

**2008 Explanatory Notes
Departmental Administration**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Staff Offices:	
Purpose Statement	2-1
Statement of Available Funds and Staff Years	2-2
Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year	2-3
Motor Vehicle Fleet Data	2-4
Appropriations Language	2-6
Lead-off Tabular Statement	2-6
Project Statement	2-7
Justifications	2-8
Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years	2-8
Classification by Objects	2-9
Status of Program	2g-1
Summary of Budget and Performance:	
Statement of Goals and Objectives	2-10
Key Performance Outcomes and Measures	2-15
Full Cost by Strategic Objective	2-17
 Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments:	
Purpose Statement	2-18
Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year	2-19
Appropriations Language	2-20
Lead-off Tabular Statement	2-20
Project Statement	2-21
Justifications	2-22
Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years	2-23
Classification by Objects	2-24
Status of Program	2g-8
Summary of Budget and Performance:	
Statement of Goals and Objectives	2-25
Key Performance Outcomes and Measures	2-28
Full Cost by Strategic Objective	2-30
 Hazardous Materials Management:	
Purpose Statement	2-31
Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year	2-32
Appropriations Language	2-33
Lead-off Tabular Statement	2-33
Project Statement	2-34
Justifications	2-34
Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years	2-35
Classification by Objects	2-36
Status of Program	2g-10
Summary of Budget and Performance:	
Statement of Goals and Objectives	2-37
Key Performance Outcomes and Measures	2-38
Full Cost by Strategic Goal	2-39
 Advisory Committees:	
USDA Advisory Committees	2-40
Status of Program	2g-11

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Purpose Statement

Departmental Administration (DA) was established to provide management leadership to ensure that the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) administrative programs, policies, advice, and counsel meet the needs of USDA program organizations, consistent with laws and mandates; and provide safe and efficient facilities and services to customers. DA's functions include human resources management, procurement and property management, emergency preparedness, hazardous materials management, government ethics, facilities management, and small business utilization programs. The administrative law functions and the Judicial Officer have been placed within DA for administrative purposes.

Headquarters. The majority of the Departmental Administration functional activities are located in Washington, D.C. As of September 30, 2006, there were 432 employees, of whom 398 were full-time permanent employees and 34 were other than full-time permanent employees included under Departmental Administration. These employees were assigned as follows (includes DA Direct, DA Reimbursement, and Working Capital Fund including the Office of Executive Secretariat):

<u>Location</u>	<u>Full-Time Permanent</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Washington, DC:			
DA (Direct & Reimb)	218	30	248
DA WCF	149	0	149
OES	23	4	27
Subtotal	390	34	424
Field Units:			
DA (Direct & Reimb)	8	0	8
Total	398	34	432

GAO Reports:

#130530	March 2006	Worker Safety in the Aftermath of Hurricane Katrina
#197012	March 2006	Managerial Cost Accounting Practices at Large Federal Agencies
#310764	May 2006	Continuity of Operations Forward Challenge 06 Exercise
#310752	April 2006	e-Government Travel Use of Small Business
#310766	August 2006	FOIA Implementation
#320406	August 2006	Review of Department of State/Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Aviation Programs
#450499	September 2006	Review of Benefits and Challenges of Return Preparation on IRS Web site
#543177	October 2006	Federal Leasing Trends and Challenges

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
Available Funds and Staff Years
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

Item	2006		2007		2008	
	Actual	Staff	Estimated	Staff	Estimated	Staff
	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years
Direct Appropriation:						
Departmental Administration.....	\$23,103,000	176	\$23,008,000	180	\$24,608,000	180
Rescission.....	-231,030	--	--	--	--	--
Transfer to WCF.....	-200,000	--	--	--	--	--
Ag. Buildings & Facilities.....	187,734,000	74	179,272,000	86	216,837,000	86
Rescission.....	-1,877,340	--	--	--	--	--
Hazardous Materials Mgmt.....	12,000,000	7	12,020,000	7	12,200,000	7
Rescission.....	-120,000	--	--	--	--	--
Total Direct	220,408,630	257	214,300,000	273	253,645,000	273
Obligations under other						
USDA appropriations:						
Departmental Administration:						
Radiation Safety.....	940,274	7	900,000	7	950,000	7
Honor Awards.....	45,927	--	80,000	--	97,000	--
Homeland Security Activities...	5,815,892	8	2,886,000	18	3,500,000	18
IT Support Services.....	570,942	4	700,000	7	725,000	7
HR Training/Software.....	1,813,766	--	487,000	--	500,000	--
Biobased Products.....	385,999	--	350,000	--	350,000	--
Flexible Spending Acct.....	1,535,536	--	1,536,000	--	1,700,000	--
Drug Testing.....	112,499	--	138,000	--	141,000	--
Shuttle Services.....	351,507	--	357,000	--	360,000	--
Personnel Details.....	222,370	2	--	--	--	--
TARGET Center.....	946,847	2	900,000	4	1,018,000	4
Visitor Center.....	136,485	1	260,000	3	377,000	3
Operations Center.....	3,226,418	4	1,894,000	5	2,352,000	5
OSEC Drivers.....	70,979	1	73,000	1	75,000	1
Interpreter Service.....	717,893	1	229,000	2	534,000	2
OCFO IT Services.....	302,371	--	307,000	--	310,000	--
Travel to Admin. Hearings.....	74,990	--	77,000	--	79,000	--
Board of Contract Appeals.....	664,393	4	149,000	1	--	--
Misc. Reimbursements.....	286,897	1	300,000	3	325,000	3
WCF Admin. Support Cost.....	4,651,886	29	4,652,000	36	4,787,000	36
Subtotal, DA Reimb.....	22,873,871	64	16,275,000	87	18,180,000	86
Ag. Buildings & Facilities:						
Other Building Services.....	5,111,576	--	2,600,000	--	2,600,000	--
Total Reimbursements.....	27,985,447	64	18,875,000	87	20,780,000	86
Working Capital Fund:						
Administration.....	25,592,188	141	27,263,000	172	26,319,000	172
Corporate Systems.....	15,131,526	8	14,263,000	10	14,414,000	10
Purchase of Equipment.....	8,491,000	--	--	--	--	--
Total, Working Capital Fund.....	49,214,714	149	41,526,000	182	40,733,000	182
Total Departmental Administration	297,608,791	470	274,701,000	542	315,158,000	541

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year Summary
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

Grade	2006			2007			2008		
	Wash DC	Field	Total	Wash DC	Field	Total	Wash DC	Field	Total
Senior Executive Service	7	1	8	8	--	8	8	--	8
CA-01	1	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--
CA-02	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
CA-03	2	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
AL-3	3	--	3	3	--	3	3	--	3
SL-1	1	--	1	1	--	1	1	--	1
GS-15	30	--	30	31	--	31	31	--	31
GS-14	70	1	71	75	1	76	75	1	76
GS-13	55	3	58	61	3	64	61	3	64
GS-12	27	1	28	31	1	32	31	1	32
GS-11	6	--	6	8	--	8	8	--	8
GS-10	7	--	7	8	--	8	8	--	8
GS-9	7	1	8	7	1	8	7	1	8
GS-8	13	--	13	13	--	13	13	--	13
GS-7	12	1	13	7	1	8	7	1	8
Ungraded Pos.	6	--	6	6	--	6	6	--	6
Total Permanent Positions	248	8	256	260	7	267	259	7	266
Unfilled Positions end-of-year	-30	--	-30	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total, Permanent Full-time Employment, end-of-year	218	8	226	260	7	267	259	7	266
Staff Year Estimate	232	8	240	260	7	267	259	7	266

Note: This chart includes DA Direct and DA Reimbursement positions.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET DATA

SIZE, COMPOSITION AND COST OF MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET

The 2008 Budget Estimates propose no additional purchases of vehicles.

Departmental Administration (DA) uses vehicles to support the mission of providing customer support to the USDA offices in the Washington, DC metro-area. DA provides mail and courier services, facility management, shuttle services, and the disposition of excess property. In addition, DA provides driving services to the Office of the Secretary, and other executive staff at USDA.

The Central Mail Unit supports DA's mission by providing daily scheduled and unscheduled pick-up and delivery service of mail to 18 USDA satellite locations throughout the Washington, DC metropolitan area, including suburban Maryland and Virginia. Vehicles are also used for scheduled service to Capitol Hill, the Executive Office Buildings, and to the Office of the Federal Register. As needed, vehicles are used for transporting employees to special conferences and/or meetings within the local area. The Centralized Excess Property Operations moves excess equipment and furniture between USDA offices and the warehouse. This service removes excess furniture and equipment from offices that no longer need it, and provides excess furniture to those offices that have a need. In addition to providing transportation services to a limited number of Departmental executives attending meetings in the Washington-metro area, DA also provides emergency transportation services if needed. DA has a full size truck on hand for moving large equipment items between buildings and meeting snow removal needs for the headquarters offices.

DA owns one vehicle, a SUV used for transporting equipment and building supplies between the headquarters buildings, and snow removal.

DA leases sedans from the General Services Administration (GSA) and commercial companies for transporting employees.

Changes to the motor vehicle fleet. No changes are proposed to the fleet.

Replacement of passenger motor vehicles. Departmental Administration will replace the leased vehicles every 2 to 4 years depending on the mileage of the vehicle. The GSA-leased vehicles are replaced based on the GSA regulations.

During the fiscal year 2006, Departmental Administration replaced two of the SUVs leased for passenger transportation. For an extended period while these vehicles were being adapted for carrying senior officials, Departmental Administration was leasing four vehicles rather than just two.

Impediments to managing the motor vehicle fleet. There are no identified impediments to managing the motor vehicle fleet in the most cost-effective manner. A major cost of managing the fleet is the cost of fuel. In the past 3 years, gasoline and ethanol has risen dramatically. Departmental administration is committed to using E85 as an alternative to gasoline and requires at all newly leased or purchased vehicles be E*% compatible.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET DATA

Size, composition and cost of agency motor vehicle fleet as of September 30, 2006 are as follows:

Size, Composition, and Annual Cost
(in thousands of dollars)

Fiscal Year	Number of Vehicles by Type							Total Number of Vehicles	Annual Operating Cost (\$ in thous)
	Sedans and Station Wagons	Light Trucks, SUVs and Vans		Medium Duty Vehicles	Ambulances	Buses	Heavy Duty Vehicles		
		4X2	4X4						
FY 2005	2	5	10	8	0	0	0	25	\$69
Change from 2005	0	-1	+1	0	0	0	0	0	\$18
FY 2006	2	4	11	8	0	0	0	25	\$87
Change from 2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$4
FY 2007	2	4	11	8	0	0	0	25	\$91
Change from 2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$4
FY 2008	2	4	11	8	0	0	0	25	\$95

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

The estimates include appropriation language for this item as follows (new language underscored; deleted matter enclosed in brackets):

Departmental Administration:

For Departmental Administration, \$24,608,000 to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration, security, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

Lead-off Tabular Statement

Estimate, 2007.....		\$22,872,000
Budget Estimate, 2008		<u>24,608,000</u>
Increase in Appropriation.....		<u>+1,736,000</u>
Adjustments in 2007:		
Estimate, 2007.....	22,872,000	
Transfer FOIA function and FTE from OC <u>a/</u>	<u>+136,000</u>	
Adjusted base for 2007.....		23,008,000
Budget Estimate, 2008		<u>24,608,000</u>
Increase over adjusted 2007.....		<u>+1,600,000</u>

a/ Adjusted to reflect the redelegation of funding and 1 FTE from the Office of Communications for the Freedom of Information Act function under 7 C.F.R. 2.36.

Summary of Increases and Decreases
(On basis of appropriation)

<u>Item of Change</u>	<u>2007 Estimated</u>	<u>Pay Costs</u>	<u>Program Changes</u>	<u>2008 Estimated</u>
Departmental Administration	\$23,008,000	+\$905,000	+\$695,000	\$24,608,000

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Project Statement
(On basis of appropriation)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Estimated</u>		<u>Increase or Decrease</u>	<u>2008 Estimate</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount a/</u>	<u>Staff Years a/</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
Departmental Administration	22,500,038	176	23,008,000	180	+1,600,000	24,608,000	180
Unobligated Balance	171,932	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total Available or Estimate	22,671,970	176	23,008,000	180	+1,600,000	24,608,000	180
Rescission	231,030	--	--	--			
Transfer to WCF for Enterprise-wide Projects	200,000	--	--	--			
Total, Appropriation	23,103,000	176	--	--			

a/ Adjusted to reflect the redelegation of funding and 1 FTE from the Office of Communications for the Freedom of Information Act function under 7 C.F.R. 2.36.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Justifications for Increases and Decreases

(1) An increase of \$1,600,000 for Departmental Administration consisting of:

- a) An increase of \$695,000 is requested for providing support to policies, technical guidance, and operating environment of USDA's Continuity of Operations (COOP) Program.

An increase of \$695,000 is requested to ensure USDA is compliant with Executive Orders and Presidential Directives dealing with Emergency Preparedness and the requirements for Federal Executive Branch Continuity of Operations. With this increase, Departmental Administration will have the funding needed to maintain the COOP for the Office of the Secretary, provide guidance and training to mission areas, and provide support and training to USDA's National Emergency Preparedness Team.

- b) A total increase of \$905,000 for pay costs, of which \$484,000 is for 2008 increased pay costs, and \$421,000 is for 2007 pay costs.

These funds are necessary to continue administrative support services to Department Headquarters and on-going programs in human resources management, supply, small business development and administrative law functions.

Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

	2006		2007		2008	
	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years
District of Columbia.....	\$22,357,670	174	\$22,859,875	178	\$24,454,961	178
Maryland.....	142,368	2	148,125	2	153,039	2
Subtotal, Available or Estimate.....	22,500,038	176	23,008,000	180	24,608,000	180
Unobligated balance.....	171,932					
Total, Available or Estimate.....	22,671,970	176	23,008,000	180	24,608,000	180

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Classification by Objects
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Personnel Compensation:			
Washington, D.C.....	\$14,239,794	\$15,073,000	\$15,798,000
Field	--	--	--
11 Total personnel compensation	14,239,794	15,073,000	15,798,000
12 Personnel benefits.....	3,090,337	3,753,000	3,933,000
13 Benefits to former personnel.....	6,017	--	--
Total pers. comp. & benefits.....	17,336,148	18,826,000	19,731,000
Other Objects:			
21 Travel and transportation of persons	116,166	113,000	113,000
22 Transportation of things.....	3,429	7,000	7,000
23.3 Communications, utilities, and misc. charges	609,945	471,000	540,000
24 Printing and reproduction	174,968	166,000	166,000
25.2 Other services	2,160,553	1,801,000	2,148,000
25.3 Purchases of goods and services from Government Accounts.....	1,344,043	1,350,000	1,550,000
26 Supplies and materials	243,594	250,000	291,000
31 Equipment.....	509,147	24,000	62,000
42 Insurance Claims and Indemnities	361	--	--
43 Interest.....	1,684	--	--
Total other objects	5,163,890	4,182,000	4,877,000
Total direct obligations	22,500,038	23,008,000	24,608,000
Position Data:			
Average Salary, ES positions	\$156,948	\$160,628	\$164,162
Average Salary, GS positions.....	\$81,151	\$72,855	\$76,440
Average Grade, GS positions	13.2	12.8	12.8

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

STATUS OF PROGRAM

Current Activities:

Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP). The USDA HQ COOP Plan was revised to include new requirements of Federal Preparedness Circular (FPC) 65 in the areas of, Human Capital, Devolution and Reconstitution. A Devolution plan is under development and the plan will regularly be updated to reflect the best practices and guidance of FPC 65. This will ensure continued direction of USDA in a catastrophic event that renders leadership unavailable or incapable of supporting execution of essential functions, takes into account threats and conditions that employees are likely to face in emergencies, and eases the burden on COOP facilities. New COOP communication requirements are under development by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and expected to be released in FY 2007. A Departmental Regulation to identify agency and staff office responsibilities for COOP planning is in the review process along with a Departmental Manual containing specific guidance on implementation of planning guidance. The plan serves as the base document for the agency COOP supplements, and as the core document for the Department's 2-year COOP plan review and 5-year exercise cycle.

Affirmative Biobased Procurement Program Model. In accordance with Section 9002 of the 2002 Farm Bill, USDA has leadership responsibility for the development of a Model Biobased Products Affirmative Procurement Program (APP). On January 11, 2006, USDA completed its draft APP and posted it on its biobased website at <http://www.usda.gov/biobased>. The APP formally establishes USDA's Biobased Procurement Program for USDA-designated biobased items and provides agency-wide guidance for implementing an effective program. The Department of Agriculture's APP ensures items composed of biobased material will be purchased to the maximum extent practicable and will serve as the government-wide model to achieve the Section 9002 goals.

Corporate Property Automated Information System (CPAIS). The Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM) is approximately mid-way through Phase II of CPAIS; the requirements document has been completed and the detailed design document is underway. The anticipated implementation date for the personal property phase of CPAIS is June 2007. The Department has successfully completed the transition from the Departmental Excess Personal Property Coordinator (DEPPC) system to the General Services Administration's (GSA) Agency Asset Management System (AAMS) for reporting Departmental excess property for disposal. This process has eliminated a mostly paper, manual-intensive process to an all electronic process.

Federal Real Property Asset Management Plan. Federal Real Property Asset Management, a component of the President's Management Agenda, is evaluated quarterly by the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) management scorecard and reported in the Department's "Proud-To-Be" annual plan. Pursuant to Executive Order 13327, Federal Real Property Asset Management, USDA OPPM has designated a Senior Real Property Officer who: actively serves on the Federal Real Property Council (FRPC); chairs a USDA Real Property Council; establishes asset management performance measures consistent with published requirements of the FRPC; maintains a comprehensive inventory and profile of agency real property; and provides timely and accurate information for inclusion in GSA's Federal Real Property Profile inventory system for FY 2006. OPPM is currently developing the baselines and targets for performance measures, the three-year rolling timeline, a comprehensive asset management plan, and identifying best practices for possible adaptation in managing the Asset Management Program to meet the requirements in the Proud-To-Be IV.

Electronics Stewardship. USDA is a signatory to the Federal Electronics Stewardship Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and identified two USDA facilities as Federal Electronics Challenge (FEC) partners. In FY 2006, one USDA FEC partner site focused on the operations and management phase of electronics stewardship and the second site focused on end-of-life electronics management.

USDA, along with 11 other Departments and agencies, signed an MOU to develop and promote common strategies for using environmentally sustainable technologies and practices to improve the quality, performance, and environmental management of Federal electronic assets throughout their life cycle. Action items resulting from this MOU will contribute to reduced energy use in USDA facilities.

Physical Security. USDA conducts its programs in approximately 25,000 buildings at more than 7,000 sites around the world. Assets unique to USDA that require protection include aircraft, dams, artillery/weapons, and laboratories, to name a few. Since September 11, 2001, USDA has conducted security assessments (Phase I) at over 300 facilities including all 205 determined to be mission-critical facilities. As the follow-on to the physical security assessments, USDA is implementing security countermeasures (Phase II) that were recommended during the review process at these facilities to mitigate their risks to the maximum extent possible. Work under Phase II, implementation of security countermeasures has been completed at 36 sites; one is currently under contract; and 15 sites are due to begin in FY 2007. USDA will continue to schedule and conduct assessments, provide recommendations on countermeasures needed, and implement those countermeasures as quickly as possible.

In addition to the on-site assessments, DA co-chairs the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD-12) implementation efforts at USDA along with the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO). A Departmental manual, Departmental regulation and implementation plan for HSPD-12 has been drafted. This has ensured USDA's compliance with all OMB-mandated milestones in FY 2006. As HSPD-12 requires more technical infrastructure, there is also a requirement to design and build an HSPD-12 compliant Physical Access Control System (ePACS). The ePACS will enterprise all of USDA's physical access control systems to leverage costs, provide Departmental system updates, and will help USDA achieve interoperability.

A GIS-Security Information System database has been developed to provide security information on all MCFs, and serves as a single location for all information concerning assessed facilities within USDA. A security self-assessment tool, Critical Risk Information System, has been developed to allow agencies and facilities to self-assess themselves with the help of a security analyst. Significant strides have been taken to identify and map mission-critical functions of the agencies and mission areas and their role in USDA continuity of operations. As a next step, templates are being developed for locations to use in establishing plans that will enable them to respond to a variety of emergency situations while continuing to operate.

Office of Human Capital Management (OHCM). OHCM continues to lead the Department's efforts in meeting the human capital initiatives embodied in the President's Management Agenda. Specifically, OHCM will continue to implement a Strategic Human Capital Plan that is fully integrated with the Department's strategic plan and annual performance goals. USDA will evaluate its leadership succession plan against specified targets and goals to ensure continuous learning, knowledge transfer, and professional development to enhance the leadership talent pool for the future. OHCM will sponsor an 18 – 24 month Senior Executive development program with a competitive entry process and a rigorous series of developmental activities including completion of college courses at American University. OHCM will administer the Department's human resources accountability system ensuring that human capital goals and programs are aligned with and support the USDA mission; that human capital planning is guided by a data driven, results-oriented process that periodically analyzes human capital data to assess results or progress toward goal achievement; and that managers and human resources practitioners are held accountable for their human capital decisions and actions. By performing annual compliance audits of USDA human resources offices, OHCM will assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department's human resources management functions and ensure human capital programs and policies adhere to merit system principles and other pertinent laws and regulations.

OHCM will conduct 19 such compliance reviews. OHCM will ensure accountability for implementation of the human capital recommendations associated with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123, Managements' Responsibility for Internal Control. OHCM will lead the Department's efforts to expand Web accessibility and functionality for human resources information and processing. OHCM will promote competency-based training and continue to increase the percentage of training provided over the Web and through distance learning.

Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU). OSDBU has the primary responsibility as the lead USDA agency for implementing the Department's small business program to provide maximum opportunity for small, small and disadvantaged, HUBZone, women-owned, veteran-owned, and service disabled veteran-owned businesses to participate in USDA contracting processes and to fully integrate small business into all aspects of USDA contracting and program activities to attain its Federally mandated small business goals for USDA's contracting portfolio.

Small Business Food Commodity Participation Program. OSDBU initiated new efforts to improve the competitiveness and participation rates of small businesses in USDA's largest procurement sector -- food and commodities contracting. Major USDA prime contractors (mentors) in the food processing industry will assist small disadvantaged as well as service disabled veteran-owned businesses (protégés) develop technical and business capabilities. This will allow them to compete successfully for prime and subcontract awards for USDA food commodities, sharpen their skills in teaming relationships, understand the complexities of working in the Federal sector, and bolster their business capacity.

Administrative Law. The Office of Administrative Law Judges conducts rule making and adjudicatory hearings throughout the United States in proceedings subject to the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. 554 *et seq.* The Judges issue initial decisions and orders in adjudicatory proceedings that become final decisions of the Secretary unless appealed to the Secretary's Judicial Officer by a party to the proceedings. The Judicial Officer serves as the final deciding officer in regulatory proceedings of a quasi-judicial nature.

Office of Operations (OO). In FY 2006, OO continued to implement improvements in systems and processes as a result of issues identified in the comprehensive customer satisfaction survey completed in FY 2005. Improvements were made in many areas including: TARGET Center support and evaluations for employees with handicaps; health-related seminars provided to all employees to encourage a healthier and more knowledgeable workforce; and coordinated responses to building emergencies. In FY 2007, OO will re-survey the customers and continue to build on the results.

Selected Examples of Recent Progress:

Affirmative Biobased Procurement Program Model. In FY 2006, USDA completed a successful pilot of biobased cafeteria-ware to test the effectiveness of the products and to determine patron acceptability of biobased, food service products. USDA also developed additional tools to support biobased initiatives including: sample contract templates, cost availability guidelines, designated product catalog, awareness brochure, and an Agriculture Acquisition Regulation Advisory for tracking and reporting of biobased contract requirements. In FY 2007, USDA plans to continue development of online awareness training and additional outreach materials.

Energy Management Program. OPPM has Departmental policy and oversight for energy resources used by USDA facilities. During FY 2006, OPPM began implementation of new initiatives to meet requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPACT). These accomplishments included development of a Departmental electric metering plan and issuance of a Departmental regulation requiring use of renewable energy and sustainable building practices. USDA also purchased renewable energy credits, positioning the Department to achieve the renewable energy performance metric requirement of EPACT and the OMB energy management scorecard.

Office of Human Capital Management (OHCM). OHCM made significant strides in designing and implementing numerous strategic human capital initiatives at both the Departmental and mission area levels. Each initiative required significant collaboration with stakeholders both external and internal. Key accomplishments included: 1) Development of a comprehensive USDA Leadership Succession Plan; obtained Office of Personnel Management (OPM) approval of the Plan. The Plan focused on the employee life-cycle and mitigation strategies to address the impact of USDA's pending retirement "wave", particularly with respect to its mission critical occupations; 2) Development of a comprehensive USDA Human Capital Accountability Program and Implementation Plan; obtained OPM approval of both; 3) Continued progress and success in closing occupational competency gaps throughout USDA. Gap closure was achieved on 18 of 19 mission critical occupations. Analysis of gaps and development of strategies to accomplish gap closure in other occupations such as human resources management (HRM) continued on a robust schedule; 4) Led efforts that resulted in USDA achieving the best hiring timeline for General Schedule (GS) employees for a Cabinet level agency in the Federal government. Average hiring timelines for GS employees dropped from more than 40 days to just over 21 days during the year; 5) Made significant improvements in USDA's SES program in FY 2006 including a reduction in hiring timelines. USDA obtained the second best SES hiring timeline in the Federal government. Hiring timelines for SES employees decreased from more than 100 days to just over 39 days; 6) Led the effort for transitioning all USDA agencies to a multi-level performance appraisal system; by June 2006, all agencies had made the transition; 7) Increased the involvement of USDA senior management in developing Human Capital Internal Scorecards. This increased visibility resulted in improved human capital accomplishments in USDA agencies and on the President's Management Agenda scorecard. At the beginning of FY 2006, none of USDA's 22 agencies and staff offices had received higher than a "yellow" score. At the end of FY 2006, eight of the 22 agencies and staff offices had been upgraded to "green" as a result of their accomplishments; 8) During Quarter 3, the human capital initiative for the President's Management Agenda received a "green" status rating from OPM and OMB, for fully or substantially completing nearly all identified human capital objectives; 9) Department-wide Executive Resource Boards were successfully piloted and made permanent, and the process for tracking and maintaining SES allocations was reengineered and simplified, resulting in more reliable statistics and quicker management decision-making; 10) Obtained OPM provisional certification of the USDA SES performance management system with several of the performance plans being used as models for other Federal agencies. Further, a cutting edge 24 month SES Candidate Development Program (SES CDP) was developed for GS 14/15 employees from throughout the Federal government. The USDA SES CDP is unique in that it incorporates a 12 college credit core development program conducted by American University and a rigorous assessment process that will be administered by OPM's Center for Talent Services.

Government Ethics. The Office of Ethics (OE) has developed and made available an Ethics Orientation module for new USDA employees. Under development is a module addressing ethics issues related to the Combined Federal Campaign. OE also worked with the OCIO to convert OE's "Ethics Sweepstakes" module to AgLearn. Also, OE has added to its Web site three self-service "walk through" guides for employees: "Can I Negotiate for Post-Employment and What Can I Do When I Leave USDA?", "Can I Participate in This Outside Organization" and "Can I Attend This Event." The office has made improvements of its online training tracking system; the in-house financial disclosure report tracking system; and its advice tracking system, named EthAdvice. As a result of EthAdvice, OE has issued 30 new advisories providing in-depth guidance to USDA ethics advisors on ethics issues, essentially increasing by 1/3 its current body of available guidance. For the fifth consecutive year, more than 98 percent of USDA's 697 public filers received annual ethics training, over 93 percent filed financial disclosure reports timely, and over 98 percent of those reports were initially reviewed in a timely manner. OE prompted, and is a significant participant in, the Office of Government Ethics' efforts to fashion consistent Federal ethics guidelines for use in disaster situations. In addition, to insure higher-risk positions received focused training, OE conducted instructor-based training for political appointees, approximately every six weeks, on subjects such as post employment and political activities.

Corporate Property Automated Information System. The requirements document for CPAIS has been completed and the detailed design document is underway. Upon completion and implementation of this phase of CPAIS, OPPM and the Office of the Chief Financial Officer will be able to retire legacy systems currently in use for personal property. The scope of the personal property phase will include interfaces with GSA's Autochoice, thereby, allowing motor vehicle acquisition data to feed from GSA to CPAIS. The Purchase Card Management System (PCMS) will feed CPAIS motor vehicle data, such as fuel, gallons and maintenance data. In addition, CPAIS will be able to feed motor vehicle data into the Federal Automotive Statistical Tool system to meet GSA and Department of Energy reporting requirements. These improvements will be a welcome enhancement to the personal property community.

Progress continues on the CPAIS real property asset management module which contains a comprehensive inventory and profile of agency real property (owned, leased, and GSA assigned) consistent with GSA's Federal Real Property Profile and requirements set forth in the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program and Departmental and agency-specific needs. OPPM has completed making necessary enhancements and changes to CPAIS to accommodate the requirements of the FRPC, specifically the level of detail for the identified 23 data elements, and will now begin changes to accommodate the added 24th data element to capture disposition data.

Personnel Security. OPPM received an average of 143 new investigative requests and adjudicated nearly 125 cases per month during FY 2006. In support of the Presidential e-Government initiative, agencies now electronically process background investigations for public trust and National security positions. USDA security clearance data is uploaded regularly into the Clearance Verification System (CVS), managed by the OPM. OPPM has volunteered to pilot test OPM's "Agency Direct" imaging program in FY 2007. OPPM enters FY 2007 in the Quality Assurance Testing phase of a revised, secure on-line personnel security database, which will track investigative requests and provide the real-time status of pending clearance actions. OPPM continues to assist USDA Human Resource Offices with the implementation of the electronic Standard Form 85, in an effort to streamline investigative requests required by HSPD-12 "Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees and Contractors."

Document Security. In FY 2006, OPPM managed hundreds of classified intelligence documents. Cabinet and senior officials received over 235 deliveries of the latest intelligence information on trade and terrorism issues. OPPM conducted annual security refresher training through published articles in the Personnel and Document Security Division's monthly bulletin, Web cast training, Web site updates, in-person security awareness refresher briefings for over 500 employees, and in-person security clearance training for 197 employees. Additionally, 4,000 documents have been reviewed for declassification.

COOP/Training. Five functional exercises from FY 2004 to FY 2005 refined USDA's capability to carry out essential functions during an emergency situation. FY 2006 marked the first time that twelve USDA agencies deployed to eight COOP sites during an exercise. Planned exercises in FY 2007 will strengthen USDA's capability to interact with other Federal Departments and agencies during emergency situations. Training will be expanded in FY 2007 to include COOP program awareness on AG Learn to USDA staff that is not directly involved in COOP activities.

COOP/Avian Influenza. Departmental Administration (DA) representatives are actively involved in USDA-wide Avian Influenza (AI) Working Groups to ensure emergency preparedness response activities are coordinated with other Federal agencies in the event of an AI outbreak in the United States. Development of a specific Pandemic Annex to the USDA HQ COOP plan is now in draft to include considerations to safeguard COOP personnel.

Continuity of Operations Strategic Plan. The Multi-year Strategy and Program Management Plan (MYS-PMP) has been revised to state the overall Departmental COOP status and identify program strategies and resources needed for improvements projected over a five year period. The revised MYS-PMP covers FY 2006 - FY 2010 and includes a Five Year Test, Training and Exercise Master Plan to ensure USDA agencies meet training and exercise objectives.

COOP/Human Pandemic Planning. DA representatives are actively involved in USDA-wide human influenza pandemic working groups to ensure emergency preparedness response activities are coordinated within USDA and between USDA and other Federal agencies in the event of an influenza pandemic in the United States. Well developed plans are crucial to ensure effective support to USDA agencies and ensure continuity of operations for mission critical USDA functions.

COOP/Emergency Planning. In efforts to ensure all employees are prepared for an emergency, OO increased the number of fire safety drills in the main USDA complex and the George Washington Carver Center, to ensure compliance with GSA standards and improved safety of employees. OO improved the Department's capability to alert, and inform employees, in real time, on weather and other local emergencies and warnings. OO has also established leadership in addressing employees with special needs in both planning and conducting drills. This experience was shared with other Federal Departments and agencies. Additionally, OO enhanced the Operations Center's role in meeting USDA responsibilities under the National Response Plan, and the capability of USDA agencies to respond to their mission emergency requirements (e.g., Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's response to animal disease).

Emergency Preparedness. The relatively new USDA Operations Center continues to mature and provide expanded services on a 24/7 basis. Emergency programs supported the hurricane damaged areas by coordinating support to displaced employees and by serving as the USDA point of contact for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for volunteer support. USDA has sent over 100 employees to assist FEMA in the volunteer outreach program and to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for their debris removal and roofing programs.

Medical Unit. The USDA medical unit continues to provide a wide variety of educational and preventative screening programs. In FY 2006, USDA employees made over 16,000 office visits to the Health Units. Included in this total were allergy shots, blood pressure checks, on the job injuries and travel-related immunizations. During the 2006/2007 flu season, USDA provided approximately 4,000 flu shots to USDA employees.

Small Business Goals. While the overall Government-wide goal is 23 percent of annual small business prime contract awards, USDA awarded 49 percent of the Department's prime contracts to small businesses, totaling \$2.01 billion. OSDBU worked closely with USDA's senior management and contracting offices and actively intervened in the acquisition process by reviewing all planned acquisitions not already set aside for small business competition; and made recommendations for small business set-aside acquisition strategies. In addition to increased accountability for USDA program executives, OSDBU implemented an aggressive outreach program to identify small businesses that offer solutions to USDA program and operational requirements and challenges.

USDA Small Business Contracting Program Agency Scorecard. In FY 2006, OSDBU instituted an internal Small Business Contracting Program Agency Scorecard to provide increased accountability for small business goal achievement by agency heads and program executives. The agency is scored on its small business outreach activities, the performance of agency small business specialists, submission of required clearance packages for contracts not set aside for small business, submission and completeness of procurement forecasts and subcontracting plans, and achievement of procurement goals.

Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) Strategic Initiative. During FY 2006, USDA continued to implement its SDVOSB Strategic Initiative. The USDA strategy serves as USDA's guide for executing the requirements of Executive Order 13360 by taking steps to significantly increase contracting and subcontracting opportunities for SDVOSB and to carry out the requirements of the Order and The Veterans Benefits Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-183). USDA agencies made a concerted effort to direct contracts to SDVOSBs in FY 2006 with an increased number of prime contract awards to these firms over the preceding year. OSDBU is tracking the SDVOSB goal achievement for all USDA agencies.

SDVOSB Policy and Increased Contracting Goal. During FY 2006, OSDBU issued Departmental Regulation (DR) 5090-005, USDA Small Business Programs – Contracting with SDVOSBs, codifying the contents of the Secretary's Memorandum 5090-001 and the USDA SDVOSB Strategic Initiative, issued on July 12, 2005. The DR details USDA policy requiring USDA agencies to fully consider SDVOSBs in their contracting actions. The policy prescribes a partnership between the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Agency Heads, Heads of Contracting Activities, the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and agency CIOs to achieve the 3 percent mandated goal. The DR contains a 5 percent goal for information technology contracting actions.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Budget and Performance
Statement of Goals and Objectives

DA has one strategic goal and five strategic objectives that contribute to all of the Department's Strategic Goals.

USDA Strategic Goals and Management Initiatives	Agency Strategic Goal	Agency Objectives	Programs that Contribute	Key Outcome
<p>DA supports all Departmental strategic goals and management initiatives.</p>	<p>Agency Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service missions.</p>	<p><u>Objective 1:</u> Ensure USDA has a diverse, ethical, results-oriented workforce able to meet mission priorities and work cooperatively with USDA partners and the private sector.</p>	<p><u>Departmental Administration.</u></p>	<p><u>Key Outcome 1:</u> USDA programs will be staffed with personnel trained to meet program objectives through the use of effective, timely and uniform human resources management. Headquarters organizations will receive effective and timely human resources management support. Employees will be trained and held accountable for compliance with Government Standards of Conduct.</p>
		<p><u>Objective 2:</u> Ensure USDA has a trained acquisition workforce with the procurement policies and systems needed to ensure responsiveness, high quality, cost-effectiveness, and accountability using an increasingly diverse vendor pool and range of products.</p>		<p><u>Key Outcome 2:</u> Mechanisms will be established to provide advantageous pricing for selected products and services and a new Integrated Acquisitions System will be fully deployed. Participation of small and disadvantaged businesses will increase. USDA vehicle fleet usage will reduce petroleum and bio-based products will be promoted.</p>

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Statement of Agency Goals and Objectives-Continued

USDA Strategic Goals and Management Initiatives	Agency Strategic Goal	Agency Objectives	Programs that Contribute	Key Outcome
DA supports all Departmental strategic goals and management initiatives.	Agency Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service missions.	<u>Objective 3:</u> Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity and ensure accountability.	<u>Departmental Administration.</u>	<u>Key Outcome 3:</u> USDA Headquarters will have the facilities, goods and services needed to successfully carryout programs. Personal property will be integrated into the Corporate Property Automated Information System and a real property management system will be established.
		<u>Objective 4:</u> Provide the policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel, information and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations.		<u>Key Outcome 4:</u> USDA will have a safe, secure, and productive work environment nationwide. Security information will be handled in the correct manner and USDA personnel will have the appropriate level of security clearances. USDA Continuity of Operations plans will be reviewed and regularly updated.
		<u>Objective 5:</u> Provide formal adjudicative support.		<u>Key Outcome 5:</u> USDA Administrative law proceedings will be handled quickly and fairly.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Strategic Objective and Funding Matrix
(On basis of appropriation)

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Ensure USDA has a diverse, ethical, results-oriented workforce able to meet mission priorities and work cooperatively with USDA partners and the private sector.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: Ensure USDA has a trained acquisition workforce with the procurement policies and systems needed to ensure responsiveness, high quality, cost-effectiveness, and accountability using an increasingly diverse vendor pool and range of products and services.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity, and ensure accountability.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4: Provide the policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel, information and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5: Provide formal adjudicative support.

Strategic Objective and Funding Matrix
(On basis of appropriation)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Estimated</u>		<u>Increase or Decrease</u>	<u>2008 Estimated</u>		
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	
<u>Strategic Objective 1:</u>								
Ensure USDA has a diverse, ethical, results-oriented workforce able to meet mission priorities & work cooperatively with USDA partners & the private sector.	\$6,267,516	50	\$5,425,000	51	+\$292,000	\$5,717,000	51	
Total, Strategic Objective 1	6,267,516	50	5,425,000	51	+292,000	5,717,000	51	
<u>Strategic Objective 2:</u>								
Ensure USDA has a trained acquisition workforce with the procurement policies & systems needed to ensure responsiveness, high quality, cost-effectiveness, & accountability using an increasingly diverse vendor pool & range of products & services.	3,995,169	29	4,263,000	30	+165,000	4,428,000	30	
Total, Strategic Objective 2	3,995,169	29	4,263,000	30	+165,000	4,428,000	30	
<u>Strategic Objective 3:</u>								
Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity & ensure accountability.	8,770,873	67	9,190,000	67	+299,000	9,489,000	67	
Total, Strategic Objective 3	8,770,873	67	9,190,000	67	+299,000	9,489,000	67	
<u>Strategic Objective 4:</u>								
Provide the policies, technical guidance, & operating environment that enhance the safety & security of USDA personnel, information & facilities, & the continuity of its vital programs and operations.	1,859,819	16	2,209,000	16	+773,000	2,982,000	16	
Total, Strategic Objective 4	1,859,819	16	2,209,000	16	+773,000	2,982,000	16	
<u>Strategic Objective 5:</u>								
Provide formal adjudicative support.	1,778,593	14	1,921,000	16	+71,000	1,992,000	16	
Total, Strategic Objective 5	1,778,593	14	1,921,000	16	+71,000	1,992,000	16	
Total, Available	22,671,970	176	23,008,000	180	+1,600,000	24,608,000	180	

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2008 Proposed Resource Level:

Objective 1: Ensure USDA has a diverse, ethical, results-oriented workforce able to meet mission priorities and work cooperatively with USDA partners and the private sector.

In fiscal year 2008, the Office of Human Capital Management (OHCM) will continue to lead the Department's succession planning activities thereby ensuring the leadership talent pool necessary to achieve USDA's mission during a time of a rapidly growing retirement eligible workforce. OHCM will administer the Department's human resources accountability system ensuring that human capital goals and programs are aligned with and support the USDA mission; that human capital planning is guided by a data driven, results-oriented process that periodically analyzes human capital data to assess results or progress toward goal achievement; and that managers and human resources practitioners are held accountable for their human capital decisions and actions. USDA's five human capital strategic goals are:

- The Department's human capital management strategies are aligned with the Department's mission, goals, and organizational objectives and integrated into strategic plans, performance plans, and budgets.
- The Department's leaders and managers effectively manage people, ensure continuity of leadership, and sustain a learning environment that drives continuous improvements.
- The Department has closed skills, knowledge, and competency gaps/deficiencies in mission-critical occupations and has made meaningful progress toward closing skills, knowledge, and competency gaps/deficiencies in all agency occupations.
- The Department has a diverse, results-oriented, high-performing workforce and a performance management system that differentiates between high and low levels of performance and links individual/team/unit performance to organizational goals and desired results effectively.
- The Department's human capital management decisions are guided by a data-driven, results-oriented planning and accountability system.

By performing annual compliance audits of USDA human resources offices, OHCM will assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department's human resources management functions and ensure human capital programs and policies adhere to merit system principles and other pertinent laws and regulations. OHCM will ensure accountability for implementation of the human capital recommendations associated with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123, Managements' Responsibility for Internal Control, and will continue to strive to meet the human capital initiatives embodied in the President's Management Agenda. OHCM will lead the Department's efforts to expand Web accessibility and functionality for human resources information and processing. OHCM will promote competency-based training and continue to increase the percentage of training provided over the Web and through distance learning. OHCM provides human resources operational services to DA and staff office employees. OHCM will improve its human resources servicing activities by implementing service agreements with its customers. OHCM will ensure the integrity of its official personnel files, as well as expand flexibility of their use by converting such files to an electronic format for the customers it services. OHCM will provide skills training to managers and supervisors on human resources rules and processes. OHCM will ensure that new DA Federal employees have appropriate background investigations and/or security clearances to protect the security of the homeland.

Objective 2: Ensure USDA has a trained acquisition workforce with the procurement policies and systems needed to ensure responsiveness, high quality, cost-effective, and accountability using an increasingly diverse vendor pool and range of products and services.

The Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM) will continue to lead the development and administration of the Department's acquisition workforce through planning activities targeting toward converting the employees from an outdated Acquisition Workforce Tracking System to the OMB mandated Acquisition Career Management Information System. OPPM will also continue oversight activities concentrating on acquisition review procedures. Strategic sourcing efforts will be coordinated with GSA initiatives to provide products and services through cost effective contracting vehicles.

The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) will continue to work closely with USDA's senior management and contracting offices to actively intervene in the acquisition process to ensure that staff persons review all planned acquisitions not already set aside for small business competition. Specifically:

- Review information technology waivers to ensure advance acquisition information about agency technology requirements that will enable OSDBU and USDA agencies to timely focus contracting strategies to increase small business participation.
- Utilize joint ventures and teaming to improve the abilities of small businesses to compete for larger contracts; increase the use of small business acquisition vehicles such as 8(a) and Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses; and more aggressive contracting strategy intervention which includes intervening with the Agency Head of Contracting Activity when there are potential opportunities for small business that otherwise would have been provided to large companies.

The Integrated Acquisition System will move to “steady state” in its development and up to \$2 billion in procurements will be processed. USDA will continue to be a leader in the Federal government in achieving small business program contracting goals.

Objective 3: Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA’s resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity, and ensure accountability.

Customer satisfaction surveys will be conducted covering functional areas within the Office of Operations (OO). The first survey provided the baseline measure of satisfaction and the subsequent annual surveys are capturing changes in customer satisfaction level. The business functional areas for OO include: facilities management; space planning and design; mail and printing services; health unit operations, TARGET Center operations; Headquarters physical security; warehouse services; and Information Technology (IT) Help Desk services.

The Chief Freedom of Information Act Officer (FOIA) will oversee implementation of the Department’s FOIA improvement plan.

Objective 4: Provide the policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel, information and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs.

COOP staff will continue reviewing agency and staff office COOP programs to enhance USDA’s ability to execute and sustain operations during a COOP event. An expanded contingency exercise will be conducted to ensure USDA preparedness in the event of a COOP activation, and validate capabilities to perform.

Objective 5: Provide formal adjudicative support.

The Office of Administrative Law Judges and the Judicial Officer will continue administrative law activities in support of USDA programs. These activities involve hearing cases, conducting rulemaking proceedings, and issuing decisions and rulings.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Budget and Performance
Key Performance Outcomes and Measures

Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service mission.

Key Outcome 1: USDA programs will be staffed with personnel trained to meet program objectives through the use of effective, timely and uniform human resources. Headquarters organizations will receive effective and timely human resources management support. Employees will be trained and held accountable for compliance with Government Standards of Conduct.

Key Outcome 2: Mechanisms will be established to provide advantageous pricing for selected products and services and a new Integrated Acquisitions System will be fully deployed. Participation of small and disadvantaged businesses will increase. USDA vehicle fleet will reduce petroleum use and biobased products will be promoted.

Key Outcome 3: USDA Headquarters will have the facilities, goods and services needed to successfully carryout programs. Personal property will be integrated into the Corporate Property Automated Information System and a real property management system will be established.

Key Outcome 4: USDA will have a safe, secure, and productive work environment nationwide. Security information will be handled in the correct manner and USDA personnel will have the appropriate level of security clearances. USDA Continuity of Operations plans will be reviewed and regularly updated.

Key Outcome 5: USDA Administrative law proceedings will be handled quickly and fairly.

Key Performance Measures:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Performance Measure 1.1 | USDA achievement in human capital scorecard performance. |
| Performance Measure 1.2 | Progress in implementing USDA Enterprise Human Resources Information System. |
| Performance Measure 1.3 | Improvement in Headquarters human resources services. |
| Performance Measure 4.1 | Percent support in areas of physical, document, and personnel security. |
| Performance Measure 4.2 | Percent establishment of USDA Continuity of Operations Program. |

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Key Performance Targets:

	<u>2003 Actual</u>	<u>2004 Actual</u>	<u>2005 Actual</u>	<u>2006 Actual</u>	<u>2007 Target</u>	<u>2008 Target</u>
Performance Measure 1.1: USDA achievements in human capital scorecard performance.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	Yellow	Green	Green	Green
b. Dollars	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Performance Measure 1.2: Progress in implementing USDA Enterprise Human Resources Information System.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	Established Staff Unit	Set Milestones	Develop Business Case	Request for Proposal
b. Dollars	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Performance Measure 1.3: Improvement of Headquarters human resources services.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set Baseline Part I	Set Baseline Part II	5%
b. Dollars	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Performance Measure 4.1: Percent support in areas of physical, document, and personnel security.						
a. Units	75%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%
b. Dollars	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Performance Measure 4.2: Percent establishment of USDA Continuity of Operations Program.						
a. Units	N/A	75%	75%	100%	100%	100%
b. Dollars	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Departmental Administration
Full Cost by Agency Strategic Objective

Agency Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service missions.

Program Items

		Dollars in thousands		
		FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Ensure USDA has a diverse, ethical, results-oriented workforce able to meet mission priorities and work cooperatively with USDA partners and the private sector				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$5,352	\$4,413	\$4,705
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	915	1,012	1,012
	Total Costs	6,267	5,425	5,717
	FTEs	50	51	51
Performance Measure: USDA achievement in human capital performance				
	BY Performance	Green	Green	Green
	Unit Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ensure USDA has a trained acquisition workforce with the procurement policies and systems needed to ensure responsiveness, high quality, cost-effectiveness, and accountability using an increasingly diverse vendor pool and range of products				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$3,160	\$3,695	\$3,860
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	835	568	568
	Total Costs	3,995	4,263	4,428
	FTEs	29	30	30
Performance Measure: Percent compliance with Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting Program (New requirement in FY 2007)				
	BY Performance	N/A	25%	100%
	Unit Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity and ensure accountability				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$5,955	\$7,033	\$7,332
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	2,816	2,157	2,157
	Total Costs	8,771	9,190	9,489
	FTEs	67	67	67
Performance Measure: Percent development of the USDA Real Property Asset Mgmt Plan & percent expanded functionality of CPAIS				
	BY Performance	75%	85%	100%
	Unit Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
Provide the policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel, information and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$1,371	\$1,958	\$2,036
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	489	251	251
	Homeland Security	0	0	695
	Total Costs	1,860	2,209	2,982
	FTEs	16	16	16
Performance Measure: Percent establishment of USDA COOP				
	BY Performance	100%	100%	100%
	Unit Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
Provide formal adjudicative support				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$1,633	\$1,727	\$1,798
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	146	194	194
	Total Costs	1,779	1,921	1,992
	FTEs	14	16	16
Performance Measure: Number of Admin. Law Cases disposed				
	BY Performance	220	235	240
	Unit Cost	\$8	\$8	\$8
	Total for Agency Goal 1	\$22,672	\$23,008	\$24,608
	FTEs	176	180	180

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Purpose Statement

Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments. This account centrally finances the appropriated portion of payments to the General Services Administration (GSA) for rental of all leased space and related services and payments to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for security services. Funding for rental payments to GSA by the Forest Service is not included in this account, as the Forest Service is funded in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Additionally, this account finances the day-to-day operations, repair, improvement, and maintenance activities at the USDA Headquarters Complex and the George Washington Carver Center in Beltsville MD, including the administrative costs for the building management and support staff. Since 1989, USDA has been delegated the responsibility for managing, operating, maintaining, repairing, and improving the Headquarters Complex, which encompasses 14.1 acres of grounds and 4 buildings containing approximately 3 million square feet of space occupied by approximately 8,000 employees.

Headquarters. The majority of the functional activities of Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments are located in Washington, D.C. As of September 30, 2006, there were 73 full-time permanent employees. Of these, 69 were assigned in Washington, D.C., and 4 were assigned in Beltsville, Maryland.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year Summary
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

Grade	2006	2007	2008
	Washington, DC	Washington, DC	Washington, DC
GS-15	4	4	4
GS-14	18	22	22
GS-13	17	20	20
GS-12	12	16	16
GS-11	11	11	11
GS-9	1	2	2
GS-8	2	2	2
GS-7	1	2	2
Ungraded Positions.....	7	7	7
Total, Permanent Positions.....	73	86	86
Total, Permanent Full-Time Employment, end-of-year.....	73	86	86
Staff Year Estimate.....	74	86	86

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for alterations and other actions needed for the Department and its agencies to consolidate unneeded space into configurations suitable for release to the Administrator of General Services, and for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and repair of Agriculture buildings and facilities, and for related costs, \$216,837,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$156,590,000 shall be available for payments to the General Services Administration for rent and the Department of Homeland Security for building security: Provided, That amounts which are made available for space rental and related costs for the Department of Agriculture in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations to cover the costs of additional, new, or replacement space 15 days after notice thereof is transmitted to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

LEAD-OFF TABULAR STATEMENT

Estimate, 2007	\$179,272,000
Budget Estimate, 2008.....	<u>216,837,000</u>
Increase in appropriation	<u>+37,565,000</u>

SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

(On basis of appropriation)

<u>Item of Change</u>	<u>2007 Estimated</u>	<u>Pay Cost</u>	<u>Program Changes</u>	<u>2008 Estimated</u>
Rental Payments to GSA and DHS				
Security Payments	\$139,672,000	--	+\$16,918,000	\$156,590,000
Building Operations and Maintenance	39,600,000	+426,000	+20,221,000	60,247,000
Total Available	<u>179,272,000</u>	<u>+426,000</u>	<u>+37,139,000</u>	<u>216,837,000</u>

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

PROJECT STATEMENT
(On basis of appropriation)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Estimated</u>		Increase or Decrease	<u>2008 Estimated</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
Rental Payments to GSA and DHS Security Payments	\$146,256,660	--	\$139,672,000	--	+\$16,918,000	\$156,590,000	--
Building Operations and Maintenance	39,600,000	74	39,600,000	86	+20,647,000	60,247,000	86
Total Available or Estimate	185,856,660	74	179,272,000	86	+37,565,000	216,837,000	86
Rescission	+1,877,340	--		--			
Total, Appropriation	187,734,000	74	179,272,000	86			

PROJECT STATEMENT
(On basis of available funds)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Estimated</u>		Increase or Decrease	<u>2008 Estimated</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
Rental Payments to GSA and DHS Security Payments	\$146,368,179	--	\$149,809,000	--	+\$6,781,000	\$156,590,000	--
Building Operations and Maintenance	43,381,525	74	39,600,000	86	20,647,000	60,247,000	86
Total, Direct Obligations	189,749,704	74	189,409,000	86	+\$27,428,000	\$216,837,000	86
Unobligated Balance, start of year	-2,209,130	--	-10,137,000	--	+10,137,000	--	--
Recoveries	-11,821,165	--	--	--	--	--	--
Unobligated Balance, end of year	+10,137,251	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total Available or Estimate	185,856,660	74	179,272,000	86	+37,565,000	216,837,000	86
Rescission	+1,877,340	--		--			
Total Appropriation	187,734,000	74	179,272,000	86			

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Justification of Increases and Decreases

- 1) An increase of \$37,565,000 for Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments consisting of:
 - (a) An increase of \$16,918,000 for the Central Rent Account. This request is to fund the current estimated cost of GSA space assignments and physical security costs payable to the Department of Homeland Security; increased costs associated with recompetition for expired leases; acquisition of additional space; and increased security costs; and to support the GSA Rent account for preventive maintenance services of the fire alarm and switchgear systems located at the USDA Headquarters Complex. Historically, GSA provided these maintenance services; however, in 2006 USDA was notified that these services would now be done by GSA on a reimbursable basis. Also included in this increase are the fire alarm preventive maintenance services provided at the George Washington Carver Center, at a cost of approximately \$14,000 per year. (Currently, GSA is being reimbursed by the Forest Service for these services at the Sydney R. Yates Building.)
 - (b) An increase of \$14,148,000 for repairs and maintenance projects for the South Building. The aging USDA South Building of the Headquarters Complex, which was built between 1930 and 1936, is in much need of repair and maintenance. The architectural and engineering study completed in 1997 deemed the majority of the mechanical, electrical, fire alarm and telecommunication systems in the South Building obsolete. The employees of the South Building are exposed to numerous health safety problems, primarily due to the deteriorating electrical wiring and fire alarm systems. Funds are needed to bring the engineering systems: electricity, ventilation, and steam up to current code. Funds will also be used to improve employee safety by installing automatic sprinklers and other fire-suppression systems. The South Building houses approximately 6,500 employees performing work and representing the various USDA mission areas including: Food Safety; Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services; Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services; Marketing and Regulatory Programs; Natural Resources and Environment; Research, Education and Economics, and Rural Development. Providing an adequate, safe and healthy work environment for these employees so that they can perform their duties is crucial to the overall mission of USDA.
 - (c) An increase of \$2,400,000 to cover the rising cost for steam and electric utilities for the USDA Headquarters Complex. During 2006, the price of GSA's district steam continued to increase. In 2005, the price of GSA's district steam went up 22 percent, increasing the cost to USDA by nearly \$400,000 for steam alone. GSA has notified all agencies to expect steep increases in 2007 and 2008 for all utility costs. Although USDA has done many projects to save energy, the impact of these steep increases will be impossible to absorb within base funds. Paying an additional \$2.4 million in utility costs from current Building Operations funding will significantly increase the deferral of preventive maintenance and repairs for facilities, which results in repairs after breakdowns or system failures occur.
 - (d) An increase of \$1,900,000 for annual contract increases due to the Fair Labor Standards Act and collective bargaining. This request supports the goal to ensure high quality services so that USDA mission areas have the space, facilities, mail and property services, personnel support and resources they need to deliver their programs in a timely and effect manner. USDA is required by law to pay these increases and no other funds are available to address these requirements. The absence of these funds erodes the Department's capability to pay the mandatory increases due to inflation for payroll and other fixed and discretionary costs associated with conducting a program of this type.

- (e) An increase of \$1,773,000 to support the Building Operations and Maintenance staffs in performing preventive maintenance and building repairs in the USDA Headquarters' Complex. This increase will cover rising general operating costs and preventive maintenance repairs to major systems found in an 80-plus-year-old building. Due to lack of funding for major repairs, USDA has been stricken with failures to major systems. Examples are: repairing major plumbing, electrical, heating, and air conditioning systems after they fail, and repairing roofs and other building components after they leak, instead of before. Repairs after the fact have a direct negative impact on mission accomplishment as it disrupts work with little or no warning. Other negative effects of breakdown maintenance are: increased long term maintenance costs because of missed opportunities to do economical minor repairs and maintenance that would prevent or postpone major failures, and interruptions to the planned and scheduled maintenance program. Without additional funding, direct mission support capabilities would be affected, or would require cost cutting in areas that do not directly support the mission, such as custodial and other similar services. This increase would be applied to non-salary object classes.
- (f) A total increase of \$426,000, of which \$228,000 is for 2008 increased pay costs, and \$198,000 is for the 2007 pay costs. This increase is necessary to ensure high quality services so that USDA mission areas have the space, facilities, mail and property services, personnel support and resources they need to deliver their programs in a timely and efficient manner. This increase will enable Agriculture Buildings and Facilities to meet its objective of providing effective building operations and maintenance services in support of all USDA employees and their activities. This office cannot absorb pay costs and maintain its current staffing levels without compromising its efforts to provide a safe and modern workplace for USDA Headquarters Complex and the George Washington Carver Center.

Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

	2006		2007		2008	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
District of Columbia	\$189,382,951	70	\$178,887,000	82	\$216,438,000	82
Maryland	366,753	4	385,000	4	399,000	4
Total, Available or Estimate	189,749,704	74	179,272,000	86	216,837,000	86

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS
Classification by Objects
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Personnel Compensation:			
Washington, D.C.	\$6,482,229	\$7,581,000	\$7,925,000
11 Total personnel compensation	6,482,229	7,581,000	7,925,000
12 Personnel benefits.....	1,519,498	1,810,000	1,892,000
13 Benefits for former personnel	2,749	--	--
Total pers. comp. & benefits	8,004,476	9,391,000	9,817,000
Other Objects:			
21 Travel	47,294	47,000	47,000
22 Transportation of things.....	7,290	7,000	7,000
23.1 Rental payments to GSA.....	146,368,179	139,672,000	156,590,000
23.3 Communications, utilities, and misc. charges	8,961,215	7,861,000	10,331,000
24 Printing and reproduction	132,447	100,000	100,000
25.2 Other services	25,301,079	21,186,000	38,937,000
25.3 Purchases of goods and services.....	214,495	220,000	220,000
25.4 Operation and maintenance of facilities.....	47,129	167,000	167,000
25.7 Operation and maintenance of equipment	131,139	134,000	134,000
26 Supplies and materials	334,131	342,000	342,000
31 Equipment.....	104,924	145,000	145,000
42 Insurance Claims and Indemnities	90,000	--	--
43 Interest and dividends.....	5,906	--	--
Total other obligations.....	181,745,228	169,881,000	207,020,000
Total direct obligations.....	189,749,704	179,272,000	216,837,000
Position Data:			
Average Salary, GS positions	\$87,598	\$88,151	\$92,157
Average Grade, GS positions	13.5	13.6	13.6

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

STATUS OF PROGRAM

In fiscal year 1985, USDA began a facilities management program to repair, improve, and preserve the four-building Washington Headquarters Complex. USDA's facilities strategy in the Washington area includes: renovation of the South Building; consolidation of USDA leased space into as few locations as possible; and return the Cotton Annex to the General Services Administration (GSA). After the renovation of the Agriculture South Building is completed, USDA agencies and employees will be housed in renovated facilities, leased space will be reduced, and USDA agencies will be better able to accomplish their missions.

Current Activities:

In fiscal year 2006, the Washington Area Service Center (WASC), the staff responsible for facilities management of the USDA Headquarters Complex, had several major on-going activities, including awarding a new Janitorial Contract and a new Food Service Contract under an expedited schedule. The Web-based Project Management Tracking System, implemented in fiscal year 2005, provides WASC with improved analytical capability for identifying opportunities for improvement while providing real time updates for customers and managers. This was reflected in reduced customer complaints and "second-calls" on the same problems.

The South Building Renovation program includes extensive interior demolition with the abatement of hazardous materials; upgraded mechanical, electrical, telecommunications, and plumbing systems; and new fire alarm and sprinkler systems to protect and preserve life and property. Each completed phase provides more efficient office space tailored to the needs of the tenant agencies. Phases 1, 2, 3 and the new Mail Operations Center have been completed, which is approximately one quarter of the planned renovation of the entire 3 million square foot South Building.

After the National Finance Center (NFC) in New Orleans was evacuated due to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in August 2005, Departmental Administration (DA) provided space at several alternate locations for displaced NFC staff and functions. After the building was re-opened, during the course of fiscal year 2006 it became apparent that the NFC building, leased from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was deficient and the replacement or renovation of the building should be considered. During 2006, to meet the immediate need for improved reliability, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer selected a location in Denver, Colorado for a Primary Computing Facility to support the NFC functions in New Orleans. DA assisted NFC in managing the design of the GSA operated and leased facility. It is expected to be fully operational in April 2007.

Selected Examples of Recent Progress toward Achievement of the Key Outcomes:

Building Maintenance and Repairs: During fiscal year 2006, DA's Office of Operations (DA/OO) responded to over 12,000 facility service calls (over 1,000 were Web-based). These calls translated into \$885,000 in building repairs. The repairs included: emergency re-pointing of portions of the Yates Building after bricks fell off the building; sidewalk and curb repairs; lead paint abatement; fire protection system repairs in the South Building kitchen and other repairs to the South Building Cafeteria kitchen to meet building and safety codes. Additionally, staff performed over 13,000 hours of preventive maintenance. The performance of diligent preventive maintenance resulted in a zero failure rate of any major mechanical system.

Energy Management: In fiscal year 2006, DA/OO implemented an energy reduction plan that included reducing the use of natural gas, gasoline and electricity. For example DA/OO reduced operating hours for lighting in public spaces and assured equipment was shut down when not in use. Additionally, buildings, facilities and equipment were carefully checked for faulty equipment, and repairs or replacement were accomplished to reduce waste. This effort also addressed the rapidly increasing utility costs associated

with operating the USDA Headquarters facilities; utilities costs increased over \$1 million in fiscal year 2006 in comparison to fiscal year 2005. Energy reduction efforts included: adding motion sensors to the lighting in copier rooms; replacing inefficient lighting systems in the loading dock and selected entrances (lights now turn off in the day time); and implementing a pilot "Daylight Harvester System" in selected offices. Daylight harvesting is the sensor automated adjustment of light fixtures to yield more or less illumination depending upon the amount of natural light available.

In fiscal year 2007, DA/OO will work to award a Utility Energy Services Contract. This contract would allow DA/OO to replace outdated and inefficient equipment at no upfront cost to the government. The energy service contractor would be paid from the energy savings obtained by implementing the energy conservation opportunities.

Biobased Products/Alternative Fuel: DA/OO continues to expand the use of biobased and alternative products. The new Janitorial Contract includes requirements to use biobased cleaning products. The new Food Service contract also incorporates biobased products where practical. Additionally, in fiscal year 2006, DA/OO started using biodiesel in the emergency generators for the headquarters' buildings, including the George Washington Carver Center. DA/OO also requires that all newly leased DA vehicles use E85 fuel.

South Building Renovation: During fiscal year 2006, Phase 2A of the South Building Renovation was completed. Phase 2A included the complete gutting of the old Law Library building in Court 4 to the building shell, abatement of hazardous materials, underpinning of the building footings to provide a new basement floor level, provision of a new first floor fire-rated structure, and full modernization to house the new Mail Operations Center and office space for the Agricultural Marketing Service. The new Mail Operations Center provides improved working conditions for employees with modern health and safety features and a greatly improved functional space layout. The Mail Operations Center was designed with security and bio-hazard controls such as an explosion resistant mail screening building, decontamination shower and eye-wash facilities, dedicated separate air-handling system capable of exhausting the Mail Operations Center and maintaining negative pressure, and high efficiency filtration systems.

Life Safety Developments: DA maintained a highly effective and responsive safety and environmental program for the USDA Headquarters facilities. DA co-sponsored employee safety information briefings for USDA agencies in Headquarters facilities to improve employee awareness and participation. In addition, DA has performed numerous analytical surveys designed to improve overall indoor air quality and recognize problem areas before they become occupant concerns. DA evaluates, tests, and routinely monitors suspect materials such as painted surfaces that may contain lead, antiquated construction materials that could contain asbestos, and other building related infrastructure items such as electrical ballasts that contain poly-chlorinated biphenyls. Naturally occurring building conditions such as mold growth and/or water incursions are also treated as hazardous and managed according to occupant exposure and relative severity.

Information Technology: In response to an Information Technology security incident, DA established and improved our incident response posture. This included timely notification of USDA management, coordination with the Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Office of the Inspector General on forensics to determine the scope and the cause of the problem, identification of risk management approaches both short and long term and providing advice to management on customer impact and notification. Long term risk management included a system reconfiguration, followed by a certification and accreditation which will be complete in fiscal year 2007.

DA conducted an evaluation of their Homeland Security Presidential Directive-12, Personal Identity Verification I process, to be used as a template for certifying the processes to be used by all agencies with employees in the Washington metropolitan area.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Summary of Budget and Performance
Statement of Goals and Objectives

Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments has one goal and two objectives that contribute to the Department's strategic goals.

USDA Strategic Goals and Management Initiatives	Agency Strategic Goal	Agency Objectives	Programs that Contribute	Key Outcome
<p>DA supports all Departmental strategic goals and management initiatives.</p>	<p>Agency Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service missions.</p>	<p><u>Objective 3:</u> Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity, and ensure accountability.</p>	<p>Departmental Administration.</p>	<p><u>Key Outcome 1:</u> USDA Headquarters agencies and staff offices can effectively carry out their functions and missions.</p>
		<p><u>Objective 4:</u> Provide policies, technical guidance, and an operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations.</p>		<p><u>Key Outcome 2:</u> USDA Emergency Preparedness plans will be current and accurate.</p>

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Strategic Objective and Funding Matrix
(On Basis of Appropriation)

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity, and ensure accountability.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4: Provide the policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations.

Strategic Objective and Funding Matrix
(On basis of appropriation)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Budget</u>		<u>Increase or Decrease</u>	<u>2008 Estimated</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
<u>Strategic Objective 3</u>	\$181,749,704	57	\$171,032,000	69	+\$35,665,000	\$206,697,000	69
<u>Strategic Objective 4</u>	8,000,000	17	8,240,000	17	1,900,000	10,140,000	17
<u>Total, Available</u>	<u>189,749,704</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>179,272,000</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>+37,565,000</u>	<u>216,837,000</u>	<u>86</u>

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2008 Proposed Resource Level:

Objective 3: Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity and ensure accountability:

Agriculture Buildings and Facilities will ensure high quality services so that USDA mission areas have the space, facilities, mail and property services, personnel support and resources they need to deliver their programs in a timely and efficient manner. USDA's present and future housing needs in the Washington Metropolitan Area are frequently reassessed, and the findings are used to update the Strategic Space Plan.

This Office will continue the planned repairs, upgrades and maintenance to the South Building. This will ensure that employees of the South Building are not exposed to the numerous safety problems that are primarily due to the deteriorating electrical wiring and fire alarm systems. The engineering systems (electricity, ventilation and steam) will be brought up to code. Improvements to employee safety will be achieved by installing automatic sprinklers and other fire suppression systems. The South Building is at the juncture of a critical evacuation route for Washington, DC via the 14th Street Bridge, fire suppression systems will be installed in the building to decrease the probability of a major fire incident, which in turn will decrease the likelihood that 14th Street will be blocked by emergency vehicles which could block a primary evacuation route from the city. These funds will also be used to bring the South Building into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Departmental Administration has an established Safety and Environmental Protection staff that manages the Headquarters' occupational safety and health program. In addition to inspecting the buildings and work sites for compliance with safety standards and regulation, this staff ensures that employees of the South Building are not exposed to lead or asbestos and other hazardous materials; and that these dangerous materials will be removed as soon as possible. This staff is responsible for inspecting all headquarters' buildings as well as the George Washington Carver Building in Beltsville MD, more than 3 million square feet.

Repairs will be made to the Jamie L. Whitten (East and West wings built in 1907, remainder of building built in 1930's) Building, and selected repairs will be made in the South Building not programmed for inclusion in the renovation projects. Repairs to these old, heavily-used buildings will reduce the risks of significant interruptions to business and protect employees. Preventive roof repairs and replacement are scheduled for 2008. During 2006, over \$150,000 was spent on emergency roof repairs, office repairs and equipment replacement due to roof leaks and water damage,

The Central Rent Account will fund the cost of: GSA space assignments and physical security costs payable to DHS; increased costs associated with recompetition for expired leases; and the acquisition of additional space. Departmental Administration continues to seek out office space that meets the needs of the mission areas and is most economical to the Department. Where possible, leases will be consolidated to save resources.

Objective 4: Provide the policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations:

Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments will provide a more highly-trained security force that is required for USDA owned and leased space; upgrades to the training manuals and procedures needed to ensure employee and visitor safety; and the continuation of the critical emergency preparedness table top training and drill development. The USDA Headquarters Complex is a critical Federal facility (as defined by the Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD) 7), located in a highly vulnerable sector of the Nation's Capital. This complex, which houses the Secretary of Agriculture and heads of the Department's primary agencies, is a potential target for domestic and international terrorists. Its very location places it in harm's way. Adequate security measures, procedures and resources will be put in place to prevent and respond to emergency situations, to save lives and to ensure the continuance of government operations. The most effective defense against attack has been a steady increase in highly visible protective resources. The placement of security officers, security technology and preventive resources will demonstrate our state of preparedness, readiness and competency to confront the challenges.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Summary of Budget and Performance
Key Performance Outcomes and Measures

Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service missions.

Key Outcome 1: USDA Headquarters agencies and staff offices can effectively carry out their functions and missions.

Long-term Performance Measure: Customer satisfaction with building services. Departmental Administration customers are satisfied with the services and products provided.

Key Outcome 2: USDA Emergency Preparedness plans will be current and accurate.

Long-term Performance Measure: USDA Emergency Preparedness plans will be current and practical for possible emergencies. They will be reviewed every two years and a 5-year test, training, and exercise program for HQ USDA will be developed and approved annually. Conducting tests, training and exercises of USDA Emergency Operation plans annually, to include personnel, and essential systems and equipment, will ensure USDA capability to continue vital programs and operations in emergency situations.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Key Performance Targets:

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>2003 Actual</u>	<u>2004 Actual</u>	<u>2005 Actual</u>	<u>2006 Actual</u>	<u>2007 Target</u>	<u>2008 Target</u>
Performance Measure 3.1						
Percent improvement above baseline in customer satisfaction with facilities management services.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	5%	10%	20%
Performance Measure 3.2						
Percent completion of South Building Renovation.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	25%	26%	27%	27%
Performance Measure 4.1						
Percent establishment of USDA Continuity of Operations Program.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	75%	100%	100%	100%
Performance Measure 4.2						
Compliance with established standards for safety, security, and emergency programs.						
a. Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set Baseline	15%

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

Summary of Budget and Performance
Full Cost by Agency Strategic Objective

Agency Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service missions.

PROGRAM	PROGRAM ITEMS	Dollars in thousands		
		FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2007 (\$000)	FY 2008 (\$000)
Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity, and ensure accountability.				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$6,165	\$7,231	\$7,559
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	175,585	164,785	200,809
	Total Costs	181,750	172,016	208,368
	FTEs	57	69	69
Provide policies, technical guidance, and operating environment that enhance the safety and security of USDA personnel and facilities, and the continuity of its vital programs and operations.				
	Salaries & Benefits	\$1,839	\$2,160	\$2,258
	Administrative Costs (Direct)	6,161	5,096	6,211
	Total Costs	8,000	7,256	8,469
	FTEs	17	17	17
	Total for Agency Goal 1	\$189,750	\$179,272	\$216,837
	FTE	74	86	86

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Purpose Statement

The Hazardous Materials Management Program provides leadership in four key environmental areas: (1) developing and prioritizing business cases for funding cleanups on USDA-managed lands and sites contaminated from past activities; (2) developing Departmental policies on pollution prevention and environmental compliance; (3) coordinating implementation of environmental management systems; and (4) planning for, evaluating, and responding to natural and other incidents affecting the natural and built environment. Requirements, criteria, and procedures of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) guide decision-making. Program activities primarily align with USDA Strategic Goal 6—Protect and enhance the Nation's natural resource base and environment. Additionally, the program directly supports homeland security objectives by representing USDA on the National Response Team for oil and hazardous substance releases and several other emergency support functions under the National Response Plan. HMMP also supports natural resources stewardship, quality-of-life goals for rural America, and the President's Brownfields and Mine-Scarred Lands initiatives. This program is assigned to the Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM) within Departmental Administration.

Headquarters. The Headquarters of Hazardous Materials Management is located in Washington, D.C. As of September 30, 2006, there were six full time employees, located in the national office and one full time employee located in a field office.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year Summary
2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

Grade	2006			2007			2008		
	Wash DC	Field	Total	Wash DC	Field	Total	Wash DC	Field	Total
GS-15	2	--	2	2	--	2	2	--	2
GS-14	3	1	4	3	1	4	3	1	4
GS-7	1	--	1	1	--	1	1	--	1
Total Permanent Positions.....	6	1	7	6	1	7	6	1	7
Total, Permanent Full- Time Employment, end-of-year.....	6	1	7	6	1	7	6	1	7
Staff Year Estimate....	6	1	7	6	1	7	6	1	7

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

The estimates include appropriation language for this item as follows (new language underscored; deleted matter enclosed in brackets):

Hazardous Materials Management

(Including transfers of funds)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.); and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.); \$12,200,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department of Hazardous Materials Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

Lead-off Tabular Statement

Estimate, 2007	\$12,020,000
Budget Estimate, 2008	<u>12,200,000</u>
Increase in Appropriation	<u>+180,000</u>

Summary of Increases and Decreases
(On basis of appropriation)

<u>Item of Change</u>	<u>2007</u> <u>Estimated</u>	<u>Pay Costs</u>	<u>2008</u> <u>Estimated</u>
Hazardous Materials Management.....	\$12,020,000	+180,000	\$12,200,000

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

PROJECT STATEMENT
(On basis of appropriation)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Estimated</u>		Increase or Decrease	<u>2008 Estimated</u>	
	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years		Amount	Staff Years
Hazardous Materials Management.....	\$16,636,043	7	\$12,020,000	7	+\$180,000	\$12,200,000	7
Unobligated Balance, start of year.....	-5,695,178	--	--	--	--	--	--
Recoveries.....	-19,105						
Unobligated Balance, end of year.....	+958,240	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total Available or Estimate.....	11,880,000	7	12,020,000	7	+180,000	12,200,000	7
Rescission.....	+120,000	--		--			
Total Appropriation....	12,000,000	7	12,020,000	7			

Justification of Increases and Decreases

(1) An increase of \$180,000 for Hazardous Materials Management, consisting of:

(a) An increase of \$29,000 for pay costs.

This increase will assist the Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) in continuing to provide leadership and direction in ensuring that the Department's HMMP is managed effectively. Without this increase, the ability to deliver staff support would be severely curtailed.

(b) An increase of \$151,000 for pay costs associated with reimbursements sent to USDA agencies for staff support related to oversight and management of their HMMP program activities.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff-Years
2006 Estimated 2007 and 2008

	<u>2006</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
District of Columbia.....	\$16,521,205	6	\$11,898,997	6	\$12,078,997	6
Denver, Colorado.....	114,838	1	121,003	1	121,003	1
Subtotal, Available or Estimate....	16,636,043	7	12,020,000	7	12,200,000	7
Unobligated Balance.....	+958,240	--	--	--	--	--
Total, Available or Estimate.....	17,594,283	7	12,020,000	7	12,200,000	7

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Classification By Objects

2006 Actual and Estimated 2007 and 2008

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Personnel Compensation:			
Washington, D.C.	\$675,231	\$691,605	\$712,353
Denver, Colorado	92,077	94,310	97,139
11 Total personnel compensation.....	767,308	785,915	809,492
12 Personnel benefits.....	157,652	161,292	166,715
Total pers. comp. & benefits	924,960	947,207	976,207
Other Objects:			
21 Travel	92,882	92,882	92,882
22 Transportation of things	2,000	2,000	2,000
23.3 Communications, utilities, and misc. charges.....	22,000	22,000	22,000
24 Printing and reproduction.....	4,000	4,000	4,000
25.1 Advisory and assistance services.....	15,572,549	10,951,911	11,102,911
25.2 Other services	5,000		
26 Supplies and materials	9,500	-----	-----
31 Equipment	3,152	-----	-----
Total other objects	15,711,083	11,072,793	11,223,793
Total direct obligations	16,636,043	12,020,000	12,200,000
<u>Position Data:</u>			
Average Salary, GS positions.....	\$109,615	\$112,274	\$115,642
Average Grade, GS positions	14.7	14.7	14.8

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT
STATUS OF PROGRAM

The Hazardous Materials Management Program (HMMP) provides leadership in four key environmental areas: (1) developing and prioritizing business cases for funding cleanups on USDA-managed lands and sites contaminated from past activities; (2) developing Departmental policies on environmental management systems, pollution prevention, and environmental compliance; (3) coordinating implementation of environmental management systems; and (4) planning for, evaluating, and responding to natural and other incidents affecting the natural and built environment. Requirements, criteria, and procedures of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and other environmental requirements guide decision making. Program activities primarily align with USDA Strategic Goal 6, to Protect and Enhance the Nation's Natural Resource Base and Environment. Additionally, the program directly supports homeland security objectives by representing USDA on the National Response Team for oil and hazardous substance releases and several emergency support functions under the National Response Plan. HMMP also supports natural resources stewardship, quality-of-life goals for rural America, and the President's Brownfields and Mine-Scarred Lands initiatives. This program is assigned to the Office of Procurement and Property Management within Departmental Administration.

Current Activities:

In FY 2006, USDA's ongoing environmental cleanup program reduced or eliminated environmental contamination on more than 35 sites, 18 of which were funded with Hazardous Materials Management Appropriation funds that were available for this work. USDA will continue to apply available funds to clean up mine and non-mine CERCLA sites; assess/characterize potential sites for response actions; develop cleanup plans; and pursue agreements with potentially responsible parties to perform cleanup/restoration at contaminated sites.

Selected Examples of Recent Progress:

As of the end of FY 2006, the Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, and Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, in collaboration with the Shoshone-Bannock tribes, Nez Perce tribes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, had cleaned up 10 of 12 contaminant sources affecting critical habitat for four threatened and endangered fish species on USDA-managed and private lands. This cooperative effort, launched in 1992, helped Idaho receive approximately \$1 million in Federal Clean Water Act grants. The Forest Service On-Scene Coordinator received the Forest Service's national Collaborative Aquatic Resources Stewardship Award for this work. When the final two sources are cleaned up in 2008, eight miles of critical threatened and endangered species habitat and 800 acres of terrestrial habitat will have been restored at a total cost of \$13.2 million.

Also in fiscal year 2006, soil contaminated with the wood preservative pentachlorophenol received three years of biotreatment at a Forest Service facility in Colorado. The treatment eliminated over 90 percent of the contamination, virtually eliminating threats to human health and the environment posed by the site. The total cost of this work was approximately \$200,000, less than \$175 per ton of treated soil.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Summary of Budget and Performance
Statement of Agency Goals and Objectives

Hazardous Materials Management has one goal and objective that contribute to one of the Department's Strategic Goals.

USDA Strategic Goal	Agency Strategic Goal	Agency Objectives	Programs that Contribute	Key Outcome
<p>USDA Goal 6: Protect and enhance the Nation's natural resource base and environment.</p>	<p>Agency Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service mission.</p>	<p>DA Objective 3: Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity and ensure accountability.</p>	<p>Hazardous Materials Management Program.</p>	<p>OPPM will provide resources to agencies with the highest priority project activities via reimbursable agreements within 45 days after notification of apportionment of Hazardous Materials Management (HMM) funds.</p>

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: Promote the efficient and economical use of USDA's resources to support customers, promote organizational productivity, and ensure accountability.

Strategic Objective and Funding Matrix
(On basis of appropriation)

	<u>2006 Actual</u>		<u>2007 Budget</u>		<u>Increase or Decrease</u>	<u>2008 Estimated</u>	
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Staff Years</u>
<u>Strategic Objective 3</u>							
Hazardous Materials Management	\$12,000,000	7	\$12,020,000	7	+\$180,000	\$12,200,000	7
Rescission	-120,000	--		--	--	--	--
Total, Available	\$11,880,000	7	12,020,000	7	+ 180,000	12,200,000	7

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2008 Proposed Resource Level:

USDA will continue to apply available funds to cleaning up the mine and non-mine CERCLA sites determined to be the Department's highest priorities for action. FY 2008 funds are currently planned to be applied to priority cleanup work on approximately 10-12 sites in Colorado (Standard Metals Mine National Priorities List sites), Idaho (phosphate mining area cleanup oversight and feasibility-study activities), Kentucky (coal mining contamination cleanups in Railroad Branch and Wildcat Branch), Maryland (Beltsville Agricultural Research Center NPL site cleanup), Montana (Cataract Creek mining-related cleanup), Ohio (Monday Creek watershed cleanup), and South Dakota (Nemo Work Center ethylene dibromide cleanup feasibility assessment). Over half of this funding will provide additional resources to larger project activities initiated in earlier fiscal years.

Summary of Budget and Performance
Key Performance Outcomes and Measures

Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service mission.

Key Outcome 1: OPPM will provide resources to agencies with the highest priority project activities via reimbursable agreements within 45 days after notification of apportionment of Hazardous Materials Management (HMM) funds.

Long-term Performance Measure: Percent of Hazardous Materials Policy Council approved projects awarded. The Hazardous Materials Policy Council is a group of senior managers from USDA mission areas, Departmental Administration, and the Office of the General Counsel. The Policy Council determines HMM Appropriation funding priorities and establishes Department-wide policies related to environmental compliance and management.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

Key Performance Targets:

Performance Measure	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Target	2008 Target
Percent of HMPC approved projects awarded.	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unit Cost	N/A	N/A	\$906,353	\$1,152,229	\$1,333,333	\$1,219,300

Full Cost By Strategic Goal

Goal 1: Provide USDA leadership with the administrative tools, services, infrastructure, and policy framework to support their public service mission.

PROGRAM	PROGRAM ITEMS	Dollars in thousands		
		<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>
Hazardous Materials Management	Direct Costs	\$ 11,880	\$ 12,020	\$ 12,200
	FTEs	7	7	7

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Language in the General Provisions of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act permits agencies funded in the Act to finance the activities of selected committees that advise them from their own funds, subject to the limitation on total obligations for these committees.

Provided below is a list of those committees subject to this spending limitation and their funding levels for fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEES		
Policy Area and Committee Title	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate
National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant and Fetal Nutrition.....	\$50,000	\$50,000
National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection.....	67,000	67,000
National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods.....	40,000	40,000
Forestry Research Advisory Council.....	26,000	26,000
Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21 st Century Agriculture.....	269,000	285,000
Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics.....	35,000	35,000
USDA/Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities.....	11,000	20,000
Advisory Committee on Foreign Animal and Poultry Diseases....	15,000	25,000
General Conference Committee on the National Poultry Improvement Plan.....	21,000	10,000
National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee.....	24,000	24,000
National Organic Standards Board.....	190,000	190,000
Federal Grain Inspection Advisory Committee.....	34,000	40,000
Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade.....	14,000	14,000
Ag. Tech. Adv. Comm. For Trade in:		
Animals & Animal Products.....	14,000	14,000
Fruits and Vegetables.....	14,000	14,000
Grains, Feed, and Oilseeds.....	14,000	14,000
Sweeteners and Sweetener Products.....	14,000	14,000
Tobacco, Cotton, Peanuts, and Planting Seeds.....	14,000	14,000
Processed Foods	14,000	14,000
Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets.....	43,000	47,000
Edward R. Madigan Agricultural Export Excellence Award Board.....	15,000	15,000

ADVISORY COMMITTEES		
Policy Area and Committee Title	2006 Actual	2007 Estimate
Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee	60,000	60,000
Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers.....	70,000	70,000
Task Force on Agricultural Air Quality Research	150,000	150,000
USDA/1890 Task Force	15,000	15,000
USDA/American Indian Higher Education Consortium.....	44,000	44,000
Total Advisory Committees.....	1,277,000	1,311,000
Contingencies/Reserve	523,000	489,000
TOTAL, ADVISORY COMMITTEES LIMITATION	1,800,000	1,800,000

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STATUS OF PROGRAM

From fiscal year (FY) 1983 through FY 1996, a central appropriation provided for direction and financial support of all authorized USDA Advisory Committee activities, other than those included in the Forest Service and those financed from user fees. Beginning in FY 1997, language in the General Provisions of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act permits agencies funded in the Act to finance the activities of selected committees that advise them from their own funds, subject to a Department-wide limitation on expenditures for those committees. These Explanatory Notes provide information on the activities of committees during FY 2006 and planned activities for FY 2007.

FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES:

National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant and Fetal Nutrition

The Council studies the operation of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) and related programs such as the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) and makes recommendations to the programs for how they may be improved as deemed appropriate. The Council is composed of 24 members and includes representatives of Federal, State and local governments, the medical field, industry, WIC and CSFP parent participants, and advocacy groups.

The Council met at Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) Headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia, on August 2-4, 2006. A total of 40 individuals attended the meeting, including 18 Council members, the general public, and FNS staff. The Council was briefed by FNS staff on current issues pertaining to WIC and CSFP. The Council worked on recommendations for WIC and CSFP. In addition, the Council held three conference calls to discuss UPC database, WIC Electronic Benefit Transfer and Food Package.

FOOD SAFETY:

National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI)

Congress established the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry in 1971 under authority of the Federal Meat and Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Poultry Products Inspection Acts (PPIA). Both acts require the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with an advisory committee before issuing product standards and labeling changes or any matters affecting Federal and State program activities.

The Committee, consisting of 16 members, held two meetings in 2006. At the first meeting on May 23 - 24, 2006, the agency presented two issues to the Committee (1) Measuring Establishment Risk Control for Risk-Based Inspection and (2) the Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) Strategic Implementation Plan for Enhancing Outreach to Small and Very Small Plants. The Committee broke up into Sub-Committees to deliberate on these issues and provide FSIS with reports of their recommendations and suggestions.

The second NACMPI meeting was held on October 12-13, 2006, to discuss (1) Using Risk to Direct In-Plant Inspection Activities in Processing Assignments and Off-Line Slaughter Inspection Activities and (2) Using Risk in Slaughter Operations. Two Sub-Committees deliberated on these issues and provided FSIS with reports of their recommendations and suggestions.

A standing NACMPI Sub-Committee was established in January of 2006 to work closely with the FSIS to ensure that any report from a third party will actually respond to the agency's goals. The Sub-Committee is currently involved in the development of an expert elicitation for Risk Based Inspection.

The current charter was approved on March 15, 2005 and will expire on March 16, 2007. A new charter is being developed. The Committee members serve a 2-year term that also expires March 16th. FSIS published a Federal Register Notice on September 12, 2006, (Docket No. FSIS-2006-0019) requesting nominations for Committee membership. Seventy-three applications were received and are being processed. Information about the NACMPI, meeting transcripts, and reports can be viewed on the FSIS Web site at http://www.fsis.usda.gov/About_FSIS/NACMPI/index.asp.

National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods (NACMCF)

The NACMCF was established under Departmental Regulation 1043-28 and is currently co-sponsored by FSIS, the Food and Drug Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Department of the Defense Veterinary Service Activity. A new charter for NACMCF was approved on August 3, 2006. Appointment of the 30 members for the 2006-2008 Committee is pending. The Committee plans meetings at least twice a year.

NACMCF held full committee meetings in FY 2006 on March 24 in Arlington, VA, and on September 22, in Washington, DC. During these meetings the following topics were discussed: determination of cooking parameters for safe seafood for consumers, consumer guidelines for the safe cooking of poultry products and assessment of the food safety importance of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies *paratuberculosis*. At the September 2006 meeting, the following future work charges were presented to the Committee by the FDA, and by FSIS, respectively: "Inoculated Pack/challenge Study Protocols," and "Determination of the Most Appropriate Technologies for the FSIS to Adopt in Performing Routine and Baseline Microbiological Analyses."

The activities of NACMCF are carried out, in part, by Sub-Committees that are focused on specific areas being considered by the full Committee. Several Sub-Committee meetings were held in Arlington, VA, during the week of March 21-24, 2006 and in Washington, D.C. during the week of September 18-22, 2006. The full Committee adopted the final report "Consumer Guidelines for the Safe Cooking of Poultry" at the March 24, 2006 meeting. Ongoing Sub-Committees work includes two issues: determination of cooking parameters for safe seafood for consumers, and assessment of the food safety importance of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies *paratuberculosis*.

NACMCF meeting minutes, transcripts and final reports can be viewed on the NACMCF Web site at http://www.fsis.usda.gov/About_FSIS/NACMCF/index.asp

RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS:

Forestry Research Advisory Council (FRAC)

The FRAC was authorized for the purpose of providing the Secretary of Agriculture with recommendations and advice on regional and national planning for forestry research supported by the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Program administered by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (CSREES). The council also provides advice related to the Forest Service research program, authorized by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Act of 1978. The Council is comprised of up to 20 members appointed by the Secretary and drawn from Federal, university, State, industry, and non-governmental organizations.

For 2006, FRAC reiterated its 2005 recommendations with follow-up comments and responses to the Secretary. The following actions are recommended to increase the value and effectiveness of USDA's forest research portfolio:

Building Capacity

- Create a competitive interdisciplinary graduate and post-graduate training program that develops cohorts of students trained to address complex forest issues. We recommend an allocation of \$3 million per year that could support ten institutional awards nationwide.

Research Initiatives

- Complete a large-scale genome sequencing projects for the major U.S. commodity conifer, *Pinus taeda* (Loblolly pine), over a period of 5-years; and

- Develop a national forestry research program in the emerging technologies of nanotechnology and biorefining. These technologies are critical to enhancing the global competitiveness and energy security of the United States.
- Efficiency and Effectiveness*
- Develop a joint, annual review of Forest Service Research & Development and CSREES programs. The purpose of this review would be to develop a coherent forest research portfolio that most efficiently addresses America's forest research priorities;
 - Competitive grants for forestry research are dispersed among several National Research Initiative (NRI) Competitive Grants Program panels that coordinate projects that related to forestry and forest ecosystem, including forest products. The description of NRI programs should explicitly identify forest resources as it does for agriculture, along with "sustaining the quality and productivity of the natural resources" as now stated;
 - Streamline USDA management of forest bioenergy and biobased products research by designating one authoritative USDA program manager; and
 - Establish a joint task force drawing from the Forest Service, CSREES, and partners to develop new models for effective and timely delivery of research information to stakeholders for forestry research.

Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21st Century Agriculture (AC21)

The AC21 was established by the Secretary to examine the long-term impacts of biotechnology on the U.S. food and agriculture system and USDA, and provide guidance to USDA on pressing individual issues, identified by the Office of the Secretary, related to the application of biotechnology in agriculture.

The AC21 has 20 members, including representatives from academia, biotechnology providers, food manufacturers, the grain trade, farmers, the legal profession, and both environmental and consumer organizations, plus *ex officio* members from six government agencies and departments and a representative from State Departments of Agriculture. The Committee met four times in FY 2006, and completed a major report entitled, "Opportunities and Challenges in Agricultural Biotechnology: The Decade Ahead." It was presented to the Office of the Secretary on August 30, 2006. This wide-ranging report touches on nearly every area where USDA and biotechnology intersect, and addresses a major part of the charge given to the Committee to examine how biotechnology may change agriculture and the work of USDA over the long term. The report is a companion to a report presented to the Secretary of Agriculture in May, 2005, entitled "Preparing for the Future." By way of context, the new report discusses the first decade of biotechnology products and describes how the world into which new biotechnology products will be entering changed over that decade—through global developments, through new priorities, through the internet, etc.—and provides some signposts on how the world has become even more complex over that period. The report then elaborates a series of 28 topics of discussion that some or all members of this Committee feel will affect the Secretary of Agriculture and USDA in work related to biotechnology over the upcoming decade. Some topics extend even beyond the legal authorities of USDA, if they may affect USDA's working environment. In particular, some issues around FDA's policies on biotechnology-derived foods and labeling are highlighted.

The AC21 has begun a new project around the topic of agricultural coexistence. The current draft formulation of the topic is the following: *In an increasingly complex marketplace, what issues should USDA consider regarding coexistence among increasingly diverse agricultural system?* The project is expected to be completed before the end of FY 2007, after which a new project related to transgenic animals will be undertaken.

In accordance with the AC21 Charter, which established a yearly process for requesting nominations for a portion of the Committee membership, a *Federal Register* notice announcing a request for nominations for the Committee was published on October 13, 2005. Two members had resigned from the Committee in FY 2006 prior to filling positions. The initial terms of nine of the original members on the Committee expired in early 2006, and on February 24, 2006, all were reappointed, plus two new members. Subsequently one other member resigned. On March 20, 2006, the AC21 Charter was amended to raise the total potential membership on the Committee from 15-20 to 20-25. On August 3, 2006, two additional members were appointed, raising the total to 20 members at present.

The process for soliciting nominations for those AC21 members whose terms expire in February 2007 or April 2007 is under way.

Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics

The Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics was established on July 16, 1962, in the Department of Commerce, and was chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. 2, in January 1973. This Committee was moved to USDA in fiscal year 1997 when responsibility for the Census of Agriculture transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Agriculture.

The Committee is discretionary, and provides advice to the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). It makes recommendations on the conduct of the periodic censuses and surveys of agriculture, other related surveys, and the types of agricultural information obtained from respondents. The Committee also advises on the content and frequency of agricultural reports.

The Committee is composed of 25 members with professional knowledge regarding the data needs of the food, fiber and rural sector. It provides a direct link with the major agricultural organizations and farm groups which could not be as effectively or efficiently obtained from any other source. The Committee is the primary forum for reconciling the divergent data needs between data user and provider groups. It is also instrumental in helping NASS provide the maximum value from their statistics, within available funding, and to continually improve its products and services.

During the fiscal year, one meeting was held in Arlington, Virginia, on February 14 and 15, 2006. The meeting focus was to advise NASS on the follow-on surveys for the 2007 Census of Agriculture; discuss small and minority farm coverage, electronic data reporting, improving respondent relations, and reducing respondent burden; and offer suggestions on the NASS on-going survey program. In addition, the Committee discussed the new NASS Web site, a Sub-Committee report on pesticide use, and established three new Sub-Committees: the Animal Unit Month Sub-Committee, Energy Sub-Committee, and Equine Sub-Committee. The Committee members recommended the following priority for follow-on surveys: Census of Horticulture, Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey, and Economics and Land Ownership Survey. The Committee also suggested conducting a follow-on census regarding energy production on farms.

A Sub-Committee on Pesticide Use was formed to evaluate the feasibility of expanding the NASS pesticide use program. After several meetings and input from data users, it was concluded there was no need for NASS to expand the data series and the Sub-Committee was disbanded.

For more information on the proceedings of the meeting, please see the following Web-site:
http://www.nass.usda.gov/About_Nass/Advisory_Committee_on_Agriculture_Statistics/advisory-es021406.pdf.

The Committee will next meet in Washington, D.C. on February 27 and 28, 2007. The purpose of this meeting is to advise NASS on the 2007 Census of Agriculture data products and offer suggestions on the NASS survey program.

USDA/Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)

The Secretary of Agriculture signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with HACU, to ensure that the Hispanic community equitably participates in USDA education and employment programs, resources, and services. The Secretary of Agriculture appointed a national body, the Leadership Group, to ensure the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in the MOU. The Leadership Group serves as the lead advisory group, to the Secretary, on issues relating to the Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) and Hispanic education. The Leadership Group consists of six members from USDA and six members from HACU.

The USDA-HACU Leadership Group has focused on the improvement of representation of Hispanics in the USDA workforce through increasing participation of Hispanic Americans, Hispanic-serving school districts, HSIs, and other educational institutions in USDA employment, education programs, and services. Seeking to be a responsive driving force behind the President's Hispanic Nine-Point Plan, and in promoting successful recruitment, retention and promotion practices, the Leadership Group recommends strategies, and identifies initiatives and mechanisms to successfully implement a strategic human capital approach to improve Hispanic representation.

The HACU National Internship Program, Public Service Leaders Scholarship Program, and the E. Kika de la Garza HSI Fellowship Program, have been utilized to close the academic achievement gap among Hispanic Americans, while engaging the Hispanic community with Federal employment opportunities. In 2006, two new programs were started: the High School Ambassadors Program and the Science Fellowship Program. Both programs aim to engage Hispanics and minorities in science-related fields.

The Leadership Group met March 24, 2006, and October 20, 2006, to discuss:

- Leveraging resources by creating effective educational partnerships;
- Program objectives for the Hispanic-Serving Institution National Program;
- Objectives and outcomes of the USDA-HSI grants Program;
- Improving the image of USDA as an employer of choice;
- HSI participation in the Farm Bill process; and
- Growth of the Hispanic population and related challenges.

A strategic plan has been developed for the USDA-HSI National Program covering each of the five geographic regions covered by the USDA-HSI liaison officers. The strategic plan is in concert with the USDA Strategic Plan and USDA Human Capital Plan. The performance plans of each staff member of the HSI National Program are linked to these Departmental plans and identify individual goals and targets. Customers are surveyed and results are measured to determine that activities are producing desired results and program targets are met. Internal goals have been set to ensure that the program meets the program objectives identified above.

MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS:

Advisory Committee on Foreign Animal and Poultry Diseases (FAPD)

This Committee advises the Secretary on issues regarding the prevention, suppression, control, and/or eradication of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth (FMD) disease or other destructive foreign animal diseases should such disease enter the United States. Committee duties involve advising and counseling on policy and regulatory action with regard to dealing with an outbreak, changing practices in the production and marketing of animals, the importation of animals and animal products, and the handling and treatment of unusual or suspicious animal or poultry problems.

The Committee of 17 members was reestablished by the Secretary of Agriculture in 2006. Under this Committee, a Sub-committee was established for animal identification issues. The Committees held their first meeting on September 12 and 13, 2006, in Riverdale, Maryland. The meeting yielded a set of recommendations for the Secretary that focused on: the Plum Island Facility and the National Bio- and Agrodefense Facility (NBAF); National Animal Identification System; Avian Influenza; the Importance of Animal Health Issues in National Policy and National Security; the National Veterinary Stockpile; the Veterinary Workforce Expansion Act (109th Congress: S.914, H.R.2206) and the National Veterinary Services Act (P.L. 108-161); pay for animal health officials; Fever Tick; Surveillance; Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy; and emergency response plan exercises. This Committee's recommendations are critical since the animal and human disease issues have become more evident in our daily lives since September 11, 2001.

Plum Island Disease Facility and the NBAF

The Committee recommends:

- The Secretary continue the United States Department of Agriculture's robust relationship with the NBAF.
- The Plum Island Disease Center be moved to the mainland in a state-of-the-art manner.
- The goal to make NBAF a Level 3 agricultural facility/Biosafety Level 4 be affirmed.
- The current deficiency of Foreign Animal Disease Diagnosticians and training capacity be addressed.
- In the interim, the current facility at Plum Island needs to be adequately maintained.

- USDA retain at least equal governance of the new facility with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).
- The new facility maintains status as an Office Internationale des Epizooties-OIE (World Organization for Animal Health) reference laboratory for applicable diseases.

Avian influenza (AI) - AI is a serious national and international issue. Introduction of highly pathogenic H5N1 virus into this country, especially the commercial poultry compartment, would have devastating effects on the quality of the food supply, public and animal health, and the economics of the Nation. Control of AI as a disease primarily of poultry is also important.

The Committee recommends:

- The Secretary ensure that USDA emergency plans include participation of State and industry personnel in addition to USDA personnel.
- The USDA Low-Path AI (LPAI) Live Bird Market System Program should continue its work.
- Approval of the 2004 National Poultry Improvement Plan (NPIP) for AI, which includes indemnification, is long overdue and necessary.
- Adequate indemnification also provides a stimulus to report disease and serves as a means of cooperation with Federal and State animal health officials.
- Education and active dialogue with our foreign partners are critical to long-term improvement of the worldwide situation on AI.

The Importance of Animal Health Issues - There are also a number of diseases affecting animals that can affect humans or transmitted through the food supply.

The Committee recommends the Secretary continually strives to integrate national animal health issues with those of their human health counterparts.

Animal Health and Element of National Security - As the Nation moves forward to address emerging and re-emerging health issues, those similarities should be reflected by the comprehensive, 'one medicine' nature of disease surveillance, prevention, treatment, control, and eradication.

The Committee recommends the Secretary:

- Continue to emphasize that animal health is a critical element of national security.
- Support issues related to the continued safety and viability of U.S. animal health on a par with those of the more traditional national security issues.

The National Veterinary Stockpile - The Committee recommends that the timeline should be accelerated for the National Veterinary Stockpile and funding increased accordingly:

- Achieving a functional response posture for at least 10 of the 17 threat agents must occur within two years rather than the current goal of five years.
- Comprehensive readiness, to include the remainder of the recognized threat list, should be achieved within an additional three years, bringing the total timeline to five years from the date of this meeting.
- Finally, the threat list should be reviewed and prioritized annually.

The Veterinary Workforce Expansion Act (109th Congress: S. 914, H.R. 2206) and the National Veterinary Medical Services Act (P.L. 108-161) - Veterinary medicine is an integral and indispensable component of the Nation's public health system. Veterinarians are essential for early detection and response to unusual disease events that could be linked to newly emerging infectious diseases such as AI, foot-and-mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and West Nile virus, to name a few. However, the Bureau of Labor Statistics projects the current shortage of veterinarians will worsen in the future. Therefore, given that:

- There is a current critical shortage of veterinarians in the following areas:
 - USDA (Food Safety and Animal Disease Control)
 - Bio-security and Homeland Security
 - Research on domestic and foreign animal disease
 - Public health service/animal disease affecting human
 - Animal care and welfare
 - Laboratory animal care and research
 - Food animal veterinarians
- Conservative estimates identify a current shortage of 1,500 veterinarians in these areas.
- With today's shortage, plus the projected increase in the need over the next 20 years, there will be a shortage of 15,000 veterinarians.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary, in keeping with Homeland Security Presidential Directive 9:

- Support the Veterinary Workforce Expansion Act, which creates a competitive grants program to increase the number of veterinarians to meet these needs.
- Request the full funding of the National Veterinary Medical Services Act (P.L. 108-161).

Pay for Animal Health Officials - There are approximately 70,000 active veterinarians in the United States. In 2005, the median professional income of experienced veterinarians in private small animal practice was \$92,000 and was about \$83,500 for Federal government veterinarians. However, the demographics of Federal government veterinarians would indicate an older population, likely at the high end of their salary scale.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary:

- Investigate compensation for Doctors of Veterinary Medicine, PhDs, and Veterinary Technicians by benchmarking with other employment categories in order to recruit and retain qualified personnel.
- Ensure that an effective workforce succession plan is put in place.

Fever Tick - Given the great effort to push fever tick out of the United States, with the exception of a safe zone in Texas; given that said zone is being increasingly encroached upon and expanded; and given that heartwater could be devastating to industry and wildlife, including endangered species and that this bont tick also transmits dermatophilosis, an acute skin disease of animals including white-tailed deer, and is a vector of African fever in populations of humans in the Caribbean region;

The Committee recommends that the Secretary:

- Devote adequate resources towards addressing the acaricide resistance problem in Mexico and that USDA interact with Mexican officials to push fever tick out of the United States and establish a free zone in Mexico in order to better control the parasite.
- Reestablish funding for bont tick control in the Caribbean at a level to bring about eradication of the bont tick working with all governments involved.

Surveillance – USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Veterinary Services has been very successful in their surveillance and eradication efforts. However, a more holistic approach to disease surveillance, prevention, and control is needed to improve the health of national animal agriculture, ensure the long-term viability of U.S. animal agriculture, and allow U.S. animal agriculture to remain competitive internationally.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary accelerate the development of a comprehensive, coordinated, and integrated disease surveillance system within the National Surveillance System to allow rapid detection and response to emerging and re-emerging diseases both domestically and internationally.

Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) - The USDA developed and implemented an enhanced surveillance system to detect 1 in 1 million cases of BSE in U.S. cattle at high risk. The USDA's aggressive interventions to protect both animal and human health, its insightful risk communication, its enhanced surveillance, and its advocacy on behalf of the domestic and international consumers and cattle industry are appreciated. The Committee recommends continued research on this disease.

Emergency Response Plan - The committee recognizes and appreciates the efforts and resources that have been put forth over the past five years by the USDA in coordinating and organizing several highly effective test exercises and tabletops on FMD (e.g. Operation Aftosa and the Equinox exercises). Short of the real event, simulations are the best way to test, and subsequently improve, our emergency response plans. In the opinion of Committee members, what has been lacking in this process is a coordinated, national process for planning and executing these exercises. For example, the Equinox exercise conducted in the Northeast in March 2005 demonstrated the need for a future simulation to model the deployment and use of the North American FMD vaccine bank. So far, this has not been accomplished.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary develop and implement a more coordinated national strategy for exercising emergency response plans through State and regional simulations.

The National Animal Identification System (NAIS) Report - In 2001, a diverse group of animal agriculture stakeholders concerned about animal agriculture and the security of the U.S. food supply was organized by the National Institute for Animal Agriculture (NIAA) into a task force to address animal identification. Since the formation of the NIAA Identification Task Force, more than 200 animal industry and State and Federal government professionals representing over 70 allied associations/organizations have collectively developed recommendations for a workable, multi-species, national animal identification system. The NAIS Subcommittee of the NIAA Committee represents the cumulative effort of five years of this industry-government partnership to develop a workable animal identification system.

The FAPD Committee accepts the NAIS Sub-Committee report including the species working group reports and agrees to forward the report to the Secretary with the desire that the Secretary implements the current recommendations.

The Committee would like to highlight the wording of the Sub-Committee report that is in conflict with the Cattle Working Group Report. The full Committee echoes the Sub-Committee language and recommendations below: The Sub-Committee feels strongly that access to the animal identification and tracking databases outlined in the animal trace processing system needs to support State and Federal animal health officials in responding to diseases or emergencies in a timely manner.

The Sub-Committee recommended that USDA establish the following description for when the State and/or Federal Animal Health Official would access the Animal Trace Processing System to submit a request for information to the animal tracking databases:

- An investigation of foreign or emerging animal disease of concern.
- An animal health emergency as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and/or State animal health official.
- A need to conduct a trace back / trace forward to determine the origin and distribution of infection for a program disease such as brucellosis and tuberculosis.

General Conference Committee (GCC) of the National Poultry Improvement Plan (NPIP)

The purpose of the GCC, which includes seven members representing both academia and industry, is to maintain and ensure industry involvement in the advice provided to the Federal administration in matters pertaining to poultry health and the administration of the NPIP. The Committee represents cooperating State agencies and poultry

industry members, and serves as a liaison between the poultry industry and the USDA on matters pertaining to poultry health.

The Committee met during the 38th Biennial Conference of the NPIP, which was held September 7-9, 2006, in Portland, Oregon. The Committee made the following recommendations and passed the following resolutions during 2006.

Recommendations:

- That USDA conditionally approves water-based foam as a method of mass depopulation for floor-reared poultry in accordance with the stipulation outlined in a GCC document provided to USDA and appended performance standards.
- That USDA supports efforts of the use of water-based foam as a method of mass depopulation and funding of research to address animal welfare concerns and to improve technology. Remove the requirement for dissipation of the foam within 4 hours due to the method of disposal of carcasses by composting because this is a different issue.
- That USDA should investigate other methods to NPIP for controlling movement and /or perceived disease requirement needs that may affect pigeons, doves, and pet birds or impact commercial poultry. NPIP has never had disease programs for these birds. These birds are not produced or managed in a manner of other birds and therefore most NPIP personnel are not familiar with their management or disease requirements.

Resolutions:

- Therefore, be it resolved that the delegates from the 38th Biennial Conference of the NPIP believe there is a need for research in the area of avian mycoplasma diagnostics to aid in the determination of a more definitive diagnosis.
- Therefore be it resolved that State Departments of Aricultures' Regulatory Laboratories that are NPIP authorized laboratories be allowed to perform the Real Time Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction (RRT-PCR) test for Avian Influenza [obtain protocol and reagents from the National Veterinary Services Laboratories (NVSL)], to participate in NVSL training to perform RRT-PCR for AI and to participate in proficiency testing for same, and Be It Further resolved that the Senior Coordinator distributes copies of this resolution to the Deputy Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, and the director of NVSL.

In addition, the Committee reviewed the status of last year's discussion points. The following are discussion points and the actions that the Committee has taken this year.

- (1) The Office Internationale des Epizooties added a new chapter on AI in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code establishing that both H5/H7 LPAI and high pathogenic AI (HPAI) are notifiable.
Action: The Official State Delegates of the NPIP added a definition for Notifiable AI to the Provisions of the Program at its meeting in Portland, Oregon, on September 9, 2006.
- (2) The Office Internationale des Epizooties added a new definition of compartmentalization used to resolve trade issues in outbreaks of AI.
Action: The Official State Delegates of the NPIP added a new classification for U.S. Compartmentalization and a definition for a Compartment to the provisions of the NPIP at its meeting in Portland, Oregon, on September 9, 2006.
- (3) Appraisal formulas and the procedure used to determine bird and egg cost for indemnification in the face of an outbreak of H5/H7 LPAI.
Action: The Official State Delegates of the NPIP have worked with the Egg, Broiler, and Turkey industry to develop fair market value charts for their stock.
- (4) Establishment of a raised-for-release upland game bird H5/H7 LPAI certification program to meet interstate shipment requirements for the upland game bird industry.

Action: The Official State Delegates of the NPIP added a new H5/H7 LPAI Monitored Program for raised-for-release upland game birds to the Provisions of the NPIP at its meeting in Portland, Oregon, on September 9, 2006.

- (5) Amendment of the auxiliary provisions of the NPIP that pertains to the procedures for conducting the agar gel immunodiffusion (AGID) test for AI by requiring three positive controls and three unknowns and the NVSL antigen in the center well of a normal 7-well AGID pattern on the agar plate.

Action: The Official State Delegates of the NPIP amended the procedures in the Provisions of the NPIP for conducting the AGID test for AI by requiring three positive controls and three unknowns and the NVSL antigen in the center well of a normal 7-well AGID pattern on the agar plate at its meeting in Portland, Oregon, on September 9, 2006.

- (6) Evaluating cleaning and disinfection language for the proposed NPIP H5/H7 LPAI program for commercial layers, broilers, and turkeys.

Action: A Committee from the commercial broiler, turkey and layers industry developed language that was added to the interim final rule for H5/H7 LPAI for commercial poultry.

National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee (NWSAC)

This NWSAC advises the Secretary on policies, issues, and research needs related to APHIS' Wildlife Services (WS) programs. The 20 members represent a broad spectrum of agricultural, environmental and conservation groups, academia, and other interests.

On August 1, 2006, the Committee met in Riverdale, Maryland. Discussion topics included a wide range of issues on rabies; urban wildlife; invertebrate wildlife damage control; tribal project overview; prairie dog control; use of lure crops; airport reporting; dissemination of research results to the field; cost/benefit analysis of research activities; non-lethal research (defining the term non-lethal); trapping best management practices; immunocontraception; endangered species incidental take; Federal policy to follow State law/policy; and the John F Kennedy International Airport supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

After thorough deliberations, the Committee passed 19 recommendations:

- Seek new funding to support the wildlife disease surveillance, monitoring, response, and research program. This program should include two wildlife biologists per State and U.S. territories, and support collaboration of the National Wildlife Research Center with the National Animal Health Laboratory Network and State wildlife agencies.
- Seek new funding to provide for yearly inflation and future annual resource needs to protect livestock and agriculture from offending animals.
- Support new funding to increase coyote and feral swine research. This research should include identifying property and ecological damage, expanding distribution and population associated disease risks, and development of effective long and short term control methods.
- Seek dialogue and cooperation with the Secretary of Interior to gain new funding to increase field resource capacity for APHIS to resolve increasing conflicts involving humans, livestock, other domestic animals, and wildlife resulting from restored and expanding wolf populations.
- Airport safety should remain a priority and APHIS should continue to provide leadership and direction in the areas of research, control, and training for the mitigation of aircraft/wildlife hazards.
- The Secretary of Agriculture should work with the Secretary of Interior to develop a cooperative arrangement between APHIS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to process and respond to migratory bird depredation permit applications within seven days.

- Expand the development of monitors with the long-term strategy being to encourage use of these monitors which results in the immediate notification of a sprung trap. The NWSAC further supports the goal of minimizing the amount of time an animal remains in a trap.
- Seek new funding to expand contraceptive research, especially for predator control/management, the use of field trials to aid in cost/benefit analysis of the technique, and encourage implementation of these methods as appropriate.
- Conduct full economic cost/benefit analysis of practices and/or programs recommended, promoted or offered by the agency, dependent upon the availability of financial resources.
- Commends the Secretary of Agriculture and APHIS for the excellent and extraordinary efforts in the development and implementation of "An Early Detection System for Highly Pathogenic H5N1 Avian Influenza in Wild Migratory Birds: U.S. Interagency Strategic Plan." In addition, NWSAC recommends appropriate recognition be given to employees by the Office of the Secretary.
- Seek \$1.5 million in new funding to sustain requirements mandated by the Department of Homeland Security for protection of APHIS' facilities.
- Seek new funding to support increased research for improved baits and vaccines critical to the control and eradication of wildlife rabies in skunk and mongoose.
- Investigate the feasibility of funding from a first point of sale or importation of each dose of rabies vaccine sold for use in the United States to aid the expansion of wildlife rabies research and eradication.
- That when feral canids and felids adversely affect agriculture, wildlife, or human health, they be officially included within the scope of APHIS research and control operations.
- Expedite the Texas Gray Fox Rabies eradication project, strategic efforts to include those endemic areas of southern New Mexico and Arizona.
- To include feral canids and felids in APHIS' Oral Rabies Vaccination (ORV) research, and if proven efficacious, that ORV be used for rabies control and prevention in those species under Memorandum of Understanding guidelines on Native Nations.
- Work with the Secretary of Interior to amend regulations such that the accessibility requirements of migratory bird permit log holders are greater than 30 days old.
- Explore long-term strategic planning, development and operations for the purpose of raising management control capacity through training and outreach of cooperators.
- Seek to minimize impacts to producers when State and Federal laws and regulations conflict and result in a limitation of services or programs.

The Committee identified three APHIS research field station sites for possible locations for next year's meeting: Hilo, Hawaii; Logan, Utah; and Gainesville, Florida.

National Organic Standards Board (NOSB)

The NOSB was established to provide recommendations to the Secretary on implementing the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (OFPA), which authorizes a national organic program for the production and handling of organically produced foods. The NOSB is composed of four farmers/growers, two handlers/processors, one retailer, one scientist, three consumer/public interest advocates, three environmentalists, and one certifying agent. Members come from all four U.S. regions.

The NOSB has assisted in the development of the National Organic Program (NOP) regulations, including the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (National List). They have reviewed and continue reviewing substances for use in organic production and advise the Secretary on different aspects of implementing the NOP.

The Secretary appointed four new members to fill vacant seats on the NOSB for FY 2007. Seats that were filled included: one consumer/public interest group representative, one environmentalist, one organic handler, and one scientist. The NOP forwarded over 15,000 post-cards seeking candidates for the NOSB to all United States organic producers and handlers, and other organizations representing the organic community. Thirty-nine applicant responses were received, as a result of the solicitation.

In FY 2008, one seat (environmentalist representative) will become vacant on the NOSB.

In FY 2006, at the November 2005 and April 2006 meetings, the NOSB completed the majority of its work related to the sunset review of substances on the National List (169 substances are set to expire on October 21, 2007). The NOSB reviewed, evaluated, and recommended that the Secretary renew 165 of the 169 exemptions and prohibitions on the National List; remove three exemptions and defer action on one exemption. In addition, the NOSB provided initial guidance to evaluate agricultural materials petitioned for listing on §205.606 of the National List as commercially unavailable or whose supply is inconsistent and fragile in response. This recommendation was developed in response to a recent court decision on *Harvey vs. Johanns* ruling that agricultural materials not commercially available as organic would not be allowed in the stream of commerce after June 9, 2007, unless they were specifically listed on §205.606.

In conjunction with its April 2006 meeting and in response to an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking comments on pasture requirements for organic dairy animals and ruminants, the NOSB participated in a Dairy Pasture Symposium in State College, PA. At this symposium, the NOSB and NOP heard from over 250 organic community representatives (including certifying agents, farmers, researchers, interest groups, processors, etc.), concerning perceptions and regulatory questions surrounding the NOP "access to pasture" requirements for organic livestock. In addition, the NOSB and NOP received scientific data and experimental information that would help them better address public concerns and regulatory questions around "access to pasture." The NOP is using results from this symposium to draft a proposed rule to clarify "access to pasture" requirements in FY 2007.

Additionally in FY 2006, the NOSB received the Interim Report of the Aquatic Animals Task Force and began exploring issues related to the development of standards for organic aquaculture in the United States. During the coming fiscal year the NOSB will review, evaluate, and make recommendations on petitioned substances to determine whether such substances should be included for use in organic production and handling. It will also begin evaluating work submitted from its Pet Food Taskforce and begin researching and developing organic pet food labeling standards.

The NOSB plans to hold two public meetings each year during FY 2007 and 2008. One administrative meeting is being planned for early February 2007 to expedite the review of petitioned materials for §205.606 and to meet the court-ordered deadline (June 2007) from the *Harvey vs. Johanns* ruling.

Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee

Under two 2-year charters that spanned 2001 to 2005, the Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee (Committee) met seven times to fulfill its purpose of providing recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture on ways USDA can tailor its programs to meet the industry's needs. Meetings took place on April 16-17, 2002; September 4, 2002; April 1, 2003; February 19-20, 2004; July 13-14, 2004; January 11-12, 2005; and July 12-13, 2005, in the Washington, D.C. area.

On June 6, 2005, Secretary Johanns re-chartered the Committee for two more years. The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) subsequently asked industry for nominations of individuals to be on the Committee, received nominations for 81 individuals, and then, once USDA selected 25 individuals representing diverse interests in the produce industry, AMS conducted its first meeting on June 27-28, 2006, under the new charter. AMS conducted the next meeting on January 23-24, 2007, in Washington, D.C.

Since its inception, the Committee has developed 48 recommendations related to issues such as grading and certification services, marketing orders, Market News, crop insurance, labor and immigration, pesticides, and nutrition. During its first 2 charters, the Committee placed particular emphasis in developing ways to increase fruit and vegetable consumption in USDA's National School Lunch Program, and recently has focused its attention on food safety initiatives.

Federal Grain Inspection Advisory Committee

The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) Grain Inspection Advisory Committee was established under section 20 of the United States Grain Standards Act on September 29, 1981. The Committee is charged with advising the GIPSA Administrator on implementing the United States Grain Standards Act and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, or, more simply, on implementing the agency's grain inspection and weighing programs. The Committee is comprised of 15 members and 15 alternates who represent all segments of the U.S. grain industry, including producers, processors, handlers, exporters, grain inspection agencies, and scientists related to the policies in section 2 of USGSA (7 U.S.C. 74).

The Committee advises GIPSA on various important issues affecting agency operations and the official grain inspection and weighing system. In fiscal year 2006, the Committee met on November 1-2, 2005, in Corpus Christi, Texas, and June 12-14, 2006, in Kansas City, Missouri. At the November meeting, the Committee addressed agency finances, reauthorization, railcar stowage examination regulations/procedures, status report on delegation and designation, progress report on re-engineering of domestic operations, update on U.S./Mexico operations, progress report on methods to assess grain end use functionality, overview of standards and future plans, and members where given a tour of the Port of Corpus Christi. At the June meeting, the Committee addressed the agency's finances, organizational structure, use of third-party contracting, progress report on reengineering domestic inspection operations, update on methods development, standards update for soybeans, sorghum and feed peas, designation updates, farm-gate quality survey, agency international activities, and agency plan for pandemic flu.

At these meetings, the Committee offered the Administrator advice and recommendations for addressing these issues and others that impact service delivery.

The first meeting for FY 2007 was held December 12-13, 2006, in Washington, D.C.

FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES:

Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade (APAC)

and

Agricultural Technical Advisory Committees for Trade (ATAC)

Pursuant to Departmental Regulation 1042-68, USDA currently administers the APAC and six ATACs: (1) Animals and Animal Products; (2) Fruits and Vegetables; (3) Grains, Feed, and Oilseeds; (4) Sweeteners and Sweetener Products; (5) Tobacco, Cotton, Peanuts, and Planting Seeds; and (6) Processed Foods. The APAC and ATACs were rechartered and reconstituted in May of 2003.

Congress established these Committees in 1974 to ensure that trade policy and trade negotiations objectives adequately reflect private sector U.S. commercial and economic interests. The Committees provide the Secretary of Agriculture and the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) information and advice on negotiating objectives, bargaining positions and other matters related to the development, implementation, and administration of U.S. agricultural trade policy. The members on the APAC and on the ATACs are important to advancing the Administration's aggressive trade agenda to liberalize agricultural trade, expand access for U.S. food and agricultural products in overseas markets, and reduce unfair competition.

A balanced representation is sought for the Committees, but there is no legal requirement stating that Committee membership is composed of exact numbers from each sector of an industry. The representation is as follows: 34 members on the APAC, 34 members on the Animals and Animal Products ATAC, 34 members on the Fruit and

Vegetables ATAC, 37 members on the Grains, Feed and Oilseeds ATAC, 27 members on the Sweeteners ATAC, and 24 members on the Tobacco, Cotton, Peanuts, and Seeds ATAC, and 32 members on the Processed Foods ATAC. All members have demonstrated leadership qualities, commodity expertise, and knowledge of the effects

that various trade barriers or absence of trade barriers can have on the commodities they represent. All members are recognized leaders in their field and are able to represent those interests with fairness.

The APAC and the ATACs are jointly chartered by USDA and the USTR. The Committees provide a formal mechanism to ensure liaison between the Federal government and private sector regarding international agricultural trade matters. The APAC provides policy advice, while the ATACs provide detailed commodity technical advice.

During FY 2006, the APAC and ATACs met two times. Both meetings were held in Washington, D.C. The Committees discussed, among other trade-related issues, the status of the Doha negotiations of the World Trade Organization (WTO), status of WTO accessions for Vietnam and Russia, and bilateral and regional trade negotiations and agreements with the Andean Countries (Notably Colombia and Peru), Central America and the Dominican Republic, Panama, Thailand, Malaysia, and Korea. During the meetings, committee members provided formal recommendations in the form of "resolution" and numerous recommendations orally. The recommendations in all cases are fully considered by USTR and USDA negotiators in the course of pursuing free trade agreements and resolving trade disputes. A full report of Committee activities is available in the Federal Advisory Committee Act database at <http://www.fido.gov>

The Administration continues to receive crucial advice on a variety of issues. FY 2007 will be another extremely busy year for the Committees. The APAC and ATACs will be called upon frequently in relation to the WTO negotiations and ongoing WTO implementation and monitoring issues; trade issues with China, Mexico, and other nations; sanitary and phytosanitary access issues for U.S. products; and continuing regional and bilateral agreements.

Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets

The Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets is composed of representatives from the private sector experienced in agribusiness and management, with interest and/or experience in exports and similar overseas operations. The primary mission of the Committee is to make recommendations on policies and programs, which will enhance agricultural exports to emerging markets through the use of Emerging Markets program authority. Specifically, Committee members review, from a business perspective, qualified proposals submitted to the program for funding assistance, principally from the private sector. This review is done prior to obtaining policy level approval and funding commitments from the agency. Committee reviews of proposals balance private sector perspectives with government views, an important consideration since the program emphasizes involvement by private industry.

Mandated by the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 as amended by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 and the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, the members operate under a Federal charter and are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture for 2-year terms.

The Committee consists of 20 members from both private industry and academia representing a cross-section of the agricultural industry, geographic and ethnic diversity. Sectorial expertise among members encompasses fields such as agricultural policy and economics; banking and finance; marketing; production and processing of food and feed; livestock and genetics; farm cooperatives and agribusiness management; transport, storage and handling; and individual commodity expertise. The Committee's Charter was reauthorized on October 25, 2006.

Frequency of meetings varies, depending upon the issues to be considered and the range and importance of activities under consideration by the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) at any given time. The Committee last convened on May 3-4, 2006, in Washington, DC, and reviewed selected applications to the Emerging Markets Program from the private sector in FY 2006. The Committee's recommendations play an important role in the agency's funding decisions.

Edward R. Madigan Agricultural Export Excellence Award Board

Section 261 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 ("the Fair Act") authorized the establishment of the Edward R. Madigan United States Agricultural Excellence Award to honor those who exhibit

significant entrepreneurial effort to increase exports of U.S. agricultural products or provide significant assistance to others in increasing U.S. agricultural exports. The Act also authorized a Board of Evaluators whose purpose is to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with advice and recommendations for the selection of recipients of the Award. The Board is composed of six representatives from the private sector selected for their knowledge and experience in exporting U.S. agricultural products. The members of the Board are appointed by and serve at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Board meets as often as necessary, either in person or via teleconference, to review nominations and make recommendations. The Board last met during fiscal year 2003 to discuss the awards ceremony held on May 16, 2003.

On May 9, 2005, Secretary Johanns signed the Reestablishing Charter for the Edward R. Madigan United States Agricultural Export Excellence Board of Evaluators. FAS is reviewing potential candidates for the Board, and will solicit award nominations once a new board has been selected. It is anticipated that 6-12, awards could be presented annually at either local ceremonies in the recipient's home State or at an annual White House ceremony that would include all recipients.

Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers

The Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers was established by Section 5 of the Agricultural Credit Improvement Act of 1992 (Pub. L. 102-554). The Committee's purpose is to advise the Secretary on the administration of the Farm Service Agency's (FSA) beginning farmer programs and methods to increase participation between Federal and State programs to provide joint financing to beginning farmers and ranchers, along with other methods of creating new farming or ranching opportunities. The duration of the Committee is indefinite. The Committee first met in 1999.

As required by law, members include representatives from FSA, State beginning farmer programs, commercial lenders, private nonprofit organizations with active beginning farmer programs, CSREES, community colleges, and other entities or persons providing lending or technical assistance for qualified beginning farmers or ranchers. Several farmers were also appointed to serve.

The Committee, consisting of 20 members, held its seventh meeting on July 11-12, 2006. The Committee came up with 18 recommendations, including many of those they recommended in the 2005 meeting (additional funding for USDA programs, USDA support on changing tax policy to assist beginning farmers and ranchers, and a 2007 Farm Bill Title addressing beginning farmer and rancher issues). Other recommendations included establishing a beginning farmer and rancher Individual Development Account Pilot Program (using a matched savings to assist those of modest means to establish a pattern of savings and promote a new generation of farmers and ranchers); and that USDA's Economic Research Service research whether obtaining medical and health insurance protection is a barrier to new farm/ranch entry.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT:

Task Force on Agricultural Air Quality Research

The Task Force on Agricultural Air Quality (AAQTF) was established by statute in 1996, P.L. 104-127 Sec. 391, to ensure intergovernmental cooperation in research activities relating to agricultural air quality. The Task Force advises the Secretary in providing oversight and coordination of air quality activities as they relate to agriculture. The Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) chairs the Task Force, whose members represent agricultural production, agricultural industry, research/academia, health science, regulators and public interest groups.

The 2004–2006 Task Force was reestablished by Departmental Regulation 1042-126 on September 17, 2004 and held meetings in 2005 and 2006, concluding its business upon expiration of the its charter in August 2006. On August 16, 2006, the charter was renewed and a new Task Force (i.e., 2006–2008 AAQTF) was established by the Secretary of Agriculture, for an additional 2-year term. The following discussion provides information on the activities conducted by the 2004–2006 Task Force and information on the initial meeting of the new Task Force (i.e., 2006–2008 AAQTF).

2004–2006 AAQTF

The first meeting of the renewed Charter was held January 27-28, 2005 in Arlington, VA. Comments were provided on behalf of the Secretary. A representative from the USDA Office of General Counsel provided members a presentation on the Federal Advisory Committee Act rules, roles, and responsibilities.

USDA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) representatives gave presentations detailing agency initiatives and activities related to air quality. USDA discussed: (1) its global climate change initiative and CERCLA/EPCRA, (2) a research project on measuring emissions from animal feeding operations and (3) Forest Service's BlueSkyRAINS Demonstration Project. EPA described the Animal Feeding Operations Consent Agreement as well as particulate matter (PM), ozone and regional haze implementation schedules.

The second meeting was held on June 22-23, 2005 in Amarillo, TX. USDA updates included current staffing, funding, and program information, a description of the ARS air quality research stations, an announcement of an Agricultural Air Quality Workshop in Potomac, MD in June 2006 and research activities by the Forest Service.

EPA provided updates regarding the consent agreement, Confined Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) rules, coarse PM and ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), the developing exceptional and natural events policy, methyl bromide, and spill prevention, control, and countermeasures plans, new source performance standards for diesel engines and the National Clean Diesel campaign.

Technical reports were provided on a number of subjects by invited speakers, including the Wind Erosion Protection System, modeling feedlot emissions, the National Park Service's PM and ammonia monitoring program, volatile organic compounds, the Buckeye Farms lawsuit, COMET-VR, PM emissions from cotton production, and the consent agreement.

Committee activities included the development of an educational brochure on agricultural air quality issues. Additionally, documents were forwarded to the Secretary, making recommendations on USDA's agricultural air quality program structure and funding, and USDA's policy on the coarse PM standard being proposed by EPA.

The final two meetings of the 2004 -2006 task force were held in the Washington, D.C. area, with the third meeting held in Bethesda, MD on February 28 – March 2, 2006 and the fourth meeting held in Harrisburg, PA on August 30 – 31, 2006. Key recommendations coming out of these meetings included, but were not limited to:

- USDA should develop definitions for Ag emission sources and discuss them with EPA
- EPA should use sound science to determine PM10 emissions for Title V and PSD permits
- EPA should address sampler bias
- USDA should establish a program that has administrative and budgetary control over air quality research
- EPA should develop a program to appropriately address emissions from agricultural burning

2006–2008 AAQTF

The first meeting of this Task Force was held on November 28 – 30, 2006 at the Holiday Inn on the Hill, in Washington, D.C. The meeting was opened by Chief Arlen Lancaster, AAQTF Chair. Chief Lancaster introduced USDA Secretary Mike Johanns, who spoke to the Task Force about the importance of the interaction between the

AAQTF and USDA. Following the conclusion of Secretary Johanns speech, Chief Lancaster set the tone of the meeting by talking about setting the direction for the 2006 – 2008 AAQTF. In addition, Mr. Marc Kesselman, USDA General Counsel, talked about regulatory issues facing agriculture. Peter Chen, USDA OGC Attorney Advisor, briefed the Task Force on their roles and responsibilities under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

USDA and EPA representatives gave presentations detailing agency initiatives and activities related to air quality. USDA discussed a number of research projects involving pollutants such as particulate matter, ozone and volatile organics. In addition, USDA talked about efforts to renew the Farm Bill and the time line associated with that work. EPA's Office of Air and Radiation described regulatory and monitoring activities related to particulate matter, ozone and ammonia emissions. EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality talked about regulations likely to affect biomass and alternative fuels. In addition, a State representative presented information on the perspective of States as it relates to air quality and agricultural emissions. Finally, breakout sessions were provided for Task Force committees (i.e., PM and Ozone; GHG and VOC; Internal Combustion Engines and Alternative Fuels; Animal Feeding Operations; and Emerging Issues) to draft initial action plans.

CIVIL RIGHTS:

USDA 1890 Task Force

The USDA/1890 Task Force consisting of 16 members was established in 1988. Its primary mission is to develop initiatives of mutual benefit to USDA and the eighteen 1890 Land-Grant Institutions. The Task Force consists of senior officials representing USDA mission areas and Presidents or Chancellors of the 1890 Land-Grant Institutions. Since its founding, the Task Force has continued to forge strong alliances and support for USDA and the 1890 community.

Margo M. McKay was sworn in as the second Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights in August 2006. As a result of delegated authority from the Secretary of Agriculture, Ms. McKay serves as the Co-chair of the Task Force with Eddie N. Moore, President of Virginia State University also a Co-chair.

The Task Force met November 2006. Secretary Johanns offered remarks during the meeting, thanked the 1890 Land-Grant Institutions for their commitment to rural America and acknowledged the successes of the USDA/1890 Task Force and the work of the 1890 Land Grant University. Decisions were made to move forward with four programmatic priorities identified by the Task Force: Human Nutrition: Health Wellness and Obesity; National Scholars Program; Centers of Excellence; and Homeland Security of the Nation's Food Supply.

Two meetings are planned for FY 2007 to continue the development and implementation of a focused and ambitious work plan, which will include phased implementation of the Programmatic Priorities and other activities of mutual interest. The Task Force will also focus on meeting the performance outcomes and measures identified in the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights Strategic Plan.

These efforts are in continued support of strengthening the partnership between USDA and the 1890 Land-Grant Universities to ensure access to USDA programs and opportunities.

USDA/American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) Leadership Group

Section 882 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 required the Secretary of Agriculture to establish programs to ensure that tribally controlled colleges and universities and American Indian communities equitably participate in USDA employment, programs, services, and resources. In response to this legislative mandate, USDA entered into a formal Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with AIHEC on February 3, 1998.

AIHEC represents 32 Tribal Colleges as member institutions, including one in Canada and has 3 pending applicants. Thirty-three tribal colleges have been granted land-grant status under the Equity in Education Land-Grant Status Act

of 1994 but two, having lost accreditation, are no longer operating. The Tribal Colleges granted land-grant status are referred to as 1994 Land-Grant Institutions.

The MOA provided for conducting USDA 1994 Institution programs and activities to enhance American Indians' and Alaska Natives' capacity to attain educational excellence and contribute to the fulfillment of USDA's missions. The MOA also called for a jointly established USDA/AIHEC Leadership Group with equal USDA and AIHEC

member institutions to provide guidance for tribal college initiatives. Under this agreement, the Secretary of Agriculture appoints the USDA Co-Chair and USDA members representing each of the 7 USDA Mission Areas. The Executive Director of AIHEC appoints the 1994 Institution Co-Chairperson and Tribal College President members.

The Committee consists of 16 members. AIHEC represents 33 Land-Grant Institutions (known as the 1994 Institutions) as defined in Section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994. The MOA created a USDA/AIHEC Leadership Group, consisting of eight USDA and eight AIHEC officials, to serve as an advisory body for all partnerships initiatives.

During fiscal year 2006, the USDA/AIHEC Leadership Group met in February and September in Washington, D.C. to discuss plans to continue implementing the recommendations of the Action Item Agenda and revision of the USDA/AIHEC strategic plan. In September 2005, a draft of the 1994/Land Grant Strategic Planning process was submitted to USDA/AIHEC Leadership Members for review.

A winter meeting of the USDA/AIHEC Leadership Group is scheduled for February 6, 2007.

AUTHORITY AND COMPOSITION OF USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN EXISTENCE BETWEEN
FY 2006 AND FY 2007

Committee Title	USDA Agency	Authority Statutory (S) or Discretionary (D)	Committee Membership
FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES:			
National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant and Fetal Nutrition	FNS	S 42 U.S.C. 1786	24
FOOD SAFETY:			
National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection	FSIS	S 21 U.S.C. 601	16
National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods	FSIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-28	30
RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS:			
Forestry Research Advisory Council	CSREES	S 16 U.S.C. 582a	20
Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21 st Century Agriculture	ARS	Departmental Regulation 1043-049	20
Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics	NASS	S 5 U.S.C. App. 2	25
USDA/Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities	REE	Memorandum of Agreement dated 10/96	12
MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS:			
Advisory Committee on Foreign Animal and Poultry Diseases	APHIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-31	17
General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan	APHIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-8	7
National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee	APHIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-27	20
National Organic Standards Board	AMS	S 7 U.S.C. 6518	15
Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee	AMS	Departmental Regulation 1042-139	25
Federal Grain Inspection Advisory Committee	GIPSA	P. L. 103-156 7 U.S.C. 87i	15

AUTHORITY AND COMPOSITION OF USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN EXISTENCE BETWEEN
FY 2006 AND FY 2007

Committee Title	USDA Agency	Authority Statutory (S) or Discretionary (D)	Committee Membership
FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES:			
Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	34
Ag. Tech. Adv. Comm. For Trade in:			
Animals & Animal Products	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	34
Fruits and Vegetables	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	34
Grains, Feed & Oilseeds	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	37
Sweeteners and Sweetener Products	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	27
Tobacco, Cotton, Peanuts and Planting Seeds	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	24
Processed Foods	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	32
Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets	FAS	P.L. 104-127	20
Edward R. Madigan Agricultural Export Excellence Award Board	FAS	P.L. 104-127	6
Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers	FSA	P.L. 102-554	20
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT:			
Task Force on Agricultural Air Quality Research	NRCS	Departmental Regulation 1042-126	25
CIVIL RIGHTS			
USDA 1890 Task Force	Civil Rights	Deputy Secretary's Memorandum dated 8/29/88	16
USDA American Indian Higher Education Consortium	Civil Rights	P.L. 104-127	16