

**Union Calendar No. 226**

113th Congress, 1st Session ----- House Report 113-308

**REPORT ON ACTIVITIES  
DURING THE 113TH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION**

(JANUARY 3, 2013 TO DECEMBER 27, 2013)

---

**R E P O R T**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**



December 27, 2013.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

39-006

WASHINGTON : 2013

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

FRANK D. LUCAS, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	COLLIN C. PETERSON, Minnesota, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
STEVE KING, Iowa	MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas	DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	JIM COSTA, California
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
GLENN THOMPSON, Pennsylvania	KURT SCHRADER, Oregon
BOB GIBBS, Ohio	MARCIA L. FUDGE, Ohio
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts
SCOTT R. TIPTON, Colorado	SUZAN K. DELBENE, Washington
ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD, Arkansas	GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD, California
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee	FILEMON VELA, Texas
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	MICHELE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	ANN M. KUSTER, New Hampshire
REID J. RIBBLE, Wisconsin	RICHARD M. NOLAN, Minnesota
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
DAN BENISHEK, Michigan	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
JEFF DENHAM, California	JUAN VARGAS, California
STEPHEN LEE FINCHER, Tennessee	CHERI BUSTOS, Illinois
DOUG LAMALFA, California	SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, New York
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
CHRIS COLLINS, New York	
TED S. YOHO, Florida	
VANCE M. McALLISTER, Louisiana	

---

NICOLE SCOTT, *Staff Director*  
KEVIN J. KRAMP, *Chief Counsel*  
TAMARA HINTON, *Communications Director*  
ROBERT L. LAREW, *Minority Staff Director*

**LETTER OF SUBMITTAL**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
*Washington, D.C., December 27, 2013.*

Hon. KAREN L. HASS,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Ms. HASS: Pursuant to rule XI, clause 1(d), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I herewith submit to the House a report of the activities of the Committee on Agriculture during the first session of the 113th Congress.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

Hon. FRANK D. LUCAS,  
*Chairman.*



# CONTENTS

---

	Page
I. Summary of Organization, Jurisdiction, and Oversight Plan of the Committee on Agriculture .....	1
A. Organization .....	1
B. Committee Jurisdiction .....	3
C. Oversight Plan .....	7
II. Committee Activities During the First Session of the 113th Congress .....	18
A. Main Legislative Activities .....	18
B. Statistical Summary of Activities .....	24
C. Digest of Bills Within the Jurisdiction of the Committee on Which Action Has Been Taken .....	25
1. Bills Enacted into Law .....	25
2. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate .....	28
3. House Resolutions Considered in the House .....	36
4. Bills Reported by the Committee on Agriculture But Not Considered .....	37
5. Bills Reported by Other Committees Within the Committee on Agriculture's Jurisdiction But Not Considered .....	37
6. Bills Ordered Reported by the Committee on Agriculture .....	38
7. Bills Ordered Reported But Not Reported by Other Committees Within the Committee on Agriculture's Jurisdiction .....	39
8. Bills Defeated .....	42
9. Bills Acted on by the Committee Included in the Other Laws Enacted .....	60
10. Bills Vetoed .....	61
11. Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted .....	61
12. Concurrent Resolutions Approved .....	73
D. Oversight .....	73
1. Oversight Hearings .....	74
2. Legislative Hearings .....	75
E. Printed Hearings .....	76
F. Meetings Not Printed .....	77
G. Committee Prints .....	77
H. Watersheds .....	77
III. Appendix .....	77
A. Executive Communications .....	77
B. Statutory and Special Reports .....	94
C. Memorials .....	101
D. Petitions .....	101



## Union Calendar No. 226

113TH CONGRESS }  
1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
113-308

---

---

### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON ACTIVITIES DURING THE 113TH CONGRESS

DECEMBER 27, 2013.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

### R E P O R T

In accordance with rule XI, clause 1(d), of the Rules of the House  
of Representatives, the Committee on Agriculture reports herewith  
on its activities during the 113th Congress.

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

##### A. ORGANIZATION

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

The Committee organized on January 23, 2013, into six sub-  
committees, five of which were assigned jurisdiction over major ag-  
ricultural commodities and one that dealt with various related agri-  
cultural operations. The six subcommittees were constituted as fol-  
lows:

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

(Ratio includes *ex officio* Members.)

(Frank D. Lucas, Chairman, and Collin C. Peterson, Ranking Mi-  
nority Member, are *ex officio* Members of all Subcommittees.)

The Committee organized on January 25, 2011, into six subcommittees, five of which were assigned jurisdiction over major agricultural commodities and one that dealt with various related agricultural operations. The six subcommittees were constituted as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION, ENERGY, AND FORESTRY  
(RATIO 10-8 (TOTAL 18))

GLENN THOMPSON, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota, <i>Ranking</i>
BOB GIBBS, Ohio	<i>Minority Member</i>
SCOTT R. TIPTON, Colorado	GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD, California
ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD, Arkansas	ANN M. KUSTER, New Hampshire
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama †	RICHARD M. NOLAN, Minnesota
REID J. RIBBLE, Wisconsin	MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	KURT SCHRADER, Oregon
DAN BENISHEK, Michigan	SUZAN K. DELBENE, Washington

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL FARM COMMODITIES AND RISK MANAGEMENT  
(RATIO 16-13 (TOTAL 29))

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas, *Chairman*

RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas	DAVID SCOTT, Georgia, <i>Ranking Minority</i>
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	<i>Member</i>
BOB GIBBS, Ohio	FILEMON VELA, Texas
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD, Arkansas	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama †	JUAN VARGAS, California
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	CHERI BUSTOS, Illinois
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, New York
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
DAN BENISHEK, Michigan	GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD, California
DOUG LAMALFA, California	JIM COSTA, California
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina	JOHN GARAMENDI, California †
RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois	
CHRIS COLLINS, New York	

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HORTICULTURE, RESEARCH, BIOTECHNOLOGY, AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURE (RATIO 9-8 (TOTAL 17))

AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia, *Chairman*

STEVE SOUTHERLAND II, Florida *	KURT SCHRADER, Oregon, <i>Ranking</i>
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	<i>Minority Member</i>
JEFF DENHAM, California	SUZAN K. DELBENE, Washington
STEPHEN LEE FINCHER, Tennessee †	JIM COSTA, California
DOUG LAMALFA, California	MARCIA L. FUDGE, Ohio
RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois	ANN M. KUSTER, New Hampshire
CHRIS COLLINS, New York	JUAN VARGAS, California
TED S. YOHO, Florida	SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, New York

**Jurisdiction:** Fruits and vegetables, honey and bees, marketing and promotion orders, plant pesticides, quarantine, adulteration of seeds and insect pests, and or-

ganic agriculture, research, education and extension, biotechnology and foreign agriculture assistance, and trade promotion programs, generally.

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND CREDIT (RATIO 14–12  
(TOTAL 26))

ERIC A. “RICK” CRAWFORD, Arkansas, *Chairman*

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia	JIM COSTA, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
STEVE KING, Iowa	MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
RANDY NEUGEBAUER, Texas	DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	FILEMON VELA, Texas
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico
GLENN THOMPSON, Pennsylvania	PETE P. GALLEGOS, Texas
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	CHERI BUSTOS, Illinois
REID J. RIBBLE, Wisconsin	KURT SCHRADER, Oregon
JEFF DENHAM, California	RICHARD M. NOLAN, Minnesota ‡
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut ‡
TED S. YOHO, Florida	

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

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS, OVERSIGHT, AND NUTRITION (RATIO  
7–6 (TOTAL 13))

STEVE KING, Iowa, *Chairman*

BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia	MARCIA L. FUDGE, Ohio, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
BOB GIBBS, OHIO	JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico
STEVE SOUTHERLAND II, Florida *	GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD, California
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama ‡	
STEPHEN LEE FINCHER, Tennessee †	

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

### Section Endnotes

- ‡ December 11, 2013—Resigned from Committee and Subcommittees.
- † February 26, 2013—Appointed to Subcommittee.
- \* February 26, 2013—Resigned from Committee and Subcommittees.
- ‡ February 26, 2013—Appointed to Committee and Subcommittees.
- ‡ January 28, 2013—Appointed to Subcommittee.

### B. COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

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

- (1) Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.
- (2) Agriculture generally.
- (3) Agricultural and industrial chemistry.
- (4) Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.
- (5) Agricultural economics and research.
- (6) Agricultural education extension services.

- (7) Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products, and commodities (not including distribution outside of the United States).
- (8) Animal industry and diseases of animals.
- (9) Commodity exchanges.
- (10) Crop insurance and soil conservation.
- (11) Dairy industry.
- (12) Entomology and plant quarantine.
- (13) Extension of farm credit and farm security.
- (14) Inspection of livestock, poultry, meat products, and seafood and seafood products.
- (15) Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.
- (16) Human nutrition and home economics.
- (17) Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.
- (18) Rural electrification.
- (19) Rural development.
- (20) Water conservation related to activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress (House Document No. 106–320) provides the following concerning the Committee on Agriculture:<sup>1</sup>

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

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

The 104th Congress consolidated the Committee’s jurisdiction over inspection of livestock and meat products to include inspection of poultry, seafood, and seafood products, and added subparagraph (20) relating to water con-

<sup>1</sup>References are to the volume and section of Hinds’ (volumes I–V, *e.g.*, IV, 500) and Cannon’s (volumes VI–VIII, *e.g.*, VI, 400) Precedents of the House of Representatives, and to the Congressional Record by date and page (*e.g.*, January 3, 1953, p. 500).

servation (sec. 202(a), H. Res. 6, Jan. 4, 1995, p. 464). Clerical and stylistic changes were effected when the House recodified its rules in the 106th Congress (H. Res. 5, Jan. 6, 1999, p. 47).

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

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

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

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

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

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

modity marketing and pricing systems on United States agriculture.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(12) Aquaculture programs of the Department of Agriculture.

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

(14) All matters relating to pesticides, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Amendments of 1988, and the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, including, but not limited to, the registration, marketing, and safe use of pesticides,

groundwater contamination, and the coordination of the pesticide program under FIFRA with food safety programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### C. OVERSIGHT PLAN

The Committee on Agriculture met on February 13, 2013 to also fulfill the General Oversight Responsibility reporting requirements of Rule X 2(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The following outline was prepared in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and approved by the Full Committee which was forwarded to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on House Administration on February 13, 2013:

OVERSIGHT PLAN HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE 113TH  
CONGRESS

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

**2008 Farm Bill and Current Agricultural Conditions**

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

*Energy*

- Assess energy programs authorized by FCEA;
- Review administration of the Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP);
- Review activities funded by the Biomass Research and Development Act (BRDA) and input from the external BRDA Advisory Board;
- Review availability of agriculture and forestry feedstocks for renewable energy production;

- Review current status of research on energy crops and feedstocks;
- Review RUS electric loan program;
- Review electricity reliability in rural America;
- Review current provisions in existing law that support agriculture-based energy production and use;
- Review the implementation of the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS);
- Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
- Review renewable fuel programs and their impact on agriculture; and
- Review USDA's energy infrastructure initiative.

*Conservation and the Environment*

- Review the impact of regulatory activities by the EPA and its effect on agriculture productivity;
- Review the impact of regulatory activities carried out pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), or any proposed legislative changes to such Act, on agricultural producers;
- Review the impact of the Administration's regulatory activity relative to methyl bromide on production of agriculture in the U.S.;
- Review any proposed legislation to implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants to the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution, and the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade;
- Review the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture;
- Review budget and program activities of the NRCS;
- Review implementation of all of USDA's conservation programs;
- Review NRCS's efforts to streamline program delivery and field operations;
- Review conservation streamlining initiatives to eliminate duplicative and overlapping programs;
- Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
- Review EPA's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its impact to U.S. agriculture;
- Review of potential impacts of EPA's Clean Air Act (CAA) regulatory program on U.S. agriculture;
- Review ongoing discussions and potential consequences for American agriculture under the United Nations Climate Change Conference;

- Review EPA's implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), FIFRA and Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 3);
- Review the impact of litigation and rulemaking concerning FIFRA, ESA, CAA, CWA, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) and for impacts agricultural operations;
- Review the EPA's regulatory actions in regard to pesticide evaluations;
- Review EPA's regulation of Animal Feeding Operations;
- Review the non-emergency haying and grazing provisions of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP); and
- Review Total Maximum Daily Load strategies and impacts on production agriculture.

*Federal Crop Insurance and Risk Management*

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

*Implementation of Title VII of Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act*

- In its review of rulemakings required by Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (P.L. 111-203) (Dodd-Frank Act), the Committee will continue to ensure—
  - (1) The U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) rulemaking process is transparent and that meaningful comment is allowed by the public;
  - (2) An adequate cost-benefit analysis is performed by the CFTC for each proposed or finalized rule;

(3) The CFTC and SEC properly coordinate with both domestic and international financial regulators;

(4) Past exemptive relief orders or no action letters issued by the CFTC and SEC provide the proper relief for market participants;

(5) Any final or proposed regulations have not harmed or adversely impacted the U.S. economy or financial markets, including the impact on jobs and competitiveness; and

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

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

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

- The Committee will review all operations of the CFTC, including: a continued examination whether the cost-benefit analysis required by section 15a of the CEA is adequate with respect to proposed and finalized rules; the efficiency of internal Commission actions; and the enforcement and oversight capabilities of the CFTC both domestically and internationally.

*Agriculture Trade and International Food Aid*

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

*Agricultural Research and Promotion*

- Review implementation of biosecurity protocols at USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) laboratories;
- Review USDA's implementation of research, education and extension programs authorized in FCEA;
- Review the administration of the ARS research stations and worksites;

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

#### *Biotechnology*

- Review current regulations and research regarding animal and plant biotechnology;
- Review the FDA's regulatory activities regarding genetically engineered animals;
- Assess USDA's efforts to develop and promote benefits of biotechnology for increasing agricultural productivity and combating hunger globally;
- Review USDA's management and controls over biotechnology-derived material; and

- Review the impact of litigation on USDA's timeliness in resolving petitions to deregulate products of biotechnology.

*U.S. Forest Service Administration*

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

*Dairy*

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

*Outreach and Civil Rights*

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

*USDA General Administration*

- Review confidentiality of information provided to USDA by agricultural producers;
- Review USDA's implementation of field office consolidation for the purpose of effectively and efficiently delivering commodity, conservation, energy and rural development programs;
- Review agency appeals process and granting of equitable relief as well as operation of the National Appeals Division;

- Review USDA's efforts to modernize its Information Technology (IT) systems; and
- Review the administrative structure of USDA for effectiveness and additional efficiencies.

*Farm Credit, Rural Development, and the Rural Economy*

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

*USDA Food and Nutrition Programs*

- Review food and nutrition programs including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), fruit and vegetable initiatives, the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) and other commodity distribution programs;
- Assess the level of participation by states in SNAP and examine state options for administering SNAP;
- Review participant eligibility criteria for SNAP;

- Review the interaction between SNAP and other low-income assistance programs such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), and with provisions in the Affordable Care Act;
- Review SNAP work requirements and the efficiency and accountability of the SNAP Employment & Training program;
- Review efforts by USDA and the states to combat waste, fraud and abuse within nutrition programs;
- Review buying patterns of SNAP recipients and methods for encouraging balanced lifestyles;
- Review programs that may be inefficient, duplicative, outdated or more appropriately administered by State or local governments for possible cuts or elimination;
- Review efforts by state SNAP administrators to modernize and streamline their programs;
- Review the Community Food Project Program to ensure cooperative grants are working;
- Review the SNAP retailer approval process; and
- Review the implementation of changes made to the SNAP Nutrition Education Program.

#### *Specialty Crops*

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

#### *Food Safety*

- Review implementation of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act;
- Review implementation of the recent FDA Egg Safety Rule;
- Review USDA's administration of meat and poultry inspection laws and the FDA's food inspection activities to ensure the development of scientifically sound systems for food safety assurance;
- Review USDA's implementation of the catfish inspection program;
- Review USDA's efforts to educate consumers regarding safe food handling practices and streamline the assessment and approval of food safety technologies;
- Review implementation of new protocols for meat, poultry, eggs, or seafood safety inspection;

- Review USDA's enforcement of the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act and humane handling regulations; and
- Review the mechanisms to establish scientifically based international food safety standards.

*Plant and Animal Health*

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

*Livestock Marketing*

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

*Homeland and Agricultural Security*

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

*Miscellaneous*

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

*Consultation With Other Committees To Reduce Duplication*

- With Natural Resources Committee on forestry issues, ESA issues and other public land issues;
- With Science, Space, and Technology Committee on research;
- With Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce on nutrition programs;

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

## II. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES DURING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 113TH CONGRESS

### A. MAIN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

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

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

#### *Agenda for the House Agriculture Committee*

- The Agriculture Committee approached its business in an open, transparent manner and maintained the strong bipartisan tradition of the Committee. One of the main priorities of the Committee during this Congress was to provide oversight to the various Federal agencies through the hearing process.
- The Agriculture Committee held 3 full committee hearings and 5 business meetings during the first session of the 113th Congress. Various subcommittees held 5 hearings during the first session of the 113th Congress
- The Committee heard testimony from Administration officials on 4 occasions, including 2 testimonies from U.S. Department of Agriculture representatives, and 3 from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Additional testimony heard by the Committee was offered by university researchers, nonprofit organizations, trade groups, and farmers and ranchers from across the United States and totaled 31 testimonies all together.
- The House Agriculture Committee successfully drafted and passed out of Committee a bipartisan Farm Bill that was the product of nearly three years of deliberation that was done in public with input from all perspectives.
- The House Agriculture Committee successfully passed six bipartisan pieces of legislation aimed at reducing the negative impacts of Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act on market participants and end-users within various sectors of the economy. In addition, the Committee passed a bipartisan bill that would re-

quire the CFTC to prospectively quantify the cost and benefits of all regulations passed by the agency.

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

*The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (FARRM)*

- Repealed outdated policies while reforming, streamlining, and consolidating over 100 government programs. These reforms contribute to deficit reduction of nearly \$40 billion dollars, which is almost seven times the amount of cuts to these programs under sequestration.
- Eliminates direct payments, repeals the ACRE program, the disaster program for crops, and the counter-cyclical program. A savings of \$23 billion.
- Creates a more market-oriented approach to policy where there is no support when market prices are high. Encourage responsible risk management where farmers are able to plan for catastrophic events.
- FARRM also reforms SNAP for the first time in decades by ensuring that states which administer the program cannot circumvent the law and endanger the integrity of the program.
- End the broad-based categorical eligibility loophole that states use to waive the asset and income tests set by Congress.
- FARRM eliminates the practice of advertising, promoting, and recruiting for SNAP and restrict lottery winners and traditional college students.
- The FARRM Act eliminates and consolidates 23 duplicative and overlapping conservation programs into 13, which saves nearly 7 billion.
- Authorize and strengthen livestock disaster assistance during devastating droughts.
- Invests in core specialty crop initiatives like the Specialty Crop Block Grants and Plant Pest and Disease Management and Prevention Programs.
- Maintains our investment in agriculture research that gives farmers and ranchers the ability to explore new ways to provide our country with the safest, most affordable, most reliable food supply in the world.

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

Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013

- The bill clarifies congressional intent and provides an explicit exemption from margin requirements for non-financial end-users that qualify for the clearing exception, including coopera-

tives that are provided a clearing exemption by CFTC regulations.

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

#### The Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013

- Swap data repositories serve as electronic warehouses for data and information regarding swap transactions. Historically, swap data repositories (SDRs) have regularly shared information with foreign regulators.
- Under Sections 725, 728 and 763 of the Dodd-Frank Act, when a foreign regulator requests information from a U.S. registered SDR or derivatives clearing organization (DCO), the SDR or DCO is required to receive a written agreement from the foreign regulator stating that it will abide by certain confidentiality requirements and will "indemnify" the Commissions for any expenses arising from litigation relating to the request for information.
  - The concept of "indemnification"—requiring a party to contractually agree to pay for another party's possible litigation expenses—is only well established in U.S. tort law, and does not exist in practice or in legal concept in foreign legal jurisdictions.
- These indemnification provisions—which were not included in the financial reform bill passed by the House of Representatives in December 2009—threaten to make data sharing arrangements with foreign regulators unworkable. Foreign regulators will most likely refuse to indemnify U.S. regulators for litigation expenses in exchange for access to data.
  - As a result, foreign regulators may establish their own data repositories and clearing organizations to ensure they have access to data they need to perform their supervisory duties.
- This legislation strikes the indemnification requirements related to both swap data gathered by swap data repositories (SDRs) and data collected by the Commission from clearinghouses.

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

#### The Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013

- This bipartisan legislation that would allow producers, utility companies, and other non-financial entities to *continue* entering into energy swaps with government-owned utilities (aka: utility special entities) without requiring them to register with the CFTC as a “swap dealers” solely because of their dealings with government-owned utilities.
- With a utility special entity there are no shareholders, so the costs imposed by this CFTC regulatory decision, born from the Dodd-Frank Act, will be paid for by everyday consumers and ratepayers of electric power and natural gas.
- As a group, public power utilities deliver electricity to *one in every seven* electricity customers in the United States—over 47 million people—serving some of the nation’s largest cities, such as Los Angeles, San Antonio, Seattle and Orlando. However, the *vast majority of public power companies serve communities with populations of 10,000 people or less*. There are over 2,000 municipal, state and locally-owned, not-for-profit electric utilities throughout the United States.
- This bill maintains the ability of utility special entities to specifically hedge risk associated with the generation of electric energy or production of natural gas, but does *not* include an exemption for interest rate, credit, equities, currency asset classes, or agriculture commodities, other than crude oil or gasoline fuel commodities used for electric energy generation.
- More importantly, this bill would not provide an exemption for utility special entities to enter into financial swaps, such as interest rate swaps related to the issuance of municipal bonds or public debt (such as the type of interest rate swaps that contributed to Jefferson County, Alabama, filing for bankruptcy in 2011, the largest municipal bankruptcy in U.S. history).
- Further, to ensure transparency, the bill still requires all special entity swap transactions to be reported to the CFTC.
- The bill will place utility special entities on a level playing field with everyone else in the marketplace, allowing many of them to keep the same swap counterparties they have used to manage risk with for years.

#### The “Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act”

- Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act was inserted during the Dodd-Frank Conference Committee deliberations in May and June of 2010 by former Senator Blanche Lincoln, despite opposition from some Senate Democrats and many Federal financial regulators. It is important to note that Section 716 was not included in the December 2009 House-passed version of the Dodd-Frank Act.
- Federal financial regulators who opposed Section 716’s addition to the Dodd-Frank Act included: Current Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, former FDIC Chairwoman Sheila

Bair, former Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, and former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker.

- On its face, Section 716 prevents any financial institution that trades certain types of swaps from receiving any type of “Federal assistance”—including access to the Federal Reserve discount window, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation coverage, or any future Federal “bailout” similar to what Congress approved in the fall of 2008 during the financial crisis.
- Due to this prohibition, Section 716 has the practical effect of forcing financial institutions from trading in certain types of swaps, and forces banks to “push out” or “spin off” their swaps business into new separately incorporated and capitalized trading businesses. However, Section 716 does not cover all swaps trading by a bank. Banks still would not be required to “push out” swaps used for hedging risks associated with their banking activities, including interest rate swaps, foreign currency swaps, and credit default swaps (CDS) on investment grade names that are centrally cleared.
- Since Dodd-Frank became law in July of 2010, no equivalent provisions have been adopted in any foreign jurisdictions that are working through their own derivatives reforms, placing U.S. firms at a competitive disadvantage with international banks.
- Earlier in 2013, U.S. Federal financial regulators effectively delayed implementation of Section 716 for both domestic banks and foreign banks doing business in the United States for up to two years (until July 2015).
- This is substantially similar to an amended version of H.R. 1838 from the 112th Congress that passed by voice vote out of the House Financial Services Committee in February of 2012. In March of 2013, the House Agriculture Committee approved of the legislation by a vote 31–14. In May of 2013, the House Financial Services Committee approved of H.R. 992 by a vote of 53–6.
- The legislation would prevent financial institutions from forcing much of the remaining derivatives business outside of the bank, which is a more heavily regulated and more highly capitalized entity than a stand-alone affiliate.
- Likewise, forcing the banks to capitalize new entities without equivalent risk mitigating benefits will unnecessarily divert capital that could otherwise be at work in the economy, and could increase risk to the financial system.
- Notably, the bill amends Section 716 to limit the swap desk push-out requirement so that it does not apply to equity or commodity swaps. However, it will continue to apply to structured finance swaps that are based on an asset-backed security.
  - Retaining coverage of structured finance swaps based on asset backed securities is intended to respond to concerns that the derivatives activities of AIG (which were based upon mortgage backed securities) were highly risky and contributed to the financial crisis.

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

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

The Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act

- The bill requires a joint rulemaking from the CFTC and SEC on cross-border transactions, and would presume that the top nine (9) foreign jurisdictions by notional swap volume would be recognized as having sufficient regulatory supervision over their own markets unless the CFTC and SEC jointly determine otherwise.
- The final amended version of the bill took into consideration many technical comments provided since the March 14, 2013, Agriculture Full Committee hearing, including limiting the number of foreign jurisdictions that are recognized as being sophisticated enough to regulate their own markets (top nine globally) so that the swaps markets do not move to jurisdictions that have not implemented financial regulatory reforms.
- Further, the bill requires the Commissions to report to Congress any determination that a foreign jurisdiction is not broadly equivalent to the regulations of the United States.
- The bill also requires that any rule jointly issued by the two agencies must go through a joint rulemaking process subject to the Administrative Procedures Act. The CFTC and SEC have failed to do so since Dodd-Frank was signed into law, leading to tremendous domestic and international confusion and uncertainty.
- More importantly, no “guidance” from either Commission will have the force of law.
- Moreover, coordination between U.S. and international regulators limits regulatory arbitrage, and the unintended concentration of risk to the financial system.
- The U.S. must not be put at a competitive disadvantage because it was the first to act on financial regulatory reform.
- The legislation provides market participants transparency and certainty that U.S. and foreign regulators will finalize rules

that effectively prevents market fragmentation and destabilization.

- The bill would require that the CFTC and SEC coordinate their rules for the swaps markets—a basic premise that should have started soon after Dodd-Frank was signed into law. Without domestic regulator coordination, getting the global rules right will be next to impossible, a dangerous possibility during times of economic uncertainty.

#### The Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act

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

#### B. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

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

House bills .....	181
Senate bills .....	0
House joint resolutions .....	0
House concurrent resolutions .....	1
Senate joint resolutions .....	0
Senate concurrent resolutions .....	0

House resolutions .....	9
Total .....	191

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

Bills enacted into law .....	0
Bills acted on by the Committee included in other bills that became law ....	0
Bills vetoed .....	0
Bills acted on by both Houses, but not enacted .....	1
Bills acted on by the House but not the Senate .....	10
Concurrent Resolutions approved .....	0
Bills reported to the House but not considered .....	1
Bills ordered reported, but not reported .....	2
Bills defeated in the House .....	2

(3) *Statistics on hearings and markups:*

	Business Meetings	Hearings Forums	Total
Full Committee .....	5	3	0
Subcommittees:			
Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture .....	0	1	0
General Farm Commodities and Risk Management .....	0	3	0
Conservation, Energy, and Forestry .....	0	1	0
Department Operations, Oversight, and Nutrition .....	0	0	0
Livestock, Rural Development, and Credit .....	0	0	0
Total .....	5	8	0

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

1. *Bills Enacted into Law*

None.

Other Laws; Legislative Matters

Appropriations

*P.L. 113–2, (H.R. 152)*

*Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013*

H.R. 152 was introduced on January 4, 2013 by Representative Harold Rogers and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the committee concerned. On January 15, 2013, the bill passed the House under suspension of the rules by a recorded vote of 241 yeas to 180 nays. On January 28, 2013, the bill passed the Senate, under the order of 1/24/13, having achieved 60 votes in the affirmative, without amendment by Yea-Nay Vote. 62 to 36. On January 29, 2013, the bill was presented to and signed by the President into Public Law 113–2.

Division A of the Act makes supplemental appropriations for FY 2013 to specified Federal agencies and programs for the expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Sandy. Title I makes supplemental appropriations to the Department of Agriculture (USDA) for the Commodity Assistance Program, for the emergency food assistance program. Title IX requires each Federal agency to submit to the Office of the Management and Budget, the General Account-

ability Office, the respective Inspector General, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by March 31, 2013, internal control plans for funds provided by this Division. The Act also requires the GAO to review the design of such plans. Title X makes supplemental appropriations to USDA for the Emergency Conservation Program and directs USDA's Office of Inspector General to use unobligated disaster assistance oversight funds provided under the Disaster Relief and Recovery Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 for continued oversight of USDA disaster- and emergency-related activities.

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

*P.L. 113–6, (H.R. 933)**Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Act excludes from such rescission: amounts designated by Congress for OCO/GWOT or for disaster relief; or the amount made available by division F of this Act for a specified limitation on ad-

ministrative expenses of the Social Security Administration for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and for the cost associated with conducting eligibility redeterminations. Also requires the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to report to the congressional appropriations committees within 30 days after enactment of this Act on the account and amount of each such rescission.

*P.L. 113–49, (H.R. 2775)*

*Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014*

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

The Act makes continuing appropriations for FY 2014 including the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013

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

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

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

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

*2. Bills Acted on by the House But Not the Senate*

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

H.R. 634 was introduced on February 13, 2013 by Representative Michael G. Grimm, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services. On March 20, 2013, the Committee on Agriculture ordered reported the bill by a voice vote. On May 7, 2013, the Committee on Financial Services ordered reported the bill by a recorded vote of 59 yeas to 0 nays. Both Committees reported the bill on June 12, 2013, H. Rept.

113–105, Part 1 and 2. On that same date, the bill passed the House, as amended, under suspension of the rules by a recorded vote of 411 yeas to 12 nays. On June 13, 2013, the measure was received by the Senate and referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

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

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

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

*H.R. 803, Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act (SKILLS Act)*

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

Senate and read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

*H.R. 992, Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act*

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

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

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

H.R. 1038 was introduced by Representative Doug LaMalfa on March 11, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 14, 2013, Committee hearings were held and on March 20, 2013, a mark-up session was held with a report to record the voice vote of passage. On June 12, 2013, H.R. 1038 was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 76 and on that same date, Mr. LaMalfa moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill. It was passed in the House with a unanimous vote of 423 yeas to 0 nays. On June 13, 2013, the bill was received and read in the Senate and then referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013 would preserve the ability of government-owned utilities, classified in the bill as “utility special entities,” to have uninterrupted and cost-effective access to the customized, non-financial commodity swaps that utility special entities have used for years. In effect, the counterparties of utility special entities would now be subject to the much higher \$8 billion *de minimis* swap dealer registration threshold. Importantly, the bill does not include an exemption for interest rate, credit, equities, currency asset classes, or agriculture commodities, other than commodities used for electric energy or natural gas production or generation. Instead, the legislation creates a new category of swap known as the “utility operations-related swap” and provides relief to counterparties of utility special entities only when

those specific types of swaps are used. To ensure transparency, the bill still requires all special entity swap transactions to be reported to the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)

*H.R. 1256, Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act*

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

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

*H.R. 1341, Financial Competitive Act of 2013*

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

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

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

that the FSOC fulfills its statutory mandate to identify risks and respond to emerging threats to financial stability.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Eliminates Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility:** Ensures all households meet the asset and income tests stated in SNAP law before they can receive benefits by restricting categorical eligibility to

only those households receiving cash assistance from Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or other state general assistance programs. Receiving a TANF-funded brochure or referral to an “800” number hotline would no longer automatically make a household eligible for SNAP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supports the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, ensures seniors and low-income families have access to farmers markets through the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program, continues current funding for the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program and allows schools to utilize all forms including fresh, frozen, canned and dried produce for students, maintains current funding for the DOD Fresh Program, reauthorizes the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations and supports grants for Community Food Projects. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 2642 under “11. Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted.”)

*H.R. 3695, To provide a temporary extension of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 and amendments made by that Act, as previously extended and amended and with certain additional modifications and exceptions, to suspend permanent price support authorities, and for other purposes.*

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

H.R. 3695 extends the authorities of the 2008 Farm Bill from September 30, 2013 until January 31, 2014. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 2642 under “11. Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted.”)

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

*H.R. 1960, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014*

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

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014—Authorizes appropriations for FY 2014 for the Department of Defense (DOD) for procurement for the Army, Navy and Marine Corps, Air Force, and defense-wide activities.

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

Reauthorizes the Sikes Act through FY 2019.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### *3. House Resolutions Considered in the House*

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

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

The resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the House managers of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk

Management Act of 2013 should: (1) agree to provisions regarding a premium subsidy limitation based on average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000, (2) agree to provisions for a crop insurance study and the impacts of an adjusted gross income limitation, and (3) not agree to provisions regarding a delayed effective date.

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

None.

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

*H.R. 657, Grazing Improvement Act*

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

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

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

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

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

Gives the Secretary concerned the sole discretion to determine the priority and timing for completing each required environmental

analysis regarding any grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on the environmental significance of such authorization and available funding.

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

#### *6. Bills Ordered Reported by the Committee on Agriculture*

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

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

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

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

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

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

benefits (including potential economic, environmental, distributive impacts and equity). (Note: See also the discussion of the March 14th, 2013: Hearing to examine legislative improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act under “D. Oversight.”)

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

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

The Reducing Regulatory Burden Act was introduced by Representative Bob Gibbs on March 4, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On March 29, 2013 the bill was ordered reported by a voice vote by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Exempts from such prohibition the following discharges containing a pesticide or pesticide residue: (1) a discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of FIFRA that is relevant to protecting water quality, if the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation or the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue contained in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation; (2) storm water discharges regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES); and (3) discharges regulated under NPDES of manufacturing or industrial effluent or treatment works effluent and discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 1947 under “8. Bills Defeated”, and H.R. 2642 under “11. Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted.”)

*H.R. 1825, Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act*

The Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act was introduced by Representative Dan Benishek on May 3, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On June 12, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 28 yeas to 15 nays.

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

other Federal statute that specifically precludes recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting on specific Federal public lands or waters; and (3) discretionary limitations on recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting determined to be necessary and reasonable.

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

Requires the heads of Federal agencies to use their authorities to: (1) lease their lands or permit use of their lands for shooting ranges, and (2) designate specific lands for recreational shooting activities.

Sets forth requirements for a permanent or temporary withdrawal, change of classification, or change of management status that effectively closes or significantly restricts 640 or more contiguous acres of Federal public lands for fishing or hunting or related activities.

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

The Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act of 2013 was introduced by Representative Joseph J. Heck on May 23, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On June 12, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill by unanimous consent.

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

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

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

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

The Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act was introduced by Representative Trey Gowdy on June 6, 2013 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Agriculture, and Natural Resources. On June 18, 2013 the Committee on Judiciary ordered reported by bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 20 yeas to 15 nays.

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

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

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

H.R. 2798 was introduced by Representative Robert E. Latta on July 23, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On November 14, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered the bill reported by a recorded vote of 19 yeas to 15 nays.

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

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

Bars the Secretary from prohibiting, as a motorized vehicle or under any other purposes, the use of cameras or related equipment used for commercial filming activities or similar projects in accordance with this Act on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary.

Requires the Secretary to recover (under current law, collect) costs incurred as a result of filming activities or similar projects, including but not limited to, administrative and personnel costs.

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

The Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement (SHARE) Act was introduced by Representative Robert E. Latta on July 23, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On October 30, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a voice vote.

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

*H.R. 3188, Yosemite Rim Fire Emergency Salvage*

The Yosemite Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act was introduced by Representative Tom McClintock on September 26, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources. On November 14, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 16 yeas to 15 nays.

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

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

Declares that such sales shall not be subject to administrative or judicial review in any U.S. court.

*H.R. 3189, Water Rights Protection Act*

The Water Rights Protection Act was introduced by Representative Scott R. Tipton on September 26, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture. On November 14, 2013 the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, amended, by a recorded vote of 19 yeas to 14 nays.

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

*8. Bills Defeated*

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

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

The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act (FARRM) is the product of nearly three years of deliberations, including 46 House hearings and audits, a joint deficit reduction proposal developed between leaders of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, and, ultimately, Committee consideration and

passage on an overwhelming and bipartisan basis. As measured by the length of the Committee's consideration and by the depth of its evaluation, having fully examined the purpose and effectiveness of each and every authority under the jurisdiction of the Committee, FARRM is the product of extensive analysis and research.

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

Highlights include:

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

#### **Title I—Commodities**

##### *Repeals Four Current Commodity Programs*

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

##### *Streamlines and Reforms Commodity Policy*

U.S. agriculture is diverse and dynamic with unique perils and risk management needs that differ by crop and region. A Washington-style command-and-control, commodity policy does not respect the diversity of American agriculture.

FARRM respects the private sector and offers producers a choice in risk management tools. It allows a one-time election for producers to choose between two options on a crop-by-crop and farm-by-farm basis. Under either option, the risk management tool provided is only there for producers when they suffer a significant loss.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Marketing Loans*

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

#### *Sugar*

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

#### *Dairy*

FARRM repeals outdated, ineffective dairy programs, including the Dairy Product Price Support Program, the Milk Income Loss Contract Program, the Dairy Export Incentive Program, and the Federal Milk Marketing Order Review Commission.

FARRM offers producers new, voluntary, basic-level margin coverage along with the opportunity to buy supplemental coverage, if they choose. By participating in the Dairy Producer Margin Protection Program, producers agree to manage supply of dairy products through participation in a Dairy Market Stabilization Program.

Revenue generated from the market stabilization program will be used by USDA to fund purchases of surplus dairy products for donation to food banks and schools meals.

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

#### *Livestock*

Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance is reauthorized for livestock producers. Livestock Indemnity Program (LIP), Livestock Forage Program (LFP),

Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honey Bees, and Farm-raised Fish (ELAP), and the Tree Assistance Program (TAP) are all generally reauthorized.

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

### **Title II—Conservation**

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

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

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

#### *Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)*

Improves and Focuses the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

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

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

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

Beginning farmers or ranchers will be afforded greater access to productive land with the continuation of the Transition Incentives Program (TIP).

*Working Lands*

Supports the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

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

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

Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

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

Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program

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

*Easements*

Agriculture Conservation Easement Program (ACEP)

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

*Regional*

Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)

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

*Other*

## Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program

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

## Grassroots Source Water Protection Program

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

**Title III—Trade**

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

*Trade Programs*

## Market Access Program (MAP)

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

## Foreign Market Development Program (FMD)

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

## Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops (TASC)

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

#### Export Credits (GSM-102)

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

#### Additional Provisions

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

#### *Food Aid Programs*

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

#### Food for Peace

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Title IV—Nutrition**

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

##### *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)*

###### Makes Common-Sense Reforms to Program Eligibility

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

###### Closes Program Loopholes

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

###### Eliminates State Performance Bonuses

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

###### Cracks Down on Waste, Fraud and Abuse

###### Ends SNAP Benefits for Lottery Winners

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

###### Prevents Traditional College Students from Receiving SNAP

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

###### Prevents Fraudulent Benefit Payments

Requires states to verify benefits are not being paid to deceased individuals and that beneficiaries are not receiving payments in more than one state.

#### Stops Fraudulent “Dumping” for Cash

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

#### Prohibits Medical Marijuana as an Income Deduction

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

#### Prohibits Government-Sponsored Recruitment Activities

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

#### Strengthens Program Integrity and Accountability

#### Demands Outcomes from the SNAP Employment and Training Program

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

#### Improves the Quality of Participating Retail Stores

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

#### Ensures Illegal Immigrants Do Not Receive SNAP Benefits

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

#### Increases Oversight of the Restaurant Meals Program

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

#### *Additional Nutrition Programs*

#### Increases Assistance for Food Banks

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

Supports the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)

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

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

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

Promotes Fruits and Vegetables to School Children

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

Continues Food Distribution on Indian Reservations

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

Supports Community Food Projects

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

**Title V—Credit**

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

*Promotes Family Farms*

FARRM recognizes the need to provide flexibility for farm operating loans in response to modern legal entities created for estate succession planning. This flexibility allows the Secretary to permit farmers to obtain farm ownership loans through these modern legal entities.

*Improves Credit Availability for Conservation Loan and Loan Guarantee Program*

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

*Maintains Producer Competitiveness for Land Purchases*

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

*Enhances Beginning Farmer and Rancher Provisions*

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

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

**Title VI—Rural Development**

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

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

Rural development programs are intended to assist communities through loans and grants to build critical infrastructure and provide access to credit. Through these programs small, rural communities can access funds to build or update water systems, build

broadband infrastructure, and finance other critical community facilities. Small businesses are able to access credit through loans, grants, and loan guarantees to finance new enterprises or expand their current business.

#### *Water and Wastewater Programs*

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

#### *Business Loans and Grants*

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

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

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

#### *Broadband Infrastructure*

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

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

*Community Facilities*

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

*Regional Authorities*

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

*Rural Transportation*

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

**Title VII—Research, Extension and Related Programs**

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

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

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

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

*Intramural Research Programs*

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

*Extramural Research Programs*

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

*Land-Grant Universities*

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

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

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

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

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

*Agriculture and Food Research Initiative*

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

*Increased Transparency for Budget Submission*

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

*Addresses the Shortage of Veterinarians*

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

*Specified Initiatives*

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

**Title VIII—Forestry**

FARRM promotes the health of America's national, state, and private forests while eliminating five expired programs. The for-

estry title also places caps on the authorization levels of several existing programs.

*Continuing Forest Conservation Programs*

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

*Combating Invasive Species and Natural Disasters*

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

*Protecting Forest Jobs*

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

*Improving Forest Health*

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

**Title IX—Energy**

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

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

*Rural Energy for America (REAP)*

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

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

*Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP)*

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

*Biorefinery Assistance Program (BAP)*

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

*Biobased Markets Program*

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

*Biodiesel Fuel Education Program*

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

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

FARRM repeals or ends authorizations of the Biofuels Infrastructure Study, and the Renewable Fertilizer Study, the Rural Energy Self-sufficiency Initiative, and the Forest Biomass for Energy Programs.

**Title X—Horticulture**

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

*Supports Farmers Markets and Local Economies*

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

*Continues the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program*

FARRM reauthorizes the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, which has been successful in enhancing the competitiveness of specialty crops through grants awarded to states to support research, product quality enhancement, food safety, and other projects important to the specialty crop industry.

*Combats Pest and Disease By Focusing on Early Detections*

FARRM reauthorizes and consolidates two very effective programs, the Plant Pest and Disease Management and Disaster Prevention Program and the National Clean Plant Network. Detecting and responding to a plant pest or disease in the early stages of an introduction is a significant cost savings for taxpayers, and can help minimize the potentially devastating impact on agriculture.

*Supports Organic Agriculture*

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

## Regulatory Relief

## Provides Regulatory Relief

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

## H.R. 935, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act

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

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

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

## Biological Opinions

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

This is the result of extensive bipartisan oversight carried out between the Agriculture Committee, Natural Resources Committee and Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies in response to litigation challenging EPA registrations of pesticides wherein the agency had not formally consulted with the Services'. Courts have ordered these consultations to proceed under an expedited schedule that precludes scientific

credibility and transparency. The results of these consultations to date are Biological Opinions of the Services' for which the EPA has testified are scientifically suspect. Despite the lack of agreement on the underlying scientific methods and data employed by the Services', current lawsuits are aimed at compelling the EPA to implement these Biological Opinions. This would circumvent the desire that EPA's process and final decision on pesticide registrations be scientifically

### **Title XI—Crop Insurance**

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

#### *Supplemental Coverage Option (SCO)*

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

#### *Enhanced Risk Management for Beginning Farmers and Ranchers*

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

#### *Expands Risk Management for Specialty Crops and under-served Commodities*

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

#### *Improved Actual Production History in the Event of Multiple Year Disasters*

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

#### *Increased Flexibility*

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

#### *Program Integrity*

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

## Title XII—Miscellaneous

### *Animal Health and Livestock Industry Promotion*

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

#### *National Sheep Industry Improvement Center (NSIIC)*

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

#### *Trichinae Certification Program*

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

#### *National Aquatic Animal Health Plan*

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

(Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 935 under “7. Bill Ordered Reported but Not Reported by other Committees within the Committee on Agriculture jurisdiction” and for further action, see also the discussion of H.R. 2642 under “11. Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted.”)

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

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

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

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

None.

10. *Bills Vetoed*

None.

11. *Bills Acted on by Both Houses But Not Enacted*

*H.R. 2642/S.954, FARRM ACT (2) in Conference*

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

**Title I—Commodity Programs**

Under both the House and Senate-passed farm bills, farm support for traditional program crops is restructured by eliminating direct payments, the counter-cyclical price (CCP) program, and the Average Crop Revenue Election (ACRE) program. Authority is continued for marketing assistance loans, which provide additional low-price protection at “loan rates” specified in current law with an adjustment made to the cotton loan rate. Direct payments account for most of current commodity spending and are made to producers and landowners based on historical production of corn, wheat, soybeans, cotton, rice, peanuts, and other “covered” crops. Approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the 10-year, \$46 billion–\$47 billion in savings associated with the proposed elimination of current farm programs would be used to offset the cost of revising farm programs, adding permanent disaster assistance, and enhancing crop insurance. The two bills provide programs for covered crops, except cotton, which would have its program. The Senate bill *suspends* permanent price support authority under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949 until program authority expires in 2018, while the House bill *repeals* permanent law and provides no expiration date for the commodity support programs authorized.

Both bills retain a counter-cyclical price program that makes a farm payment when prices for covered crops decline below certain levels. It is renamed Adverse Market Payments or AMP in the Senate bill and Price Loss Coverage or PLC in House bill. To better protect producers in a market downturn, the price guarantees are called “reference prices” in both bills that determine payment levels are set in statute and increased relative to current parameters called “target prices”. An exception applies in the Senate bill to the reference price for crops other than rice and peanuts, where it is

calculated as 55% of a rolling five-year average (excluding the high and low years).

The Senate bill continues current policy by making payments on 85% of *historical plantings* or “base acres”, a provision designed to minimize the program’s effect on planting decisions. The House bill pays on 85% of *planted acreage* to better align payments with producer risk.

Both bills retain a revenue-based program designed to cover a portion of a farmer’s out-of-pocket loss referred to as “shallow loss”. It is renamed Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) in the Senate bill and Revenue Loss Coverage or (RLC) in the House bill. Payments are made on planted acres when actual crop revenue drops below a specified percentage of historical or “benchmark” revenue (88% in S. 954 and 85% in H.R. 2642). In the Senate bill under ARC, farmers can select coverage at either the county or individual farm level, and any payments are made in addition to AMP. In the House bill, coverage under RLC is available at only the county level, and the program is not available in combination with PLC.

Both bills retroactively reauthorize four programs covering livestock and tree assistance, specifically FY 2012–FY 2018 for the Senate bill and beginning FY 2012 and continuing without an expiration date for the House bill. The crop disaster program from the 2008 Farm Bill (Supplemental Revenue Assistance, or SURE) is not reauthorized in either bill, but elements of it are folded into the new ARC in the Senate bill by allowing producers to protect against farm-level revenue losses (not included in the House bill). S. 954 also provides disaster benefits to tree fruit producers who suffered crop losses in 2012.

Farm commodity programs have certain limits that cap payments (currently \$105,000 per person) and set eligibility based on adjusted gross income (AGI, currently a maximum of \$500,000 per person for nonfarm income and \$750,000 for farm income). The two bills are somewhat similar and diverge from current law, with S. 954 reducing the farm program payment limit to \$50,000 per person for combined AMP and ARC payments and adding a \$75,000 limit on loan deficiency payments (LDPs). Under H.R. 2642, the limit for all title I payments would be \$125,000, of which LDPs would be limited to \$75,000 and other payments including PLC, RLC, and transitional direct payments to \$50,000. The House bill combines peanuts into the limit with other commodities, while the Senate bill continues separate but equal limits for peanuts. Both the Senate and House bills change the threshold to be considered “actively engaged” and to qualify for payments, by effectively requiring personal labor in the farming operation. Both bills also tighten limits on AGI, with a combined AGI limit of \$750,000 in S. 954 and \$950,000 in H.R. 2642. The House bill caps overall farm program spending at \$16.96 billion for FY 2014–FY 2020 for combined payments under Price Loss Coverage and Revenue Loss Coverage collectively called Farm Risk Management Election.

Both House and Senate bills contain similar dairy policy with significant changes, including elimination of the dairy product price support program, the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program, and export subsidies. These are replaced by a new program, which makes payments to participating dairy producers when the national margin (average farm price of milk minus average feed costs)

falls below \$4.00 per hundredweight (cwt.), with coverage at higher margins available for purchase. A provision in S. 954 makes participating producers subject to a separate program, which reduces incentives to produce milk when margins are low. This provision is not in H.R. 2642, however, H.R. 2642 requires USDA to adhere to standard rulemaking procedures and to determine the market impacts of the new program during the rulemaking process. Separately, Federal Milk Marketing Orders have permanent statutory authority and continue intact. However, S. 954 includes two additional provisions: one that requires USDA to use a specified pre-hearing procedure to consider alternative formulas for Class III milk product pricing, and a second that requires USDA to analyze and report on the potential effects of replacing end-product pricing with alternative pricing procedures.

The structure of the sugar program is left unchanged in both bills, but the Senate bill reauthorizes the program through the 2018 crop year, while the House bill reauthorizes the program without an expiration date.

#### **Title II—Conservation**

Both the House and Senate bills reduce and consolidate the number of conservation programs while also reducing mandatory funding over the 10-year baseline by \$3.5 billion in S. 954 and \$4.8 billion in H.R. 2642.

The larger existing conservation programs, such as the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), and the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), are reauthorized by both bills with smaller and similar conservation programs “rolled” into them. The largest conservation program, CRP, is reauthorized with a reduced acreage enrollment cap using a step-down approach from the current 32 million acres to 25 million by FY 2018 under S. 954 and 24 million acres under H.R. 2642. CRP is also amended to include the enrollment of grassland acres similar to the Grasslands Reserve Program (GRP), which is repealed. These grassland acres are limited to 1.5 million acres in S. 954 and 2 million acres in H.R. 2642. EQIP, a program that assists producers applying conservation measures on land in production, is reauthorized by both bills with a 5% funding carve-out for wildlife habitat practices (similar to the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, WHIP, which is repealed). The Senate bill reduces budget authority for EQIP by a total of almost \$1 billion over 10 years, while the House bill offers no reduction from the current \$1.75 billion annually. CSP, another working lands program, is reauthorized at a reduced enrollment level under both bills: 10.348 million acres annually under S. 954 and 8.695 million acres annually under H.R. 2642, down from 12.769 million acres annually under current law.

Both bills create two new conservation programs—the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) and the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)—out of several of the existing programs. Conservation easement programs, including the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), Farmland Protection Program (FPP), and GRP, are repealed and consolidated to create ACEP. ACEP retains most of the program provisions in the current easement programs by establishing two types of easements: wetlands

easements (similar to WRP) that protect and restore wetlands, and agricultural land easements (similar to FPP and GRP) that prevent non-agricultural uses on productive farm or grasslands. The Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP), Chesapeake Bay Watershed program, Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI), and Great Lakes Basin program are repealed by both bills and consolidated into the new RCPP. RCPP uses partnership agreements with state and local governments, Indian tribes, farmer cooperatives, and other conservation organizations to leverage Federal funding and further conservation on a regional or watershed scale.

The Senate bill adds the federally funded portion of crop insurance premiums to the list of program benefits that could be lost if a producer is found to produce an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land without implementing an approved conservation plan or qualifying exemption, or converts a wetland to crop production. This prerequisite, referred to as conservation compliance, has existed since the 1985 Farm Bill and currently affects most USDA farm program benefits, but has excluded crop insurance since 1996.

### **Title III—Trade**

Title III of both the House and Senate farm bills reauthorize all of the international food aid programs, including the largest, Food for Peace Title II (emergency and nonemergency food aid). Both bills contain amendments to current food aid law that place greater emphasis on improving the quality of food aid products (enhancing their nutritional quality). The Senate bill places new restrictions on the practice of monetization or selling U.S. food aid commodities in recipient countries to raise cash to finance development projects. The Senate bill requires implementing partners such as U.S. private voluntary organizations or cooperatives to recover 70% of the U.S. commodity procurement and shipping costs. The Senate bill repeals the specified dollar amounts for nonemergency food aid required in current law (the “safe box”). In place of the safe box, S. 954 provides that nonemergency food aid be not less than 20% nor more than 30% of funds made available to carry out the program, subject to the requirement that a minimum of \$275 million be provided for nonemergency food aid. The House bill places no limits on the practice of monetization, other than new reporting requirements, and fixes the amount of “safe box” nonemergency assistance at \$400 million annually.

The Senate bill creates a new local and regional purchase program in place of the expired local and regional procurement (LRP) pilot program of the 2008 Farm Bill. The bill also increased the appropriation authorization for LRP to \$60 million annually for FY 2014 through FY 2018, up from \$40 million.

Both bills reauthorize funding for the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) Export Credit Guarantee program and various agricultural export market promotion programs. S. 954 reduces the value of U.S. agricultural exports that can benefit from export credit guarantees from \$5.5 billion to \$4.5 billion annually. The House bill retains the \$5.5 billion level of guarantees. Both bills authorize CCC funding of \$200 million annually for the Market Access Program (MAP), which finances promotional activities for both generic and branded U.S. agricultural products. Authorized CCC funding

for the Foreign Market Development Program (FMDDP), a generic commodity promotion program, continues in both bills at \$34.5 million annually through FY 2017.

H.R. 2642 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the position of Under Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Agricultural Services. S. 954 requires the Secretary, in consultation with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees and House and Senate Appropriations Committees to propose a plan for reorganization of the trade functions of USDA, including the establishment of an Under Secretary of Agriculture for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs. The Secretary is required to report on the plan 180 days after the farm bill's enactment. Within one year of submission of the report, the Secretary is required to implement the reorganization plan including establishment of the Under Secretary position.

#### **Title IV—Nutrition**

Title IV of the House and Senate bills both propose to reduce spending for the nutrition programs. For the Nutrition title of each bill, CBO estimates total 10-year budget savings of \$3.9 billion in the Senate bill and \$39.0 billion in the House bill.

SNAP provisions in both bills propose changes to the requirements for retailers who apply for authorization to accept SNAP and changes to some of the rules that govern participants' and retailers' redemption of SNAP benefits. Both bills would provide additional mandatory funding for reducing SNAP trafficking (the sale of SNAP benefits for cash or ineligible goods). In terms of eligibility for SNAP and the calculation of monthly benefit amounts, both bills would change how a household's receipt of Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) benefits affects the household's SNAP benefit calculation; S. 954 would set a \$10 threshold and the House bill would set a \$20 threshold. In addition, the House bill would (1) restrict categorical eligibility, (2) repeal state performance bonuses, and (3) reduce funding for the Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program. The House bill also would make changes to the nutrition assistance provided to the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico and authorize new pilot projects in the areas of Employment and Training programs and retailer fraud.

The Senate bill would allow certain delivery services that serve the elderly and disabled to redeem SNAP, and would bar additional categories of ex-offenders from receiving SNAP benefits.

The House bill would expand states' drug testing for SNAP applicants, to establish a state option program that would change work-related requirements and incentives for states, and to bar additional categories of ex-offenders from receiving benefits.

The House bill provides increased funding incentives for states to opt into a broader work requirement; gives no labor-market waivers for able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs) who are working less than 20 hours per week; reduces exemptions under the ABAWDs rule.

The House bill would also increase resources for Community Food Projects (by \$10 million each year, with a carveout of \$5 million of these grants for projects that incentivize low-income households to purchase fruits and vegetables). Both bills increase mandatory funding for the Emergency Food Assistance Program

(TEFAP)—the Senate bill by \$54 million over 10 years, and the House bill by \$333 million over 10 years (according to CBO). Both measures would limit eligibility for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP). Both bills would add discretionary authority for a Healthy Food Financing Initiative, a financing mechanism to sustain and create food retail opportunities in communities that lack access to healthy food. The Senate bill provides \$100 million (over five years) in mandatory funding for Hunger-Free Communities Incentive Grants, which would fund incentives for SNAP participants' purchase of fruits and vegetables.

#### **Title V—Credit**

The House and Senate bills give USDA discretion to recognize (1) alternative legal entities to qualify for farm loans and (2) alternatives to meet a three-year farming experience requirement; and both bills increase the maximum size of down-payment loans and facilitate loans for the purchase of highly fractionated land in Indian reservations.

The Senate bill also updates and modernizes the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (known as the ConAct). The Senate bill also updates the ConAct's statutory language and organizes the various programs into separate subtitles.

The House bill does not restructure the ConAct nor change any term limit provisions. However, it does create a new microloan program that is similar to a microloan program that USDA created administratively in the past year. It also increases the percentage of a conservation loan that can be guaranteed, and adds another lending priority for beginning farmers, among other changes.

#### **Title VI—Rural Development**

The Rural Development title in the Senate bill makes additional changes to the ConAct, which provides permanent authority for USDA to carry out its portfolio of rural development programs. The Rural Development title in the House-passed bill makes funding authorization amendments to many existing rural development programs. The House bill amends the water and waste water direct and guaranteed loan program to encourage financing by private or cooperative lenders to the maximum extent possible. The House bill also provides a 3–7% carve-out of the Community Facilities appropriation for technical assistance, and encourages loan guarantees. It also includes a new provision directing the Secretary of Agriculture to begin collecting data on the economic effects of the projects that USDA Rural Development funds, and directs the Secretary to develop simplified applications for funding.

The Senate bill consolidates various rural water and wastewater assistance programs and the Community Facilities loan and grant program into a new Rural Community Program category, and establishes criteria for which rural communities will receive priority in making loan and grant awards. The restructuring of the ConAct also eliminates several business programs, but consolidates many of their objectives into a broad program of Business and Cooperative Development grants. The Senate bill provides a total of \$228 million in new mandatory rural development funding over 10 years, including funds for the Value-Added Producer Grant Program (\$12.5 million annually for FY 2014–FY 2018) and the Rural

Microentrepreneur Assistance Program (\$3 million annually for FY 2014–FY 2018), and \$150 million in mandatory spending for pending rural development loans and grants. The House bill increases mandatory spending by \$96 million over 10 years including \$50 million more for the Value-Added Producer Grant program over 10 years, and an additional \$46 million for Rural Economic Development Loans and Grants.

The Senate bill retains the definition of “rural” and “rural area” for purposes of program eligibility and makes it the basis for all rural development programs. The definition of “rural area” for electric and telephone programs is eliminated by Senate bill and the definition becomes the same as for other rural programs. The bill retains the 2008 Farm Bill provision permitting communities that might otherwise be ineligible for USDA Rural Development funding to petition USDA to designate their communities as “rural in character,” thereby making them eligible for program support. The measure also eliminates the existing statutory definition of “rural” and “rural areas” for water and waste water programs and community facilities, but permits areas currently deemed as rural to remain eligible for these programs, unless USDA determines that they are no longer “rural in character.” The Senate bill also amends the definition of rural area in the 1949 Housing Act so that areas deemed rural between 2000 and 2010 would retain that designation until USDA receives data from the 2020 decennial census. The provision also raises the population threshold for eligibility from 25,000 to 35,000.

Both the House and Senate bills provide reauthorization of funding for programs under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, including the Access to Broadband Telecommunications Services in Rural Areas Program and the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program. The Senate bill also establishes a new grant program for the Access to Broadband Telecommunications Services in Rural Areas Program in addition to its current loan guarantee program. The Senate bill creates a new pilot program for “ultra-high speed” broadband connectivity. The Delta Regional Authority and the Northern Great Plains Regional Authority are reauthorized by both bills, but the Senate bill makes various technical changes to the organizational structure and operation of the two authorities.

#### **Title VII—Research, Extension and Related Programs**

Both the House and Senate bills reauthorize funding for various agricultural research laws through FY 2018, subject to annual appropriations, and amend authority so that only competitive grants can be awarded under certain programs.

In both bills, mandatory funding is increased for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative (\$416 million over 10 years in the Senate bill and \$555 million in the House bill) and the Organic Agricultural Research and Extension Initiative (\$80 million over 10 years in the Senate bill and \$100 million in the House bill). Also, mandatory funding is continued for the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program in both the Senate bill (\$85 million) and House bill (\$100 million).

The Senate bill provides new mandatory funding of \$200 million to establish the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research, a nonprofit corporation designed to supplement USDA’s basic and ap-

plied research activities. It will solicit and accept private donations to award grants for collaborative public and private partnerships with scientists at USDA and in academia, nonprofits, and the private sector.

#### **Title VIII—Forestry**

The House and Senate bills, both repeal, reauthorize, and modify existing programs and provisions under two main authorities: the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act (CFAA), as amended, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (HFRA), as amended.

The House bill amends several forestry assistance programs by replacing their permanent authority to receive annual appropriations of such sums as necessary with a set level of appropriations through FY 2018. The Senate bill limits permanent authority for one program. Both bills repeal programs that have expired or have never received appropriations.

Both bills also include provisions that address the management of the National Forest System. And both bills include provisions reauthorizing stewardship contracting, requiring revised strategic plans for forest inventory and analysis, and adding alternatives for addressing insect infestations and disease. The House bill also includes provisions to modify the existing public notice, comment, and appeals process for land and resource management plans and projects.

#### **Title IX—Energy**

The House and Senate bills extend most of the renewable energy provisions of the 2008 Farm Bill, with the exception of the Rural Energy Self-Sufficiency Initiative, the Forest Biomass for Energy Program, the Biofuels Infrastructure Study, and the Renewable Fertilizer Study which are either omitted or repealed by both bills. In addition, the Senate bill omits the Repowering Assistance Program, while House bill adds a new reporting requirement on energy use and efficiency at USDA facilities. The primary difference between the House and Senate bills is in the source of funding. Over their five-year reauthorization period (FY 2014–FY 2018), the Senate bill contains a total of \$880 million in new mandatory funding and authorizes \$1.140 billion to be appropriated for the various farm bill renewable energy programs. The House bill contains no mandatory funding for these programs, while authorizing \$1.405 billion over the five years, subject to annual appropriations.

#### **Title X—Horticulture**

The House and Senate bills reauthorize many of the existing farm bill provisions supporting farming operations in the specialty crop and certified organic sectors. CBO estimates a total increase in mandatory spending of \$197 million (FY 2014–FY 2018) for Title X in the Senate bill and \$279 million in the House bill. Many Title X provisions fall into the categories of marketing and promotion; organic certification; data and information collection; pest and disease control; food safety and quality standards; and local foods. The House bill also includes provisions that would provide exemptions from certain regulatory requirements under some laws, such as the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Both the House and Senate bills provide increased funding for several key programs benefitting specialty crop producers, including the Specialty Crop Block Grant Program, plant pest and disease programs, USDA's *Market News* for specialty crops, the Specialty Crop Research Initiative (SCRI), and also the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program (Snack Program) and Section 32 purchases for fruits and vegetables under the Nutrition title. Both bills also reauthorize most programs benefitting certified organic agriculture producers, including continued support for USDA's National Organic Program (NOP) and development of crop insurance mechanisms for organic producers, Organic Production and Market Data Initiatives (ODI), and research programs such as the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative (OREI) and the Organic Transitions Program (ORG) under the Integrated Research, Education, and Extension Competitive Grants Program. Both bills would give USDA authority to consider an application for a research and promotion order (or "checkoff" program) by the organic sector.

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

#### **Title XI—Crop Insurance**

The House and Senate bills increase funding for crop insurance relative to baseline levels by an additional \$5.0 billion over 10 years in the Senate bill and \$8.9 billion in the House bill. The crop insurance title modifies the existing Federal crop insurance program, which is permanently authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act. The Federal crop insurance program makes available subsidized crop insurance to producers who purchase a policy to protect against individual farm losses in yield, crop revenue, or whole farm revenue. More than 100 crops are insurable.

With cotton not covered by the counter-cyclical price or revenue programs established in Title I of both bills, a new crop insurance policy called Stacked Income Protection Plan (STAX) is made available in both bills for cotton producers. The STAX policy indemnifies losses in county revenue of greater than 10% of expected revenue but not more than the deductible level (25%) selected by the producer for the underlying individual policy (or not more than 30% if used as stand-alone policy). For other crops, both bills make available an additional policy called the Supplemental Coverage Option (SCO), based on expected county yields or revenue, to cover part of the deductible under the producer's underlying policy (referred to as a farmer's out-of-pocket loss or "shallow loss"). The farmer subsidy as a share of the policy premium is set at 80% for STAX and 65% for SCO.

Both bills are designed to expand or improve crop insurance for other commodities, including specialty crops. Provisions in both

bills revise the value of crop insurance for organic crops to reflect prices of organic crops. Both bills require USDA to conduct more research on whole farm revenue insurance with higher coverage levels than currently available. Studies are also required on insuring (1) specialty crop producers for food safety and contamination-related losses, (2) swine producers for a catastrophic disease event, (3) producers of catfish against reduction in the margin between the market prices and production costs, (4) commercial poultry production against business disruptions caused by integrator bankruptcy, (5) poultry producers for a catastrophic event, and (6) producers of biomass sorghum or sweet sorghum grown as feedstock for renewable energy. The Senate bill requires a study for alfalfa insurance and a peanut revenue insurance product also is mandated. A provision in the Senate bill makes payments available to producers who purchase private-sector index weather insurance, which insures against specific weather events and not actual loss.

The Senate bill reduces crop insurance subsidies and noninsured crop disaster assistance for the first four years of planting on native sod acreage. The same provision in the House bill would apply only to the Prairie Pothole National Priority Area (portions of Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota). The Senate bill provides that crop insurance premium subsidies are available only if producers are in compliance with wetland conservation requirements and conservation requirements for highly erodible land.

The House bill requires the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) to conduct a study regarding fraudulent claims filed, and benefits provided under the crop insurance program.

#### **Title XII—Miscellaneous**

The House and Senate bills extend authority for outreach and technical assistance programs for socially disadvantaged farmer and ranchers, and create a research center to develop policy recommendations for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. They also add military veteran farmers and ranchers as a qualifying group. Both bills reauthorize funding for the USDA Office of Advocacy and Outreach, which assists socially disadvantaged and veteran farmers and ranchers. The House bill includes a provision to amend a transparency and accountability law to automatically provide receipts for service or denial of service to socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.

The livestock provisions of both bills renew the trichinae certification and aquatic animal health programs that were established in the 2008 Farm Bill; establish an animal health laboratory network; and require USDA to continue to administer the avian influenza surveillance program through the National Poultry Improvement Plan.

The Senate bill establishes a grant program for research on brucellosis, bovine tuberculosis, and other priority animal diseases; sets up a grant program to study the eradication of feral swine; and establishes a competitive grant program to improve the sheep industry. The House bill does not contain these provisions, and repeals the National Sheep Industry Improvement Center.

The House bill includes provisions to repeal regulations on livestock and poultry practices that USDA finalized in December 2011,

and prevents USDA from finalizing or implementing similar rules; and repeals the 2008 Farm Bill provision that transferred the inspection of catfish to USDA from the Food and Drug Administration. The bill also requires that USDA submit three livestock-related reports to Congress. The first is an economic analysis of the impact of the country-of-origin labeling (COOL) law and the rule that USDA proposed in March 2013 to bring the United States into compliance with World Trade Organization rules; the second, an economic analysis of the economic impact of fraud and mislabeling on wild and farm raised seafood; and last, a report on bovine tuberculosis in Texas.

The other miscellaneous provisions House and Senate bill make available higher coverage levels under the Noninsured Crop Assistance Programs, prohibit attendance at animal-fighting events, include clarifications of conditions for releasing data gathered by USDA to state or local government agencies, include an increase in administrative expenses for three regional development commissions that were established by the 2008 Farm Bill, and include grants to promote the U.S. maple syrup industry and for technological training for farm workers. Both bills establish a military veterans agricultural liaison within USDA to advocate for and to provide information to veterans, and establish an Office of Tribal Relations to coordinate USDA activities with Native American tribes.

The Senate bill includes the establishment of a Pima Cotton Trust Fund and an Agriculture Wool Apparel Manufacturers Trust Fund for users of pima cotton and wool, and a Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund for research on citrus disease.

The House bill provides for a High Plains Water Study, which preserves 2013 Farm Bill benefits for participants in the study; flood protection for the Missouri River basin; flood protection for agricultural interests in the Wallkill River and Black Dirt region; prohibitions on closing Farm Service Agency (FSA) offices with high workloads; and a prohibition on FSA employees keeping GSA-leased cars overnight. The bill also includes an interstate commerce provision that prohibits states from imposing production standards on agricultural products from other states, a provision to ensure high standards for agencies' use of scientific information, and a provision that sunsets all discretionary programs when the farm bill expires.

The House bill requires a regulatory review and economic impact statement from USDA on EPA proposals that significantly impact agricultural entities; amends EPA's spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule; prohibits EPA from disclosing producer information; and provides EPA permit exemptions for certain silviculture activities.

The House bill includes provisions to protect honey bees and other pollinators, promote urban agriculture, improve consideration of the impact of regulations on small businesses, and provide technical assistance on produce misidentified as grown in the United States. There are two senses of Congress provisions: one is on increased opportunities for black farmers, women, minorities, and small businesses, and the other on the importance of chemicals in production agriculture.

The House bill also requires that three reports be submitted to Congress. The Secretary of State is to submit a report on water sharing between the United States and Mexico; the Secretary of Health and Human Services is required to submit a scientific and economic analysis of the Food Safety Modernization Act; and the Inspector General of USDA is to submit a report on the activities and resources expended on ocean policy.

The House bill also includes a provision that requires OMB to prepare and report to Congress an interagency cross-cut budget on Federal and state activities on restoring the Chesapeake Bay. The provision also directs EPA to develop a plan to provide technical and financial assistance to Chesapeake Bay states in carrying out watershed restoration

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

*H. Con. Res. 25/S. Con. Res. 8, Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.*

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

The resolutions lists recommended budgetary levels and amounts for FY 2013–FY 2023 with respect to: (1) Federal revenues, (2) new budget authority, (3) budget outlays, (4) deficits, (5) public debt, and (6) debt held by the public. Additionally, the resolution lists the appropriate levels of new budget authority, outlays, and administrative expenses for the Social Security Administration (SSA), including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, U.S. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses, and specified major functional categories for FY 2013–FY 2023 and sets forth reconciliation instructions for the Senate Committee on Finance. (Note: See also the discussion of H.J. Res. 59 under the “11. Bills Act on by Both Houses But Not Enacted.”)

*H.J. Res. 59, Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013*

H.J. Res. 59 was introduced by Representative Harold Rogers on September 10, 2013 and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget. On September 20, 2013 the resolution passed the passed the House by a recorded vote of 230 yeas to 189 nays. On September 27, 2013 the resolution passed the Senate, amended, by a recorded vote of 54 yeas to 44 nays. On September 29, 2013 the House agreed to the Senate amendment with two amendments. Both passed by a recorded vote of 248 yeas to 174 nays and the other 231 yeas to 192 nays. On September 30, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 367, the House

receded from the House amendments previous passed and concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment by a recorded vote of 228 yeas to 201 nays. On September 30, 2013, the Senate tabled the House amendments to the Senate amendment by a recorded vote of 54 yeas to 46 nays and sent the message to the House. On October 1, 2013 the House appointed conferees pursuant H. Res. 368; Cantor, Camp, Ryan (WI) and Graves (GA). On that same date the Senate agreed to table the message from the House by a recorded vote of 54 yeas to 46 nays and sent the Message to the House. On December 12, 2012 the resolution passed the House, amended, as the Bipartisan Budget Act by a recorded vote of 332 yeas to 94 nays. On December 18, 2013 the Senate agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment by a recorded vote of 64 yeas to 36 nays.

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 establishes discretionary spending levels for FYs 2014 and 2015, identifies deficit saving proposals, including mandatory savings and non-tax revenue; and reduces the deficit.

Included in the Act is a provision that allows the Natural Resources Conservation Service to charge a fee for providing technical and financial assistance on the development of individualized, site-specific conservation plans.

#### *12. Concurrent Resolutions Approved*

None.

#### D. OVERSIGHT

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

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

In keeping with the objective of the Oversight Plan as submitted to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and House Administration, and Rule XI, clause 2 of the House of Representatives, the Committee and its subcommittees conducted the following chronological oversight hearings during the first session of the 113th Congress (Note: To see a copy of the Oversight Plan as

submitted, see “I. Summary of Organization, Jurisdiction, and Oversight Plan of the Committee on Agriculture.”):

### 1. Oversight Hearings

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

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

**March 13, 2013:** *Hearing to Examine the National Forest Management and its Impacts on Rural Economies and Communities*. Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry. Hearing Serial No. 113–2.

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

**April 24, 2013:** *Hearing to Review Horticulture Priorities for the 2013 Farm Bill*. Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture. Hearing Serial No. 113–4.

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

**May 21, 2013:** *The Future of the CFTC: Market Perspectives*. Full Committee. Hearing Serial No. 113–5.

This hearing was the first in a series of hearings being held in advance of writing legislation to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). The agency’s statutory authorization expires at the end of the fiscal year. Members of the Committee heard perspectives from the futures and swaps market, including the two largest derivatives exchanges, a futures commis-

sion merchant whose customers are farmers and ranchers, and industry trade associations who represent hundreds of companies. The purpose of the hearing was to begin to allow members to develop a greater understanding of the regulatory challenges faced by individuals involved in the derivative marketplace.

**July 23, 2013:** *The Future of the CFTC: Commission Perspectives.* Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management. Hearing Serial No. 113–6.

The purpose of this hearing was to continue the process of gathering information and perspectives on the future of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission in advance of writing legislation to reauthorize the regulatory agency. The statutory authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 2013. This was the second hearing on the future of the CFTC.

**July 24, 2013:** *The Future of the CFTC: End-User Perspectives.* Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management. Hearing Serial No. 113–7.

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

**October 2, 2013:** *The Future of the CFTC: Perspectives on Customer Protections.* Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management. Hearing Serial No. 113–8.

The purpose of this hearing was to explore ways to improve customer protections and understand how best to avoid or prevent the collapse of another futures commission merchant that disproportionately impacts farmers and ranchers in light of the failures at MF Global and PFGBest in advance of writing legislation that would reauthorize the CFTC. This was the final hearing in the series on the future of the CFTC.

## 2. Legislative Hearings

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

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

All of the following are bills reviewed during the hearing: (1) H.R. 634, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act, ensures that end-users can continue to use derivatives to manage business risks without being subject to costly margin requirements; (2) H.R. 677, the Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act, ensures that transactions between affiliates within a single corporate group

are not regulated as swaps; (3) H.R. 742, the Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013, would allow data sharing between U.S. and international regulators and swap data repositories without adding an unnecessary layer of legal bureaucracy; (4) H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, amends Section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act to limit the swap desk push-out requirement so that it does not apply to equity or commodity swaps; (5) H.R. 1003 would require the CFTC to assess the costs and benefits of its actions; and (6) H.R. 1038, the Public Power Risk Management Act, would allow producers, utility companies, and other non-financial entities to continue entering into energy swaps with government-owned utilities without danger of being required to register with the CFTC as a swap dealer.

Additionally, the Committee also examined one draft proposal, the Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act, which would direct the CFTC and the Securities and Exchange Commission to adopt a joint rule on how they will regulate cross-border swaps transactions as part of the new requirements created in the Dodd-Frank Act. (Note: See also the discussion of H.R. 634, H.R. 742, H.R. 992, H.R. 1038 and H.R. 1256 under “2. Bills Acted on by the House but not the Senate”; and the discussion of H.R. 677 and H.R. 1003 under “6. Bills Ordered Reported by the Committee on Agriculture.”)

#### E. PRINTED HEARINGS

- 113-1 HEARING TO REVIEW THE STATE OF THE RURAL ECONOMY—Full Committee, March 5, 2013.
- 113-2 NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT AND ITS IMPACTS ON RURAL ECONOMIES AND COMMUNITIES—Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, March 13, 2013.
- 113-3 EXAMINING LEGISLATIVE IMPROVEMENTS TO TITLE VII OF THE DODD-FRANK ACT—Full Committee, March 14, 2013.
- 113-4 HEARING TO REVIEW HORTICULTURE PRIORITIES FOR THE 2013 FARM BILL—Subcommittee on Horticulture, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, April 24, 2013.
- 113-5 THE FUTURE OF THE CFTC: MARKET PERSPECTIVES—Full Committee, May 21, 2013.
- 113-6 THE FUTURE OF THE CFTC: COMMISSION PERSPECTIVES—Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, July 23, 2013.
- 113-7 THE FUTURE OF THE CFTC: END-USER PERSPECTIVES—Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, July 24, 2013.
- 113-8 THE FUTURE OF THE CFTC: PERSPECTIVES ON CUSTOMER PROTECTIONS—Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, October 2, 2013.

## F. MEETINGS NOT PRINTED

January 23, 2013—ull Committee open business meeting. Organizational meeting for the 113th Congress. Approval by voice vote of the Committee Rules.

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

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

March 20, 2013—Full Committee open business meeting. To consider H.R. 634, H.R. 677, H.R. 742, H.R. 992, H.R. 1003, H.R. 1038, and H.R. 1256.

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

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

## G. COMMITTEE PRINTS

*Committee on Agriculture Rules*. Print. No. 113-1.

## H. WATERSHEDS

None.

## III. APPENDIX

## A. EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

E.C. 6—Jan. 14, 2013: A letter from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Farmer Mac Capital Planning (RIN: 3052-AC80) received January 3, 2013.

E.C. 74—Jan. 22, 2013: A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Determination of Foreign Exchange Swaps and Foreign Exchange Forwards Under the Commodity Exchange Act received January 9, 2013.

E.C. 75—Jan. 22, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fluroxypyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0962; FRL-9371-1] received January 9, 2013.

E.C. 97—Jan. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spiromesifen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0038; FRL-9374-3] received January 10, 2013.

E.C. 179—Feb. 4, 2013: A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the

Department's final rule—Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Doc. No.: FSIS-2012-0039] (RIN: 0583-AD05) received January 22, 2013.

E.C. 180—Feb. 4, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Approved Tests for Bovine Tuberculosis in Cervids [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0087] received January 22, 2013.

E.C. 181—Feb. 4, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Golden Nematode; Removal of Regulated Areas in Livingston and Steuben Counties, NY [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0079] received January 22, 2013.

E.C. 182—Feb. 4, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Traceability for Livestock Moving Interstate [Doc. No.: APHIS-2009-0091] (RIN: 0579-AD24) (RIN: 0579-AD24) received January 22, 2013.

E.C. 197—Feb. 5, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Epoxy Polymer; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0615; FRL-9369-7] received January 18, 2013.

E.C. 198—Feb. 5, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export; Clarification of Requirements [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0607; FRL-9360-8] (RIN: 2070-AJ59) received January 18, 2013.

E.C. 199—Feb. 5, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of Sulfur Emissions from Stationary Boilers [EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0763; FRL-9772-6] received January 18, 2013.

E.C. 267—Feb. 14, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Alpha-Cypermethrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0234; FRL-9376-1A] received January 30, 2013.

E.C. 268—Feb. 14, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Styrene-2-Ethylhexyl Acrylate Copolymer; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0456; FRL-9367-2] received January 30, 2013.

E.C. 301—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Fresh Bananas From the Philippines into the Continental United States [Doc. No.: APHIS-2011-0028] (RIN: 0579-AD61) received February 7, 2013.

E.C. 302—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Texas (Splenic) Fever in Cattle [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0069] received February 7, 2013.

E.C. 303—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule—Importation of Horses From Contagious Equine Metritis-Affected Countries [Doc. No.: APHIS-2008-0112] (RIN: 0579-AD31) received February 12, 2013.

E.C. 304—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Soybean Promotion and Research: Amend the Order To Adjust Representation on the United Soybean Board [Doc. No.: AMS-LS-12-0022] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 305—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0043; FV12-948-1 IR] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 306—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Assessment Rate Decrease for Processed Pears [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0031; FV12-927-2 IR] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 307—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0027; FV12-922-1 IR] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 308—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0090; FV12-925-1 FR] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 309—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0094; FV12-915-1 FIR] received February 14, 2013.

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

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

E.C. 312—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Organic Program; Periodic Residue Testing [Doc. No.: AMS-NOP-10-0102; NOP-10-10FR] (RIN: 0581-AD10) received February 14, 2013.

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

E.C. 314—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Suspension of Handling Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0028; FV12-922-2 IR] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 315—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees (RIN: 0572-AC06) received February 12, 2013.

E.C. 316—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glycine max Herbicide-resistant Acetolactate Synthase; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0795; FRL-9376-4] received February 5, 2013.

E.C. 317—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0916; FRL-9376-9] received February 5, 2013.

E.C. 318—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Thiacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0311; FRL-9374-9] received February 5, 2013.

E.C. 319—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protections for Subjects in Human Research Involving Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0785; FRL-9353-4] (RIN: 2070-AJ76) received February 12, 2013.

E.C. 320—Feb. 15, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—3-decen-2-one; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0065; FRL-9378-1] received February 14, 2013.

E.C. 558—Feb. 28, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0051; FV12-966-1 IR] received February 22, 2013.

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

E.C. 771—Mar. 20, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Declaration of Prion as a Pest Under FIFRA; Related Amendments; and Availability of Final Test Guidelines [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0427; FRL-9372-7] (RIN: 2070-AJ26) received February 27, 2013.

E.C. 772—Mar. 20, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances

[EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0302; FRL-9377-6] received February 27, 2013.

E.C. 773—Mar. 20, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenpyrazamine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0357; FRL-9373-9] received February 27, 2013.

E.C. 774—Mar. 20, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyraflufen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1002; FRL-9379-6] received February 27, 2013.

E.C. 775—Mar. 20, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0308; FRL-9379-9] received February 27, 2013.

E.C. 776—Mar. 20, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Tetrachlorvinphos; Extension of Time-Limited Interim Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0360; FRL-9380-9] (RIN: 2070-AZ16) received March 13, 2013.

E.C. 862—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the PRAB Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP): Updated Trafficking Definition and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations Duel Participation [FNS-2009-0019] (RIN: 0584-AD97) received March 18, 2013.

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

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

E.C. 865—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amitraz; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0051; FRL-9381-1] received March 19, 2013.

E.C. 866—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Banda de *Lupinus albus* doce (BLAD); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1026; FRL-9380-6] received March 22, 2013.

E.C. 867—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Emamectin Benzoate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0665; FRL-9381-4] received March 22, 2013.

E.C. 868—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Abamectin; Pesticide Toler-

ances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0418; FRL-9379-1] received March 22, 2013.

E.C. 869—Mar. 23, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0488; FRL-9377-3] received March 22, 2013.

E.C. 999—Apr. 10, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Castor Oil, Polymer with Adipic Acid, Linoleic Acid, Oleic Acid and Ricinoleic Acid Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0057; FRL-9381-2] received April 2, 2013.

E.C. 1029—Apr. 11, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0860; FRL-9378-6] received March 26, 2013.

E.C. 1099—Apr. 15, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Live Birds and Poultry, Poultry Meat, and Poultry Products From a Region in the European Union [Doc. No: APHIS-2009-0094] (RIN: 0579-AD45) received April 2, 2013.

E.C. 1100—Apr. 15, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Styrene-Ethylene-Propylene Block Copolymer; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0043; FRL-9380-5] received April 5, 2013.

E.C. 1222—Apr. 24, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services Under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) (RIN: 0580-AB13) received April 16, 2013.

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

E.C. 1262—Apr. 25, 2013: A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process (RIN: 0596-AD07) received April 8, 2013.

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

E.C. 1264—Apr. 25, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0139; FRL-9381-7] received April 5, 2013.

E.C. 1310—Apr. 26, 2013: A letter from the Board Chair and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding

and Fiscal Affairs; GAAP References and other Conforming Amendments (RIN: 3052-AC75) received April 17, 2013.

E.C. 1356—Apr. 30, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Identity Theft Red Flags Rules [Release Nos.: 34-69359, IA-3582, IC-30456; File No. S7-02-12] (RIN: 3235-AL26) received April 25, 2013.

E.C. 1391—May 7, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Controlled Import Permits [Doc. No.: APHIS-2008-0055] (RIN: 0579-AD53) received May 2, 2013.

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

E.C. 1466—May 14, 2013: A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Updates to the List of Plant Inspection Stations [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0099] received April 29, 2013.

E.C. 1467—May 14, 2013: A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0075] received April 29, 2013.

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

E.C. 1469—May 14, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Recordkeeping for Approved Livestock Facilities and Slaughtering and Rendering Establishments [Doc. No.: APHIS-2007-0039] (RIN: 0579-AC61) received May 9, 2013.

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

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

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

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

E.C. 1692—Jun. 4, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Committee Membership Reapportionment for Processed Pears [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0032; FV12-927-3 FR] received May 8, 2013.

E.C. 1693—Jun. 4, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-07-0026; AO-14-A77, *et al.*; DA-07-02] received May 28, 2013.

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

E.C. 1695—Jun. 4, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Reestablishment of Membership on the Colorado Potato Administrative Committee, Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0044; FV12-948-2 FR] received May 8, 2013.

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

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

E.C. 1703—Jun. 5, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0051; FV12-966-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1704—Jun. 5, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreases Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0027; FV12-922-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1705—Jun. 5, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0045; FV12-905-1 FR] received May 28, 2013.

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

E.C. 1712—Jun. 6, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Pro-

gram; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS-LS-07-0143] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1713—Jun. 6, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 1 (Scotch) and Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2012–2013 Marketing Year [Doc. Nos.: AMS-FV-11-0088; FV12-958-1A FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1714—Jun. 6, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Suspension of Handling Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0028; FV12-922-2 FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1715—Jun. 6, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling of Beef, Pork, Lamb, Chicken, Goat Meat, Wild and Farm-Raised Fish and Shellfish, Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Peanuts, Pecans, Ginseng, and Macadamia Nuts [Doc. No.: AMS-LS-13-0004] (RIN: 0581-AD29) received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1718—Jun. 10, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0076; FV13-932-1 IR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1803—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Termination of Proceeding on Proposed Amendments to Tentative Marketing Agreements and Orders [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-13-0016; AO-14-A74, *et al.*; DA-06-01] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1804—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Changing Reporting Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0002; FV12-929-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1805—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—United States Standards for Grades of Almonds in the Shell [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0046] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1806—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Redistricting and Reapportionment of Grower Members, and Changing the Qualifications for Grower Membership on the Citrus Administrative Committee [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0076; FV11-905-1 FR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1807—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Assessment Rate Decrease for Processed Pears [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0031; FV12-927-2 FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1808—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Regulations Defining *Bona Fide* Cotton Spot Markets [Doc. No.: AMS-CN-12-0024] (RIN: 0581-AD26) received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1809—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0039; FV12-959-1 FR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1810—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Modification of the Assessment Rate for Fresh Pears [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0030; FV12-927-1 FR] received May 28, 2013.

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

E.C. 1812—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0010; FV13-946-1 IR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1813—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0043; FV12-948-1 FIR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1814—Jun. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Increased Assessments Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0038; FV12-906-1 FR] received May 28, 2013.

E.C. 1864—Jun. 14, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Procedures to Establish Appropriate Minimum Block Sizes for Large Notional Off-Facility Swaps and Block Trades (RIN: 3038-AD08) received June 3, 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

E.C. 1896—Jun. 18, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Postdecisional Administrative Review Process for Occupancy or Use of National Forest System Lands and Resources (RIN: 0596-AB45) received June 7, 2013.

E.C. 2035—Jun. 28, 2013: A letter from the Manager, BioPreferred Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Designation of Product Categories for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA16) received June 24, 2013.

E.C. 2186—Jun. 28, 2013: A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting proposed legislation, titled "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, and Natural Resources.

E.C. 2235—Jul. 15, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Lacey Act Implementation Plan: Definitions for Exempt and Regulated Articles [Doc. No.: APHIS-2009-0018] (RIN: 0579-AD11) received July 9, 2013.

E.C. 2362—Jul. 26, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Fresh Citrus Fruit From Uruguay, Including Citrus Hybrids and *Fortunella spp.*, Into the Continental United States [Doc. No.: APHIS-2011-0060] (RIN: 0579-AD59) received July 11, 2013.

E.C. 2450—Aug. 1, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations [Doc. No.: APHIS-2006-0159] (RIN: 0579-AC69) received July 31, 2013.

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

E.C. 2551—Aug. 2, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulation Revision: Removal of the Pesticide Discharge Permitting Exemption in Response to Sixth Circuit Court of

Appeals Decision [EPA-HQ-OW-2003-0063; FRL-9829-2] received June 26, 2013.

E.C. 2552—Aug. 2, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Streptomycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0852; FRL-9385-3] received May 15, 2013.

E.C. 2553—Aug. 2, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0755; FRL-9384-9] received August 2, 2013.

E.C. 2554—Aug. 2, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0110; FRL-8886-5] (RIN: 2070-AD30) received May 1, 2013.

E.C. 2555—Aug. 2, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-QPP-2012-0204; FRL-9387-9] received June 4, 2013.

E.C. 2831—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0005; FV13-925-1 FR] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2832—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Fees for Voluntary Federal Dairy Grading and Inspection Services [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-10-0002] (RIN: 0581-AD25) received August 5, 2013.

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

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

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

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

E.C. 2837—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint

Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2013–2014 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0064; FV13–985–1 FR] received August 5, 2013.

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

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

E.C. 2840—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Changing Reporting Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS–FV–12–0002; FV12–929–1 FIR] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2841—Sep. 12, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2013 Amendment) [Doc. No.: AMS–CN–12–0065] received August 5, 2013.

E.C. 2861—Sep. 16, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Enhanced Risk Management Standards for Systemically Important Derivatives Clearing Organizations (RIN: 3038–AC98) received August 22, 2013.

E.C. 2862—Sep. 16, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Inspection and Weighing of Grain in Combined and Single Lots (RIN: 580–AB15) received August 29, 2013.

E.C. 2863—Sep. 16, 2013: A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Weighing, Feed, and Swine Contractors (RIN: 0580–AA99) received August 29, 2013.

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

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

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

E.C. 2966—Sep. 17, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commis-

sion's final rule—Clearing Exemption for Certain Swaps Entered into by Cooperatives (RIN: 3038-AD47) received September 3, 2013.

E.C. 3060—Sep. 23, 2013: A letter from the Chief, Planning & Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Trafficking Controls and Fraud Investigations (RIN: 0584-AE26) received September 5, 2013.

E.C. 3143—Sep. 30, 2013: A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Privacy Protections of Information From Applicant Households [FNS-2009-0024] (RIN: 0584-AD91) received September 11, 2013.

E.C. 3144—Sep. 30, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interstate Movement of Sharwil Avocados From Hawaii [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0008] (RIN: 0579-AD70) received September 17, 2013.

E.C. 3236—Oct. 5, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Litchi Fruit From Australia [Doc. No.: APHIS-2009-0084] (RIN: 0579-AD56) received September 25, 2013.

E.C. 3352—Oct. 23, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Animal Welfare; Retail Pet Stores and Licensing Exemptions [Doc. No.: APHIS-2011-0003] (RIN: 0579-AD57) received September 19, 2013.

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

E.C. 3354—Oct. 23, 2013: A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations; Income Deductions and Resource Eligibility [FNS-2011-0036] (RIN: 0584-AE05) received September 24, 2013.

E.C. 3399—Oct. 28, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methyl Parathion; Removal of Expired Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0332; FRL-9401-3] received September 25, 2013.

E.C. 3438—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Wisconsin [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0075] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3439—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cold Treatment for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables; MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Mascoutah, IL [Doc. No.: APHIS-2012-0089] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3440—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's

final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Change in Minimum Grade Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0067; FV13-915-1 FR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3441—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Temporary Change to the Handling Regulations and Reporting Requirements for Yellow Fleshed and White Types of Potatoes [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0067; FV13-946-2 IR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3442—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0041; FV13-922-2 FR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3443—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0071; FV13-920-2 IR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3444—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Suspension of Handling Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0040; FV13-922-1 IR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3445—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0055; FV13-932-1 IR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3446—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Revising Handler Reporting and Grower Diversion Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0030; FV13-930-2 IR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3447—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Organic Program (NOP); Sunset Review (2013) [Doc. No.: AMS-NOP-11-0003; NOP-10-13FR] (RIN: 0581-AD13) received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3448—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—United States Standards for Condition of Food Containers [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0027; FV-05-332] (RIN: 0581-AC52) received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3449—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Paper and Paper-Based Packaging Promotion, Research and Information Order; Referendum Procedures [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0069; FR-B] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3450—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Relaxing Size and Grade Requirements on Valencia and

Other Late Type Oranges [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0009; FV13-905-2 FIR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3451—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Potato Research and Promotion Plan; Amend the Administrative Committee Structure and Delete the Board's Mailing Address [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0027] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3452—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0053; FV13-987-1 IR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3453—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Change in Reporting and Assessment [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0071; FV13-955-1 FIR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3454—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research and Information Order: Assessment Rate Increase [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0062] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3455—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Revising Determination of Sales History [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0042; FV12-929-2 FR] received October 23, 2013.

E.C. 3456—Oct. 30, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Citrus Canker, Citrus Greening, and Asian Citrus Psyllid; Interstate Movement of Regulated Nursery Stock [Doc. No.: APHIS-2010-0048] (RIN: 0579-AD29) received October 23, 2013.

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

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

E.C. 3729—Nov. 19, 2013: A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0010; FV13-946-1 FIR] received November 14, 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

E.C. 3786—Nov. 21, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Ovine Meat From Uruguay [Doc. No.: APHIS–2008–0085] (RIN: 0579–AD17) received November 18, 2013.

E.C. 3787—Nov. 21, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation of Fresh Beans, Shelled or in Pods, From Jordan Into the Continental United States [Doc. No.: APHIS–2012–0042] (RIN: 0579–AD69) received November 19, 2013.

E.C. 3994—Dec. 5, 2013: A letter from the Ambassador, Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia, transmitting a letter regarding the Farm Bill of 2013, received December 2, 2013.

E.C. 4020—Dec. 9, 2013: A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; Importation of Bovines and Bovine Products [Doc. No.: APHIS–2008–0010] (RIN: 0579–AC68) received December 4, 2013.

E.C. 4038—Dec. 10, 2013: A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Food Additive Regulations; Incorporation by Reference of the Food chemicals Codex, 7th Edition [Doc. No.: FDA–2010–F–0320] received December 3, 2013.

E.C. 4062—Dec. 11, 2013: A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Derivatives Clearing Organizations and International Standards (RIN: 3038–AE06) received November 22, 2013.

E.C. 4134—Dec. 12, 2013: A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Energy Efficiency and Conservation Loan Program (RIN: 0572–AC19) received December 9, 2013.

## B. STATUTORY AND SPECIAL REPORTS

USDA: Report on Healthy Incentives Pilot (HIP) 2012 Summary Report as required by Section 4141 of the Food, Energy, and Conservation, Act of 2008 (FECA). Submitted by USDA, December 20, 2012.

USDA: Risk Management Agency National Appeals Division Determinations Implementation Report as required by Section 14009(b) of the Food, Energy, and Conservation Act of 2008. Submitted by USDA, January 3, 2013.

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

DOT: Quarterly report for the period July 1 thru September 30, 2012, as required by section 906(b) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000. Submitted by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, January 22, 2013.

USDC: Report on the export licensing actions taken by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) relating to exports of agricultural commodities to Cuba from October through December 2012 as required by section 906(b) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000. Submitted by the Department of Commerce, January 25, 2013.

USDA: Department of Agriculture 2012 Equitable Relief Report as required by section 1613 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act. Submitted by USDA, February 4, 2013.

Farm Credit Administration: Report on Fiscal Year 2014 Proposed Budget and Performance Plan. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, February 7, 2013.

USDA: Annual Report on USDA's Federal Grain Inspection Service (FGIS) pursuant to section 87 of the U.S. Grain Standards Act. Submitted by USDA, February 6, 2013.

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

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

USDA: Proposed Bye Real Estate and Development land exchange referred to as Submission No. 02/01-13 located on the Hoosier National Forest within Crawford and Orange counties, State of Indiana. Submitted by USDA, February 21, 2013.

USDA: Report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency: Biomass Crop Assistance Program, Energy Feedstocks From Farmers and Foresters. Submitted by USDA, February 2013.

USDA: Proposed Simplot-Dairy Syncline Land Exchange referred to as Submission No. 03/02-25, located on the Caribou-Targhee Na-

tional Forest within Caribou County, State of Idaho. Submitted by USDA, March 5, 2013.

USDI: Submission of the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement (FLAME) Act Suppression Expenditures for Interior and Agriculture Agencies: March 2013 Forecasts for Fiscal Year 2013. Submitted by the U.S. Department of the Interior, March 6, 2013.

USDA: Report on the Global Effort to Reduce Child Hunger and Increase School Attendance as required by section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002. Submitted by USDA, March 13, 2013.

USDA: Proposed Backbone Ridge purchase located in the Grandfather District of the Pisgah National Forest. Submitted by USDA, March 18, 2013.

USDA: In compliance with P.L. 92-463, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, enclosed is a copy of a recently approved Federal Advisory Committee Charter: Secure Rural Schools Act Resource Advisory Committee. Submitted by USDA, March 19, 2013.

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

FCA: 2012 Annual Report as required under the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act). Submitted by FCA, March 27, 2013.

FCSIC: Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation 2012 Annual Report as required under the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act). Submitted by FCSIC, March 27, 2013.

USDHHS: Twelfth Report to Congress on Indicators of Welfare Dependence as required by the Welfare Indicators Act of 1994. Submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services, March 29, 2013.

FCA: Final Rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, as required under 5. U.S.C. 801(a)(1). Submitted by Farm Credit Administration, April 3, 2013.

USDA: 2012 Annual Report on the Packers and Stockyards Program as required by the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921. Submitted by USDA, April 3, 2013.

USDA: 2012 Annual Report of the Farmland Protection Policy Act pursuant to section 1546 of FPPA, 7 U.S.C. 4207. Submitted by USDA, April 3, 2013.

EPA: 2012 Annual Report pursuant to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002. Submitted by EPA, April 8, 2013.

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

GAO: Report on major rule promulgated by USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, entitled "Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Pro-

gram: Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program” (RIN: 0585–AE07).

Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Investigative Report “JPMorgan Chase Whale Trades: A Case History of Derivatives Risks and Abuses”. Submitted by the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, April 15, 2013.

USTR: Report on proposed modification to current U.S. country of origin labeling (COOL) regulations to implement recommendations and rulings of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Dispute Settlement Body (DSB). Submitted by the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, April 18, 2013.

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

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

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

USDA: Federal Advisory Committee Charter: Agricultural Air Quality Task Force as required by P.L. 92–463, The Federal Advisory Committee Charter. Submitted by USDA, April 15, 2013.

USDC: Quarterly Report to Congress on Activities Undertaken by the Department of Commerce pursuant to section 906(b) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000. Submitted by U.S. Department of Commerce, April 16, 2013.

EPA: Annual Report to Congress pursuant to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002. Submitted by EPA, April 23, 2013.

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

FCA: The final rule adopted by the Farm Credit Administration Board under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 which amends Title 12, Chapter VI of the *Code of Federal Regulations*. Submitted by the Farm Credit Administration, April 19, 2013.

USDA: Letter from David R. Shipman, Administrator, USDA, informing the Committee and Chairman that the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) intends to release a copy of the current list of all individual growers, farmers and processors eligible to vote on the current Federal pistachio marketing order. Submitted by USDA, April 26, 2013.

USDA: The annual Administrative Expenses of Research and Promotion Boards Supervised by Agriculture Marketing Service report. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, May 2, 2013.

USDA: The Federal Advisory Committee Charters: Forestry Research Advisory Council and the Recreation Resource Advisory Committees. Submitted by USDA, May 3, 2013.

GAO: Report on the major rule promulgated by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, entitled "Clearing Exemption for Swaps Between Certain Affiliated Entities." Pursuant to section 801(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code. Submitted by the United States Government Accountability Office on May 6, 2013.

EPA: Letter from the Arthur A. Elkins, Jr., EPA, requesting input in an effort to achieve its mission of preventing and detecting fraud, waste and abuse in EPA programs and operations. Submitted by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, May 8, 2013.

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

USDA: The annual USDA AMS National Organic Cost-Share Programs Report to Congress. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, May 10, 2013.

DOE: The Charter establishing the Biomass R&D Technical Advisory Committee. Submitted by the United States Department of Energy, May 13, 2013.

USDA: Letter from the Secretary of Agriculture expressing the USDA's views on H.R. 818, the Healthy Forest Management and Wildlife Prevention Act. Submitted by USDA, May 14, 2013.

USDA: The U.S. International Food Assistance Report 2011 as required by section 407 of the Food for Peace Act. Submitted by USDA and USAID, May 17, 2013.

USDA: The report on the implementation of the 2008 amendments to the Lacey Act, as required by Congress by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. Submitted by Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, May 21, 2013.

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

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

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

USDA: The annual report on the No FEAR Act of 2002 for Fiscal Year 2012. Submitted by Joe Leonard, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, USDA, May 22, 2013.

DOI: Estimate of anticipated wildfire suppression costs for Fiscal Year 2013. Submitted by Sally Jewell, DOI, May 23, 2013.

USDA: Semiannual Report to Congress published by the Office of Inspector General at the USDA highlighting the accomplishments from October 1, 2012 through March 20, 2013. Submitted by Phyllis K. Fong, Inspector General, USDA, May 31, 2013.

USTelecom: Letter of thanks for supporting the industry with the Federal Communications Commission's finalization of its rules. Submitted by Walter B. McCormick, Jr., USTELECOM, May 31, 2013.

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

GAO: Report on the major rule promulgated by the Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Marketing Service, entitled "Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling of Beef, Pork, Lamb, Chicken, Goat Meat, Wild and Farm-Raised Fish and Shellfish, Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Peanuts, Pecans, Ginseng, and Macadamia Nuts". Submitted by Robert J. Cramer, GAO, June 10, 2013.

USDA: Informing the Committee on Agriculture of the Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Science Division Realignment and Regionalization Plan. Submitted by Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, June 13, 2013.

GAO: Report on a major rule promulgated by the CFTC entitled "Core Principles and Other Requirements for Swap Execution Facilities". Submitted by Robert J. Cramer, GAO, June 17, 2013.

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

USDA: Copies of two recently approved Federal Advisory Committee Charters: Forest Resource Coordinating Committee and Lake Tahoe Basin Federal Advisory Committee. Submitted by Ashlee N. Johnson, USDA, June 24, 2013.

DOI: Public Review and Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Shasta Lake Water Resources Investigation. Submitted by David G. Murillo, Regional Director, DOI, June 25, 2013.

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

USDA: Letter recommending to move forward with the proposed TNC A960 purchase, a 1,190 parcel of land located in Florida. Submitted by Robert Bonnie, USDA, June 14, 2013.

Farm Credit Administration: Proposed amendments to title 12, chapter VI of the *Code of Federal Regulations* as promulgated by the Farm Credit Administration (FCA). Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, FCA, July 9, 2013.

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

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

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

CFTC: Letter regarding the upcoming reauthorization of the CFTC. Submitted by Bart Chilton, U.S. CFTC, July 19, 2013.

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

USDA: Copy of the Federal Advisory Committee Charter regarding Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee, in compliance with P.L. 92-463. Submitted by Ashlee N. Johnson, USDA, July 29, 2013.

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

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

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

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

Farm Credit Administration: Interim rule under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 amending Title 12, chapter VI of the *Code of Federal Regulations*. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, FCA, August 14, 2013.

USAID: U.S. Agency for International Development's report to Congress titled Multilateral Development Banks' Assistance Proposals Likely to Have Adverse Impacts on the Environment, Natural Resources, Public Health and Indigenous Peoples covering August 2012 to march 2013. Submitted by Charles Cooper, USAID, August 19, 2013.

USDA: Office of Inspector General's management challenges report for 2013 as required by the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000. Submitted by Phyllis K. Fong, USDA, August 19, 2013.

USDA: Federal Information Security Management Act Report for fiscal year 2012. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, September 3, 2013.

USDA: Foreign Holdings of U.S. Agricultural Land through December 31, 2011 Report reflecting data and according to the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978. Submitted by Juan M. Garcia, USDA, September 4, 2013.

CFTC: Letter supporting the language related to targeted transaction fees being imposed upon traders of futures and swaps. Submitted by Bart Chilton, U.S. CFTC, September 12, 2012.

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

EPA: Draft rules pursuant to Section 25(a)(3) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. Submitted by James J. Jones, U.S. EPA, September 13, 2013.

EPA: Letter in support of the charter renewal of the Children's Health Protection Advisory Committee in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App 2. Submitted by Gina McCarthy, U.S. EPA, September 13, 2013.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: Letter urging against Section 4024 of H.R. 1947 and Nutrition Assistance Programs. Submitted by Juan E. Hernández, Executive Director, September 16, 2013.

USDA: Report responding to the requirement of section 4405 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, September 23, 2013.

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

Congress: Letter to CFTC Chairman Gensler and Commissioners Chilton, O'Malia, and Wetjen regarding concerns of the November 14, 2012 proposed rule to improve protections for futures customers. Submitted by Hon. Frank D. Lucas, Hon. Debbie Stabenow, Hon. Collin C. Peterson, Hon. Thad Cochran, September 25, 2013.

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

USDA: Request for a copy of the 2012/2013 Independent Raisin Grower List from the Raisin Administrative Committee as requested by the Agricultural Marketing Service under the Freedom of Information Act. Submitted by Rex A. Barnes, USDA, October 22, 2013.

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

DOI: Forecast of fire suppression expenditures for Fiscal Year 2014 pursuant to the Federal Land Assistance Management Act of 2009. Submitted by Sally Jewell, DOI, October 28, 2013.

USDA: Annual FLAME Report for fiscal year 2012 pursuant to the requirements outlined in Title V—FLAME Act of 2009. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, October 28, 2013.

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

DOC: Export Licensing Actions Report taken by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security relating to exports of agricultural commodities to Cuba from July 1 through Sep-

tember 30, 2013. Submitted by Eric L. Hirschhorn, United States Department of Commerce, Under Secretary for Industry and Security, November 6, 2013.

USDA: Recommendation to move forward with the proposed North Carolina Mountain Land Conservancy Purchase regarding 77,988 acres located in Henderson County, North Carolina. Submitted by Robert Bonnie, USDA, November 7, 2013.

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

USDA: Special Nutrition Programs Report No. CN-13-DC pursuant to section 4301 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, November 14, 2013.

USDA: Activities of the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program Report as required by Section 702 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended. Submitted by Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack, USDA, November 21, 2013.

Farm Credit Administration: Semiannual report prepared by the Inspector General of the Farm Credit Administration for the period of April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978. Submitted by Jill Long Thompson, FCA, November 22, 2013.

EPA: Initial evaluation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's classified information program as required by the Reducing Over-Classification Act. Submitted by Arthur A. Elkins, Jr., EPA, November 22, 2013.

GAO: Enhancing Protections Afforded Customers and Customer Funds Held by Futures Commission Merchants and Derivatives Clearing Organizations report promulgated by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Submitted by Robert J. Cramer, GAO, November 27, 2013.

#### C. MEMORIALS

Memorial No. 31 of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 149 requiring the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration to come up with a nation-wide system for monitoring, labeling, and enforcing the labeling of all whole and processed genetically engineered foods. Submitted May 22, 2013.

Memorial No. 140 of the Legislature of the Territory of Virgin Islands, relative to Resolution No. 1794 urging the Congress adopt H.R. 92. Submitted October 10, 2013.

#### D. PETITIONS

Petition No. 21 of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York relative to Resolution No. 186 urging the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 712. Submitted May 23, 2013.