and reviewed implementation of school meal regulations as well as waste, fraud and abuse within nutrition programs. The Members discussed potential ways to identify and help beneficiaries of nutrition programs who showed indications of illegal drug use.

During the hearing to review the USDA's Rural Development (RD) mission area, the Subcommittee focused on the shocking spike in the cost of the Rental Assistance program and support for rural broadband programs. Members also questioned the Administration on proposed funding cuts for rural housing programs necessary for the continued well-being of rural communities.

During the hearing to review the USDA's Research, Education, and Economics mission area, the Subcommittee focused on the efficient use of limited research dollars and coordination of research efforts within USDA. The Subcommittee also expressed its interest

in USDA's ongoing investigation of animal care at the Agricultural Research Service's (ARS) Meat Animal Research Center (MARC) in Clay Center, Nebraska.

The Subcommittee discussed implementation of the 2014 farm bill and international, in-kind food aid during its hearing with USDA's Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services mission area. The Subcommittee also received an update on the farm bill directive to create an Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs within USDA.

During the hearing with USDA's Marketing and Regulatory Programs mission area, the Subcommittee focused on USDA's response to emerging threats to animal and plant health, particularly the recent outbreak of HPAI.

Because the Subcommittee knows that it cannot fulfill all requests for funding, it focuses on those areas that are most effective, broadly supported, and capable of delivering positive outcomes and a substantial return on investment. The Subcommittee will monitor the issues identified by its constituents and other stakeholders, those issues discussed at the hearings, and other high priority matters relevant to the management of USDA, FDA, CFTC, and FCA. The Subcommittee will maintain its oversight efforts throughout the 114th Congress to ensure taxpayer dollars are wisely and prudently used on behalf of the American people.

## TITLE I

### AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

#### PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$45,555,000
2017 budget estimate .....	64,403,000
Provided in the bill .....	45,555,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 18,848,000

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

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Office of the Secretary .....	\$5,051	\$10,178	\$5,051
Office of Tribal Relations .....	502	755	502
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination .....	1,496	1,592	1,496
Office of Advocacy and Outreach .....	1,209	11,220	1,209
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration .....	804	807	804
Departmental Administration .....	25,124	27,420	25,124
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations .....	3,869	3,919	3,869
Office of Communications .....	7,500	8,512	7,500
Total .....	\$45,555	\$64,403	\$45,555

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Secretary, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$45,555,000. The Committee recommendation includes the following offices under the Office of the Secretary: immediate Office of the Secretary; Office of Tribal Relations; Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination; Office of Advocacy and Outreach; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; Departmental Administration; Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations; and Office of Communications.

*Pay Cost.*—The Committee does not include requested funding for a civilian pay increase across the Department. Should the President provide a civilian pay increase for fiscal year 2017, it is assumed that the cost of such a pay increase will be absorbed within existing appropriations for fiscal year 2017.

*Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) Obligations and Commitments.*—The Secretary is directed to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in writing 15 days prior to the obligation or commitment of any emergency funds from the CCC.

*CCC Report.*—The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a report on November 15, 2016, and May 16, 2017, on planned uses of funding under the authorities of Section 4 and Section 11 of the CCC Charter Act.

*Crop Biotechnology & Biotech Ingredients.*—Plants, food, and food ingredients developed using genetic engineering were introduced into the U.S. food supply in the 1990s. Public and private sector scientists knowledgeable in genetic engineering, toxicology, chemistry, nutrition, and other scientific areas have carefully evaluated and assessed the safety of these products and have determined that such products are safe for human and animal consumption. The Committee provides a total of \$3,000,000 for the FDA to coordinate with USDA to provide education and outreach to the public on the safety and benefits of crop biotechnology and food and animal feed ingredients derived from biotechnology. The Committee expects this educational information to be posted on both agency websites and through other social media and communications platforms within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

*Federal Employee Conduct.*—The federal government grants federal employees with tremendous responsibility and trust to carry out their duties. They must do so free from conflicts of interest and without seeking private gain. Employees are public servants charged with implementing federal programs in a legal and ethical manner. Federal employees are reminded that they shall not advance a personal agenda or give preferential treatment to any outside organization or individual within the government programs which they administer. Information that is received by the employee, including information from the employees, offices, or Committees of the Congress of the United States, should be handled in a professional and confidential manner according to the federal government's code of conduct, standards, regulations, and statutes. The Committee is aware of recent conduct in violation of these principles, and the Committee believes that it is incumbent upon agency officials to take immediate disciplinary action when they confirm such behavior.

*Nutrition Research Coordination.*—The Committee seeks to bring more transparency and coordination to nutrition research and evaluation projects conducted by the Department. The Secretary is directed to ensure both the Research, Education, and Economics (REE) and the Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services mission areas coordinate and finalize the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) Research and Evaluation Plan submitted in fiscal year 2017 to prevent duplication of efforts and resources. The plan submitted for fiscal year 2017 shall include a brief description of the projects FNS expects to pursue and whether or not it was mandated by law.

Section 732 states that FNS shall not receive any funding for new research and evaluation projects in fiscal year 2017 until the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate receive the fiscal year 2017 Research and Evaluation Plan that has been developed in coordination with REE. In submitting the fiscal year 2018 budget justification, FNS is directed to provide its Research and Evaluation Plan simultaneously with its budget request. There is an expectation that this process will be followed in the future.

*Improper Payments, Unachieved Savings, and Financial Management.*—The Committee remains concerned with the Department's overall management of crucial financial issues that result in savings and efficiencies for taxpayers. This includes its consistent lack of compliance with mandatory improper payments reporting information, failure to complete OIG recommendations that would total \$801 million in savings, and delaying the submission of financial statements for the second consecutive year.

The Department has made gradual progress on some of these issues. USDA has reduced the amount of unachieved savings identified by the IG slightly since fiscal year 2015, and certain agencies, including the Risk Management Agency (RMA), have reduced their improper payment rates. The Committee directs the Department to properly report information related to improper payments and continue to work to reduce unachieved savings. Finally, the Department is directed to work with the Office of Management and Budget to submit financial statements on schedule for fiscal year 2016 and correct deficiencies identified for fiscal year 2015.

*Avian Influenza.*—The Committee appreciates the Department's response to the recent outbreak of HPAI, which caused considerable devastation to America's poultry industry and cost the economy well over \$1,000,000,000 between the public and private sector. The Committee encourages the Department to continue its work with trading partners to reopen trade for poultry and poultry products to the greatest extent possible. The Committee will continue to closely monitor the situation and directs USDA to keep the Committee apprised of future developments.

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

*State Office Co-location.*—The Committee continues to direct that any reallocation of resources related to the co-location of state offices scheduled for fiscal year 2017 and subsequent years is subject to the Committee's reprogramming procedures required under law.

*Administrative Provision.*—The Committee directs the Secretary to advise the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, through the Office of Budget and Program Analysis (OBPA), of the status of all reports requested of the Department in this bill at the time of submission of the fiscal year 2018 budget request and monthly thereafter. The Department needs to improve its timeliness in adhering to this requirement as stated in the fiscal year 2015 and 2016 House Appropriations reports. The Committee reminds the Secretary that all correspondence related to the directives in this bill must be addressed to the Committee on Appropriations.

*Loan and Grant Programs.*—The Committee directs the Department, through OBPA, to provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the status of obligations and funds availability for the loan and grant programs provided in this bill.

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

*Communication from USDA.*—The Department is reminded that the Members of the Committee must be informed of the activities, pending and proposed actions, and expenditures made by USDA and its respective agencies so that Congress can determine whether laws and programs are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress. A collaborative working relationship between the Committee and the agencies is necessary to ensure efficient and effective implementation of Congress' funding decisions. USDA is directed to ensure the Committee is notified of major changes to existing policies and any significant developments in its operations prior to providing non-governmental stakeholders such information.

*Late Reports.*—The Committee reminds the Secretary that the timelines specified by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for fiscal year 2016 reports are deadlines that must be met. While the Committee notes that the Department has made progress since 2014, the Department still has several outstanding reports that are delayed due to long reviews and clearances, especially in the immediate Office of the Secretary. The Committee directs the Secretary to submit these overdue reports.

*Decentralized Rent and Homeland Security.*—In fiscal year 2015, the Committee provided the Department with authority to decentralize rent from the General Services Administration (GSA) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Secretary submitted this request “as part of USDA’s implementation of the President’s ‘Freeze the Federal Footprint’ initiative” and to encourage efficiencies across the Department at individual agencies. On the contrary, USDA did not freeze, but expanded, its footprint by approximately 141,000 square feet. Meanwhile, the Secretary has claimed savings of \$25,200,000, while there will be a projected increase of \$9,900,000 since fiscal year 2015.

The Secretary is directed to find actual savings within the total estimated costs for fiscal year 2017, in accordance with the President's "Reduce the Footprint" initiative. If USDA does not find ways to reduce its physical footprint or the cost of its existing footprint, such increased costs will need to be absorbed by the agency to the detriment of the core missions of these agencies. Further, the Committee in fiscal year 2015 directed that "any future requests for increases to rent and security costs will need to be accompanied by detailed justifications." USDA has not provided such justification. The following table shows the increased costs, with the most recently available data as provided by USDA:

(Dollars in Thousands)

Year	GSA Rent and DHS Costs	Change
2015 .....	\$209,436	---
2016 .....	216,657	+7,221
2017 .....	219,328*	+2,671
Total .....		+\$9,892

\* Amount does not include the Administration's request for \$17,700,000 to support a move in FNCS.

*FSMA Implementation and Interagency Coordination.*—The Committee provides the full amount requested, \$5,000,000, for the National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) to be the sole agency providing education and technical assistance for farmers in implementing new requirements resulting from FSMA. The Committee commends NIFA's extension programs for the relationship they have built with our nation's producers, and hopes that they will continue to build this trust through FSMA implementation. However, USDA must clearly communicate their lead role in the collaborative partnership with the FDA to administer and manage the National Food Safety Training, Education, Extension, Outreach, and Technical Assistance Program. The Secretary is directed to work with the Commissioner of the FDA to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts and resources for FSMA education and training at the farm level.

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

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

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

*Scientific Integrity.*—Pursuant to the President's 2009 memorandum and as directed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, USDA adopted a scientific integrity policy in 2011. It appears to conform to the President's directive by requiring the use of information based upon well-established scientific processes, including peer review where appropriate, making the Department's scientific findings and conclusions publicly available and ensuring

a mechanism is in place to resolve disputes regarding scientific processes or the integrity of scientific information. The Committee directs the Secretary to ensure all USDA agencies are complying with the policy and using it as a requirement in their policy and regulatory decisions.

*Rural Poverty.*—The Department has statutory authorities and programs designed to help break the multi-generational trap of poverty in rural counties. The Committee recognizes that USDA may utilize existing programs and funding within RD and FNS in order to assist families, create jobs, and develop a path towards independence and self-sufficiency. Other existing resources such as the extension service and public universities can be used for coordination and outreach activities. As of April 2016, the Committee has not received the detailed plan required to be submitted by the Secretary which would detail all funding resources and bundled services to combat rural poverty.

*StrikeForce Initiative.*—The Committee appreciates the Department's efforts to target assistance to at-risk communities through the StrikeForce Initiative for Rural Growth and Opportunity. USDA, in collaboration with public and private partners, helps rural counties experiencing chronic poverty improve economic opportunities and quality of life for local residents. The Committee encourages USDA to place special emphasis on persistent poverty counties and continue to utilize a strategy of partnering public resources with local expertise to grow rural economies and create jobs in these poverty-stricken areas.

*Administrative Savings.*—The Secretary has repeatedly stated that USDA has achieved \$1,400,000,000 in savings through the Blueprint for Stronger Service initiative. The Committee acknowledges that the Department has taken positive steps to cut costs and modernize operations, but USDA must also acknowledge that a majority of cost savings were made necessary by funding limitations instituted by Congress and at the direction from Congress. The Committee is still awaiting a detailed report describing each of the specific cost savings and the actions taken to achieve such savings for each agency in order to arrive at the estimated total.

*U.S.-Mexico Cooperation.*—The Committee directs the Secretary of Agriculture to work with his Mexican counterpart to develop a U.S.-Mexico working group to increase cooperation between the two countries in a similar manner as the “Beyond the Borders Initiative” between the United States and Canada. The working group shall develop proposals and create potential solutions aimed at facilitating commerce through improvements in the efficiency of the inspection process on both sides of the border, integrating small and large producers into the trade supply chain, and improving border wait times and transportation costs, among others.

*Urban Agriculture.*—The Committee acknowledges the need for an expanded USDA role in support of urban agriculture in American cities. Support from the Department is lacking for urban producers who often have different needs than rural producers. Therefore, the Committee directs USDA to evaluate policies and programs and deliver a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate explaining how to further advance urban agriculture.

*Conflict of Interest.*—The Committee is aware of concerns within Congress and the agricultural community regarding conflict of interest issues with the consultants, academics, and other personnel contracted out by the Department. Such contracts may include parties in multiple roles who receive funding from the Department for legitimate activities who are simultaneously employed by advocacy or partisan-leaning research institutions. Such situations are particularly harmful to the Department’s credibility when parties employed in advocacy or other roles opine on similar topics or products as those involved in the Department’s contract. The Committee directs the Secretary to avoid such conflicts of interest in order to protect the credibility of the Department and the integrity of the programs and policies under the Department’s purview.

*Cottonseed as an Oilseed.*—Section 8702(10) of Title 7 of the U.S. Code states the Secretary of Agriculture may choose to define “any oilseed as designated by the Secretary.” The Committee notes that this law is explicit in its intent. The Secretary has publicly chosen not to exercise such authority regarding cottonseed, even given significant demand from Congress and its constituencies. The Committee recognizes the significant obstacles facing cotton producers who are in need of financial assistance and encourages the Secretary to use the authority he has in law, and has used recently, to provide such assistance.

*Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs.*—The Secretary is directed to complete the report regarding the establishment of an Under Secretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs required by the 2014 farm bill, the 2015 Agriculture Appropriations Act, and the 2016 Agriculture Appropriations Act. This report is two years overdue.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ECONOMIST

2016 appropriation .....	\$17,777,000
2017 budget estimate .....	17,592,000
Provided in the bill .....	16,777,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	–1,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	–815,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

*Drought Resilience.*—The Committee is concerned about the extent and severity of the drought in the U.S. and recognizes the importance of understanding and being prepared for drought. The Committee encourages the OCE to continue research and work with partners on drought resilience efforts to better address the serious threat posed by drought in the U.S.

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

## NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

2016 appropriation .....	\$13,317,000
2017 budget estimate .....	13,481,000
Provided in the bill .....	13,317,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 164,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

## OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

2016 appropriation .....	\$9,392,000
2017 budget estimate .....	9,525,000
Provided in the bill .....	9,392,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 133,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

## OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

2016 appropriation .....	\$44,538,000
2017 budget estimate .....	65,716,000
Provided in the bill .....	44,538,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 21,178,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$44,538,000. This includes \$28,000,000 for cybersecurity activities.

*IT Purchases and Oversight.*—The Committee directs the CIO to comply with the spirit and letter of the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act and incorporate its principles into future planning and current oversight of IT activities across the Department and the performance plan required in H. Rpt. 113-468.

## OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

2016 appropriation .....	\$6,028,000
2017 budget estimate .....	9,119,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,028,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 3,091,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

*Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (DATA).*—The Committee supports the work of the CFO to bring the Department into compliance with the DATA.

*Shared Costs Report.*—While the Committee notes that the Department did not find any increased costs in its Shared Costs Programs per the report required by the 2015 Appropriations Act, the Department also did not identify any savings. The Committee continues to direct the production of the report required in Public Law 113–235 and directs the agency to identify areas of savings and efficiencies.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$898,000
2017 budget estimate .....	901,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	— — —
2017 budget estimate .....	– 3,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$24,070,000
2017 budget estimate .....	24,750,000
Provided in the bill .....	24,070,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	— — —
2017 budget estimate .....	– 680,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$64,189,000
2017 budget estimate .....	84,365,000
Provided in the bill .....	84,189,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+20,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	– 176,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Agriculture Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$84,189,000.

*Report on Headquarters Modernization.*—The Committee directs the Department to provide the report required in H. Rpt. 113–468. The Committee requests the report include an update on the establishment of the Nonrecurring Expense Fund through the authority provided in Public Law 113–235. This authority was provided to enable the Secretary to use funding from expired accounts to invest in the Department’s infrastructure. The Committee is concerned the Department has failed to utilize this previously provided authority.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$3,618,000
2017 budget estimate .....	3,633,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,618,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 15,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Hazardous Materials Management, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$3,618,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

2016 appropriation .....	\$95,738,000
2017 budget estimate .....	100,998,000
Provided in the bill .....	96,040,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+302,000
2017 budget estimate .....	- 4,958,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Inspector General, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$96,040,000. This amount includes an increase for GSA rent.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

2016 appropriation .....	\$44,383,000
2017 budget estimate .....	49,599,000
Provided in the bill .....	44,383,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 5,216,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

OFFICE OF ETHICS

2016 appropriation .....	\$3,654,000
2017 budget estimate .....	4,617,000
Provided in the bill .....	4,556,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+902,000
2017 budget estimate .....	- 61,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of Ethics, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$4,556,000.

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

2016 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2017 budget estimate .....	901,000
Provided in the bill .....	893,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	- 8,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$893,000.

*Administrative Reorganization.*—The Committee does not concur with the agency’s proposal to combine NIFA Research and Education Activities, Extension Activities, and Integrated Activities into one account. While the Committee supports greater efficiency in the management of limited federal research dollars, the proposal fails to demonstrate that such reorganization would result in significant savings or the improvement of programs offered through NIFA.

*Biological Research Stations.*—The Committee directs USDA to provide a report within 120 days of enactment of this Act on the feasibility of establishing a new biological research station in association with a Historically Black College or University that has previously established partnerships in the conservation field. The report should examine the need for such a station, the economic and educational benefits, and associated costs.

*Coffee Plant Health.*—The Committee appreciates ARS and NIFA’s work to address existing and emerging challenges to coffee production in the United States and commends the agency’s work with research partners and coffee grower groups. The Committee encourages ARS, NIFA, and its partners to maintain support for coffee plant health research.

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

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

*Potato Research.*—The Committee supports research efforts to combat crop-threatening pest and disease pressures, including the potato cyst nematode. The Committee also recognizes the importance of research initiatives to identify and improve desired traits for new potato varieties and directs the Department to continue

working with universities, industry and potato growers on these projects.

*Screening Technologies.*—The Committee encourages the development of technologies that will provide rapid, portable, and facile screening of food fish species at port sites and wholesale and retail centers.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

2016 appropriation .....	\$85,373,000
2017 budget estimate .....	91,278,000
Provided in the bill .....	86,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+627,000
2017 budget estimate .....	−5,278,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Economic Research Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$86,000,000, including \$627,000 for cooperative agreements on groundwater modeling and drought resilience.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

2016 appropriation .....	\$168,443,000
2017 budget estimate .....	176,639,000
Provided in the bill .....	168,443,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	−8,196,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$168,443,000, of which \$41,871,000 is for the Census of Agriculture.

*Pecan Data.*—The Committee encourages NASS to restart surveys and reports for pecans, including publication of the 2016 Non-citrus Fruits and Nuts Preliminary Summary.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2016 appropriation .....	\$1,143,825,000
2017 budget estimate .....	1,161,340,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,151,825,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+8,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	−9,515,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Agricultural Research Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,151,825,000.

The Committee does not concur with the agency’s proposed reductions of research programs or increases for fiscal year 2017.

*Agriculture Research Stations.*—The Committee is concerned about the continued trend towards reductions in on-the-ground agriculture research through proposed cutbacks and consolidations without a clear plan to ensure that research which reflects the local needs and growing conditions continues. The Committee directs the

ARS to prioritize funding for field stations and work directly with local growers as changes in local research offerings are considered.

*Animal Research.*—The Committee expects the Department to keep the Committee informed on the progress of implementing changes to policies and procedures as a result of the January 19, 2015, *New York Times* article titled “U.S. Research Lab Lets Livestock Suffer in Quest for Profit” about MARC in Clay Center, Nebraska.

The Committee understands that some specific instances mentioned in the article may have been taken out of context and that others may have been exaggerated. It also believes that ARS scientists sincerely care about the animals they work with. The Committee recognizes the need for and value of animal research, but it demands that all animals be treated humanely and that the risk of premature death will be limited wherever possible. No type of abuse or mistreatment will be tolerated.

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

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

*ARS Field Stations.*—The Committee recognizes the successful utilization of authorities granted in previous annual appropriations Acts to further cooperation between industry and the ARS Canal Point, Florida Sugarcane Field Station. However, the Committee is concerned that this partnership is jeopardized by requirements that are outside the scope of the functionality of the facilities. The Committee directs ARS to resolve these issues, thus allowing this model partnership to continue. Additionally, the Committee recognizes Florida’s importance as a sentinel state in studying invasive pests and diseases. With new species entering ports every week, it is critical that ARS devote attention to the need for research facilities to study these threats.

*Aquaculture Industry Coordination.*—Nearly half the seafood consumed across the world is the product of aquaculture, and the aquaculture industry is a critical and growing part of the U.S. economy. However, less than one percent of worldwide production comes from U.S. producers. In January 2016, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Services issued a final rule to open the federal waters in the Gulf of Mexico to development of aquaculture. The Committee is concerned that vital seedstock required to implement this initiative will be sourced from foreign aquaculture producers. The Committee encourages the agency to support and protect the U.S. aquaculture industry by working collaboratively with U.S. aquaculture producers and research institutions that specialize in the development of aquaculture technologies.

*Aquatic Animal Health.*—The Committee supports ARS’ work with land-grant universities and other federal partners to develop solutions to aquatic animal pathogens including *Aeromonas* in cat-

fish and viral *hemorrhagic septicemia* in finfish. ARS is encouraged to collaborate with industry stakeholders on the development of potential vaccines and therapeutants.

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

*Co-Location of Researchers.*—The Committee encourages ARS to develop a plan to maximize its investments in plant science facilities and research by taking advantage of the synergies and efficiencies realized through the co-location of USDA researchers in state-of-the-art facilities with university and other stakeholders.

*Cotton Ginning.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of pollution abatement, improving fiber quality, ginning efficiency, cotton seed and other byproducts, and remains committed to expanding research in cotton ginning and innovation by existing laboratories.

*Cranberry Research.*—The Committee recognizes the ongoing research needs of the cranberry sector, ranging from disease control to pesticide use to responsible management of water resources. The Committee urges ARS to continue these efforts.

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

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

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

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

*Germplasm Enhancement of Maize.*—The Committee supports the germplasm enhancement of maize project and encourages continued cooperation between ARS and industry.

*Greenhouse Technology Research.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of advancing greenhouse technology and exploring its capabilities to address the energy and water challenges inherent in

four-season production systems, beginning in food insecure communities across the country. The Committee encourages ARS to work with the Department of Energy (DOE) for greenhouse technology research that explores how to integrate ongoing research projects at the various DOE National Labs to develop affordable, deployable, and energy- and water-efficient food production platforms for undernourished regions of the country. By working together, ARS and DOE can bring their respective strengths and resources to designing the most desirable, low-cost, and efficient production system.

*Horticultural Research and Education.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the U.S. National Arboretum and its role as a center for discovery and education, as well as a destination for more than 500,000 visitors every year. The Committee encourages the agency to continue to support the Arboretum.

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

*Long-Term Agro-ecosystem Research Network.*—The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$1,000,000 above fiscal year 2016 for the Long-Term Agro-ecosystem Research (LTAR) network.

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

*National Agricultural Library.*—The Committee encourages ARS to maintain a focus on agricultural-related legal issues within the National Agricultural Library. The Committee notes that as the agriculture sector faces increasing financial stress, there is a necessity that agricultural-related legal issues be addressed on an increasingly frequent basis. Further, agricultural-related legal issues are increasingly complex, and the impact of these legal issues continues to broaden in scope. The Committee recommends that the National Agricultural Library play an important role in assisting all stakeholders with understanding these issues.

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

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

*Safe and Abundant Water Supply.*—The Committee supports technological development to address key agricultural water resource issues across the U.S. The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$4,000,000 above fiscal year 2016 to conduct further research for Safe and Abundant Water Supplies to Support U.S. Agricultural Production.

*Sage Grouse.*—The Committee is aware that listing the greater sage grouse as endangered under the Endangered Species Act has the potential to negatively affect rural communities in the 11 states that have sage brush ecosystems. The Committee encourages ARS to work with its partners on sage brush and related rangeland research that will help preserve the greater sage grouse and the other species that rely on the sage brush ecosystem.

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

*Small Grain Genomics.*—The Committee supports research on small grain genomics and recognizes its importance in improving crop traits and developing new cultivars. The Committee provides an increase of \$1,000,000 above fiscal year 2016 to support the Small Grains Genomic Initiative.

*Sodium Consumption.*—The Committee directs the ARS Human Nutrition Research Centers to provide a plan within 90 days of enactment of this Act for conducting a study on the levels of sodium consumption in school-aged children. The plan shall include the methodology and timeframes necessary to conduct such a study, focusing on whether the consumption levels are within or outside the usual range of consumption, both domestically and worldwide.

*Sorghum in Agriculture.*—The Committee recognizes the growing significance of sorghum in agriculture due to water conservation traits and increased utilization. Funding is included to initiate gene flow research to advance the durability and sustainability of fitness traits in sorghum.

*U.S. Sheep Experiment Station (USSES).*—The Committee recognizes the unique and valuable contributions the USSES makes toward increasing the production efficiency of sheep and improving sustainable rangeland ecosystems. The Committee also recognizes a unique opportunity to expand other research initiatives. The Committee encourages ARS to work with various stakeholders regarding efforts to propose mission improvements for the USSES.

*U.S. Wheat and Barley Scab (USWBS).*—The Committee recognizes that *fusarium* head blight is a major threat to agriculture, inflicting substantial yield and quality losses throughout the U.S. The Committee supports research carried out through the USWBS initiative. The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$2,000,000 above fiscal year 2016 to conduct further research for the USWBS initiative to enhance food safety and supply by reducing the impact of *fusarium* head blight on wheat and barley.

## BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2016 appropriation .....	\$212,101,000
2017 budget estimate .....	94,500,000
Provided in the bill .....	99,600,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	-112,501,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+5,100,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Agricultural Research Service, Buildings and Facilities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$99,600,000 for priorities identified in the USDA ARS Capital Investment Strategy, April 2012, including not less than \$5,100,000 for planning and design purposes for the next highest priorities identified in the USDA ARS Capital Investment Strategy.

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

## RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

2016 appropriation .....	\$819,685,000
2017 budget estimate .....	836,915,000
Provided in the bill .....	832,860,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+13,175,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-4,055,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Research and Education Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$832,860,000.

*Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI).*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the research conducted through AFRI and provides an increase of \$25,000,000 for this competitive grant program. The Committee believes that each of the six AFRI Challenge Areas are of equal importance to the agricultural community and rejects the President's proposal that any increase to the AFRI program be available only to the Sustainable Bioenergy Challenge Area.

*Agricultural Research Enhancement Awards.*—The Committee continues to direct that not less than 15 percent of the competitive research grant funds be used for USDA's agriculture research enhancement awards program, including USDA-EPSCoR, in accordance with 7 U.S.C. 450i.

*Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2018.*—The Committee appreciates NIFA's efforts to provide additional information in its budget requests over the past three years. For the fiscal year 2018 budget request, the Committee is particularly interested in the request for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative and requests that the agency provide greater detail on the levels proposed to be allocated to and the expected publication date, scope, and allocation level for each request for awards to be published under each priority area specified in section 2(b)(2) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)(2)).

*Childhood Obesity.*—Within the funds made available for AFRI, the Committee encourages NIFA to support innovative efforts to address the unique challenges faced in addressing childhood obesity through a combination of family education and clinical studies

focused on early life influences on obesity risk; the development of eating behavior during infancy and early childhood; the role of sleep in the development of childhood obesity; and obesity prevention strategies for low-income children in childcare and educational settings.

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

*Food Manufacturing Efficiencies.*—The Committee is aware of many new and promising food manufacturing processes and technologies. The nation’s food supply can be made safer, more secure, and more affordable through means such as automation of equipment and modifying processes along the entire supply chain to work more efficiently and use less water, energy and other resources. The Committee urges the Department to promote enhanced technology, processes, and data analysis throughout the food manufacturing industry.

*Livestock and Poultry Waste Research.*—The Committee recognizes the benefits of improved methods of managing animal waste in livestock and poultry production and encourages NIFA to support research and development of innovative technologies, particularly those that are operationally and economically feasible and have a high probability of widespread implementation.

*Organic Agriculture.*—The Committee encourages USDA to ensure that the needs of the U.S. organic sector are more fully addressed through AFRI. As USDA’s flagship competitive agricultural research grant program, AFRI funding should be reflective of the needs of all aspects of U.S. agriculture, including organic. The Committee directs USDA to develop a plan for meeting this goal, including how the agency will ensure organic research conducted through AFRI is not duplicative of research conducted with mandatory funds through the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative and other research programs, and report back to the Committee within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

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

*Unmanned Aircraft Systems.*—The rapidly evolving field of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) provides highly promising opportunities for timely collection of geospatial data that can be used to increase profitability for agricultural producers and improve envi-

ronmental stewardship in a broad range of areas. The Committee believes that research, development, education, and extension programs are needed to help further develop the technology and educate farmers and natural resource managers on best practices and safe operation of UAS. The Committee encourages NIFA to support the research, development, education and training of techniques, sensor and imaging technology, data analytics tools, best practices, and the safe and efficient deployment of UAS for improved agriculture and environmental stewardship.

*Urban Agriculture.*—The Committee acknowledges the need for expanded research in support of urban agriculture in American cities. Support from the Department is lacking for urban producers who often have different needs than rural producers. Therefore, the Committee directs USDA to evaluate its policies and programs and deliver a report to the Committee explaining how to further advance urban agriculture.

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

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES  
[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	2016 enacted	2017 estimate	Committee provision
Hatch Act .....	7 U.S.C. 361a–i .....	\$243,701	\$243,701	\$243,701
McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act .....	16 U.S.C. 582a through a–7 ...	33,961	33,961	33,961
Research at 1890 Institutions (Evans-Allen Program).	7 U.S.C. 3222 .....	54,185	58,000	54,185
Payments to the 1994 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 301 note .....	3,439	3,654	3,439
Education Grants for 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(b) .....	19,336	20,410	19,336
1890s Capacity Coordination Initiative .....	.....	---	10,000	---
Education Grants for Hispanic-Serving Institutions ..	7 U.S.C. 3241 .....	9,219	9,219	9,219
Education Grants for Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions.	7 U.S.C. 3156 .....	3,194	3,194	3,194
Research Grants for 1994 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 301 note .....	1,801	3,914	1,801
Capacity Building for Non Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture.	7 U.S.C. 3319i .....	5,000	---	---
Grants for Insular Areas .....	7 U.S.C. 3222b–2, 3362 and 3363.	2,000	1,800	1,800
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(b) .....	350,000	375,000	375,000
Veterinary Medicine Loan Repayment .....	7 U.S.C. 3151a .....	5,000	5,000	6,500
Veterinary Services Grant Program .....	7 U.S.C. 3151b .....	2,500	---	2,500
Food and Agriculture Resiliency Program for Military Veterans.	.....	---	2,500	---
Continuing Animal Health and Disease Research Program.	7 U.S.C. 3195 .....	4,000	---	4,000
Supplemental and Alternative Crops .....	7 U.S.C. 3319d .....	825	---	---
Multicultural Scholars, Graduate Fellowship and Institution Challenge Grants.	7 U.S.C. 3152(b) .....	9,000	---	9,000
Secondary and 2-year Post-Secondary Education .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(j) .....	900	---	900
Aquaculture Centers .....	7 U.S.C. 3322 .....	4,000	---	4,000
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education .....	7 U.S.C. 5811, 5812, 5831, and 5832.	24,667	29,967	24,667
Farm Business Management .....	7 U.S.C. 5925f .....	1,450	---	---
Sun Grant Program .....	7 U.S.C. 8114 .....	2,500	---	---
Alfalfa and Forage Research Program .....	7 U.S.C. 5925 .....	2,000	---	---

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES—  
Continued  
[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	2016 enacted	2017 estimate	Committee provision
Minor Crop Pest Management (IR-4) .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	11,913	11,913	11,913
Special Research Grants: .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....			
Global Change/UV Monitoring .....	.....	1,405	1,405	1,405
Potato Research .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	2,000	---	2,000
Aquaculture Research .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	1,350	---	---
Total, Special Research Grants .....	.....	4,755	1,405	3,405
Necessary Expenses of Research and Education Ac- tivities:				
Grants Management Systems .....	.....	7,830	9,790	7,830
GSA Rent and DHS Security Expenses .....	.....	5,960	5,960	5,960
Federal Administration—Other Necessary Ex- penses.	.....	6,549	7,527	6,549
Total, Necessary Expenses .....	.....	20,339	23,277	20,339
Total, Research and Education Ac- tivities.	.....	\$819,685	\$836,915	\$832,860

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

2016 appropriation .....	(\$11,880,000)
2017 budget estimate .....	(11,880,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(11,880,000)
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

2016 appropriation .....	\$475,891,000
2017 budget estimate .....	501,859,000
Provided in the bill .....	477,391,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+1,500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-24,468,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Extension Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$477,391,000.

*Rural Health and Safety Education Programs.*—The opioid abuse epidemic is one of the greatest threats facing rural America today, and the Committee supports all efforts to address this problem through improved health and safety education and outreach. The Committee provides \$3,000,000 for Rural Health and Safety Education Programs to combat opioid abuse in rural communities.

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee:

## NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

## EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(b) and (c) programs and Cooperative Extension.	7 U.S.C. 343(b) and (c) and 208(c) of P.L. 93–471.	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
Extension Services at 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3221 .....	45,620	48,350	45,620
Extension Services at 1994 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3) .....	4,446	6,724	4,446
Facility Improvements at 1890 Institutions .....	7 U.S.C. 3222b .....	19,730	21,703	19,730
Renewable Resources Extension Act .....	16 U.S.C. 1671 et seq. ....	4,060	4,060	4,060
Rural Health and Safety Education Programs .....	7 U.S.C. 2662(i) .....	1,500	---	3,000
Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7642 .....	1,250	---	1,250
Women and Minorities in STEM Fields .....	7 U.S.C. 5925 .....	400	---	400
Grants to Youth Organizations .....	.....	---	1,000	---
Food Safety Outreach Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7625 .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Smith-Lever Act, Section 3(d): .....	7 U.S.C. 343(d) .....	.....	.....	.....
Food and Nutrition Education .....	.....	67,934	68,034	67,934
Farm Safety and Youth Farm Safety Education Programs.	.....	4,610	4,610	4,610
New Technologies for Agricultural Extension ....	.....	1,550	---	1,550
Children, Youth, and Families at Risk .....	.....	8,395	8,395	8,395
Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program .....	.....	3,039	5,839	3,039
Home Visits for Remote Areas .....	.....	---	20,000	---
Total, Section 3(d) .....	.....	85,528	106,878	85,528
Necessary Expenses of Extension Activities:				
Agriculture in the K–12 Classroom .....	7 U.S.C. 3152(j) .....	552	---	552
Federal Administration—Other Necessary Expenses for Extension Activities.	.....	7,805	8,144	7,805
Total, Necessary Expenses .....	.....	8,357	8,144	8,357
Total, Extension Activities .....	.....	\$475,891	\$501,859	\$477,391

## INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

2016 appropriation .....	\$30,900,000
2017 budget estimate .....	28,900,000
Provided in the bill .....	30,900,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	+2,000,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Integrated Activities, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$30,900,000.

*Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative (FADI).*—The Committee supports the important work being done through the diagnostic laboratory network and encourages NIFA to prioritize funding to strengthen animal health diagnostic laboratories operated and administered by Colleges of Veterinary Medicine at land grant institutions. NIFA should take into consideration the degree to which the capacity for surveillance, monitoring, response, and capacity is enhanced; the concentration of human and animal populations that are directly at risk; trade, tourism, and cultural considerations; geography, ecology, and climate; the strength of biomedical, agricultural, environmental, and public health expertise at the hosting land grant university; evidence of active collaboration with, and support of, the state department of agriculture; and evidence of stakeholder support and engagement.

The following table reflects the amount provided by the Committee.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

[Dollars in Thousands]

Program/Activity	Authorization	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Methyl Bromide Transition Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	\$2,000	\$--	\$2,000
Organic Transition Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
Regional Rural Development Centers .....	7 U.S.C. 450i(c) .....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative .....	7 U.S.C. 3351 .....	6,700	10,000	6,700
Crop Protection/Pest Management Program .....	7 U.S.C. 7626 .....	17,200	20,200	17,200
Total, Integrated Activities .....		\$30,900	\$35,200	\$30,900

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

2016 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2017 budget estimate .....	901,000
Provided in the bill .....	893,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	--
2017 budget estimate .....	-8,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$893,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$894,415,000
2017 budget estimate .....	901,196,000
Provided in the bill .....	930,831,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+36,416,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+29,635,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Salaries and Expenses, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$930,831,000.

Included in this funding level are increases of \$21,000,000 for Emergency Preparedness and Response; \$9,916,000 for Zoonotic Disease Management; \$9,500,000 for Specialty Crop Pests; \$1,750,000 for the National Veterinary Stockpile; \$1,500,000 for Equine, Cervid, and Small Ruminant Health; and \$1,518,000 for Animal Health Technical Services. The Committee maintains recent increases for such functions as Avian Health; Overseas Technical and Trade Operations in order to help resolve sanitary and phytosanitary trade issues that could result in the opening of new markets and retaining and expanding existing market access for

U.S. agricultural products; the National Animal Health Lab Network; the Citrus Health Response Program; and Wildlife Damage Management.

Within the amount included for Specialty Crop Pests, the Committee includes increases of \$1,500,000 for fruit fly exclusion and detection; \$5,000,000 for the Citrus Health Response Program; \$2,000,000 for the glassy-winged sharpshooter; and \$1,000,000 for the light brown apple moth. Funding for the European grapevine moth should be no less than the amount provided in fiscal year 2016. The Committee continues to provide an additional \$5,500,000 for citrus greening emergency response to the HLB MAC.

The following table reflects the amounts provided by the Committee:

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Committee provision
Animal Health Technical Services .....	\$36,857
Aquatic Animal Health .....	2,253
Avian Health .....	55,340
Cattle Health .....	91,500
Equine, Cervid, and Small Ruminant Health .....	21,000
National Veterinary Stockpile .....	5,723
Swine Health .....	24,800
Veterinary Biologics .....	16,417
Veterinary Diagnostics .....	36,540
Zoonotic Disease Management .....	19,439
<i>Subtotal, Animal Health</i> .....	<i>309,869</i>
Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (Appropriated) .....	27,900
Cotton Pests .....	11,520
Field Crop & Rangeland Ecosystem Pests .....	8,826
Pest Detection .....	27,446
Plant Protection Methods Development .....	20,686
Specialty Crop Pests .....	167,500
Tree & Wood Pests .....	45,933
<i>Subtotal, Plant Health</i> .....	<i>309,811</i>
Wildlife Damage Management .....	100,376
Wildlife Services Methods Development .....	18,856
<i>Subtotal, Wildlife Services</i> .....	<i>119,232</i>
Animal & Plant Health Regulatory Enforcement .....	16,224
Biotechnology Regulatory Services .....	18,875
<i>Subtotal, Regulatory Services</i> .....	<i>35,099</i>
Contingency Fund .....	470
Emergency Preparedness & Response .....	37,966
<i>Subtotal, Safeguarding and Emergency Preparedness</i> .....	<i>38,436</i>
Agriculture Import/Export .....	15,099
Overseas Technical and Trade Operations .....	22,114
<i>Subtotal, Safe Trade &amp; International Technical Assistance</i> .....	<i>37,213</i>
Animal Welfare .....	28,510
Horse Protection .....	697
<i>Subtotal, Animal Welfare</i> .....	<i>29,207</i>
APHIS Information Technology Infrastructure .....	4,251
Physical/Operational Security .....	5,146
GSA Rental and DHS Security Payments .....	42,567
<i>Subtotal, Agency Management</i> .....	<i>51,964</i>
Total, Salaries & Expenses .....	\$930,831

*Animal Welfare.*—The bill provides \$28,510,000 for the Animal Welfare program in order to ensure that minimum standards of care and treatment are provided for certain animals bred for commercial sale, used in research, transported commercially, or exhibited to the public. The Committee provides \$500,000 to support the renewal of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between APHIS and ARS. The MOU is necessary for ARS to utilize the skills and expertise of APHIS' animal care staff and to help ARS address some of their recent failures to maintain high standards of care for animals used in ARS funded research. At a minimum, the MOU should ensure that ARS is adhering to its own standards and guidelines for research practices as required by the Humane Animal Care and Use policy, a policy that is closely aligned with the Animal Welfare Act; ensure that every ARS location engaging in research and testing on vertebrate animals has a fully functioning Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) in place; and, ensure that each IACUC produces a semi-annual report with a description of and the reasons for any major deviations from the requirements outlined in ARS policy.

*Antimicrobial Resistance.*—There is currently no evidence to support the claim that agriculture is largely to blame for the increase in antibiotic-resistant strains of bacteria, and so the Committee supports funding to collect additional data that will inform policy related to the appropriate antibiotic use in all settings across agriculture and clinical medicine. The Committee provides \$9,916,000 for on-farm surveillance and data collection to enhance the understanding of on-farm levels of antibiotic use and the impact on antimicrobial resistance levels. The information collected should clearly delineate between antibiotics used for food-producing and companion animals. Further, to avoid duplication with existing programs like the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System, the Committee expects surveys regarding on-farm usage to be limited to collecting information about the antibiotics used and should not be utilized for other regulatory purposes. In designing these surveys, the Committee expects the agency to work primarily with end-users of antibiotics and veterinarians providing care to the animals. APHIS will collect this information through its statistical unit under the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act, which will guarantee that all information collected is protected from distribution in a manner that could identify an individual respondent for the full time the data is in existence. This information is needed for use in the larger National Strategy for Combatting Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria with other federal partners.

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

industry. Collaborative efforts among the agency, industry, and other federal and state partners are essential to improving preparedness, surveillance, and response capabilities, as well as reducing the likelihood of disease spread. APHIS should collaborate with ARS' Aquatic Animal Health Research Unit as necessary to support its aquatic animal health efforts.

*Biotechnology Review Process.*—The Committee is aware of an Administration-wide effort to modernize the regulatory system for biotechnology products. As noted by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy memo on the subject dated July 2, 2015, this regulatory system “. . . must protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.” In moving forward, it should be noted that, since the establishment of the original coordinated framework over three decades ago, there are no known validated instances of harm to the environment, agriculture, or non-target organisms arising from the use of plants regulated by APHIS. The Committee encourages the agency to continue to maintain some of the benefits of the existing regulatory system, but find greater efficiencies and utilize this opportunity to include advances in biotechnology methodology. The agency should engage in a deliberative, science-based process devoid of political agendas and the baseless scare tactics used to disparage the industry.

*Cervid Health.*—Data from 2007 indicates that the cervid industry in the United States accounts for 5,600 deer farms and 1,900 elk farms, has an economic value of \$894,000,000, and supports nearly 30,000 jobs. This industry continues to participate in the agency's national, voluntary Herd Certification Program (HCP) that supports the domestic and international marketability of U.S. cervid herds. The Committee encourages APHIS to maintain its commitment to the HCP and the cervid industry and directs the agency to spend no less than \$3,500,000 for cervid health activities. Within the funds provided, the agency should give consideration to indemnity payments if warranted.

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

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

*Cotton Pests.*—The Committee is concerned that every effort be made by APHIS and the cotton industry to ensure the boll weevil does not re-infest areas of the United States where it has been successfully eradicated. The Boll Weevil Eradication Program, an out-

standing example of a public-private partnership, has successfully eradicated the boll weevil from all U.S. cotton-producing regions except for the extreme lower parts of Texas in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) bordering Tamaulipas, Mexico. Growers in the LRGV, with assistance from APHIS and the support of the entire industry, continue to conduct an active program to eradicate the boll weevil. The LRGV serves as the barrier between boll weevil infested areas of Mexico and boll weevil-free areas of the United States. The Department is directed to work with the U.S. cotton industry to develop a plan of action to protect the United States from re-infestation and to report its findings to the Committee not less than 120 days after enactment of this Act.

*Emergency Outbreaks.*—The Committee continues to include specific language relating to the availability of funds to address emergencies related to the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious diseases or pests of animals, poultry or plants. The Committee expects the Secretary to continue to use the authority provided in this bill to transfer funds from the CCC for the arrest and eradication of animal and plant pests and diseases that threaten American agriculture. By providing funds in this account, the Committee is enhancing, not replacing, the use of CCC funding for emergency outbreaks.

*Export Certification.*—The Committee recognizes personnel constraints on the U.S.-Mexico border, with regard to phytosanitary inspections for exported goods. In the best interest of cross-border trade and agribusiness, the Committee encourages APHIS to ensure adequate levels of staffing to provide timely phytosanitary certification in support of exports.

*Feral Swine Management.*—Feral swine are found in at least 41 states with a population of more than 5,000,000 and cause more than \$1,500,000,000 in damages and control costs in the United States each year, with at least \$800,000,000 of this due to direct damage to agriculture. The Committee believes this damage assessment far underestimates the level of damage when considering the impact to the environment, native species, habitat, historic sites, and residential and commercial areas. The Committee supports APHIS' National Feral Swine Damage Management Program but has concerns that the currently budgeted amount does not provide sufficient funding to allow for the increasing demands in the areas of research, development, education, outreach, and coordination. Therefore, the Committee provides an increase of \$3,000,000 above the funds provided in fiscal year 2016 and directs APHIS to use these funds to support its existing cooperative service agreement process, which identifies and develops unmet needs for feral swine control nationwide.

*Foreign Market Access Requests.*—Increasingly, U.S. agriculture is facing non-tariff trade barriers, which are limiting the ability for U.S. agriculture to open and maintain access to key export markets. The Committee directs APHIS to review and update the list of foreign market access requests submitted by U.S. producers, producer groups, companies and/or non-government agencies. All efforts should be made to assign the appropriate agency resources to opening and maintaining access to foreign markets for U.S. products. By March 2017, the agency should provide an update to the Committee on the number of foreign market access requests that

have been successfully granted for U.S. agriculture; export volumes; the number of foreign market access requests that have been granted for imports to the U.S. marketplace; and the number of outstanding requests and the length of time each request has been pending before the agency. The agency should identify the limitations in achieving and maintaining foreign market access for U.S. agriculture.

*Foreign Zoonotic Disease Response.*—The Committee recognizes and commends APHIS for its efforts to address the challenges associated with eradicating foreign zoonotic diseases such as HPAI and FMD in a timely manner. In order to reduce the spread of disease outbreaks in the future, the Committee directs APHIS to use existing funds to undertake a review of existing protocols for foreign zoonotic disease eradication, including stamping-out policies, and to develop a strategy that improves agency, state and local, and industry responsiveness. This plan should take into consideration existing technology limitations, adverse weather, lack of water, and other issues that may hinder APHIS' eradication efforts in the event of future outbreaks. Furthermore, APHIS should consider funds available to states through the current cooperative agreements for surveillance testing and backyard flock surveillance; grant or cost share opportunities for farmers to give them the ability to enhance biosecurity measures at their operations; the need for veterinarian positions in states for biosecurity activities; and needs to address the unavailability of vaccine for FMD.

*Grapevine Import Regulations.*—The Committee urges APHIS to update its import regulations for grapevines. The current regulatory review process and requirements for pathogen screening of imports are expensive, cumbersome and time-consuming. Complying without the use of available technology can take in excess of thirteen years to complete. APHIS should issue new regulations that dramatically shorten the review timeline by using new technology and prioritize the approval of new grape varieties suited for colder, harsher climates.

*Horse Protection Act.*—The Committee has continually encouraged APHIS to work more closely with stakeholders pursuant to the Horse Protection Act. Specifically, the agency has been directed to provide greater and more consistent transparency, to work more closely with stakeholders on rules and regulations, and to move away from the subjective nature of current inspection methods in favor of objective measurements. The Committee is disappointed that the agency has not worked in good faith to address the Committee's requests, which are intended to further the dual goals of the Horse Protection Act—to care for animals engaged in the trade and promote the industry in a safe manner. The Committee has become aware that APHIS intends to modify regulations associated with Horse Protection Act through rule-making actions and notes that any substantive changes to the statute or its intent should be made by Congress through the legislative process.

*Huanglongbing Emergency Response.*—The Committee maintains the increased funding levels for Huanglongbing Emergency Response within the Specialty Crop Pests line item. The Committee encourages APHIS to allocate sufficient resources in order to continue vital management, control, and associated activities to address citrus greening. The disease, for which there is no cure, has

caused a reduction in citrus production by over 60 percent since 2007 in Florida alone. All citrus producing counties in Texas are under quarantine, and California has found the Asian Citrus Psyllid, the vector of the disease, in some backyard trees. The spread of this disease has called the future of the domestic citrus industry into question, costing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in lost revenue. In addition, the agency is encouraged to support priorities and strategies identified by the HLB MAC group to benefit the citrus industry. The agency should appropriately allocate resources based on critical need and maximum effect to the citrus industry.

The Committee maintains the \$2,000,000 increase from fiscal year 2016 for citrus health to support priorities and strategies identified by the HLB MAC group. The MAC is focused on short-term solutions to help the citrus industry, and the cooperative nature of federal, state, and industry representatives in this group is expected to result in the development of tools and techniques to address this devastating disease. Helping growers explore new possible solutions, the MAC has been an effective resource. The agency should appropriately allocate resources based on critical need and maximum impact to the citrus industry. These citrus health activities directly protect citrus production on approximately 765,000 acres in the United States worth more than \$3,300,000,000 for the 2014–2015 growing season.

*Light Brown Apple Moth.*—The Committee encourages APHIS to engage state and international regulatory bodies to deregulate the light brown apple moth. The Committee is concerned that if APHIS simply withdraws federal regulation without the necessary work with other regulatory officials, APHIS will shift, not reduce, the regulatory burden. Should APHIS withdraw the federal order for light brown apple moth, it must take steps to reduce the overall burden on growers. The Committee includes an increase for the light brown apple moth to support the second phase of the Joint Forward Plan and urges the Department to develop initiatives for permanent, ongoing departmental regulatory partnerships while continuing to engage stakeholders and trading partners throughout North America.

*National Animal Health Laboratory Network (NAHLN).*—The laboratories within the NAHLN network are on the frontline for detection of newly identified and reemerging animal diseases. NAHLN laboratories provide a critical contribution to animal and public health. The bill provides funding for NAHLN through both APHIS and NIFA at approximately \$12,000,000 and \$3,000,000, respectively, resulting in a total investment of \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2017.

NAHLN laboratories were invaluable during the 2015 outbreak of HPAI, which significantly increased testing needs. At the same time, NAHLN laboratories must also continue testing for other animal diseases of concern. The Committee encourages NAHLN to consider partnering with other accredited private laboratories as necessary to assist with increased testing demands in order to prevent backlogs and provide results as quickly as possible.

*Orobanche Ramosa.*—The Committee recognizes that APHIS-funded efforts to control *orobanche ramosa*, also known as branched broomrape, in Texas were not completely successful and

its spread is a threat to agriculture. As such, the Committee encourages APHIS to work with the appropriate Congressional Committees, along with states and local stakeholders to formulate a plan to manage branched broomrape.

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

*Potato Cyst Nematode Eradication*.—The Committee includes funding to maintain resources for the potato cyst nematode eradication program at the fiscal year 2016 level in order to continue with successful efforts to eradicate this pest. If left untreated, this pest could spread, affecting other crops.

*Regional Biosecurity Plans*.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, at the time the President's budget for fiscal year 2018 is submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report describing the steps USDA has taken to implement the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii, as developed jointly by the Department and other federal and non-federal entities. The report shall include an update on previous and upcoming implementation activities, including estimates of additional funding to be used or needed for planned activities.

*Vaccine for Foot-and-Mouth Disease*.—FMD is a highly contagious viral disease eradicated from the U.S. in 1929, but it is still a threat since countries around the globe continue grappling with the disease. This disease could cause billions of dollars in damage to the economy if unchecked. APHIS has publicly stated that the FMD vaccine bank is insufficient to deal with a large scale FMD outbreak in the U.S. and that a larger vaccine bank is needed. APHIS has also noted that expanding the current FMD vaccine supply is an expensive investment. Having sufficient quantities of vaccine readily available and deployable to control an FMD outbreak would appear to be a critical part of the USDA APHIS mission. Rapid control of FMD protects the security of the U.S. food supply, limiting the economic damage from livestock losses due to the disease, and also shortens disruptions to trade and commerce that would occur as long as FMD goes uncontrolled due to a lack of vaccine. The Committee is concerned that this potential vaccine shortage could result in the compromised management of an FMD outbreak in the United States. In order that the Committee can better understand the budget implications required to address this vaccine shortage, APHIS is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate within 90 days of enactment of this Act on contingency plans to develop an expanded vaccine bank and the estimated funding necessary for implementation and maintenance.

*Wildlife Damage Management.*—While receiving support from co-operators to conduct wildlife management operations, special emphasis should be placed on those areas such as oral rabies vaccination, livestock protection, predator damage management for avian predators such as the raven in Western states and cormorants in the south, and other such activities that will reduce or eliminate threats to agricultural industries. The Committee expects APHIS to provide no less than \$28,000,000 for the national rabies control and surveillance efforts.

Of particular concern is the continued and repeat depredation by wolves and packs in the Pacific Northwest. In certain states where state management plans require state agencies to utilize lethal control of wolves, it is important these actions are taken to protect livestock. As experts in the field of managing predators to prevent depredation, USDA has valuable knowledge, tools and resources that can assist states in managing the federally reintroduced wolves. The Committee directs USDA to prioritize and complete the documentation and processes needed to allow them to assist states and local livestock producers with managing this situation.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2016 appropriation .....	\$3,175,000
2017 budget estimate .....	3,175,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,175,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	---

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

*Facilities for Fruit Fly Eradication.*—In Section 743, the Committee provides \$30,000,000 for the improvement and repair of facilities and infrastructure related to the research and production of fruit fly eradication initiatives. Recent fruit fly contaminations have cost producers more than \$1,100,000,000 in economic loss. The Committee directs APHIS to provide a report and consult with the Committee on plans for construction and location of the new facilities.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

##### MARKETING SERVICES

2016 appropriation .....	\$81,223,000
2017 budget estimate .....	81,933,000
Provided in the bill .....	82,223,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+1,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+290,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Marketing Services of the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$82,223,000.

*Organic Integrity.*—The Committee is aware that the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB) is conducting its sunset review process for reviewing substances on the National List. It is important that this process includes sound science and robust stake-

holder participation. The Committee expects both the NOSB and USDA to fully consider all currently available scientific information during the sunset review and rulemaking procedures.

*Research and Promotion Programs.*—The Committee notes that the commodity Research and Promotion boards that the agency oversees are not agencies of the federal government, nor are Research and Promotion programs funded with federal funds. The funding used to operate and carry out the activities of the various Research and Promotion programs is provided by producers and industry stakeholders, and employees of the boards are not federal employees. Therefore, the Committee urges USDA to recognize that such boards are not subject to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. Section 552.

*Rural Infrastructure.*—Inadequate market access is a critical barrier to economic growth in rural and agricultural communities. The Committee provides \$1,000,000 for the Transportation Services Division to continue working with other federal, state and local agencies, as well as producers and those involved in all sectors of agricultural transportation, to address rural infrastructure needs to ensure producers have domestic and international market access.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2016 limitation .....	(\$60,982,000)
2017 budget limitation .....	(61,227,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(61,227,000)
Comparison:	
2016 limitation .....	+245,000
2017 budget limitation .....	— —

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee provides a limitation of \$61,227,000 on Administrative Expenses of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

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

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	(\$20,489,000)
2017 budget estimate .....	(20,705,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(20,489,000)
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	— —
2017 budget estimate .....	– 216,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Marketing Agreements and Orders Program, the Committee provides a transfer from Section 32 funds of \$20,489,000.

The following table reflects the status of this fund for fiscal years 2016 and 2017:

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD FISCAL YEARS 2016–2017  
[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate
Appropriation (30% of Customs Receipts) .....	\$10,316,645	\$10,929,841
<i>Less Transfers:</i>		
Food & Nutrition Service .....	– 8,969,178	– 9,462,665

ESTIMATED TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AND BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD FISCAL YEARS 2016–  
2017—Continued  
[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate
Commerce Department .....	– 145,811	– 145,175
<i>Total, Transfers</i> .....	– 9,114,989	– 9,607,840
Prior Year Appropriation Available, Start of Year .....	223,344	125,000
Unavailable for Obligations (recoveries & offsetting collections) .....	0	0
Transfer of Prior Year Funds to FNS (F&V) .....	– 122,000	– 125,000
<i>Budget Authority:</i> .....	1,303,000	1,322,000
Rescission of Current Year Funds .....	– 215,636	– 231,443
Appropriations Temporarily Reduced—Sequestration .....	– 77,384	– 79,557
Unavailable for Obligations (F&V Transfer to FNS) .....	– 125,000	– 125,000
<i>Available for Obligation:</i> .....	884,980	886,000
<i>Less Obligations:</i>		
Child Nutrition Programs (Entitlement Commodities) .....	465,000	465,000
State Option Contract .....	5,000	5,000
Removal of Defective Commodities .....	2,500	2,500
Emergency Surplus Removal .....	118,500	0
Small Business Support .....	0	0
Disaster Relief .....	5,000	5,000
Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases .....	107,500	206,000
Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program .....	40,000	44,000
Estimated Future Needs .....	87,192	102,571
<i>Total, Commodity Procurement</i> .....	830,692	830,071
<i>Administrative Funds:</i>		
Commodity Purchase Support .....	33,799	35,440
Marketing Agreements and Orders .....	20,489	20,489
<i>Total, Administrative Funds</i> .....	54,288	55,929
<i>Total Obligations</i> .....	884,980	886,000
Unobligated Balance, End of Year .....	0	0
Unavailable for Obligations (F&V Transfer to FNS) .....	125,000	125,000
Balances, Collections, and Recoveries Not Available .....	0	0
<i>Total, End of Year Balances</i> .....	\$125,000	\$125,000

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

2016 appropriation .....	\$1,235,000
2017 budget estimate .....	1,235,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,235,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	– – –
2017 budget estimate .....	– – –

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2016 appropriation .....	\$43,057,000
2017 budget estimate .....	43,482,000
Provided in the bill .....	43,057,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	– – –
2017 budget estimate .....	– 425,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, the Committee provides \$43,057,000.

## LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

2016 limitation .....	(\$55,000,000)
2017 budget limitation .....	(57,500,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(55,000,000)
Comparison:	
2016 limitation .....	---
2017 budget limitation .....	-2,500,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee includes a limitation on inspection and weighing services expenses of \$55,000,000. The Committee does not concur with the agency's proposal to eliminate the limitation on inspection and weighing services expenses. The agency has sufficient carry-over balances in this account for these activities. Additionally, the bill includes authority to exceed by 10 percent the limitation on inspection and weighing services with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

## OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

2016 appropriation .....	\$816,000
2017 budget estimate .....	819,000
Provided in the bill .....	816,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	-3,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

## FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

2016 appropriation .....	\$1,014,871,000
2017 budget estimate .....	1,030,405,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,030,405,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+15,534,000
2017 budget estimate .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,030,405,000.

The following table reflects the Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2017:

## FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Recommendation
Federal Inspection .....	\$914,098
Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure System .....	34,580
International Food Safety and Inspection .....	16,487
State Food Safety and Inspection .....	61,568

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE—Continued

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Recommendation
Codex Alimentarius .....	3,672
Total, Food Safety and Inspection Service .....	\$1,030,405

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

*Water Conserving Technologies.*—The Committee continues to direct FSIS to utilize water conserving technologies that allow hand-washing facilities to be immediately activated and deactivated in a hands-free manner to reduce cross-contamination.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

2016 appropriation .....	\$898,000
2017 budget estimate .....	901,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	-3,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	Transfer from Program Accounts	Total, FSA S&E
2016 appropriation .....	\$1,200,180,000	(\$309,880,000)	(\$1,510,060,000)
2017 budget estimate .....	1,209,751,000	(309,610,000)	(1,519,361,000)
Provided in the Bill .....	1,200,180,000	(309,610,000)	(1,509,790,000)
Comparison:			
2016 appropriation .....	---	-270,000	(-270,000)
2017 budget estimate .....	-\$9,571,000	\$---	(-\$9,571,000)

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Farm Service Agency (FSA), the Committee provides an appropriation of \$1,200,180,000 and transfers of \$309,610,000, for a total program level of \$1,509,790,000.

*Oriental Fruit Fly.*—The Committee strongly urges FSA to make funds available to those farmers who were negatively impacted by an Oriental Fruit Fly quarantine from October 2015 through Feb-

ruary 2016. The farmers, who were unable to bring their crop to market, sustained devastating losses, although the quarantine was necessary and successful in eradicating the Oriental Fruit Fly pest. Because crop insurance and other similar programs do not apply in instances of a state or federally declared quarantine, the impacted farmers are in need of relief. The Committee believes it is within FSA's purview to make funds available to the impacted farmers.

*FSA Farm Loan Levels.*—The Committee does not agree with FSA's proposal to waive loan fees for certain groups of farmers. However, the Committee does recognize increased demand for overall loan levels and provides this relief in accordance with the President's budget request, including additional funding for Emergency Loans. In general, USDA data demonstrates that farmers are experiencing a significant decline in farm income and the cost of doing business is growing. As such, the need for larger individual loan limitations and flexibility may be increasing. The Department is directed to work with stakeholders to address these issues.

*Budgetary Reductions.*—FSA has submitted consecutive proposals for significant annual budget savings through "operational efficiencies" with little detail for achieving these goals. FSA proposed nearly \$40,000,000 in reductions for fiscal year 2016. An additional \$24,000,000 in IT savings is proposed for fiscal year 2017 through contractual savings. The Committee directs FSA to provide a report by the end of fiscal year 2016 detailing the specific contracts and amounts FSA proposes to achieve these savings from.

*Proposal to Close County Offices.*—The Committee includes statutory language preventing the closure of county offices.

*FSA IT.*—The agreement includes statutory language that allows FSA to release funds for farm program delivery IT projects only after the submission of a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. The roadmap submitted by FSA in fiscal year 2015 and submission of a spend plan for review to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in fiscal year 2016 were the first steps toward bringing accountability and guidance to almost a decade of mismanagement of the Modernize and Innovate the Delivery of Agricultural Systems (MIDAS) IT system. MIDAS was over budget by hundreds of millions of dollars, took years longer than expected, and only delivered a fraction of the promised results. While FSA has made some improvements in reforming the program, the Committee further directs the agency to provide a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act on its future plans for MIDAS-specific IT functions.

*Loan Deficiency Payments.*—The Committee encourages the Secretary to work with producers who have already received a benefit under 7 U.S.C. 7935 with respect to the 2015 crop of a commodity prior to the availability of a benefit under 7 U.S.C. 8286 as provided by amendments made by Public Law 114–113.

*Alternative Imaging Capabilities.*—The Committee notes that space-based infrared and hyper-spectral satellites are ideally suited to managing and monitoring agricultural lands and waters. These commercially-available capabilities could do much toward more efficient use of agriculture resources. Accordingly, the Committee encourages the Department to examine the utility and cost of new, commercially-derived, space-based imaging data systems that can support the agriculture community, including ways that improve

efficiencies within the Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services mission area.

*Economic Impact of Livestock and Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).*—CRP is a federal program under FSA that pays a yearly rental payment in exchange for farmers and ranchers to remove environmentally sensitive land from agricultural production. Due to increasing enrollment in CRP in certain areas, livestock operations have been reduced. In an effort to focus on the economic impact of CRP in rural communities, specifically livestock production, the Committee directs FSA to submit a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act. Central facets of the report should focus on (1) the opportunities livestock production brings to rural communities; (2) determine the economic impact livestock production has on rural communities (feed sales, construction/fencing costs, management practice investments that increase revenue for local businesses); (3) explore the tax benefits for rural school districts resulting from property taxes and cash receipts due to livestock production; and (4) assess the ability for nutrients to be captured and soil quality maintained by grazing livestock (similar to the CRP program).

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$3,404,000
2017 budget estimate .....	3,404,000
Provided in the bill .....	3,404,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

2016 appropriation .....	\$6,500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	---
Provided in the bill .....	6,500,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	+6,500,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Grassroots Source Water Protection Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$6,500,000.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	<sup>1</sup> 500,000
Provided in the bill .....	<sup>1</sup> 500,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	---

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

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Dairy Indemnity Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary (estimated to be \$500,000 in the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request).

## AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

## ESTIMATED LOAN LEVELS

2016 loan level .....	\$6,402,114,000
2017 budget estimate .....	6,655,053,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,667,144,000
Comparison:	
2016 loan level .....	+265,030,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+12,091,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund program account, the Committee provides a loan level of \$6,667,144,000.

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

## AGRICULTURE CREDIT PROGRAMS—LOAN LEVELS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Farm Loan Programs:			
Farm Ownership:			
Direct .....	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Farm Operating:			
Direct .....	1,252,004	1,460,047	1,460,047
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	1,393,443	1,432,430	1,432,430
Emergency Loans .....	34,667	22,576	34,667
Indian Tribe Land Acquisition Loans .....	2,000	20,000	20,000
Conservation Loans:			
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	150,000	150,000	150,000
Indian Highly Fractionated Land .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Boll Weevil Eradication .....	60,000	60,000	60,000
Total .....	\$6,402,114	\$6,655,053	\$6,667,144

## ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Direct Loan subsidy	Guaranteed loan subsidy	Grants	Administrative expenses
2016 appropriation .....	\$53,961	\$14,352	\$---	\$314,918
2017 budget estimate .....	62,198	15,327	1,500	317,068
Provided in the Bill .....	62,198	15,327	---	314,918
Comparison:				
2016 appropriation .....	+8,237	+975	---	---
2017 budget estimate .....	\$---	\$---	-\$1,500	-\$2,150

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

## AGRICULTURE CREDIT PROGRAMS—SUBSIDIES AND GRANTS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Farm Loan Subsidies:			
Farm Operating:			
Direct .....	\$53,961	\$62,198	\$62,198
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	14,352	15,327	15,327
Emergency Loans .....	1,262	1,262	1,938
Indian Highly Fractionated Land .....	---	2,550	2,550
Individual Development Accounts .....	---	1,500	---
Total .....	69,575	82,837	82,013
ACIF Expenses:			
Salaries and Expenses .....	306,998	306,998	306,998
Administrative Expenses .....	7,920	10,070	7,920
Total, ACIF Expenses .....	\$314,918	\$317,068	\$314,918

## RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

2016 appropriation .....	\$74,829,000
2017 budget estimate .....	<sup>1</sup> 66,615,000
Provided in the bill .....	74,829,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	+8,214,000

<sup>1</sup>Does not include up to \$20,000,000 transfer from mandatory crop insurance funding.

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Risk Management Agency, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$74,829,000.

*Standard Reinsurance Agreement (SRA) Discrepancies.*—The Committee notes that stakeholders, including specialty crop insurance agents, are concerned about commissions received for their products as compared to other crops. In a manner consistent in law, the Committee encourages RMA to address this issue by working with all such stakeholders and involving them in any future negotiations of the SRA. The Committee directs RMA to provide a report to the Committee on the amount of commissions paid to crop insurance agents, broken down by state, year, and crop for fiscal years 2006 through 2015. The report shall also provide such information by insurance products subject to and not subject to the administrative and operating expenses limitation in the SRA and the 80 percent limitation on agent commissions by state.

## CORPORATIONS

## FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

2016 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$7,857,970,000
2017 budget estimate .....	18,839,089,000
Provided in the bill .....	18,839,089,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+981,119,000
2017 budget estimate .....	---

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

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund, the Committee provides an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary (estimated to be \$8,839,089,000 in the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND  
REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$6,871,132,000
2017 budget estimate .....	<sup>1</sup> 13,476,854,000
Provided in the bill .....	<sup>1</sup> 13,476,854,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+6,605,722,000
2017 budget estimate .....	---

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

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Committee provides such sums as may be necessary to reimburse for net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be \$13,476,854,000 in the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request).

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT  
(LIMITATION ON EXPENSES)

2016 limitation .....	(\$5,000,000)
2017 budget estimate .....	(5,000,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(5,000,000)
Comparison:	
2016 limitation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	---

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

## TITLE II

## CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND  
ENVIRONMENT

2016 appropriation .....	\$898,000
2017 budget estimate .....	901,000
Provided in the bill .....	898,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	-3,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE  
CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

2016 appropriation .....	\$850,856,000
2017 budget estimate .....	860,374,000
Provided in the bill .....	855,256,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+4,400,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-5,118,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Conservation Operations, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$855,256,000.

The Committee provides \$9,300,000 for the Snow Survey and Water Forecasting Program; \$9,400,000 for the Plant Materials Centers; and \$80,000,000 for the Soil Surveys Program. The Committee provides \$756,556,000 for Conservation Technical Assistance and includes a \$15,000,000 increase for written conservation plans and conservation program delivery. The Committee is pleased with the progress of the Conservation Effects Assessment Project and the Conservation Delivery Streamlining Initiative and directs NRCS to continue to invest in these programs.

*Administrative Reorganization.*—The Committee commends NRCS for its organizational realignment of administrative functions and appreciates the savings this will generate. NRCS has worked to become a more efficient, accountable organization, and the Committee encourages NRCS to work with other agencies within USDA to do the same.

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

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

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

*Floodplain Buyouts.*—The Committee commends the successful efforts of NRCS with voluntary floodplain homeowner buyout projects. The Committee encourages the NRCS to continue collaborative efforts with participating towns and counties to mitigate unintended consequences resulting from buyouts, such as utility cost increases for homeowners in these regions.

*Harmful Algal Blooms.*—The Committee supports NRCS' ongoing work to prevent soil erosion leading to harmful algal blooms

through the introduction of cover crops and encourages continued targeting of watersheds where harmful algal blooms pose a threat.

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

*Irrigation Agriculture.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of irrigation agriculture and commends efforts to expand irrigation systems in states and regions that have not previously irrigated. The Committee directs NRCS to study the benefits of waiving irrigation history requirements within the Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP) as it has under the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) and to submit a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act on actions it can take to prevent unnecessary barriers to states that would otherwise have access to funds for irrigation systems.

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

*Milkweed.*—The Committee is concerned about the rapid decline in milkweed for monarch butterfly habitat. The Committee encourages NRCS consider the increased benefits of restoring milkweed for monarch habitat in fiscal year 2017.

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

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

*Regional Conservation Partnership Program.*—The Committee commends NRCS for the success of RCPP, through which NRCS provides assistance to producers through partnership agreements, program contracts, or easement agreements. These programs allow for diverse and innovative conservation projects which leverage both public and private funding. The Committee encourages NRCS to consider the needs of organic farmers, who implement a wide variety of creative methods to improve water quality and enhance the environment, while implementing RCPP.

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

*Water Use Efficiency.*—The Committee is encouraged by the work being undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation and NRCS under the California Bay-Delta Program Water Use Efficiency Grants Program, which coordinates the water use efficiency assistance authorized under the Secure Water Act. The Committee directs NRCS to work with Reclamation to identify and implement ways within existing authorities to extend the benefits of this collaborative effort.

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

2016 appropriation .....	\$12,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-----
Provided in the bill .....	12,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	-----
2017 budget estimate .....	+12,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Watershed Rehabilitation Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$12,000,000.

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

2016 appropriation .....	\$893,000
2017 budget estimate .....	896,000
Provided in the bill .....	893,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	-----
2017 budget estimate .....	- 3,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$893,000.

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

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

*StrikeForce Initiative.*—The Committee appreciates the Department’s efforts to target assistance to at-risk communities through the StrikeForce Initiative for Rural Growth and Opportunity. USDA, in collaboration with public and private partners, helps rural counties experiencing chronic poverty improve economic opportunities and quality of life for local residents. The Committee encourages USDA to place special emphasis on persistent poverty counties and continue to utilize a strategy of partnering public resources with local expertise to grow rural economies and create jobs in these poverty-stricken areas.

*Persistent Poverty Areas.*—The bill directs certain RD programs, including the Section 502 Single Family Housing Direct Loan Pro-

gram, Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants, Rural Community Facilities Program, Rural Business Program Account, Rural Cooperative Developments Grants, Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program, and the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program, to provide at least 10 percent of the amounts provided to persistent poverty counties, defined as those areas that have 20 percent of their population living in poverty over the past 30 years.

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

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Appropriations .....	\$225,835,000	\$230,679,000	\$225,835,000
Transfer from:			
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account .....	417,854,000	426,821,000	410,086,000
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account .....	4,468,000	4,564,000	3,495,000
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loan Program Account .....	34,707,000	36,451,000	33,414,000
Total, RD Salaries and Expenses .....	\$682,864,000	\$698,515,000	\$672,830,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Salaries and Expenses of the Rural Development mission area, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$225,835,000.

**RURAL HOUSING SERVICE**

**RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT**

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Administrative expenses
2016 Appropriation .....	\$25,148,531	\$79,377	\$417,854
2017 Budget Estimate .....	25,233,208	81,963	426,821
Provided in the Bill .....	25,305,132	89,302	410,086
Comparison:			
2016 Appropriation .....	+156,601	+9,925	-7,768
2017 Budget Estimate .....	+\$71,924	+\$7,339	-\$16,735

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account, the Committee provides a loan level of \$25,305,132,000.

*Section 502 Intermediary Pilot Program.*—The bill directs the Secretary to continue and expand the pilot program for packaging section 502 direct loans. The pilot requires not less than ten non-profit organizations to prepare and review applications for single family loans, saving federal funds and staff time. The Committee expects the Rural Housing Service to expeditiously implement this program.

*Rural Definition.*—Communities need transparency and deserve to understand the criteria that are evaluated when determining eligibility for RHS programs. The Committee directs RHS to submit

a report listing the criteria used to define “rural in character” in determining program eligibility.

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

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Loans:			
Single Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct .....	\$900,000	\$900,000	\$1,000,000
Unsubsidized Guaranteed .....	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
Housing Repair (sec. 504) .....	26,278	26,277	26,277
Rental Housing (sec. 515) .....	28,398	33,074	35,000
Multi-family Guaranteed (sec. 538) .....	150,000	230,000	200,000
Site Development Loans .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Credit Sales of Acquired Property .....	10,000	10,000	10,000
Self-help Housing Land Development Fund .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Farm Labor Housing .....	23,855	23,857	23,855
Total, Loan Authorization .....	\$25,148,531	\$25,233,208	\$25,305,132

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

#### ESTIMATED LOAN SUBSIDY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES LEVELS

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account (Loan Subsidies and Grants):			
Single Family Housing (sec. 502):			
Direct .....	\$60,750	\$60,930	\$67,700
Housing Repair (sec. 504) .....	3,424	3,663	3,663
Rental Housing (sec. 515) .....	8,414	9,790	10,360
Farm Labor Housing .....	6,789	7,052	7,051
Site Development (sec. 524) .....	---	111	111
Self-Help Land (sec. 523) .....	---	417	417
Total, Loan Subsidies .....	79,377	81,963	89,302
Farm Labor Housing Grants .....	8,336	8,336	8,336
RHIF Expenses:			
Administrative Expenses .....	\$417,854	\$426,821	\$410,086

#### RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2016 appropriation .....	\$1,389,695,000
2017 budget estimate .....	1,405,033,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,405,033,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+15,338,000
2017 budget estimate .....	---

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rental Assistance Program, the Committee provides a program level of \$1,405,033,000.

## MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

2016 appropriation .....	\$37,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	37,362,000
Provided in the bill .....	40,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+3,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+2,638,000

For the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$40,000,000, including \$18,000,000 for the rural housing voucher program.

## MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$27,500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	18,493,000
Provided in the bill .....	30,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+2,500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+11,507,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

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

## RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$32,239,000
2017 budget estimate .....	28,701,000
Provided in the bill .....	33,701,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+1,462,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+5,000,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Housing Assistance Grants program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$33,701,000 including \$5,000,000 for rural housing preservation grants.

## RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

## (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$42,278,000
2017 budget estimate .....	37,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	47,100,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+4,822,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+10,100,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Community Facilities Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$47,100,000.

*Power Plus.*—In conjunction with the Administration’s POWER+ initiative and Partnerships for Opportunity and Workforce and Economic Revitalization, the Committee encourages USDA to give consideration to Community Facility investments in coal communities that have been negatively impacted by changes in the coal industry and power sector.

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

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Loan Levels:			
Community Facility Direct Loans .....	(\$2,200,000)	(\$2,200,000)	(\$2,200,000)
Community Facility Guaranteed Loans .....	(148,305)	(--)	(148,305)
Subsidy and Grants:			
Community Facility Guaranteed Loans .....	3,500	--	3,322
Community Facility Grants .....	25,000	25,000	30,000
Rural Community Development Initiative .....	4,000	4,000	4,000
Economic Impact Initiative .....	5,778	--	5,778
Tribal College Grants .....	4,000	8,000	4,000
Total, Rural Community Facilities Program Subsidy and Grants .....	\$42,278	\$37,000	\$47,100

The following is included in the bill for the Rural Community Facilities Program: \$4,000,000 is for the Rural Community Development Initiative.

### RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE

#### RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$74,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	81,444,000
Provided in the bill .....	76,883,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+2,883,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-4,561,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Business Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$76,883,000.

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

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimated	Committee provision
Loan Level:			
Business and Industry Guaranteed Loans .....	(\$919,768)	(\$892,244)	(\$919,768)
Subsidy and Grants:			
Business and Industry Guaranteed Loans .....	35,687	35,779	36,883
Rural Business Development Grants .....	24,000	55,000	35,000
Delta Regional Authority/Appalachian Regional Commission .....	3,000	--	5,000
Total, Rural Business Program Subsidy and Grants ...	\$62,687	\$90,779	\$76,883

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

*Rural Business Development Grants.*—The Committee understands the important role that rural business development grants have in supporting the development or expansion of businesses in

rural areas. However, the Committee is concerned that scarce grant monies are not always awarded to best stimulate small business through building upon other investments in technology infrastructure. The bill includes \$10,000,000 for grants to businesses with proposals that have identified a community need that can be addressed through technology investment. The Committee encourages the Department to award grants to applicants with sound proposals and significant commercial potential.

INTERMEDIARY RELENDING PROGRAM FUND ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Administrative expenses
2016 appropriation .....	\$18,889	\$5,217	\$4,468
2017 budget estimate .....	18,889	5,476	4,564
Provided in the bill .....	18,889	5,476	3,495
Comparison:			
2016 appropriation .....	---	+259	- 973
2017 budget estimate .....	\$---	\$---	-\$1,069

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account, the Committee provides for a loan level of \$18,889,000.

For the loan subsidy, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$5,476,000. In addition, the Committee provides \$3,495,000 for administrative expenses.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$33,077,000
2017 budget estimate .....	85,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	50,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+16,923,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-\$35,000,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account, the Committee provides for a loan level of \$50,000,000.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$22,050,000
2017 budget estimate .....	22,250,000
Provided in the bill .....	26,550,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+4,500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+4,300,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Rural Cooperative Development Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$26,550,000.

The total includes \$2,750,000 for a cooperative agreement for the Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas program and

\$15,000,000 for the value-added agricultural product market development grant program.

The Committee notes that the 2014 farm bill provided mandatory funding for value-added agricultural product market development grants.

#### RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

2016 appropriation .....	\$500,000
2017 budget estimate .....	18,515,000
Provided in the bill .....	464,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	- 36,000
2017 budget estimate .....	- 18,051,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Energy for America Program, the Committee provides a loan level of \$10,000,000 and an appropriation of \$464,000 for the loan subsidy to make loans as authorized by section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107).

The Committee notes that the 2014 farm bill provides mandatory funding for this program in fiscal year 2017.

#### RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

##### RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$522,365,000
2017 budget estimate .....	461,593,000
Provided in the bill .....	533,210,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+10,845,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+71,617,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$533,210,000.

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

*Carryover Balances for AK, HI, and Colonias Grants.*—The Committee is aware of significant carryover balances of unobligated funds provided in prior year appropriations for Water and Waste Disposal grants for Alaskan villages, Native American Tribes, Hawaiian Homelands, and the Colonias. The Committee urges the Department to work with state, local and tribal organization stakeholders to provide assistance via water and waste disposal grant programs as long as such assistance was requested by the respective groups in the year in which the funds were appropriated. The Department has flexibility to shift these prior year funds among the four areas through a reprogramming of funds. Further, the

Committee provides flexibility in fiscal year 2017 to move funds to other water and waste disposal priorities in order to reduce the backlog of related needs nationwide.

*Open and Free Competition Policy.*—The Committee supports the Department's underlying adherence to free and open competition on water and waste projects as contained in 7 CFR 1780.70(b) and (d). The Committee supports efforts to eliminate arbitrary actions in the procurement process but is concerned that the Department is undermining the ability of local communities and the engineer of record to design water and wastewater projects in the manner that best serves the unique needs and considerations of local communities. In particular, the Committee is concerned about the May 17, 2012 memorandum and the implementation of pipe materials. The Committee believes that the Department must apply its policy uniformly to all building materials but is concerned with the Department requirements that would unnecessarily delay projects by including onerous approval processes. Communities and professional engineers are different and specify the pipe materials that best suit the needs of their community and project. These communities and engineers, therefore make different determinations depending on what is suited for a given community, including the existence of applicable federal, state, or local ordinances or standard specifications. The Committee encourages the Department to defer to the engineer of record in the selection of materials that meet nationally recognized standards, including pipe, absent extraordinary circumstances demonstrating arbitrary action.

*Domestic Preference.*—The bill includes language specifying that funds made available for RUS' Rural Water and Waste Disposal program account shall use iron and steel products produced in the United States. RUS shall apply the Environmental Protection Agency's definition of public water systems while implementing the domestic preference provision.

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

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Loan Levels:			
Water and Waste Direct Loans .....	(\$1,200,000)	(\$803,802)	(\$1,200,000)
Water and Waste Guaranteed Loans .....	(50,000)	---	(50,000)
Subsidy and Grants:			
Direct Subsidy .....	31,320	34,885	52,080
Guaranteed Subsidy .....	275	---	240
Water and Waste Revolving Fund .....	1,000	500	1,000
Water Well System Grants .....	993	500	993
Grants for the Colonias and AK/HI .....	64,000	42,544	53,000
Water and Waste Technical Assistance Grants .....	20,000	13,930	20,000
Circuit Rider Program .....	16,397	13,000	16,897
Solid Waste Management Grants .....	4,000	1,000	4,000
High Energy Cost Grants .....	10,000	---	---
Water and Waste Disposal Grants .....	364,380	350,234	375,000
306A(i)(2) Grants .....	10,000	5,000	10,000
<b>Total, Subsidies and Grants .....</b>	<b>\$522,365</b>	<b>\$461,593</b>	<b>\$533,210</b>

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM  
ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

[Dollars in Thousands]

	Loan level	Subsidy level	Administrative expenses
2016 Appropriation .....	\$6,940,000	\$104	\$34,707
2017 Budget Estimate .....	7,190,056	14,071	36,451
Provided in the Bill .....	6,940,000	3,071	33,414
Comparison:			
2016 Appropriation .....	— — —	+2,967	— 1,293
2017 Budget Estimate .....	— \$250,056	— \$11,000	— \$3,037

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account, the Committee provides a loan level of \$6,940,000,000. In addition, the Committee provides \$33,414,000 for administrative expenses.

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

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Loan Authorizations:			
Electric:			
Direct, FFB .....	\$5,500,000	\$6,500,000	\$5,500,000
Guaranteed Underwriting .....	750,000	— — —	750,000
Subtotal .....	6,250,000	6,500,000	6,250,000
Telecommunications:			
Direct, Treasury Rate .....	690,000	690,056	690,000
Total, Loan Authorizations .....	\$6,940,000	\$7,190,056	\$6,940,000

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

[Dollars in Thousands]

	FY 2016 enacted	FY 2017 estimate	Committee provision
Broadband Program:			
Loan Authorization .....	\$20,576	— — —	\$20,000
Loan Subsidy .....	4,500	— — —	4,560
Grants .....	10,372	39,492	33,000
Distance Learning and Telemedicine:			
Grants .....	22,000	34,950	25,000
Total, Loan Subsidy and Grants .....	\$36,872	\$74,442	\$62,560

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband Program, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$62,560,000, which includes \$25,000,000 for distance learning and telemedicine grants.

*Broadband Loan and Grant Program Priorities.*—The Committee recognizes the advantages of extending broadband services, including the economic development opportunities and improved health care services that broadband technology provides. Funding pro-

vided for the broadband programs is intended to promote availability in those areas where there is not otherwise a business case for private investment in a broadband network. The Committee directs RUS to focus expenditures on projects that bring broadband service to underserved households and areas.

*Tribal Communities.*—The Committee notes that tribal communities continue to struggle with gaining access to broadband service. The Committee encourages the Secretary to provide a report that identifies the specific challenges Indian Tribal Organizations (ITOs) have in gaining access to broadband service and provide a plan for addressing these challenges, including how the Community Connect program can assist ITOs.

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

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

2016 appropriation .....	\$811,000
2017 budget estimate .....	814,000
Provided in the bill .....	811,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	— — —
2017 budget estimate .....	— 3,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$811,000.

*Communication from FNS.*—The Committee recognizes the efforts made to increase communication and reduce delays by FNS in completing requested reports. Reports requested by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, as well as information regarding FNS programs, are an important part of the Committees’ oversight responsibilities. The directives and issues that are specified in the House, Senate, or conference report are very important to the Committee and the dates specified are mandatory. FNS is expected to keep the Committee apprised of activities and issues, especially those mentioned in Committee reports. FNS is reminded that the Committee reserves the right to call before it any agency that does not submit reports on time.

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

*Program Eligibility.*—The Committee directs FNS to work with states to ensure full compliance with the law mandating that every WIC and SNAP participant meet all program eligibility requirements. FNS is also directed to ensure these programs are not being promoted to ineligible individuals, which would increase program costs.

*Fruit and Vegetable Consumption.*—The Committee continues to urge FNS to recognize in relevant agency publications and regulations related to all federal nutrition programs, including nutrition education programs and child nutrition programs, the nutritional benefits provided by all forms of fruits, vegetables, and beans, whether canned, dried, fresh, or frozen.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$22,149,746,000
2017 budget estimate .....	23,230,733,000
Provided in the bill .....	23,175,679,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+1,025,933,000
2017 budget estimate .....	–55,054,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Child Nutrition Programs, the Committee provides \$23,175,679,000.

*School Meals.*—The Committee remains concerned about the challenges and costs that local schools face in implementing the various regulations from the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010. Some schools are continuing to have difficulty complying with the whole grain requirements that went into effect on July 1, 2014, and schools are increasingly concerned with further reductions in the sodium requirements. In order to provide schools with the certainty and flexibility they need for the 2017–2018 school year, the Committee continues to extend the whole grain waiver provision to those school food authorities demonstrating a hardship in implementing the whole grain standards.

The Committee also continues a provision stating that sodium standards cannot be reduced below Target 1 until the latest scientific research establishes that the reduction is beneficial for children. According to information provided by USDA, the overwhelming majority of research that has been reviewed on this issue was conducted more than 10 years ago, with most research conducted in the 1980s and 1990s. The Committee notes that the requirement that the latest scientific research prove that further sodium reductions are beneficial for children has not been met.

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

*Improper Payments.*—The Committee remains concerned about the staggering error rates for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP), which were about 16 percent and 23 percent, respectively, in fiscal year 2015. This amounts to \$1,800,000,000 in improper payments for NSLP and \$875,000,000 for SBP. While the error rate for SBP had a small decrease, there was a slight increase in the error rate for NSLP. OIG completed an audit report in May of 2015 that evaluated how FNS is attempting to lower the error rates, and the Committee acknowl-

edges FNS is working to address this issue. The fiscal year 2016 explanatory statement directed FNS to provide a report addressing OIG's recommendations. The Committee expects this report by June 1, 2016.

*Potable Water.*—The Committee is aware of the statutory requirement that schools and child care centers make potable water available to children free of charge during meal times in the place where meals are served. The Committee directs USDA to provide a report on the actions that have been taken to ensure that potable water is being provided in schools and child care centers.

*Technology Use in School Meal Programs.*—The Committee supports increased use of technology as a strategy to combat waste, fraud and abuse in the school meal programs and urges USDA to continue to allow local control in the selection of technology platforms. The Committee directs USDA to clearly communicate to recipients of any funding that can be used for technology infrastructure in or for the support of school meal programs that the funds are intended to establish state systems that are capable of interoperability or interface with the technology platforms selected by school districts.

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

(Dollars in Thousands)

Child Nutrition Programs:	
School Lunch Program .....	\$12,756,627
School Breakfast Program .....	4,486,347
Child and Adult Care Food Program .....	3,446,278
Summer Food Service Program .....	628,484
Special Milk Program .....	9,236
State Administrative Expenses .....	279,058
Commodity Procurement .....	1,428,089
Food Safety Education .....	2,869
Coordinated Review .....	10,000
Computer Support and Processing .....	11,876
Training and Technical Assistance .....	18,137
CNP Studies and Evaluations .....	21,274
CN Payment Accuracy .....	10,974
Farm to School Team .....	3,426
Team Nutrition .....	15,504
Healthier U.S. Schools Challenge .....	1,500
School Meals Equipment Grants .....	25,000
Summer EBT Demonstration .....	21,000
<i>Total</i> .....	\$23,175,679

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

2016 appropriation .....	\$6,350,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	6,350,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	6,350,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	---

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$6,350,000,000. The Committee provides for continuation of the breastfeeding peer counselor program and infrastructure.

USDA data shows that WIC participation rates have decreased steadily since fiscal year 2010. The President's budget request includes a projection of an average monthly participation rate of 8.1 million women, infants, and children for fiscal year 2017. However, the average monthly participation rate was 8.0 million for fiscal year 2015, and the current average for fiscal year 2016 is 7.9 million. Birth rates also remain at an all-time low according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

USDA is estimating recovery and carryover funds to be much higher than average at more than \$600,000,000. Furthermore, the Secretary has a sufficient WIC contingency reserve fund as a safety net to meet unexpected demand. With lower participation rates, higher carryover funds, and an ample reserve fund, the Committee provides funding that will ensure all eligible participants will be served. The Committee will continue to monitor WIC participation, carryover funds, and food costs and take additional action as necessary to ensure that funding provided in fiscal year 2017 remains sufficient to serve all eligible applicants.

*Income Eligibility Standards.*—The Committee continues to monitor WIC income eligibility standards to ensure all procedures are followed by the WIC state and local agencies. FNS has been conducting Certification and Eligibility Management Evaluations on all state agencies and ITOs in order to ensure compliance and maintain program integrity in the participant certification process. USDA is directed to provide a report describing the results of these evaluations, detailing discrepancies found in determining participant eligibility and the certification process. The report should include steps FNS will take to ensure state agencies and ITOs adhere to the income verification procedures that the Department has implemented.

*Program Integrity and Fraudulent Activities.*—The FNS WIC Program Integrity and Monitoring Branch plays a role in helping WIC state agencies address vendor management, cost containment, and fraudulent activities such as the online sale of WIC-provided infant formula. The Committee remains concerned about fraud and abuse in the program and directs FNS to provide a report on this branch's efforts and results in addressing these areas.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2016 appropriation .....	\$80,849,383,000
2017 budget estimate .....	81,689,168,000
Provided in the bill .....	79,673,277,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	- 1,176,106,000
2017 budget estimate .....	- 2,015,891,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Committee provides \$79,673,277,000. The total amount includes \$3,000,000,000 for a contingency reserve to be used only in the amount necessary. Section 748 provides an additional \$19,000,000 for the purchase of TEFAP commodities in order to maintain the fiscal year 2016 funding level.

The Committee provides an increase of \$4,000,000 for Nutrition Education and Program Information solely for SNAP Employment and Training technical assistance. The Committee is aware of co-

ordinated attempts to circumvent the directive in the fiscal year 2016 explanatory statement in order to provide funding for existing Centers of Excellence. Therefore, consistent with the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016, the Committee does not provide funding for new or existing Centers of Excellence, which have not been authorized by Congress.

*Required Reporting for Out-of-State Moves.*—The Committee remains committed to eliminating fraud and abuse within SNAP. Bill language is included to require SNAP participants to report to the state agency when they move outside of the state in which they are certified. This provision closes a loophole in order to prevent fraudulent SNAP participation in multiple states.

*SNAP Purchase Report.*—The Committee is aware that FNS is preparing a report describing purchases made by SNAP recipients as compared to non-SNAP recipients. FNS is directed to complete this report as soon as practicable and make this report publicly available.

*SNAP Error Rates.*—An OIG report issued in September of 2015 reviewed the FNS quality control process for determining the SNAP error rate associated with benefits provided to recipients. OIG found vulnerabilities and inconsistencies in the methods used to determine the error rate and concluded FNS' quality control process resulted in an understatement of SNAP's error rates. The fiscal year 2016 explanatory statement directed the Department to provide a report on how FNS will address OIG's recommendations. The Committee expects this report no later than June 1, 2016.

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

*Issuance of SNAP Benefits.*—The Committee notes that some states issue SNAP benefits to recipients in a compressed time frame, usually at the beginning of the month, which causes challenges for both SNAP participants and retailers. The Committee continues to direct FNS to work with those states with a compressed issuance schedule to provide benefits at least twice per month and to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate progress made on this issue.

*Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Equipment.*—The Committee is aware that some farmers markets and farmers selling directly to consumers are interested in EBT equipment that operates for a variety of federal nutrition programs. FNS is encouraged to assist farmers markets and direct-selling farmers in obtaining EBT equipment that allows participation in other federal nutrition programs.

The following table reflects the Committee recommendations for SNAP:

[Dollars in Thousands]

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Account:	
Benefits .....	\$68,801,122
Contingency Reserve .....	3,000,000
<i>Administrative Costs:</i>	
State Administrative Costs .....	4,348,604
Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program .....	414,000
Employment and Training .....	465,680
Mandatory Other Program Costs .....	193,417
Discretionary Other Program Costs .....	998
Administrative Subtotal .....	5,422,699
Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico (NAP) .....	1,965,415
American Samoa .....	7,893
Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations .....	151,000
TEFAP Commodities .....	299,000
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands .....	12,148
Community Food Project .....	9,000
Program Access .....	5,000
Subtotal .....	2,449,456
Total .....	\$79,673,277

## COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

2016 appropriation .....	\$296,217,000
2017 budget estimate .....	313,139,000
Provided in the bill .....	315,139,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+18,922,000
2017 budget estimate .....	+2,000,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

The Committee provides an appropriation of \$315,139,000 for the Commodity Assistance Program. The recommended funding level for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program is \$236,120,000.

The Committee recommendation includes \$18,548,000 for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program.

The Committee has included \$59,401,000 for administrative funding for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP).

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

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

## NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

2016 appropriation .....	\$150,824,000
2017 budget estimate .....	179,447,000
Provided in the bill .....	168,524,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+17,700,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-10,923,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Nutrition Programs Administration, the Committee provides \$168,524,000. This funding level includes \$1,000,000 for FNS to

contract for an independent study to identify the best means of efficiently consolidating Child Nutrition Program reporting requirements for school food authorities and state agencies. The Committee expects the study to be completed no later than 18 months from the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE V

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	Transfer from export loan account	Total
2016 appropriation .....	\$191,566,000	\$6,394,000	\$197,960,000
2017 budget estimate .....	196,571,000	6,074,000	202,645,000
Provided in the Bill .....	194,566,000	6,074,000	200,640,000
Comparison:			
2016 appropriation .....	+3,000,000	- 320,000	+2,680,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-\$2,005,000	\$- - -	-\$2,005,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$194,566,000 and transfer of \$6,074,000, for a total appropriation of \$200,640,000.

This amount includes a \$3,000,000 increase above estimated amounts specifically for the Country Strategy Support Fund. This should be specifically targeted to increase U.S. exports and remove existing trade barriers.

*Farmer-to-Farmer.*—The Farmer-to-Farmer program provides valuable outreach opportunities for U.S. agricultural exports. The program enhances agricultural efforts overseas and strengthens international ties. USDA should take a lead role in promoting and administering the program.

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

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$2,528,000
2017 budget estimate .....	149,000
Provided in the bill .....	149,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	- 2,379,000
2017 budget estimate .....	- - -

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For administrative expenses to carry out the credit program of Food for Peace Title I, Food for Peace Act, and the Food for Progress Act, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$149,000.

## FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

2016 appropriation .....	\$1,466,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	1,350,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	1,466,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	+116,000,000

## COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Food for Peace Title II grants, the Committee provides \$1,466,000,000, of which \$350,000,000 is for non-emergency assistance. This is \$116,000,000 above the President's request and includes statutory language that requires the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to meet the level for non-emergency assistance using the funds appropriated for the Food for Peace Act (FFPA).

*Food Aid Funding and Reform.*—The Committee provides \$116,000,000 in funding above the President's budget request level. The Committee is concerned that U.S. commodity purchases and maritime sealift capabilities have been significantly reduced due to reforms and circumvention of the spirit of the FFPA. This lack of participation by key stakeholder and constituency groups has resulted in decreased demand and support for the Title II program as reflected in the levels proposed in the President's budget request for the past two years, the most recent of which is \$116,000,000 below the fiscal year 2016 enacted level.

In fiscal year 2014, approximately 15 percent, or \$210,000,000, was spent on local and regional purchases, vouchers, cash and other delivery methods under reforms enacted in the 2014 farm bill and the Community Development Fund (CDF). These reforms have reduced the amount of U.S commodities since fiscal year 2011 from 45 percent to 25 percent of the program, while Internal Transportation, Storage, and Handling (ITSH) costs have increased by a similar amount.

The Committee is concerned that no data has shown that the enactment of these reforms has produced increased feeding of beneficiaries and quicker food aid delivery as promised. These reforms have only resulted in decreased support and proposed funding for the program. USAID's IG audit report 7-962-16-003-P examined \$23,000,000 in cash and voucher transfers under the Office of Food for Peace. The report found that "None of the implementers completed distributions on time, the average delay being 3 months." In addition, one implementer predicted being able to feed 20,000 beneficiaries, but 6 months past the target date, had only reached approximately 6,000. This data is disturbing and significantly undermines the claims of benefits that would be achieved through the farm bill reforms and further changes proposed by the President's budget.

*Nonemergency Assistance.*—In a recent legal opinion, GAO determined that "USAID only obligated \$261.6 million of the appropriation for nonemergency food assistance" out of the \$350 million required by the FFPA. While the Committee acknowledges that USAID was able to waive this level legally through "notwithstanding" authority in the FFPA for emergency funding purposes, the 2014 farm bill excluded the authority for USAID to waive the

level for nonemergency assistance. Therefore, the Committee does not include the new bill language requested by USAID to credit funding from the CDF to the FFPA for nonemergency assistance. Instead, the Committee includes statutory language requiring USAID to meet the nonemergency assistance level for FY 2017 as intended by Congress. The Committee notes that USAID has access to the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT) for emergency purposes, for which the Committee provided additional funding in FY 2016. USAID requested use of emergency funds from the BEHT as recently as 2014 when USDA released \$50 million from the BEHT to procure an estimated 67,400 metric tons of commodities, and this action was further supported by an additional \$130 million from USDA's CCC for associated costs, including transportation and distribution.

*CCC Financial Statements.*—The Committee directs the Department and USAID to address issues arising from deficiencies identified in USDA's delayed financial statements and the parent-child relationship between USDA and USAID. The Committee further directs both agencies to continue to update and ratify a written agreement that clearly defines roles and responsibilities for carrying out the Food for Peace Title II program.

*ITSH Costs.*—The Committee directs the Department and USAID to provide a clear definition of these costs, how they are incurred, and how they differ from Inland Freight Costs. The Committee is concerned that these costs have increased significantly in recent years and seeks to understand the causes. The Committee also directs USAID to identify whether local and regional purchases, cash, and vouchers are counted as a part of these costs. USAID is directed to provide this information within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

*Central American Food Assistance.*—The Administrator of USAID is directed to provide a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act on the amounts and types of food aid to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador.

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

2016 appropriation .....	\$201,626,000
2017 budget estimate .....	182,045,000
Provided in the bill .....	201,626,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	+19,581,000

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program Grants, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$201,626,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT (LOANS)  
CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

2016 appropriation .....	\$6,748,000
2017 budget estimate .....	8,537,000
Provided in the bill .....	8,537,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+1,789,000
2017 budget estimate .....	-- --

COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Credit Guarantee Program Account, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$8,537,000.

TITLE VI

RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG  
ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Appropriation	User Fees	Total, FDA S&E
2016 appropriation .....	\$2,720,808	\$1,960,584	\$4,681,392
2017 budget estimate .....	2,730,924	2,025,020	4,755,944
Provided in the bill .....	2,753,855	2,025,020	4,778,875
Comparison:			
2016 appropriation .....	+33,047	+64,436	+97,483
2017 budget estimate .....	+\$22,931	\$-- --	+\$22,931

The Committee provides an appropriation of \$2,753,855,000 in new budget authority for the FDA. In addition, the Committee recommends the following user fee amounts: \$865,653,000—prescription drugs; \$144,859,000—medical devices; \$324,085,000—human generic drugs; \$22,079,000—biosimilar biologicals; \$22,977,000—animal drugs; \$10,367,000—animal generic drugs; \$635,000,000—tobacco products; estimated \$21,000,000—mammography quality standards; estimated \$1,000,000—food and feed recalls; estimated \$6,000,000—food reinspection; and, estimated \$5,000,000—voluntary qualified importers. The combination of new budget authority and definite user fees provides the FDA with a total discretionary salaries and expenses level of \$4,778,875,000. This total does not include permanent, indefinite user fees for mammography, pharmacy compounding, export, and color certification.

The Committee recommendation does not include proposed user fees for Export and Color Certification, Food Facility Registration and Inspection, Food Import, International Courier, Cosmetics, or Food Contact Notification.

The Committee does not include funding for a civilian pay increase across the agency. Should the President provide a civilian pay increase for fiscal year 2017, it is assumed that the cost of such

a pay increase will be absorbed within existing appropriations for fiscal year 2017.

The Committee recommendation maintains fiscal year 2016 funding levels for the medical countermeasures initiative as well as recent funding increases for antimicrobial resistance, counterfeit drugs, food safety, foreign drug inspections, import safety, and pharmacy compounding.

*Funding for Food Safety.*—The Committee includes increases of \$33,152,000 for the implementation of FSMA. These increases include \$19,139,000 for the National Integrated Food Safety System (NIFSS) and \$14,013,000 for Import Safety. The increases provided in this bill and the increases provided since fiscal year 2011 should assist the FDA in preparation for the implementation of FSMA prior to the effective dates of the seven foundational proposed rules. While the FDA has not implemented the final rules, the Committee understands that most businesses will not need to comply with the two rules for preventive controls for human food and for animal food until August 2016 and that the other five rules will not be effective until fiscal year 2017 and later. Within the amount provided for NIFSS, the Committee includes \$5,000,000 to allow for the development of a data exchange to maximize standardization and access to farm data across FDA and States.

The Committee notes that with these increases, the estimated total funding for food safety since FSMA was signed into law on January 4, 2011, would be nearly \$340,000,000. In addition to the increases for FSMA, the FDA utilizes base resources for its comprehensive food safety efforts. The Committee directs the FDA to provide a detailed accounting of its food safety resources in the fiscal year 2018 budget request, including which pre-2011 base resources are now repurposed for activities in support of FSMA and which resources are the result of appropriated increases from fiscal years 2011 to 2017, a detailed explanation of what the FDA has accomplished with increased food safety resources since fiscal year 2011, and how the aggregate total of these base resources for food safety will be utilized in fiscal year 2017.

*Medical Product Safety Funding.*—The Committee provides an increase of \$9,411,000 for medical product safety initiatives. Included in this amount is \$2,911,000 for the Animal Drug and Medical Device Review; \$2,000,000 for the Precision Medicine initiative, and \$2,500,000 for the Pediatric Device Consortia Grant Program. According to the FDA's fiscal year 2017 budget request, the agency is spending approximately \$41,700,000 on antimicrobial resistance activities in fiscal year 2016. In addition, the Committee provides an additional \$2,000,000 for Orphan Product Grants as a result of administrative savings from the Office of the Commissioner.

*Foreign High Risk Inspections.*—The bill provides an additional \$2,500,000 and a total of \$7,500,000 for the FDA's Office of Global Regulatory Operations and Policy to enhance the compliance of foreign manufacturers and exporters of food, medical devices and pharmaceuticals through on-site verification.

*Animal Drug Compounding.*—The Committee is concerned that the FDA has proposed draft guidance for industry (#230) for animal drug compounding that applies Sections 503A and 503B of the FDCA to animal health even though these provisions were written in regard to compounding of human drugs. The Committee is con-

cerned that this will result in confusion in the industry and may result in a misallocation of the resources Congress makes available to the FDA to oversee compounding activities. The Committee expects that any final guidance on animal drug compounding will reference statutory provisions that specifically relate to veterinary practices.

*Antibiotics.*—The Committee urges the FDA to work to foster the development of new antibiotics by supporting greater collaboration between industry and the FDA around adaptive clinical trials and labeling changes. The President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology has recommended this proposal to help support the type of robust drug development that will be needed to ensure patients are protected from bacterial resistance.

*Biological Products.*—The Committee commends the FDA for issuing draft guidance to address the mixing, diluting, or repackaging of biological products outside the scope of an approved biologics license application. The Committee urges the FDA to finalize the guidance without delay following the public comment period and continues to emphasize the need for close FDA inspection and supervision of large-scale compounding and repackaging of sterile injectable drugs and biological products, particularly products that are administered into areas of the human body where there is tempered immunity, such as the eye or spinal column, to ensure that they are processed in keeping with current good manufacturing practice for sterile products, in particular 21 CFR 200.50 regarding ophthalmic preparations.

*Biosimilars.*—The Committee recognizes that biosimilars offer an important opportunity for expanding the market and reducing costs for patients. The Committee urges the FDA to partner with external stakeholders including patient organizations on educating patients and professionals about biosimilars, with a focus on populations for which approved biosimilars are indicated.

*Centers of Excellence.*—The Committee is encouraged by the ongoing research and collaboration underway at the Centers of Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (CERSI) program. The Committee believes that these programs will help the agency improve public health, address scientific challenges presented by revolutions in medical product development, and improve food safety and quality. The Committee commends the agency for launching this program in 2011 and expanding it in 2014. For this reason, the Committee believes that the agency should continue to invest in the existing four locations in the CERSI network at their original funding level to ensure their efficacy and to capitalize on existing studies.

*Compassionate Use.*—The Committee is aware of GAO’s current plans to conduct a review of the FDA’s work with patient stakeholder groups as it relates to Expanded Access or Compassionate Use of human drugs. The Committee encourages the FDA to work with GAO in order to provide them with all the necessary information they need to complete their review of the program.

*Continued FDA Approval of Drug Safety Labeling.*—The Committee is deeply concerned with the FDA’s failure to resolve issues with and finalize its proposed rule entitled “Supplemental Applications Proposing Labeling Changes for Approved Drugs and Biological Products.” The proposed rule, as currently drafted, has the po-

tential to threaten public health and create unprecedented patient and provider confusion by allowing multiple versions of safety labeling for the same bioequivalent product. The Committee urges the FDA to establish in the final rule a system where safety information in prescription drug labeling in a multisource environment (i.e., when there is both an innovator and a generic manufacturer or more than one generic manufacturer) is always FDA-approved, grounded in scientific evidence, and presents no opportunity for mismatched safety information between the innovator and generic versions of a drug. The FDA should be the final decision maker regarding whether a manufacturer should change its labeling in a multisource environment. The FDA is the only entity that possesses all of the clinical trial, safety, and post-marketing data submitted by all manufacturers. Only the agency has all of the necessary tools to make an informed decision when it comes to making safety labeling changes, and, as a result, consistent with the FDA's responsibility to approve drug applications and labeling prior to marketing, only the FDA should determine whether a safety labeling change should occur.

*Crop Biotechnology & Biotech Ingredients.*—Plants, food, and food ingredients developed using genetic engineering were introduced into the U.S. food supply in the 1990s. Public and private sector scientists knowledgeable in genetic engineering, toxicology, chemistry, nutrition, and other scientific areas have carefully evaluated and assessed the safety of these products and have determined that such products are safe for human and animal consumption. The Committee provides a total of \$3,000,000 for the FDA to coordinate with USDA to provide education and outreach to the public on the safety and benefits of crop biotechnology and food and animal feed ingredients derived from biotechnology. The Committee expects this educational information to be posted on both agency websites and through other social media and communications platforms within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

*Drug Compounding.*—The Committee is concerned that, since passage of the Drug Quality and Security Act (DQSA) of 2013, the FDA has interpreted provisions of Section 503A of the FDCA in a manner inconsistent with its legislative intent and with the agency's own previous positions. Specifically, the FDA has taken the position that under 503A, a pharmacist may not compound medications prior to receipt of a prescription and transfer the drugs to a requesting physician or other authorized agent of the prescriber for administration to his or her patients without a patient-specific prescription accompanying the medication. This practice, which is often referred to as "office-use" compounding, is authorized in the vast majority of states and was intended to be allowable under DQSA. The Committee is aware that in 2012, prior to passage of the DQSA, the FDA was working on a draft compliance policy guide for 503A of the FDCA that provided guidance on how "office-use" compounding could be done consistent with the provisions of 503A. The Committee understands the intent of the DQSA was not to prohibit compounding pharmacists from operation under existing 503A exemptions; therefore, the Committee directs the FDA to issue a guidance document on how compounding pharmacists can continue to engage in "office-use" compounding before the receipt of

a patient-specific prescription consistent with the provisions of 503A within 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

*Drug Compounding Inspections.*—The Committee understands that the FDA is interpreting provisions of Section 503A of the FDCA to inspect state-licensed compounding pharmacies under current Good Manufacturing Practices (cGMPs) instead of under the standards contained in the United States Pharmacopeial Convention (USP) for sterile and non-sterile pharmaceutical compounding or other applicable pharmacy inspection standards adopted by state law or regulation. The Committee reminds the FDA that compounding pharmacies are not drug manufacturers, but rather, are state licensed and regulated health care providers that are inspected by state boards of pharmacy pursuant to state laws and regulations that establish sterility and other standards for the pharmacies operating within their states. Compounding pharmacies are more appropriately inspected using USP standards or other pharmacy inspection standards adopted by state law or regulation in the state in which a pharmacy is licensed.

*Drug Compounding of Allergen Extracts.*—The Committee is concerned that proposed changes to general chapter 797 of the USP contradicts the legislative intent of Section 503A of DQSA regarding the practice of “office-use” compounding of allergen extracts. The FDA recognizes USP general chapter 797 as federal policy on the practice of drug compounding. The Committee is concerned that the proposed changes to USP general chapter 797 would be inconsistent with its legislative intent of Section 503A and with the agency’s own previous positions on the practice of office-use compounding of allergen extracts. It is the sense of the committee that the practice of office-use compounding of allergen extracts by physicians is proven to be both safe and effective for the diagnosis and treatment of allergic conditions. The Committee suggests that the USP work with organizations from the physician and patient communities that represent physicians who regularly engage in office-use compounding of allergen extracts or patients who benefit from such compounding of allergen extracts, to ensure that any changes to USP general chapter 797 regarding office-use compounding of allergen extracts are reflective of the clear legislative intent of Section 503A of the DQSA.

*Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy.*—The Committee is encouraged that the FDA has the tools, authorities, and latitude necessary to review and approve safe and effective treatments for rare diseases, such as Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy, as efficiently as possible. In particular, the Committee is aware that the use of intermediate clinical endpoints (ICE) may be an appropriate approach as it has been in similar deadly diseases with dire unmet needs, such as HIV and cancer.

*Emerging Public Health Threat Funding.*—In order for the FDA to mount as rapid a response as possible to the spread of the Zika virus, the Committee reinforces its position that the agency obligate unobligated Ebola funds for the higher threat of Zika. The legislative text of the fiscal year 2015 emergency supplemental provided the FDA with such flexibility to deal with future public health emergencies such as those threats associated with the Zika viruses. Due to ongoing threats, the bill includes an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to support needs related to work on Ebola and Zika,

such as support for FDA staff conducting ongoing response activities; support for regulatory science research to develop the tools, standards, and approaches to characterize investigational medical product safety, efficacy, quality, and performance; and support to expedite the development and availability of medical products for Ebola and Zika.

*FDA and Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Parallel Review Pilot.*—The Committee directs the FDA to provide a report within 60 days of enactment of this Act on whether it plans to once again extend the pilot and steps the agency will take to encourage more manufacturers to utilize the pilot, including considerations for manufacturers choosing the 510(k) approval pathway and for novel products deemed covered by CMS but that warrant evaluation to ensure the appropriate level of coverage. The Committee also directs the FDA to report on efforts to work with CMS to balance each agency's evidentiary needs with the burden on manufacturers, including the consideration and use of alternative trial designs.

*FDA Partnerships under FSMA.*—The purpose of FSMA is to reform the nation's food safety laws to ensure a safe public food supply. As the FDA continues implementation of FSMA, the Committee encourages the FDA to work in partnership with existing government food safety programs, including the use of MOUs, to verify compliance with FSMA rules once they are finalized as a way to eliminate duplication of activities under the law. In addition, the Committee continues to provide \$5,000,000 for the Food Safety Outreach Program under NIFA and expects that NIFA will serve as the sole agency providing food safety training, education, outreach, and technical assistance at the farm level.

*Federal Employee Conduct.*—The federal government grants federal employees with tremendous responsibility and trust to carry out their duties. They must do so free from conflicts of interest and without seeking private gain. Employees are public servants charged with implementing federal programs in a legal and ethical manner. Federal employees are reminded that they shall not advance a personal agenda or give preferential treatment to any outside organization or individual within government programs in which they administer. Information that is received by the employee, including information from the employees, offices, or Committees of the Congress of the United States, should be handled in a professional and confidential manner according to the federal government's code of conduct, standards, regulations, and statutes. The Committee is aware of recent conduct in violation of these principles, and the Committee believes that it is incumbent upon agency officials to take immediate disciplinary action when they confirm such behavior.

*Food Contact Notification User Fees.*—The funds made available by this Act include sufficient monies to fund the FDA's Food Contact Notification Program and shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of 21 U.S.C. 348(h)(5)(A). The Committee recommendation does not include proposed user fees.

*Genomic Editing.*—The Committee understands the potential benefits to society in the genetic modification of living organisms. However, researchers do not yet fully understand all the possible side effects of editing the genes of a human embryo. Editing of the

human germ line may involve serious and unquantifiable safety and ethical issues. Federal and non-federal organizations such as the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Medicine continue to understand the potential risks of genome editing and a broader public discussion of the societal and ethical implications of this technique is still ongoing. In accordance with the current policy at the National Institutes of Health, the Committee includes bill language that places a prohibition on the FDA's use of funds involving the genetic modification of a human embryo. The Committee continues to support a wide range of innovations in biomedical research, but will do so in a fashion that reflects well-established scientific and ethical principles.

*Harm Reduction.*—It is the Committee recommendation that the FDA consider the benefits of harm reduction as part of evaluations under the Deeming regulations for tobacco products.

*Indoor Tanning Devices.*—Last December, the FDA proposed two rules intended to prevent the use of sunlamp products, including tanning beds, by certain age groups, reduce the risks for adults using these devices, and require manufacturers to take additional safety precautions. While the Committee remains deeply concerned with the deadly threat of melanoma, it questions some elements of the proposed rules. In particular, the Committee requests that the FDA hold a meeting with industry officials as it begins to consider the final regulations to discuss such issues as the number of allowable visits by adults and other similar measures that could create an undue economic burden on the industry.

*Late Reports.*—The Committee reminds the Commissioner that the timelines specified by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for fiscal year 2016 reports are deadlines that must be met. While the Committee notes that the FDA has made progress in providing more timely information and updates, the FDA still has several outstanding reports that are delayed due to long reviews and clearances. The Committee directs the Commissioner to submit these overdue reports.

*Local Port Cooperation.*—The Committee directs the FDA to work with local governments at high volume ports of entry to explore activities which reduce the risk of food borne illnesses and enhance the capacity of local officials in dealing with food borne threats.

*Mammography Exam Reports.*—More than four years ago, in November 2011, the National Mammography Quality Assurance Advisory Committee approved a change to the mammogram patient report and physician report to include information regarding an individual's breast density. This process has not been completed. The Committee urges the FDA to implement this change in an expedited manner and must report to Congress on the status of this change no more than 60 days from the enactment of this Act.

*Medical Countermeasures.*—The Committee directs that not less than \$24,552,000 shall be available for the FDA's Medical Countermeasures Initiative. This total is in addition to the unobligated funds remaining to support the FDA's emergency response to Ebola and related disease outbreaks.

*Medical Gas Rulemaking.*—The Committee is significantly concerned that the FDA has not initiated rulemaking to address numerous longstanding regulatory issues for medical gases despite

the statutory requirement in the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (FDASIA) to issue a final rulemaking addressing all necessary changes for medical gases by July 9, 2016. In fact, the FDA rulemaking on medical gases is not even listed in the most recent Unified Agenda as a priority. Designated medical gases are a unique class of drugs that differ significantly from traditional pharmaceuticals and therefore must be addressed in the federal drug regulations to prevent safety and enforcement issues caused by current regulations. The Committee disagrees with the FDA report to Congress sent on June 30, 2015, which stated that, despite decades of issues created by existing regulations, “the current regulatory framework is adequate and sufficiently flexible to appropriately regulate medical gases.” The bill includes language requiring the FDA to issue final regulations revising the federal drug regulations with respect to medical gases not later than July 9, 2016. If the Commissioner fails to issue final regulations with respect to medical gases by the statutory deadline, the Commissioner shall incorporate by reference voluntary consensus safety and labeling standards developed by an ANSI-accredited standard development organization until such time as the Commissioner issues final regulations consistent with Section 1112 of Public Law 112–144.

*Laboratories Near High Volume Ports.*—The Committee directs the FDA to submit a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act on the potential for implementing pilot programs which will allow for public-private partnerships at high volume ports of entry in an effort to increase the number of FDA-certified public or private labs located near major ports of entry to provide services on weekends and holidays, reduce the risk of food borne illnesses, and enhance the capacity of local officials in dealing with foodborne threats.

*Laboratory Developed Tests.*—The FDA’s draft guidance issued on October 3, 2014, titled “Framework for Regulatory Oversight of Laboratory Developed Tests” (LDTs), puts forth a proposed regulatory framework that is a significant shift in the way LDTs are regulated. Such a shift deserves input from the public, and Congress has been working with stakeholders, constituencies, and the FDA to find common ground on regulating LDTs. The FDA’s guidance circumvents the normal rulemaking process and changes expectations for patients, doctors, and laboratories for the first time since the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments Act was passed in 1988. The Committee directs the FDA to suspend further efforts to finalize the LDT guidance and continue working with Congress to pass legislation that addresses a new pathway for regulation of LDTs in a transparent manner.

*Medical Device Facility Inspections.*—The Committee is concerned about the lack of transparency and consistency with the medical device facility inspection process. This often leads to inefficiencies and inconsistencies in the inspection process. The Committee urges the agency to work with stakeholders and Congress to improve the facility inspection process. Potential process improvements may include, but are not necessarily limited to, more timely and frequent communications related to inspection observations and remediation plans, as well as changes to the way medical device Export Certificates (e.g., Certificate to Foreign Government, etc.) are affected by FDA Observational Findings following a facil-

ity inspection. In addition, the agency shall produce a report to the Committee by September 30, 2016, which provides information on the rates of inspection for facilities across districts and internationally and any FDA efforts to standardize rates of inspections across districts and internationally. The Committee understands that five days is typically sufficient for the FDA to complete an overseas inspection and determine the suitability of the location to provide product into the U.S. market while inspections inside the U.S. can take several weeks or months to complete the same assessment. These discrepancies lead to variations in inspection standards and potentially competitive advantages for those who choose to manufacture outside the U.S.

*Menu Labeling.*—The Committee is concerned about the recent FDA final determination that increased the size and scope of those affected under restaurant menu labeling regulations. Specifically, the final rule attempts to regulate local grocery chains that typically do not qualify as restaurants. The Committee includes bill language which directs the FDA to implement the final rule no earlier than December 1, 2016, at least one-year following agency publication of related guidance to newly regulated stakeholders.

*Nanotechnology.*—The Committee recognizes the increased capabilities that the FDA has developed to study environment, health, and safety of nanomaterials within the FDA's Jefferson Laboratory Campus, including the National Center for Toxicological Research, and its consolidated headquarters at White Oak, Maryland. The Committee recommends continued collaborative research with universities and industry on the toxicology of nanotechnology products and processes, in accordance with the National Nanotechnology Initiative Environment, Health, and Safety Research Strategy as updated in October 2011.

*Nutrient Content Claims.*—The Committee expects the FDA to amend its “healthy” nutrient content claim regulation to be based upon significant scientific agreement. In addition, to ensure that food producers can make truthful and non-misleading statements about the healthfulness of products, the Committee directs the FDA to make such regulatory changes during the rulemaking process and issue guidance to industry no more than six months after the enactment of this Act providing for the use of the word “healthy” in food labeling statements.

*Nutrition Facts Label.*—The Committee is concerned that proposed rules that have been issued to revise the Nutrition and Supplemental Facts labels may create confusion and misinformation among consumers. The FDA is encouraged to determine how the proposed new label disclosure statements regarding added sugars would be understood and interpreted by consumers before proceeding with a final rule. Additionally, the FDA should evaluate the consumer perception and impact on healthful nutrient dense foods that use added sugar to make the food more palatable.

*Office of Cosmetics and Colors.*—The Committee recommendation includes not less than \$11,700,000 for cosmetics activities, including not less than \$7,200,000 for the Office of Cosmetics and Colors (OCAC) and other supporting offices within the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN). Funding provided for CFSAN is for direct support of operation, staffing, compliance, research and international activities. The Committee notes that

every year since fiscal year 2012 it has requested that OCAC respond to a citizen petition setting safety levels for trace amounts of lead in cosmetics. The Committee is disappointed that OCAC has not responded to these requests and urges OCAC to make this a priority. Therefore, the Committee directs OCAC to respond to the petition by September 15, 2016.

The Committee appreciates OCAC's willingness to engage with China in 2016 for a cosmetics regulatory dialogue. In light of China's importance to U.S.-based manufacturers and consumers, the Committee directs the FDA to seek ways to continually enhance engagement with Chinese regulators on cosmetic technical and regulatory issues. The Committee directs the FDA to promote international regulatory harmonization and trade in cosmetic products by supporting international trade negotiations on cosmetics in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, the International Cooperation on Cosmetics Regulation (ICCR), and other bilateral and multilateral trade agreements.

*Olive Oil.*—The Committee is concerned with reports that consistently describe the prevalence of adulterated and fraudulently labeled olive oil imported into the United States and sold to American consumers. In addition, some products labeled as olive oil may contain seed oil, which poses a serious health risk to consumers who are allergic to seed oil. The Committee directs the FDA to take a sampling of imported olive oil to determine if it is adulterated or misbranded, pursuant to Section 342 or Section 343 of the FDCA, respectively, and report to Congress within 270 days on its findings and what actions the FDA will take to ensure consumer safety and proper labeling of imported olive oil.

*Opioid Abuse.*—The abuse, misuse and diversion of opioid painkillers has precipitated an epidemic in the United States. The CDC indicates that one American loses his or her battle with addiction every twenty minutes. For years, the Committee has encouraged the FDA to utilize the full breadth of its regulatory authority to address this challenge. The Committee is pleased that, with the Opioids Action Plan, the FDA has acknowledged that the agency shoulders some responsibility for turning the tide of abuse. The FDA's recent regulatory changes related to scheduling and labeling of opioids are positive developments, as are efforts to encourage the development of abuse-deterrent formulations (ADF) and new evidence-based medication-assisted therapies (MAT).

The use of opioids as first-line therapies for any form of pain has led to over-prescribing, and the CDC has made clear that clinicians should consider opioid therapy only if expected benefits for both pain and function are anticipated to outweigh the risks to the patient. With respect to prescribing patterns, the Committee supports efforts to incentivize ADF use by clinicians and to increase the number of prescribers who receive training on pain management and safe prescribing of opioid drugs in order to decrease inappropriate opioid prescribing. The Committee notes that 38,370 Extended Release/Long-Acting (ER/LA) opioid analgesic prescribers have been trained through the FDA's Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS), but is disappointed that this constitutes less than half of the 80,000 prescriber training goal that was established in 2012. Even if the FDA was on track to meet its lofty goal of having 60 percent of ER/LA prescribed take a REMS class by

2017, there will still be some 128,000 prescribers without additional, opioid-specific training. The Committee understands that FDA intends to share these lackluster results with an advisory committee to assess its impact on preventing the misuse and abuse of opioids, and to determine what changes, if any, need to be made to the program.

The Committee notes that treatment is not a “one size, fits all” enterprise and that every patient’s treatment regimen should be tailored by his or her doctor to his or her unique needs. The federal government, therefore, ought to be promoting the full suite of available treatment options—including abstinence-based models and non-opioid medications—rather than picking winners and losers. The Committee supports efforts at the FDA and elsewhere to develop MATs that improve efficacy of daily administration, are resistant to diversion and misuse, and/or help patients on a path to abstinence. Finally, the Committee has been supportive of naloxone distribution and training licensed healthcare professionals and emergency responders on its use. When considering the appropriateness of providing naloxone over the counter, the Committee asks the FDA to ensure that the administration of naloxone serves as a point of intervention to spur an honest conversation between the patient and his doctor about addiction and treatment.

*Over-the-Counter (OTC) Monograph Resources.*—The Committee understands that, over the past few years, funding allocated to OTC monograph issues has declined, in part due to stagnation in rulemaking and timely responses to Citizen Petitions related to OTC Monograph ingredients. The FDA is directed to provide an exhibit within the fiscal year 2018 budget justification with the total obligations and staffing levels associated with OTC Monograph issues for the past 11 years (fiscal years 2006–2016). In addition, the FDA is directed to develop detailed justifications and supporting documentation if the agency proposes to increase funding or staffing levels with regard to reforms of the OTC process in future budget submissions.

*Packaged Ice.*—The Committee recognizes that packaged ice is produced in the U.S., traded internationally, and consumed as both a packaged food and a food ingredient. The FDA has had a citizen petition regarding a proposed standard of identity for packaged ice for a significant and unacceptable length of time and is directed to provide quarterly status reports to the Committee on this effort until a response has been provided. Further, the Conference for Food Protection recently reviewed issues related to commercial ice machines in the retail environment and found that research is needed to identify the type of microbial growth and locations of concern within these machines. Therefore, the FDA is directed to research the issue more carefully and establish a cleaning and sanitizing frequency standard for commercial ice machines.

*Pediatric Devices.*—The Committee applauds the FDA’s support of development of pediatric medical devices through the Pediatric Device Consortia and notes the significant investment of more than \$65,000,000 in non-FDA funding that consortia members have raised to advance pediatric device projects. The program funds consortia to assist innovators in developing medical and surgical devices designed for the unique needs of children that often go unmet by devices currently available on the market. The Committee pro-

vides an increase of \$2,500,000 in fiscal year 2017 for the consortium to better leverage federal investments and move more devices to the market. The Committee directs that the agency spend no less than \$6,000,000 in order to attract additional funds for these vital projects.

*Pet Food Imports.*—As of September 2014, the FDA has received more than 5,800 complaints of illness related to consumption of chicken, duck, or sweet potato jerky treats, nearly all of which are imported from China. The reports involve more than 5,800 dogs, 25 cats, three humans and include more than 1,000 pet deaths. These incidents date back to 2007. The Committee requests that the FDA provide it with a timeline of all activities associated with the investigation into the pet illnesses associated these products, including any import alerts and import refusals, within 60 days of the enactment of this Act. In addition, the Committee requests that the agency provide it with semi-annual reports on the status of the investigation into these illnesses beginning in April 2016 and continuing until the issue has been resolved.

*Pharmacy Compounding.*—The Committee remains concerned with the draft MOU that the FDA proposed under Section 503A of the FDCA. Section 503A distinguishes between “distribution” and “dispensing” for the purposes of the MOU. In the DQSA, Congress only allowed the FDA to regulate “distribution”. The MOU appears to exceed the authority granted in the statute by redefining “distribution” in a manner that includes dispensing. Congress did not intend to include dispensing of compounded drugs over state lines within the scope of the MOU. The MOU should not address dispensing of compounded drugs to a patient over state lines if all other requirements of 503A are met.

*Premium Cigars.*—The Committee includes statutory language exempting premium and traditional large cigars, in keeping with FDA’s intent under Option 2 of its proposed rule “Deeming Tobacco Products To Be Subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as Amended by the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act (TCA); Regulations on the Sale and Distribution of Tobacco Products and Required Warning Statements for Tobacco Products” (Docket No. FDA-2014-N-0189). The Committee notes that premium cigars are shown to be distinct from other tobacco products in their effects on youth initiation, the frequency of their use by youth and young adults, and other such behavioral and economic factors. Lastly, a large number of participants in this unique business are small and very small operations that might not be able to maintain jobs and a physical presence in the United States due to the financial impact of this pending regulatory burden. Given that there is very little mention of cigars throughout the TCA, it is clear Congress did not intend to focus on the unique subset of premium cigars.

*Prescription Drug Labeling Inserts.*—The Committee is aware of FDA proposals that would subvert repeatedly expressed Congressional intent by permitting the distribution of prescription drugs without printed prescribing information on or within the packages from which such drugs are to be dispensed. The FDA intends to replace such printed labeling with an electronic labeling system for the majority of prescription drugs. On several occasions Congress has directly declined to provide the FDA the necessary statutory

authority to implement this change. As recently as 2012, Congress commissioned a GAO report (GAO-13-592) discussing this issue. The GAO report concluded that such a change could adversely impact public health. Thus, the Committee is very concerned that the FDA is moving to promulgate a regulation that would generally eliminate printed prescribing information inserts for prescription drugs. Therefore, the Committee has included a provision prohibiting the FDA from utilizing any funds to propose or otherwise promulgate any rule that requires or permits any prescription drug or biologic products to be distributed without printed prescribing information on or within the packaging from which such products are to be dispensed, unless such actions are expressly provided by an amendment to the FDCA.

*President's Budget Submission to Congress.*—The Administration has submitted the President's budget request the past two years with a false level of base funding for the agency. Congress provided funds for the Department of Health and Human Services OIG in the FDA's Salaries and Expenses Appropriation in fiscal years 2015 and 2016. While those funds were transferred to the OIG following an apportionment by the Office of Management and Budget, such a transfer did not alter the Congressional appropriation level for the FDA. The Subcommittee directs the FDA to incorporate the actual funding level approved by Congress when displaying the previous year funding level in the fiscal year 2018 President's budget.

*Private Accredited Laboratories.*—As the FDA begins to implement the regulations associated with FSMA and increase sampling of food products, the agency is encouraged to use and contract with, when appropriate, ISO/IEC 17025 certified, and other certified laboratories to advance the goals of FSMA and for other data collection purposes.

*Protecting Proprietary Information.*—The Committee is concerned about the FDA's ability to protect trade secrets and confidential information the agency obtains from its regulated industries. FDA's access to such information has been expanded under FSMA and other regulatory actions. Recent cybersecurity breaches at the FDA underscore the importance of the FDA's ability to safeguard sensitive information. The agency has a legal obligation under the FDCA to protect confidential information. The Committee directs the FDA to provide a detailed plan on how this information will be protected no later than 60 days after enactment.

*Public Disclosure.*—The FDA's current rules and policies governing what drug and device developers may say about their own products were designed decades ago. Since then, the way that medicine is practiced and delivered and the way that information is communicated have fundamentally changed. The Committee urges the FDA to convene a working group with stakeholders, including representatives from government, industry, health professionals, and patient advocacy groups, in order to solicit information to inform the FDA's evaluation of its rules and policies regarding the appropriate scope of scientific and medical information that can be shared with physicians, insurers, and researchers, with appropriate safeguards, in order to optimize patient care.

*Ready-to-Eat Foods.*—The Committee is aware that the FDA is in the process of finalizing guidance documents regarding *Listeria monocytogenes* in ready-to-eat (RTE) foods, which may include fro-

zen vegetables that are not currently considered as RTE foods. Reducing incidents of *listeriosis* is an important health goal, and the Committee supports the issuance of scientifically based guidance. However, including foods that are not considered RTE should be justified based upon a quantitative risk assessment. The Committee urges the FDA to conduct such an assessment prior to taking any action that would formally consider frozen vegetables or other foods currently not considered RTE as RTE foods.

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

*Sodium Guidance.*—The Committee is aware that the FDA is considering issuing guidance to food manufacturers in order to reduce sodium in various food categories. It is imperative that any guidance be issued using the latest sound science. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the IOM are working together to update the Dietary Reference Intake (DRI) report on sodium. The FDA is encouraged to issue any voluntary or mandatory guidance based upon an updated DRI report.

*Spent Grains.*—The Committee recognizes that the FDA took into consideration public comments and revised some of its proposed regulations on spent grains used for animal food. Processors already complying with FDA human food safety requirements would not need to implement additional preventive controls when supplying a by-product like wet spent grains for animal food. However, further processing a by-product for use as animal food such as drying spent grains, would require additional compliance under the proposed rule. The FDA has said that potential hazards associated with spent grains are minimal and steps to prevent contamination are likely already in place. The Committee includes bill language to ensure dry and wet spent grains used for animal food are regulated equally.

*State Inspections.*—The Committee is aware of the December 2011 OIG report that outlined vulnerabilities in the agency’s oversight of non-FDA food inspections and the agency’s intention to further rely on state inspections. The Committee understands that both the federal government and states share authority and responsibility for domestic food facilities and that the FDA will continue to contract with the states to conduct inspections on its behalf, which is critical to performing its mission in an efficient and effective manner. The agency must assure it has strong federal inspection standards that are met by both federal investigators and state inspectors. The FDA must continue its progress in improving federal oversight and monitoring of state inspection programs, reviewing and strengthening internal directives and processes, and identifying new methods to improve oversight capabilities.

The FDA should continue working with states to: (1) build the capacity and effectiveness of their inspection programs through im-

plementation of national program standards, such as the Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards and the Animal Feed Regulatory Program Standards; (2) utilize state or private laboratory services with ISO/IEC 17025 laboratory accreditation; and (3) improve federal-state collaboration during investigations and responses to food borne illness outbreaks by supporting the implementation of Rapid Response Teams.

The Committee is aware of the FDA's continuing progress to modernize existing IT systems and infrastructure, allowing for the secure and efficient exchange of data between the FDA and the states, in addition to efforts to add capabilities supporting mobile inspection applications. The FDA should continue work with state partners toward promoting data standards and developing shared database schemas to facilitate secure electronic information sharing.

*Sunscreen Ingredients.*—The Committee is significantly concerned that despite the increase in incidence of skin cancer in the United States, the Surgeon General's 2014 Call to Action to Prevent Skin Cancer, unanimous passage of the Sunscreen Innovation Act (SIA) in Congress and President Obama's January 2016 Presidential Memorandum creating the White House Cancer Moonshot Task Force to prevent and cure cancer, the FDA has still not approved a new OTC sunscreen ingredient through the process created by the SIA. For several years, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees have directed the FDA to clear the sunscreen backlog and ensure that Americans have access to the latest skin cancer prevention technology (H. Rept. 113–116, H. Rept. 113–468, H. Rept. 114–205, S. Rept. 114–82). The agency has failed to do so. The Committee directs the FDA to work with stakeholders to develop a benefit-risk testing regimen that appropriately balances the benefit of additional skin cancer prevention tools versus the risk of skin cancer to the 5 million Americans that will be diagnosed with the condition this year. The agency is directed to reach agreement with stakeholders on this testing regimen by June 20, 2016 and publish the summary of the meetings and results of the specific testing requirements on its website. The Committee reminds the FDA that section 4(c) of the SIA requires the FDA to report to the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee and House Energy & Commerce Committee on the implementation of the Act on or before May 26, 2016. The FDA shall include in this report a detailed analysis of how the FDA is balancing the Surgeon General's Call to Action, the President's Moonshot effort to remove administrative hurdles to cancer prevention, the known public health benefits that regular sunscreen use provides to prevent skin cancer and melanoma, and the long history of safe and effective use of sunscreens currently backlogged at the FDA in comparable countries versus the hypothetical risk sunscreens theoretically may pose to human health in FDA's GRAS standard. The funding level for the FDA maintains the \$700,000 increase in fiscal year 2016 to help address the critical public health threat resulting from no new sunscreen ingredients being available to the public.

*Surrogate Endpoints.*—The Committee urges the FDA to issue guidance on the use of surrogate and intermediate endpoints for accelerated approval of regenerative medicine products under section 506(c) of the FDCA (21 U.S.C. 356(c)). In the process of issuing

guidance, the FDA shall consult with appropriate stakeholders in the development of this guidance.

*User Fee Collections/Obligations.*—The Committee continues to be concerned about the financial management of the FDA’s user fee programs. The Committee directs that not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, and each month thereafter through the months covered by this Act, the Commissioner to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate a report on user fees collected for each user fee program included in the Act. The report shall also include monthly obligations incurred against such fee collections. The report shall include a distinct categorization of the user fee balances that are being carried forward into fiscal year 2018 for each user fee account as well as a detailed explanation of what accounts for the balance and what the balance will be used for.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

2016 appropriation .....	\$8,788,000
2017 budget estimate .....	11,788,000
Provided in the bill .....	11,788,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	+3,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	---

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For Buildings and Facilities of the Food and Drug Administration, the Committee provides \$11,788,000.

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

##### COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

2016 appropriation .....	\$250,000,000
2017 budget estimate .....	330,000,000
Provided in the bill .....	250,000,000
Comparison:	
2016 appropriation .....	---
2017 budget estimate .....	-80,000,000

#### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Committee provides an appropriation of \$250,000,000, of which \$50,000,000 is for the purchase of IT and \$3,000,000 is for the Inspector General. The bill includes language to permit the Commission to sublease its excess space for cost savings and allow the Commission to correct leasing payments and potential violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

*GAO Review of Leasing Costs.*—The Committee requested a review of GAO’s leasing costs following the CFTC’s IG review, which found approximately \$74,000,000 in savings over the life of the Commission’s leases. GAO’s review found that: (1) if CFTC had received its full budget request in recent years, it could have staffed 1,015 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) versus a capacity of 1,289 FTEs; (2) CFTC’s actual occupancy rate of FTE ranges from 38 percent to 78 percent; and (3) 26 percent of CFTC’s claimed occupancy rate is fulfilled by on-site contractors that have increased by 324 percent from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2015. The Committee’s

inclusion of authority to sublease space will allow the agency to find cost-savings through increasing occupancy rates of leased space. The Committee also encourages the Commission to have its on-site contractors bear the cost of office space through renegotiation of current contracts.

*Collective Bargaining Agreement Reductions.*—The Committee notes that the Commission’s level of FTEs has been reduced from a projection of 746 in fiscal year 2015 to an actual level of 690. These reductions are the result of a self-imposed collective bargaining agreement that has limited the Commission’s ability to increase staffing levels.

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

##### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2016 limitation .....	(\$65,600,000)
2017 budget estimate .....	(69,800,000)
Provided in the bill .....	(65,600,000)
Comparison:	
2016 limitation .....	— — —
2017 budget estimate .....	– 4,200,000

##### COMMITTEE PROVISIONS

For a limitation on the expenses of the Farm Credit Administration (FCA), the Committee provides \$65,600,000.

#### TITLE VII

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS

###### (INCLUDING RESCISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The General Provisions contained in the accompanying bill for fiscal year 2017 are fundamentally the same as those included in last year’s appropriations bill.

The following general provisions are included in the bill:

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

Section 702: Transfer authority regarding the Working Capital Fund.

Section 703: Limitation on certain obligations.

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

Section 705: Disbursement of rural development loans.

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

Section 707: Availability of mandatory conservation program funding.

Section 708: Rural Utility Service borrower eligibility.

Section 709: Rescission of certain unobligated balances.

Section 710: Prohibition on first-class airline travel.

Section 711: Use of funds authorized by the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

Section 712: Funding for advisory committees.

Section 713: Indirect costs for competitive agricultural research grants.

Section 714: Limitation on certain funds.

Section 715: Limitation on certain funds.  
 Section 716: Language on user fee proposals without offsets.  
 Section 717: Language on reprogramming.  
 Section 718: Language on fees for the business and industry guaranteed loan program.  
 Section 719: Language on questions for the record.  
 Section 720: Language regarding prepackaged news stories.  
 Section 721: Language on prohibition on paid details in excess of 60 days.  
 Section 722: Language regarding rulemaking.  
 Section 723: Language regarding spending plans.  
 Section 724: Language on controls over humanitarian food assistance.  
 Section 725: Language regarding Single Family Housing Direct Loan Program.  
 Section 726: Language regarding USDA loan programs.  
 Section 727: Transfer authority regarding the Working Capital Fund.  
 Section 728: Language regarding purchases made through Child Nutrition Programs.  
 Section 729: Language regarding potable water supplies.  
 Section 730: Language regarding research programs.  
 Section 731: Language regarding child nutrition programs.  
 Section 732: Language regarding nutrition research.  
 Section 733: Language regarding housing loan programs.  
 Section 734: Language regarding consumer information.  
 Section 735: Language regarding menu labeling.  
 Section 736: Language regarding tissue regulation.  
 Section 737: Language regarding animal feed.  
 Section 738: Language regarding APHIS regulation.  
 Section 739: Language regarding animal research.  
 Section 740: Language regarding FDA regulation.  
 Section 741: Language regarding rural housing lender fees.  
 Section 742: Language regarding IT systems.  
 Section 743: Language regarding APHIS Buildings & Facilities.  
 Section 744: Language regarding nutrition programs.  
 Section 745: Language regarding certain unobligated balances.  
 Section 746: Language regarding domestic preference.  
 Section 747: Language regarding FDA regulations.  
 Section 748: Language regarding emergency food assistance.  
 Section 749: Language regarding FDA regulation.  
 Section 750: Language regarding persistent poverty.  
 Section 751: Language regarding community eligibility.  
 Section 752: Language regarding Ebola virus funding.  
 Section 753: Language regarding watershed programs.  
 Section 754: Language regarding lobbying.  
 Section 755: Language regarding 21st Century Cures.  
 Section 756: Language regarding FDA regulation.  
 Section 757: Language regarding citrus greening.  
 Section 758: Language regarding certain unobligated balances.  
 Section 759: Language regarding certain unobligated balances.  
 Section 760: Language regarding the Spending Reduction Account.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

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

**[TO BE INSERTED]**

## STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

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

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

## RESCISSIONS

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

<i>Program or Activity</i>	Amount
USDA Cushion of Credit .....	\$151,487,000
USDA NRCS .....	\$98,000,000
USDA AMS (prior year balances) .....	\$231,000,000
USDA RD (prior year balances) .....	\$4,221,000
USDA FNS (prior year balances) .....	\$100,000,000

## TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

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

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

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

3. *Agriculture Buildings and Facilities.*—The bill allows funds appropriated in prior years for rental payments to be transferred to meet shortfalls in prior or current year rent.

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

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

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

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

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

9. *Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account.*—The bill provides funds to be transferred to the Farm Service Agency.

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

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

12. *Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account, Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account, and Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Program Account.*—The bill provides that funds in this account shall be transferred to the salaries and expenses of Rural Development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DISCLOSURE OF EARMARKS AND CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED  
SPENDING ITEMS

Neither the bill nor this report contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CL. 3(e) (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman:

## [TO BE INSERTED]

## CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

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

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

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

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

3. *Agricultural Research Service.*—Language is included that allows the Agricultural Research Service to grant easements at the Beltsville, MD, agricultural research center and to grant easements at any facility for the construction of a research facility for use by the agency.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19. *General Provisions.*—

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

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

Section 706: Language is included that requires approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board for acquisition of

new information technology systems or significant upgrades, and that prohibits the transfer of funds to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without the notification of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

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

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

Section 709: Language is included that allows unobligated balances of the Farm Service Agency and Rural Development mission areas to be used for information technology purposes.

Section 710: Language is included regarding the prohibition of first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded in this Act.

Section 711: Language is included regarding the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 712: Language is included that limits the amount of spending for USDA Advisory Committees.

Section 713: Language is included regarding indirect costs for grants.

Section 714: Language regarding certain limitations of mandatory programs.

Section 715: Language regarding certain limitations of mandatory programs.

Section 716: Language is included that prohibits funds from being used to prepare a budget submission to Congress that assumes reductions from the previous year's budget due to user fee proposals unless the submission also identifies spending reductions which should occur if the user fees are not enacted.

Section 717: Language is included that requires certain reprogramming procedures of funds provided in Appropriations Acts.

Section 718: Language is included regarding fees for the business and industry guaranteed loan program.

Section 719: This provision prohibits the Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration from transmitting or making available to any non-Department of Agriculture or non-Department of Health and Human Services employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

Section 720: Language regarding prepackaged news stories.

Section 721: This provision prohibits any employee of the Department of Agriculture from being detailed or assigned to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 60 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

Section 722: Language is included regarding rulemaking.

Section 723: Language is included requiring spending plans for each agency funded by the Act.

Section 724: Language is included regarding the use funds for humanitarian food assistance programs.

Section 725: Language is included regarding the Single Family Housing Direct Loan Program.

Section 726: Language is included on certain USDA loan programs.

Section 727: Language is included regarding the Working Capital Fund.

Section 728: Language is included regarding purchases made through child nutrition programs.

Section 729: Language is included regarding farm disaster programs.

Section 730: Language is included regarding the Agriculture and Food Research Institute.

Section 731: Language is included regarding school meal programs.

Section 732: Language is included regarding interagency coordination of nutrition research.

Section 733: Language is included regarding rural loan programs.

Section 734: Language is included regarding disclosure of information for pharmaceuticals.

Section 735: Language is included regarding menu labeling.

Section 736: Language is included regarding research exemptions.

Section 737: Language is included regarding spent grains for animal feed.

Section 738: Language is included regarding APHIS.

Section 739: Language is included regarding the Animal Welfare Act.

Section 740: Language is included regarding partially hydrogenated oils.

Section 741: Language is included regarding the Rural Housing Service.

Section 742: Language is included regarding federal IT regulations.

Section 743: Language is included regarding funding for APHIS Buildings and Facilities.

Section 744: Language is included regarding SNAP household reporting requirements.

Section 745: Language is included regarding a rescission of unobligated balances.

Section 746: Language is included regarding RUS programs.

Section 747: Language is included regarding FDA labeling.

Section 748: Language is included regarding the emergency food assistance program.

Section 749: Language is included regarding FDA.

Section 750: Language is included regarding rural poverty programs.

Section 751: Language is included regarding Rural Development programs.

Section 752: Language is included regarding Ebola funding.

Section 753: Language is included regarding the Emergency Watershed Program.

Section 754: Language is included regarding lobbying by federal employees.

Section 755: Language is included regarding 21st Century Cures.

Section 756: Language is included regarding FDA regulation.

Section 757: Language is included regarding citrus greening disease.

Section 758: Language is included regarding a rescission of certain unobligated balances.

Section 759: Language is included regarding a rescission of certain unobligated balances.

Section 760: Spending Reduction Account.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

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

Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriation in last year of authorization	Appropriations in this bill
CFTC .....	2013	Such sums	205,000,000	250,000,000
Food and Nutrition Service: Farmers' Market Nutrition Program: .....	2015	Such sums	16,548,000	18,548,000
State Administrative Ex- penses .....	2015	Such sums	263,686,000	279,058,000
Summer Food Service Pro- gram .....	2015	Such sums	495,521,000	628,484,000
WIC .....	2015	Such sums	6,623,000,000	6,350,000,000

COMPARISON WITH THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

**[TO BE INSERTED]**

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII and section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill as provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

**[TO BE INSERTED]**

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII and section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office has provided the following estimates of the amounts of financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

**[TO BE INSERTED]**

PROGRAM DUPLICATION

No provision of this bill establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the GAO to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139, or

a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

DIRECTED RULE MAKING

Pursuant to section 3(i)(1) of H. Res. 5 (114th Congress), the Committee estimates that the bill directs one rulemaking in section 756.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the Secretary.....	5,051	10,178	5,051	---	-5,127
Office of Tribal Relations.....	502	755	502	---	-253
Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination.....	1,496	1,592	1,496	---	-96
Office of Advocacy and Outreach.....	1,209	11,220	1,209	---	-10,011
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration..	804	807	804	---	-3
Departmental Administration.....	25,124	27,420	25,124	---	-2,296
Subtotal, Departmental Administration.....	25,928	28,227	25,928	---	-2,299
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,869	3,919	3,869	---	-50
Office of Communications.....	7,500	8,512	7,500	---	-1,012
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	45,555	64,403	45,555	---	-18,848

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Executive Operations:					
Office of the Chief Economist.....	17,777	17,592	16,777	-1,000	-815
National Appeals Division.....	13,317	13,481	13,317	---	-164
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	9,392	9,525	9,392	---	-133
Subtotal, Executive Operations.....	40,486	40,598	39,486	-1,000	-1,112
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	44,538	65,716	44,538	---	-21,178
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	6,028	9,119	6,028	---	-3,091
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights.....	898	901	898	---	-3
Office of Civil Rights.....	24,070	24,750	24,070	---	-680
Building and Facilities					
Agriculture Buildings and Facilities.....	64,189	84,365	84,189	+20,000	-176
Hazardous materials management.....	3,618	3,633	3,618	---	-15
Office of Inspector General.....	95,738	100,998	96,040	+302	-4,958
Office of the General Counsel.....	44,383	49,599	44,383	---	-5,216
Office of Ethics.....	3,654	4,617	4,556	+902	-61
Total, Departmental Administration.....	373,157	448,699	393,361	+20,204	-55,338
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics.....	893	901	893	---	-8
Economic Research Service.....	85,373	91,278	86,000	+627	-5,278
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	168,443	176,639	168,443	---	-8,196
Census of Agriculture.....	(42,177)	(42,177)	(41,871)	(-306)	(-306)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,143,825	1,161,340	1,151,825	+8,000	-9,515
Buildings and facilities.....	212,101	94,500	99,600	-112,501	+5,100
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	1,355,926	1,255,840	1,251,425	-104,501	-4,415
-----					
National Institute of Food and Agriculture:					
National Institute of Food and Agriculture (leg. proposal).....	---	1,373,974	---	---	-1,373,974
Research and education activities.....	819,685	---	832,860	+13,175	+832,860
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(11,880)	(11,880)	(11,880)	---	---
Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities Endowment Fund.....	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
Extension activities.....	475,891	---	477,391	+1,500	+477,391
Integrated activities.....	30,900	---	30,900	---	+30,900
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, National Institute of Food and Agriculture.....	1,326,476	1,373,974	1,341,151	+14,675	-32,823
-----					
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.....	893	901	893	---	-8
-----					
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	894,415	901,196	930,831	+36,416	+29,635
Buildings and facilities.....	3,175	3,175	3,175	---	---
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....	897,590	904,371	934,006	+36,416	+29,635

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Agricultural Marketing Service:</b>					
Marketing Services.....	81,223	81,933	82,223	+1,000	+290
Standardization activities (user fees).....	(65,000)	(65,000)	(65,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(60,982)	(61,227)	(61,227)	(+245)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (Section 32):					
Permanent, Section 32.....	1,303,000	1,322,000	1,322,000	+19,000	---
Marketing agreements and orders (transfer from section 32).....	(20,489)	(20,705)	(20,489)	---	(-216)
Payments to States and Possessions.....	1,235	1,235	1,235	---	---
<b>Total, Agricultural Marketing Service program...</b>	<b>1,446,440</b>	<b>1,466,395</b>	<b>1,466,685</b>	<b>+20,245</b>	<b>+290</b>
<b>Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	43,057	43,482	43,057	---	-425
Limitation on inspection and weighing services....	(55,000)	(57,500)	(55,000)	---	(-2,500)
<b>Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-3</b>
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	1,014,871	1,030,405	1,030,405	+15,534	---
Lab accreditation fees.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
<b>Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing....</b>	<b>6,652,953</b>	<b>6,732,477</b>	<b>6,655,908</b>	<b>+2,955</b>	<b>-76,569</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	898	901	898	---	-3
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,200,180	1,209,751	1,200,180	---	-9,571
(Transfer from Food for Peace (P.L. 480)).....	(2,528)	(149)	(149)	(-2,379)	---
(Transfer from export loans).....	(354)	(2,463)	(2,463)	(+2,109)	---
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(306,998)	(306,998)	(306,998)	---	---
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts.....	(309,880)	(309,610)	(309,610)	(-270)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,510,060)	(1,519,361)	(1,509,790)	(-270)	(-9,571)
State mediation grants.....					
Grassroots source water protection program.....	3,404	3,404	3,404	---	---
Dairy indemnity program.....	6,500	---	6,500	---	+6,500
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	1,210,584	1,213,655	1,210,584	---	-3,071

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (ACIF) Program</b>					
Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
Guaranteed.....	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	---	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(1,252,004)	(1,460,047)	(1,460,047)	(+208,043)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,393,443)	(1,432,430)	(1,432,430)	(+38,987)	---
Subtotal.....	(2,645,447)	(2,892,477)	(2,892,477)	(+247,030)	---
Emergency loans.....					
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(34,667)	(22,576)	(34,667)	---	(+12,091)
Conservation loans:	(2,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+18,000)	---
Guaranteed.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	---
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	---	---
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(6,402,114)	(6,655,053)	(6,667,144)	(+265,030)	(+12,091)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	---	---	---	---	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	53,961	62,198	62,198	+8,237	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	14,352	15,327	15,327	+975	---
Subtotal.....	68,313	77,525	77,525	+9,212	---
Emergency Loans.....	1,262	1,262	1,938	+676	+676
Individual Development Account Grants.....	---	1,500	---	---	-1,500
Indian Highly Fractionated Land Loans.....	---	2,550	2,550	+2,550	---
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	69,575	82,837	82,013	+12,438	-824
<b>ACIF administrative expenses:</b>					
Salaries and Expenses (transfer to FSA)....	306,998	306,998	306,998	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	7,920	10,070	7,920	---	-2,150
Total, ACIF expenses.....	314,918	317,068	314,918	---	-2,150
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund... (Loan authorization).....	384,493 (6,402,114)	399,905 (6,655,053)	396,931 (6,667,144)	+12,438 (+265,030)	-2,974 (+12,091)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,595,077	1,613,560	1,607,515	+12,438	-6,045

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Risk Management Agency:</b>					
RMA Salaries and Expenses.....	74,829	66,615	74,829	---	+8,214
FCIC User Fee (transfer) (leg. proposal).....	---	(20,000)	---	---	(-20,000)
Subtotal, Risk Management Agency.....	74,829	86,615	74,829	---	-11,786
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,670,804	1,681,076	1,683,242	+12,438	+2,166
<b>Corporations</b>					
<b>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:</b>					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	7,857,970	8,839,089	8,839,089	+981,119	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	6,871,132	13,476,854	13,476,854	+6,605,722	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Total, Corporations.....	14,729,102	22,315,943	22,315,943	+7,586,841	---
<b>Total, Title I, Agricultural Programs.....</b>	<b>23,052,859</b>	<b>30,729,496</b>	<b>30,655,093</b>	<b>+7,602,234</b>	<b>-74,403</b>
(By transfer).....	(330,369)	(330,315)	(330,099)	(-270)	(-216)
(Loan authorization).....	(6,402,114)	(6,655,053)	(6,667,144)	(+265,030)	(+12,091)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(120,982)	(123,727)	(121,227)	(+245)	(-2,500)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	898	901	898	---	-3
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation Operations.....	850,856	860,374	855,256	+4,400	-5,118
Farm Security and Rural Investment program (transfers authority).....	---	(1,033,983)	---	---	(-1,033,983)
Total, Conservation operations.....	850,856	1,894,357	855,256	+4,400	-1,039,101
Watershed rehabilitation program.....	12,000	---	12,000	---	+12,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service...	862,856	860,374	867,256	+4,400	+6,882
Total, Title II, Conservation Programs.....	863,754	861,275	868,154	+4,400	+6,879

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development...	893	896	893	---	-3
Rural Development:					
Rural development expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	225,835	230,679	225,835	---	-4,844
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(417,854)	(426,821)	(410,086)	(-7,768)	(-16,735)
(Transfer from RDLFP).....	(4,468)	(4,564)	(3,495)	(-973)	(-1,069)
(Transfer from RETLP).....	(34,707)	(36,451)	(33,414)	(-1,293)	(-3,037)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.....	(457,029)	(467,836)	(446,995)	(-10,034)	(-20,841)
Total, Rural development expenses.....	(682,864)	(698,515)	(672,830)	(-10,034)	(-25,685)
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502).....	(900,000)	(900,000)	(1,000,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Single family.....	(24,900,000)	(24,900,000)	(25,000,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Housing repair (Sec. 504).....	(26,278)	(26,277)	(26,277)	(-1)	---
Rental housing (Sec. 515).....	(28,398)	(33,074)	(35,000)	(+6,602)	(+1,926)
Multi-family housing guarantees (Sec. 538)	(150,000)	(230,000)	(200,000)	(+50,000)	(-30,000)
Site development loans (Sec. 524).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Single family housing credit sales.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (Sec. 523)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Farm Labor Housing (Sec.514).....	(23,855)	(23,857)	(23,855)	---	(-2)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(25,148,531)	(25,233,208)	(25,305,132)	(+156,601)	(+71,924)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (Sec. 502).....	60,750	60,930	67,700	+6,950	+6,770
Housing repair (Sec. 504).....	3,424	3,663	3,663	+239	---
Rental housing (Sec. 515).....	8,414	9,790	10,360	+1,946	+570
Site development loans (Sec. 524) (leg. proposal).....	---	111	111	+111	---
Farm labor housing (Sec.514).....	6,789	7,052	7,051	+262	-1
Self-help land dev. housing loans (Sec. 523) (leg. proposal).....	---	417	417	+417	---
Total, Loan subsidies.....	79,377	81,963	89,302	+9,925	+7,339
Farm labor housing grants.....					
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	8,336	8,336	8,336	---	---
	417,854	426,821	410,086	-7,768	-16,735
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund program. (Loan authorization).....	505,567	517,120	507,724	+2,157	-9,396
	(25,148,531)	(25,233,208)	(25,305,132)	(+156,601)	(+71,924)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rental assistance program:					
Rental assistance (Sec. 521).....	1,389,695	1,405,033	1,405,033	+15,338	---
Multi-Family Housing Revitalization Program Account:					
Rural housing voucher program.....	15,000	18,000	18,000	+3,000	---
Multi-family housing revitalization program.....	22,000	19,362	22,000	---	+2,638
Total, Multi-family housing revitalization..	37,000	37,362	40,000	+3,000	+2,638
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	27,500	18,493	30,000	+2,500	+11,507
Rural housing assistance grants.....	32,239	28,701	33,701	+1,462	+5,000
Rural community facilities program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Community facility:					
Direct.....	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	---	---
Guaranteed.....	(148,305)	---	(148,305)	---	(+148,305)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(2,348,305)	(2,200,000)	(2,348,305)	---	(+148,305)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Loan subsidies and grants:</b>					
Community facility:					
Guaranteed.....	3,500	---	3,322	-178	+3,322
Grants.....	25,000	25,000	30,000	+5,000	+5,000
Rural community development initiative.....	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---
Economic impact initiative grants.....	5,778	---	5,778	---	+5,778
Tribal college grants.....	4,000	8,000	4,000	---	-4,000
Total, RCFP Loan subsidies and grants....	42,278	37,000	47,100	+4,822	+10,100
<b>Subtotal, grants and payments.....</b>					
	102,017	84,194	110,801	+8,784	+26,607
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	2,034,279	2,043,709	2,063,558	+29,279	+19,849
(Loan authorization).....	(27,496,836)	(27,433,208)	(27,653,437)	(+156,601)	(+220,229)
<b>Rural Business--Cooperative Service:</b>					
Rural Business Program Account:					
(Guaranteed business and industry loans).....	(919,765)	(892,244)	(919,765)	---	(+27,521)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Guaranteed business and industry subsidy..	35,687	35,779	36,883	+1,196	+1,104
Rural business development grants.....	24,000	30,000	35,000	+11,000	+5,000
Demonstration Projects (rural child poverty) (leg. proposal).....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
Data Alignment (rural child poverty) (leg. proposal).....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Delta regional authority.....	3,000	---	5,000	+2,000	+5,000
Total, RBP loan subsidies and grants.....	62,687	90,779	76,883	+14,196	-13,896

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Intermediary Relending Program Fund Account:</b>					
(Loan authorization).....	(18,889)	(18,889)	(18,889)	---	---
Loan subsidy.....	5,217	5,476	5,476	+259	---
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....	4,468	4,564	3,495	-973	-1,069
<b>Total, IRP Fund.....</b>	<b>9,685</b>	<b>10,040</b>	<b>8,971</b>	<b>-714</b>	<b>-1,069</b>
<b>Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:</b>					
(Loan authorization).....	(33,077)	(85,000)	(50,000)	(+16,923)	(-35,000)
Limit cushion of credit interest spending.....	(179,000)	(151,487)	(151,487)	(-27,513)	---
(Rescission).....	-179,000	-151,487	-151,487	+27,513	---
<b>Rural Cooperative Development Grants:</b>					
Cooperative development.....	5,800	6,000	5,800	---	-200
Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas.....	2,500	2,500	2,750	+250	+250
Grants to assist minority producers.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
Value-added agricultural product market development.....	10,750	10,750	15,000	+4,250	+4,250
<b>Total, Rural Cooperative development grants.</b>	<b>22,050</b>	<b>22,250</b>	<b>26,550</b>	<b>+4,500</b>	<b>+4,300</b>
<b>Rural Microenterprise Investment Program Account</b>					
(leg. proposal):	---	(23,419)	---	---	(-23,419)
Loan authorization).....	---	4,904	---	---	-4,904
Loan subsidies and grants.....	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Total, Rural Microenterprise Investment.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>4,904</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-4,904</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Energy for America Program					
(Loan authorization).....	(7,576)	(75,754)	(10,000)	(+2,424)	(-65,754)
Loan subsidy and grants.....	500	3,515	464	-36	-3,051
Grants.....	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Total, Rural Energy for America Program.....	500	18,515	464	-36	-18,051
Rural Business Investment Program Account (leg. proposal):					
(Loan authorization).....	---	(20,600)	---	---	(-20,600)
Loan subsidy .....	---	2,577	---	---	-2,577
Grants.....	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
Total, Rural Business Investment Program...	---	6,577	---	---	-6,577
Healthy Foods Financing Initiative (leg. proposal):					
Grants.....	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Total, Healthy Foods, Healthy Neighborhoods	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.....	-84,078	2,578	-38,619	+45,459	-41,197
(Loan authorization).....	(979,307)	(1,115,906)	(998,654)	(+19,347)	(-117,252)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Rural Utilities Service:</b>					
Rural water and waste disposal program account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct.....	(1,200,000)	(803,802)	(1,200,000)	---	(-396,198)
Guaranteed.....	(50,000)	---	(50,000)	---	(+50,000)
Total, Loan authorization.....	1,250,000	803,802	1,250,000	---	+446,198
<b>Loan subsidies and grants:</b>					
Direct subsidy.....	31,320	34,885	52,080	+20,760	+17,195
Guaranteed subsidy.....	275	---	240	-35	+240
Water and waste revolving fund.....	1,000	500	1,000	---	+500
Water well system grants.....	993	500	993	---	+493
Colonias and AK/HI grants.....	64,000	42,544	53,000	-11,000	+10,456
Water and waste technical assistance.....	20,000	13,930	20,000	---	+6,070
Circuit rider program.....	16,397	13,000	16,897	+500	+3,897
Solid waste management grants.....	4,000	1,000	4,000	---	+3,000
High energy cost grants.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Water and waste disposal grants.....	364,380	350,234	375,000	+10,620	+24,766
306A(i)(2) grants.....	10,000	5,000	10,000	---	+5,000
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	522,365	461,593	533,210	+10,845	+71,617
<b>Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans</b>					
Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, FFB.....	(5,500,000)	(6,500,000)	(5,500,000)	---	(-1,000,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Guaranteed underwriting.....	(750,000)	---	(750,000)	---	(+750,000)
Subtotal, Electric.....	(6,250,000)	(6,500,000)	(6,250,000)	---	(-250,000)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, Treasury rate.....	(690,000)	(345,000)	(345,000)	(-345,000)	---
Direct, FFB.....	---	(345,056)	(345,000)	(+345,000)	(-56)
Subtotal, Telecommunications.....	(690,000)	(690,056)	(690,000)	---	(-56)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(6,940,000)	(7,190,056)	(6,940,000)	---	(-250,056)
Loan Subsidy:					
Telecommunications Direct, Treasury					
Rate.....	104	3,071	3,071	+2,967	---
Loan Modifications (leg. proposal).....	---	11,000	---	---	-11,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	104	14,071	3,071	+2,967	-11,000
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	34,707	36,451	33,414	-1,293	-3,037
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account.. (Loan authorization).....	34,811 (6,940,000)	50,522 (7,190,056)	36,485 (6,940,000)	+1,674 ---	-14,037 (-250,056)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Broadband telecommunications.....	(20,576)	---	(20,000)	(-576)	(+20,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(20,576)	---	(20,000)	(-576)	(+20,000)
Loan subsidies and grants:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Grants.....	22,000	34,950	25,000	+3,000	-9,950
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct.....	4,500	---	4,560	+60	+4,560
Grants.....	10,372	39,492	33,000	+22,628	-6,492
Total, Loan subsidies and grants.....	36,872	74,442	62,560	+25,688	-11,882
=====					
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	594,048	586,557	632,255	+38,207	+45,698
(Loan authorization).....	(8,210,576)	(7,993,858)	(8,210,000)	(-576)	(+216,142)
=====					
Total, Title III, Rural Development Programs.....	2,770,977	2,864,419	2,883,922	+112,945	+19,503
(By transfer).....	(457,029)	(467,836)	(446,995)	(-10,034)	(-20,841)
(Loan authorization).....	(36,686,719)	(36,542,972)	(36,862,091)	(+175,372)	(+319,119)
=====					

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	811	814	811	---	-3
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs .....	22,108,746	23,148,733	23,129,679	+1,020,933	-19,054
School breakfast program equipment grants.....	25,000	35,000	25,000	---	-10,000
Demonstration projects (Summer EBT).....	16,000	26,000	21,000	+5,000	-5,000
Summer Food Service Program (leg. proposal)...	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Direct Certification (leg. proposal).....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Child Nutrition State Exchange Activities (leg. proposal).....	---	1,000	---	---	-1,000
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	22,149,746	23,230,733	23,175,679	+1,025,933	-55,054
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	6,350,000	6,350,000	6,350,000	---	---
Supplemental nutrition assistance program: (Food stamp program).....	77,848,385	76,681,170	76,672,279	-1,176,106	-8,891
Reserve.....	3,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	---	-2,000,000
FDPIR nutrition education services.....	998	998	998	---	---
National food consumption survey (leg. proposal).....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Traditional and Local Foods Demonstration Project (leg. proposal).....	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
FY 2018 (first quarter) (leg. proposal).....	---	19,647,500	---	---	-19,647,500
Total, Food stamp program.....	80,849,383	101,336,668	79,673,277	-1,176,106	-21,663,391
Fiscal year 2017.....	(80,849,383)	(81,689,168)	(79,673,277)	(-1,176,106)	(-2,015,891)
Commodity assistance program:					
Commodity supplemental food program.....	222,198	236,120	236,120	+13,922	---
Farmers market nutrition program.....	18,548	16,548	18,548	---	+2,000
Emergency food assistance program.....	54,401	59,401	59,401	+5,000	---
Pacific island and disaster assistance.....	1,070	1,070	1,070	---	---
Total, Commodity assistance program.....	296,217	313,139	315,139	+18,922	+2,000
Nutrition programs administration.....	150,824	179,447	168,524	+17,700	-10,923
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	109,796,170	131,409,987	109,682,619	-113,551	-21,727,368
FY 2017.....	(109,796,170)	(111,762,487)	(109,682,619)	(-113,551)	(-2,079,868)
Total, Title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	109,796,981	131,410,801	109,683,430	-113,551	-21,727,371
FY 2017.....	(109,796,170)	(111,762,487)	(109,682,619)	(-113,551)	(-2,079,868)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Salaries and expenses.....	191,566	196,571	194,566	+3,000	-2,005
(Transfer from export loans).....	(6,394)	(6,074)	(6,074)	(-320)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	197,960	202,645	200,640	+2,680	-2,005
Food for Peace Title I Direct Credit and Food for Progress Program Account, Administrative Expenses					
Farm Service Agency, Salaries and expenses (transfer to FSA).....	2,528	149	149	-2,379	---
Food for Peace Title II Grants:					
Expenses.....	1,466,000	1,350,000	1,466,000	---	+116,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
Foreign Agriculture Service, S&E (transfer to FAS).....	6,394	6,074	6,074	-320	---
Farm Service Agency S&E (transfer to FSA).....	354	2,463	2,463	+2,109	---
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	6,748	8,537	8,537	+1,789	---
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program grants.....	201,626	182,045	201,626	---	+19,581
Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program (leg. proposal).....	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Total, Title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,868,468	1,752,302	1,870,878	+2,410	+118,576
(By transfer).....	(6,394)	(6,074)	(6,074)	(-320)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	2,720,808	2,730,924	2,753,855	+33,047	+22,931
Prescription drug user fees.....	(851,481)	(865,653)	(865,653)	(+14,172)	---
Medical device user fees.....	(137,677)	(144,859)	(144,859)	(+7,182)	---
Human generic drug user fees.....	(318,363)	(324,085)	(324,085)	(+5,722)	---
Biosimilar biological products user fees.....	(21,540)	(22,079)	(22,079)	(+539)	---
Animal drug user fees.....	(22,818)	(22,977)	(22,977)	(+159)	---
Animal generic drug user fees.....	(9,705)	(10,367)	(10,367)	(+662)	---
Tobacco product user fees.....	(599,000)	(635,000)	(635,000)	(+36,000)	---
Subtotal, user fees, enacted and definite.....	(1,960,584)	(2,025,020)	(2,025,020)	(+64,436)	---
Subtotal (including user fees).....	(4,681,392)	(4,755,944)	(4,778,875)	(+97,483)	(+22,931)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Mammography user fees.....	(20,109)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(+891)	---
Export and color certification user fees .....	(13,835)	---	---	(-13,835)	---
Food and Feed Recall user fees.....	(1,434)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(-434)	---
Food Reinspection fees.....	(6,414)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(-414)	---
Voluntary qualified importer program fees.....	(5,300)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(-300)	---
Pharmacy compounding fees (CB0 estimate).....	(1,000)	---	---	(-1,000)	---
Subtotal, FDA user fees.....	(2,008,676)	(2,058,020)	(2,058,020)	(+49,344)	---
Subtotal, FDA (including user fees).....	(4,729,484)	(4,788,944)	(4,811,875)	(+82,391)	(+22,931)
FDA New User Fees (Leg. proposals):					
Export and color certification user fees cap					
increase (leg. proposal).....	---	(4,280)	---	---	(-4,280)
Food Inspection and Facility Registration user					
fees.....	---	(61,252)	---	---	(-61,252)
Food import user fees.....	---	(105,289)	---	---	(-105,289)
International courier user fees.....	---	(6,038)	---	---	(-6,038)
Cosmetic user fees.....	---	(20,230)	---	---	(-20,230)
Food contact substance notification user fees...	---	(5,193)	---	---	(-5,193)
Subtotal, FDA new user fees (Leg Proposals).	---	(202,282)	---	---	(-202,282)
Buildings and facilities.....	8,788	11,788	11,788	+3,000	---
Total, FDA (w/user fees, including proposals)...	(4,738,272)	(5,003,014)	(4,823,663)	(+85,391)	(-179,351)
Total, FDA (w/enacted user fees only).....	(4,738,272)	(4,805,012)	(4,823,663)	(+85,391)	(+18,651)
Total, FDA (excluding user fees).....	2,729,596	2,742,712	2,765,643	+36,047	+22,931

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission 1/.....	250,000	330,000	250,000	---	-80,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(65,600)	(69,800)	(65,600)	---	(-4,200)
Total, Title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	2,979,596	3,072,712	3,015,643	+36,047	-57,069

TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Limit Dam Rehab (Sec. 714(1)).....	-68,000	---	-54,000	+14,000	-54,000
(rescission).....	---	-54,000	---	---	+54,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives Program (Sec. 714(2)).....	-209,000	---	-111,000	+98,000	-111,000
Limit Environmental Quality Incentives Program FY16 (Sec. 714 (2)) (rescission).....	---	---	-98,000	-98,000	-98,000
Limit Biomass Crop Assistance Program (Sec. 714(3)).....	-20,000	---	-20,000	---	-20,000
Limit Biorefinery Assistance (Sec. 714(4)).....	-19,000	---	-30,000	-11,000	-30,000
Limit Conservation Stewardship Program (Sec. 714 (5)).....	---	---	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
Limit Ag Management Assistance (Sec. 714 (6)).....	---	---	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000
Limit fruit and vegetable program (Sec. 715).....	-125,000	-125,000	-125,000	---	---
Section 32 (Sec. 715) (rescission).....	-216,000	-311,000	-231,000	-15,000	+80,000
APHIS B&F - Fruit Fly Rearing (Sec. 743).....	---	---	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
AIC (rescission) (Sec. 745).....	---	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
TEFAP (Sec. 748).....	---	---	19,000	+19,000	+19,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Ebola/Zika Funding (Sec. 752).....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Emergency Watershed Protection Program (Sec. 753).....	120,000	---	5,000	-115,000	+5,000
Citrus Greening (Sec. 757).....	5,500	---	5,500	---	+5,500
RD balances (Sec. 758) (rescission) .....	---	-4,221	-4,221	-4,221	---
FSA, CCE (rescission).....	---	---	---	+1,000	---
RD unobligated balances (rescission).....	-13,000	---	---	+13,000	---
Marketing Certificate CHIMP.....	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Watershed Flood and Prevention Program (rescission)...	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
Emergency Watershed .....	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
Hardwood Trees (Reforestation Pilot Program).....	600	---	---	-600	---
Water Bank program .....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Geographic Disadvantaged farmers .....	1,996	---	---	-1,996	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency Forest Restoration Program.....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Emergency Conservation Program.....	17,000	---	---	-17,000	---
Emergency Watershed Protection (disaster relief category).....	37,000	---	---	-37,000	---
Emergency Forestry Restoration Program (disaster relief category).....	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
Emergency Conservation Program (disaster relief category).....	91,000	---	---	-91,000	---
NAM Study.....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Summer EBT.....	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
School Equipment Grants.....	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Food for Peace.....	250,000	---	---	-250,000	---
Rural Energy Savings Program.....	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
<b>Total, Title VII, General Provisions.....</b>	<b>-129,904</b>	<b>-494,221</b>	<b>-712,721</b>	<b>-582,817</b>	<b>-218,500</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>141,202,731</b>	<b>170,196,784</b>	<b>148,264,399</b>	<b>+7,061,668</b>	<b>-21,932,385</b>
Appropriations fiscal year 2017.....	(141,501,731)	(151,069,992)	(148,849,107)	(+7,347,376)	(-2,220,885)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---
Disaster relief.....	(130,000)	---	---	(-130,000)	---
Rescissions.....	(-429,000)	(-520,708)	(-584,708)	(-155,708)	(-64,000)
Advance appropriations, FY 2017.....	---	(19,647,500)	---	---	(-19,647,500)
(By transfer).....	(793,792)	(804,225)	(783,188)	(-10,624)	(-21,057)
(Loan authorization).....	(43,088,833)	(43,198,025)	(43,529,235)	(+440,402)	(+331,210)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(186,582)	(193,527)	(186,827)	(+245)	(-6,700)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2016  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2017  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs.....	23,052,859	30,729,496	30,655,093	+7,602,234	-74,403
Mandatory.....	(16,032,602)	(23,638,443)	(23,638,443)	(+7,605,841)	---
Discretionary.....	(7,020,257)	(7,091,053)	(7,016,650)	(-3,607)	(-74,403)
Title II - Conservation programs (discretionary).....	863,754	861,275	868,154	+4,400	+6,879
Title III - Rural development (discretionary).....	2,770,977	2,864,419	2,883,922	+112,945	+19,503
Title IV - Domestic food programs.....	109,796,981	131,410,801	109,683,430	-113,551	-21,727,371
Mandatory.....	(102,958,129)	(124,478,401)	(102,802,956)	(-155,173)	(-21,675,445)
Discretionary.....	(6,838,852)	(6,932,400)	(6,880,474)	(+41,622)	(-51,926)
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs (discretionary).....	1,868,468	1,752,302	1,870,878	+2,410	+118,576
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration (discretionary) 1/.....	2,979,596	3,072,712	3,015,643	+36,047	-57,069
Title VII - General provisions (discretionary).....	-129,904	-494,221	-712,721	-582,817	-218,500
Total .....	141,202,731	170,196,784	148,264,399	+7,061,668	-21,932,385

1/ FY2016 CFTC funds were provided in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016