

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Purpose Statement

Departmental Administration (DA) was established to provide management leadership to ensure that the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) administrative programs, policies, and advice, meet the needs of USDA program organizations and are consistent with laws and mandates. DA's functions include: Human Resources Operations, Executive Services, Budget and Financial Management for appropriated and non-appropriated funds, the Washington Communications and Technology Services, Procurement Operations and other management programs, such as audit compliance and Department-wide compliance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The administrative law functions and the Judicial Officer have been placed within DA for administrative purposes.

The majority of DA's functional activities are located in Washington, D.C. As of September 30, 2011, there were 436 full-time permanent employees under DA. These employees were assigned as follows (DA Direct Appropriation, DA Reimbursement, Working Capital Fund (WCF) and the Office of Executive Secretariat):

<u>Location</u>	<u>Full-Time Permanent</u>
Washington, D.C.:	
DA (Direct & Reimbursement)	228
DA WCF	167
Office of Executive Secretariat	<u>23</u>
Subtotal	418
Field Units:	
DA (Direct & Reimbursement)	<u>18</u>
Total	436

Office of Inspector General Reports – On-Going

500-24-1-13	June 2011	Review of the Department's US-Bank Purchase and Travel Charge Card Data – Agency responding to OIG inquiries.
-------------	-----------	---

Government Accountability Office Reports - Completed

GAO-120956	April 2011	Agency Acquisition Savings Strategies
------------	------------	---------------------------------------

Government Accountability Office Reports – On-Going

GAO-542185	September 2011	Federal Real Property – Agency providing information and responding to GAO inquiries.
GAO-361230	February 2011	Green Buildings - Closed but no final report issued.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Available Funds and Staff Years
(Dollars in thousands)

Item	<u>2010 Actual</u>		<u>2011 Actual</u>		<u>2012 Estimate</u>		<u>2013 Estimate</u>	
	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years
Salaries and Expenses:								
Discretionary Appropriations a/.....	\$28,319	152	\$29,706	183	\$24,165	144	\$29,647	183
Rescission.....	-	-	-59	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers In.....	2,000	-	2,000	-	2,000	-	b/	-
Total Available.....	30,319	152	31,647	183	26,165	144	29,647	183
Lapsing Balances.....	-101	-	-215	-	-	-	-	-
Obligations.....	30,218	152	31,432	183	26,165	144	29,647	183
<u>Obligations under other USDA appropriations:</u>								
Radiation Safety.....	947	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Homeland Security Activities.....	16,352	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HR Training/Software.....	1,040	-	2,072	-	539	-	539	-
Flexible Spending Account.....	2,540	-	2,355	-	2,355	-	2,355	-
Biobased Product.....	352	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honor Awards.....	67	-	80	-	80	-	80	-
Drug Testing.....	213	-	210	-	100	-	100	-
Medical Services.....	-	-	350	-	350	2	350	2
Shuttle Services.....	374	-	437	-	400	-	400	-
TARGET Center.....	934	3	946	3	947	4	947	4
Visitor Center/People's Garden.....	752	4	1,009	4	1,050	6	1,050	6
Deepwater Horizon.....	216	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Operations Center.....	2,312	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interpreter Service.....	793	2	1,234	2	1,244	2	1,244	2
IT Support Services.....	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Misc. Reimbursements.....	1,296	3	200	3	5,482	39	907	6
Management Serv. Reimbursement....	5,048	30	3,855	28	4,336	34	4,336	34
Personnel Details.....	96	1	18	1	-	-	-	-
Overseas Deployment.....	657	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
HR Transformation Programs.....	100	-	1,683	12	1,689	12	1,689	12
OSEC Driver.....	103	1	103	1	103	1	103	1
Virtual University.....	-	-	1,379	9	2,233	13	2,233	13
SES Candidate Program.....	-	-	1,184	-	500	-	500	-
Total, Agriculture Appropriations....	34,321	54	17,115	63	21,408	113	16,833	80
<u>Working Capital Fund: c/</u>								
Administration (USDA).....	39,658	112	37,366	128	40,871	159	40,441	149
Executive Secretariat (USDA).....	2,995	22	3,119	23	3,883	24	3,684	24
Administration (Non-USDA).....	2,247	-	2,295	4	637	4	1,258	19
WCF Admin. Support Costs d/.....	5,115	21	-	35	-	35	-	35
Total Working Capital Fund.....	50,015	155	42,780	190	45,391	222	45,383	227
Total DA.....	114,554	361	91,327	436	92,964	455	91,863	466

a/ Appropriations for 2010 provided \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

b/ Subject to reauthorization.

c/ This section includes WCF activities managed by DA. Please see the WCF Explanatory Notes for details.

d/ WCF Administrative Support Cost Staff Years are under the Working Capital Fund.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Permanent Positions by Grade and Staff Year Summary

Item	2010 Actual			2011 Actual			2012 Estimate			2013 Estimate		
	Wash. D.C.	Field	Total	Wash. D.C.	Field	Total	Wash. D.C.	Field	Total	Wash. D.C.	Field	Total
SES.....	7	-	7	6	-	6	6	-	6	6	-	6
AL-3.....	2	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	2
AL-2.....	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1
SL.....	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1
GS-15.....	36	1	37	31	1	32	33	1	34	36	1	37
GS-14.....	79	3	82	63	3	66	63	3	66	66	3	69
GS-13.....	48	17	65	37	6	43	37	6	43	37	6	43
GS-12.....	41	2	43	33	-	33	33	-	33	33	-	33
GS-11.....	15	2	17	14	1	15	14	1	15	14	1	15
GS-10.....	8	-	8	8	1	9	8	1	9	8	1	9
GS-9.....	24	1	25	19	-	19	19	-	19	19	-	19
GS-8.....	8	-	8	8	-	8	8	-	8	8	-	8
GS-7.....	8	-	8	8	-	8	8	-	8	8	-	8
GS-6.....	3	-	3	3	-	3	3	-	3	3	-	3
GS-5.....	3	1	4	3	-	3	3	-	3	3	-	3
GS-4.....	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1
Ungraded Positions.....	5	-	5	5	-	5	5	-	5	5	-	5
Total Perm. Positions.....	290	27	317	243	12	255	245	12	257	251	12	263
Unfilled, EOY.....	14	-	14	9	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total, Perm. Full-Time Employment, EOY.....	276	27	303	234	12	246	245	12	257	251	12	263
Staff Year Est.....	179	27	206	234	12	246	245	12	257	251	12	263

Note: This section includes appropriated and reimbursed only; WCF and WCF-Administrative Support Cost staff years are shown in the WCF Explanatory Notes.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET DATA

SIZE, COMPOSITION AND COST OF MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET

The 2013 budget estimates propose no additional vehicles.

Departmental Administration (DA) uses vehicles to support the mission of providing customer support to the USDA offices in the Washington, D.C. metro area. DA provides mail and courier services, facility management, disposal of excess property, and transportation of forms, publications, and supplies. In addition, DA provides executive chauffeur services to the Office of the Secretary, and other executive staff members 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, D.C. 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 Beltsville Service Center moves excess equipment and furniture between USDA offices and the warehouse, and picks up surplus property for disposal from various other Federal agencies in the Washington metropolitan area; operates a shipping and receiving facility; provides forms and publications acquisition, management, warehousing and worldwide distribution; and general office supply acquisition, warehousing and sales. 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 as needed.

DA leases sedans and vans 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 follow GSA regulatory vehicle replacement standards which are three years or 60,000 miles. Vehicle replacement is based on funding priority, program management, vehicle mileage, and vehicle age.

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 three years, the cost of gasoline and ethanol has risen dramatically. DA is committed to using E85 as an alternative to gasoline to support the Departments' goal of increasing alternative fuels procurement and requires all newly leased or purchased vehicles to be E85 compatible if available for the vehicle type.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET DATA

Size, composition and cost of agency motor vehicle fleet as of September 30, 2011, 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 thou)
	Sedans and Station Wagons	Light Trucks, SUVs and Vans		Medium Duty Vehicles	Ambulances	Buses	Heavy Duty Vehicles		
		4X2	4X4						
2009	5	19	5	0	0	0	0	29	\$183
Change from 2009	-2	-1	+1	+5	0	0	0	0	+\$7
2010	3	18	6	5	0	0	1	33	\$190
Change from 2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+\$11
2011	3	18	6	5	0	0	1	33	\$201
Change from 2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+\$17
2012	3	18	6	5	0	0	1	33	\$218
Change from 2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+\$17
2013	3	18	6	5	0	0	1	33	\$218

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

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

Salaries and Expenses:

For Departmental Administration, [\$24,165,000] \$29,647,000, 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

Appropriations Act, 2012.....	\$24,165,000
Budget Estimate, 2013.....	<u>29,647,000</u>
Change from 2012 Appropriation.....	<u>+ 5,482,000</u>

Summary of Increases and Decreases

(Dollars in thousands)

	2010 <u>Actual</u>	2011 <u>Change</u>	2012 <u>Change</u>	2013 <u>Change</u>	2013 <u>Estimate</u>
Discretionary Appropriations:					
Departmental Administration <u>a/</u>	\$28,319	+\$1,328	-\$5,482	+\$5,482	\$29,647

a/ DA appropriations for 2010 totaled \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Project Statement
(On basis of appropriations)
(Dollars in thousands)

Program	<u>2010 Actual</u>		<u>2011 Actual</u>		<u>2012 Estimate</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>2013 Estimate</u>	
	Staff		Staff		Staff		Staff		Staff	
	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years
Discretionary Appropriations:										
Departmental Administration a/..	\$28,319	152	\$29,647	183	\$24,165	144	+\$5,482 (1)	+39	\$29,647	183
Total Adjusted Appropriation....	28,319	152	29,647	183	24,165	144	+5,482	+39	29,647	183
Rescissions and										
Transfers (Net).....	-	-	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Appropriation.....	28,319	152	29,706	183	24,165	144	+5,482	+39	29,647	183
Transfers In:										
Biobased Markets Prog.....	2,000	-	2,000	-	2,000	-	-2,000	-	b/	-
Rescission.....	-	-	-59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Available.....	30,319	152	31,647	183	26,165	144	+3,482	+39	29,647	183
Lapsing Balances.....	-101	-	-215	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Obligations.....	30,218	152	31,432	183	26,165	144	+3,482	+39	29,647	183

a/ Appropriations for 2010 provided \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

b/ Subject to reauthorization.

Project Statement
(On basis of obligations)
(Dollars in thousands)

Program	<u>2010 Actual</u>		<u>2011 Actual</u>		<u>2012 Estimate</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>2013 Estimate</u>	
	Staff		Staff		Staff		Staff		Staff	
	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years	Amount	Years
Discretionary Obligations:										
Departmental Administration a/	\$28,218	152	\$29,432	183	\$24,165	144	+\$5,482 (1)	+39	\$29,647	183
Mandatory Obligations:										
Biobased Markets Prog.....	2,000	-	2,000	-	2,000	-	-2,000	-	b/	-
Total Obligations.....	30,218	152	31,432	183	26,165	144	+3,482	+39	29,647	183
Lapsing Balances.....	101	-	215	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Available.....	30,319	152	31,647	183	26,165	144	+3,482	+39	29,647	183
Transfers In.....	-2,000	-	-2,000	-	-2,000	-	+2,000	-	b/	-
Rescission.....	-	-	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Appropriation.....	28,319	152	29,706	183	24,165	144	+5,482	+39	29,647	183

a/ Appropriations for 2010 provided \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

b/ Subject to reauthorization.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Justification of Increases and Decreases

The base level is necessary to provide management leadership to ensure that the Department's administrative programs, policies, and advice, meet the needs of USDA program organizations and are consistent with laws and mandates. DA's functions include: Human Resources Operations, Executive Services, Budget and Financial Management for appropriated and non-appropriated funds, the Washington Communications and Technology Services, Procurement Operations and other management programs, such as audit compliance and Department-wide compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, as well as, administrative law and Judicial Officer functions.

- (1) A net increase of \$5,482,000 and 39 staff years (\$24,165,000 and 144 staff years available in 2012) for Departmental Administration.
- (a) A net increase of \$71,000 to fund pay costs. These funds are necessary to maintain staffing levels to continue administrative support services to Department Headquarters and on-going programs in human resources management, financial management, procurement and property management, government ethics, small business utilization programs, other management programs, such as audit compliance and Department-wide compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, and administrative law functions. DA is a labor intensive staff office with little ability to absorb pay cost increases without holding a large number of positions vacant for the entire year.
- (b) The increase of \$5,411,000 and 39 staff years will be used to restore the office's policy and operational activities. This would involve staffing and operations across the offices that support the entire Department for: personnel policy activities and personnel operations, procurement policy and operational activities that support the DA and USDA agencies, real property policy and operations that track and monitor USDA space inventories in the National Capital region and across the continental United States, policy oversight and guidance in the area of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization goals and achievement of planned targets for participation of women and minorities in USDA agencies' programs, and the implementation of Administrative Law judicial functions and oversight under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years

(Dollars in thousands)

State/Territory	2010 Actual		2011 Actual		2012 Estimate		2013 Estimate	
	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years	Amount	Staff Years
California.....	\$149	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado.....	-	-	\$98	1	\$99	1	\$100	1
Minnesota.....	-	-	102	1	103	1	104	1
District of Columbia.....	43,069	151	31,232	181	25,963	142	29,443	181
Obligations.....	30,218	152	31,432	183	26,165	144	29,647	183
Lapsing Balances.....	101	-	215	-	-	-	-	-
Total, Available a/.....	30,319	152	31,647	183	26,165	144	29,647	183

a/ Appropriations for 2010 provided \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Classification by Objects
(Dollars in thousands)

	2010 <u>Actual</u>	2011 <u>Actual</u>	2012 <u>Estimate</u>	2013 <u>Estimate</u>
Personnel Compensation:				
Washington D.C.....	\$15,623	\$18,900	\$14,741	\$18,989
Field.....	117	200	201	202
11 Total personnel compensation.....	15,740	19,100	14,942	19,191
12 Personal benefits.....	4,268	5,105	4,075	5,121
13.0 Benefits for former personnel.....	-	4	-	-
Total, personnel comp. and benefits.....	20,008	24,209	19,017	24,312
Other Objects:				
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons.....	368	168	168	160
22.0 Transportation of things.....	2	1	1	1
23.3 Communications, utilities, and misc. charges...	667	539	539	530
24.0 Printing and reproduction.....	188	204	204	175
25.2 Other services from non-Federal sources.....	4,360	4,057	3,982	2,480
25.3 Other purchases of goods and services from Federal sources.....	4,081	1,813	1,813	1,813
26.0 Supplies and materials.....	270	280	280	130
31.0 Equipment.....	68	92	92	46
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities.....	206	69	69	-
Total, Other Objects.....	10,210	7,223	7,148	5,335
99.9 Total, new obligations a/, b/.....	30,218	31,432	26,165	29,647
Position Data:				
Average Salary (dollars), ES Position.....	\$152,584	\$166,940	\$166,940	\$166,940
Average Salary (dollars), GS Position.....	\$94,530	\$98,894	\$96,845	\$99,195
Average Grade, GS Position.....	13.3	13.5	13.4	13.5

a/ Appropriations for 2010 provided \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

b/ Obligations for the 2008 Farm Bill BioPreferred/Biodiesel Marketing Program included.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

STATUS OF PROGRAM

Current Activities:

Departmental Administration (DA) became part of Departmental Management (DM) pursuant to Secretary's Memorandum 1060-001 effective October 1, 2009. DM provides overall direction, leadership and coordination for the Department's management of human resources, ethics, property, procurement, hazardous materials management, facilities management, small and disadvantaged business utilization programs and the regulatory hearing and administrative proceedings conducted by the Administrative Law Judges, and the Judicial Officer. Activities of the offices that comprise DA follow:

Management Services (MS) provides executive leadership in administrative policies and operations that cut across the DM staff offices' activities functional lines. MS manages strategic planning, procurement and human resources operations, budget development and financial management activities; oversees DM's Freedom of Information Act Program; and investigates allegations of executive misconduct; and serves as the DM's internal Government Accountability Office and Office of Inspector General liaison. MS also provides leadership within DM for the implementation of government-wide electronic solutions and provides an IT infrastructure that supports the staff offices.

The Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM) (formerly the Office of Human Capital Management and Office of Ethics) leads the Department-wide human resources initiatives to ensure that USDA's programs are staffed with the personnel necessary to meet program objectives. Under the Departmental Management reorganization, OHRM develops and administers Departmental principles, policies and objectives related to: organizational development, position classification, training and employee development, leadership development, labor relations, executive resources, recruitment, diversity, mediation and work life programs, enterprise systems management, position management, performance management, strategic human resources management, cultural transformation, non-EEO mediation and alternative dispute resolution programs. These activities support USDA mission area agencies in the accomplishment of their goals and objectives by ensuring that human capital management goals and programs align with and support USDA's missions. This office also manages the Department-wide ethics program and provides responsive counseling and advice to all USDA employees; administers personal financial disclosure requirements on covered staff; provides training to USDA staff on various rules governing employee ethical conduct, conflicts of interest, and political activity; handles financial disclosure and ethics aspects of Presidential nominations requiring Senate confirmation; and acts as liaison with the White House Counsel's Office, the Office of Government Ethics, and the Office of Special Counsel on ethics issues.

The Office of Operations (OO) is responsible for Department-wide activities relating to facilities management services, security, and operational support for agencies and offices occupying USDA's Headquarters Complex, the George Washington Carver Center, and USDA-leased facilities in the National Capital Region. OO provides support in the following areas: engineering, architecture, space management, internal energy conservation, recycling, sustainable practices, physical security, occupational safety and health, accessible technology, reasonable accommodation, interpreting services, and business services (e.g., mail, photocopying and duplication, general supply/equipment, excess personal property, forms and publication distribution, and warehouse services). The office also is responsible for the management and oversight of the Secretary's People's Garden Initiative and for the USDA Visitor's Center, which provide education and outreach to employees and the public.

The Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM) provides Department-wide leadership and management in acquisition, asset management, environmental stewardship, and employee health and safety. OPPM is an organizational leader delivering service, accountability, and stewardship across DM's priorities. OPPM is also responsible for the Hazardous Materials Management Program and manages the Department's BioPreferred Marketing Program.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) has primary responsibility for leading the implementation of the Department's small business program, providing 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. OSDBU ensures that the Department implements the Ability One Program (Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act Program) which encourages contracting with nonprofit agencies that hire people who are blind or severely disabled.

The Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ) 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 render initial decisions and orders that become final decisions of the Secretary if not appealed to the Secretary's Judicial Officer by a party to the proceedings.

The Office of the Judicial Officer (OJO) serves as final deciding officer in regulatory proceedings of a quasi-judicial nature, including appeals from the administrative law judges' initial decisions and reparation proceedings under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act and the Packers and Stockyards Act. Any party to a proceeding may appeal an administrative law judge's initial decision to the Judicial Officer. The Judicial Officer also rules on questions certified by the administrative law judges. Oral argument before the Judicial Officer is discretionary.

Selected Examples of Recent Progress:

OHRM implemented numerous strategic human resources initiatives at both the Departmental and mission area levels, addressing HR-related recommendations to improve performance internally and with USDA's customers. Each initiative required significant collaboration with stakeholders both external and internal to the Department. Key accomplishments are: 1) Transformed the manner in which applicants apply for Federal jobs and re-engineered the applicant assessment process including elimination of narrative Knowledge Skills and Abilities at the initial stage of the application process which allowed applicants to apply for a Federal position with a resume and cover letter; implemented category rating; increased hiring managers' accountability; improved quality and speed of hiring; notified applicants of their status at key stages in the application process; and reduced hiring time by twenty-eight percent; 2) Increased Veteran new hires from approximately six percent to twenty-four percent; 3) Established the USDA Plan to increase Federal Employment of Individuals with Disabilities; piloted a streamlined four step processing model for increasing the use of Schedule A to hire new employees with disabilities, including a USDA Disability Employment Program and Leadership Team; 4) Established a one stop application website for USDA student interns and hiring managers; 5) Established diverse national partnerships with employee and professional associations and organizations to support and assist our diversity efforts in hiring, retention, training and advancement of USDA's workforce; conducted five Department-wide "One USDA" Special Emphasis Observances; and 6) Implemented a comprehensive Diversity Road Map which was recognized by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) as a model program, further defining USDA's strategic focus to cultivate a diverse and inclusive work environment that ensures equality of opportunity and inclusion.

OHRM established the USDA Virtual University (VU) with three components: (1) Academy of Interns and Scholars; (2) School of Talent Management; and (3) College of Leadership and Professional Development. VU initiated and implemented the USDA Senior Executive Candidate Development Program (SES CDP) to build a cadre of diverse and skilled executive leadership for USDA's Workforce and Succession Planning; issued a Departmental Regulation (DR) on developing Individual Development Plans (IDPs) to ensure all employees have access to training and development, increasing the use of IDPs and increasing the number of AgLearn users with IDPs by thirty-six percent; and established a USDA-wide Student Internship Program. VU is piloting a detail registry to provide a website where employees can post their interest in a detail along with their skills as well as allowing human resource professionals the ability to post detail opportunities across USDA.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

In order to communicate the progress of the cultural transformation initiatives to all employees, OHRM publishes *MyUSDA* newsletter from Secretary Vilsack. OHRM manages the Secretary's Honor Awards program that recognizes outstanding performance across USDA. In the area of Labor-Management Relations, OHRM orchestrated the implementation of Executive Order 13622, Creating Labor-Management Forums to Improve Delivery of Government Services by forming the USDA Labor-Management Forum made up of leaders from the seven National labor unions. USDA is one of four Executive Branch departments with a bargaining pilot project that involves an expanded scope of bargaining between agencies and unions concerning permissive negotiation subjects, a pilot program recently recognized by the National Council (chaired jointly by the Directors of OPM and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as a "Best Practices" for its metrics on mission and service delivery.) The USDA Forum publishes a quarterly publication (the *Bulletin*) that keeps USDA employees informed of the transformational work being done in partnership between labor and management.

For the first time since the implementation of SES Pay-For-Performance in 2005, USDA has received full certification of our SES performance appraisal system from OPM and OMB. Standardized Cultural Transformation performance language was incorporated into all 2011 USDA senior executive service performance plans.

OHRM issued a DR entitled "Administrative Grievance System" DR 4070-771 which focuses on shorter processing timeframes for grievance appeals and encourages the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR). To date, we have received 47 administrative grievances, which is an increase of one hundred and seventy-four percent, demonstrating increased credibility in the administrative grievance process since employees entrust their concerns to the review of an OHRM Grievance Examiner. Since the issuance of the DR, thirty-two percent of employees who appealed an administrative grievance elected the use of ADR. Since implementing the Equal Opportunity Accountability Initiative in 2010, the review and analysis of 124 cases has resulted in disciplinary or adverse action being initiated against fifty-eight individuals, and USDA personnel at all levels are held accountable and responsible for their actions.

The Wellness and Work Life Division implemented the DR for Telework to meet the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010 at 5 U.S.C. 6501, DR 4040-811-002 with the premise that all employees are eligible for Telework which helped increase the eligibility rate for Telework from sixteen percent in 2010 to fifty-four percent in 2011, meeting or exceeding all requirements of the Telework Enhancement Act.

The Ethics Division implemented e-filing of Financial Disclosure report, and developed a new employee "on boarding" process including an innovative new Onboarding Portal website. The Office of Government Ethics awarded USDA the 2011 "Ethics Program Excellence and Innovation Award" in recognition for creating an Ethics Program that goes above mere compliance with ethics regulations in truly creative and innovative ways.

(OO) provided seasonal flu vaccines at no cost to all USDA and Contractor employees. The Health Units at the Washington, DC Headquarters and the George Washington Carver Center conducted twice-weekly allergy clinics and weekly blood pressure clinics. Providing these clinics at the workplace reduces the time employees need to be away from work. Several health screenings were provided for employees, including echocardiograms, stroke, osteoporosis, cancer, diabetes, vision acuity and glaucoma. The Health Units also conducted blood screenings to test for cholesterol levels, prostate cancer, ovarian cancer and a variety of other conditions. In total, the two Health Units received 10,885 employee visits, including eighty-five for emergency conditions. Six Red Cross blood drives were conducted, plus one Armed Forces blood drive at each location. The Medical Officer reviewed medical records for employees who work with toxic substances, applications for disability retirements, requests for reasonable accommodations, and pre-employment. In 2011, a new health unit was established at the recently occupied consolidated lease facility, Patriots Plaza III, at 355 E Street S.W. Washington, DC. The new health unit provides service to approximately 1,100 USDA employees at this facility.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(OPPM) procurement policy strengthened service through administrative solutions. In 2011, USDA embarked on an effort to take a comprehensive approach to evaluate its administrative services delivery model in order to identify opportunities to save money and improve services that support mission area activities. The Procurement Steering Committee developed recommendations designed to improve USDA's procurement program. The initial recommendations, to be implemented in the first quarter of 2012, will establish a department-wide strategic sourcing strategy, standardize procurement processes, and enhance compliance and oversight to improve program integrity and identify areas for improvement. The next set of recommendations involves streamlining operational activities.

USDA supported OMB's Campaign to Cut Waste by reducing spending in Management Support Services' contracts by approximately thirty percent, doubling the goal to reduce spending by fifteen percent by the end of 2012. Spending was reduced by more than one hundred million dollars, from three hundred sixty-one and a half million dollars in 2010 to two hundred fifty-nine and a half million dollars in 2011.

USDA continues to be a leader across the Government in minimizing high risk contracts, having significantly lower percentages of high risk contract spending relative to contract dollars obligated compared to Government-wide averages. In 2011, USDA further reduced new high risk contract awards with 4,773 fewer new high risk contract actions than 2010, an eighteen percent reduction in new contract awards using high risk contract types. USDA decreased new contract spending in 2011 by two million dollars in cost-type contracts, approximately eight million dollars in time and material and labor hour contracts, and by thirty and a half million dollars in noncompetitive contracts below 2010 spending on these types of high risk contracts.

USDA managed various Acquisition Workforce improvements in 2011. A total of 221 Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (FAC-C) certificates was awarded in 2011. The percentage of certified contracting professionals increased from 72 percent in 2010 to 84 percent in 2011. Additionally, USDA tracked certifications and managed training for over 2,600 employees in the Federal Acquisition Certification for Contracting Officers Representatives (FAC-COR) program. Finally, USDA transitioned over 3,000 users to a new acquisition workforce career management system entitled Federal Acquisition Institute Training Application System (FAITAS).

OPPM property management assisted USDA agencies in disposing of over 400 buildings and structures. This resulted in reduced annual operating and maintenance costs of \$11.5 million, as well as reducing agencies' space footprints by one million square feet. This effort was in response to the June 10, 2010 Presidential Memorandum entitled "Disposing of Unneeded Federal Real Estate." In addition, OPPM led the Department in exceeding the alternative fuel use target set by Executive Order 13423 by eleven percent. The alternative fuel vehicle inventory also increased twenty-two percent over the previous year as well. OPPM also donated \$93,600 in equipment under the "Computers for Learning" initiative of EO 12999; \$621,270 in equipment under the Stevenson-Wydler Act, and \$1,594,550 to qualified educational institutions under the FAIR Act.

OPPM environmental and sustainability launched the BioPreferred voluntary labeling program designed to increase the purchase of biobased products in the commercial marketplace. In the seven months during which the program was active in 2011, USDA received about 1,000 applications for the label and certified about 500 biobased products. Moreover, OPPM promoted sustainable Federal procurement by designating an additional fourteen biobased product categories, bringing the total number of designated biobased item groups to sixty-four. These designated categories represent an estimated 9,000 individual products subject to the Federal procurement preference.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

USDA is actively pursuing environmentally sound practices to advance sustainability and reduce greenhouse gas emissions as established in our Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan (SSPP). These include: (1) improving energy efficiency and renewable energy use performance. In 2011, USDA achieved a sixteen percent reduction in energy intensity compared to the 2003 baseline. USDA purchased and consumed renewable energy equivalent to nine percent of the Department's total electricity use; (2) reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from employee travel, contracted waste disposal, and transmission and distribution losses from purchased energy with USDA achieving a five percent reduction in Scope 3 GHG emissions compared to the 2008 base year; (3) reducing USDA potable water use intensity by fourteen percent compared to the 2007 baseline; and 4) establishing a nationwide network of buildings that not only provide waste and recycling data, but also implement waste management best practices. USDA-occupied, Government-owned buildings achieved a forty-five percent waste diversion rate.

OSDBU worked closely with USDA's senior management and contracting offices and actively assisted 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. This outreach program included advancing small business contracting opportunities in USDA's largest procurement section, food and commodities, by enhancing the competitive posture of small farmer-owned cooperatives, small rural businesses, and producers to successfully compete for government and commercial contracts. While the overall government-wide goal is twenty-three percent of annual small business prime contract awards, in 2011 USDA awarded over fifty-three percent of the Department's prime contracts to small businesses totaling \$2.7 billion. USDA continues to be a leader in the Federal Government for providing maximum opportunity for small businesses and has made a concerted effort to direct contracts to Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) which were awarded two percent of the Department's prime contracts, or \$117 million.

OALJ conducted 255 hearings (including one rulemaking hearing conducted at multiple locations). The hearings ranged from less than a day to several weeks. OALJ judges issued 254 initial decisions, 27 default decisions, 97 consent decisions and 111 miscellaneous orders and decisions, for a total of 489 dispositions during the year. A total of 424 complaints and petitions were filed with the office during 2011.

OJO has issued 439 reparation decisions under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act and the Packers and Stockyards Act. In addition, the Judicial Officer has issued decisions and rulings in 2011 as follows:

Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act	1
Animal Quarantine Act	1
Animal Welfare Act	8
Organic Food Production Act	4
Packers and Stockyards Act	4
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act	5
Plant Variety Protection Act	1
Statute of Limitation-Office of Civil Rights	<u>3</u>
Total	27

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Budget and Performance
Statement of Agency Goals and Objectives

Departmental Administration (DA) was established to provide management leadership to ensure that the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) administrative programs, policies, and advice, meet the needs of USDA program organizations and are consistent with laws and mandates. DA functions include: human resources operations, executive services, budget and financial management, procurement policy and operations, small business utilization, and administrative law functions, and the Judicial Officer.

DA has one strategic goal and three strategic objectives that contribute to all of the strategic goals of the Department.

USDA Strategic Goal	Agency Strategic Goal	Agency Objectives	Programs that Contribute	Key Outcomes
DA supports all USDA strategic goals	Provide effective policy, services, and coordination; ensure that all USDA programs and activities are accessible and accountable; and transform Departmental Management into a sustainable, high-performing organization.	Provide value-added products, services and solutions to USDA	Office of Procurement and Property Management	1: Improve contract performance, ensure high quality services, and reduce risks of nonperformance for future procurements.
		Provide oversight and ensure timely and accurate reporting to achieve accountability and resource stewardship.		
		Attract, develop and sustain a talented, diverse and collaborative workforce within Departmental Management.	Office of Human Resources Management	2: Transform USDA into a sustainable, high-performing organization that attracts, develops, and sustains a talented, diverse and collaborative workforce.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Key Outcome 1: Improve contract performance, ensure high quality services, and reduce risks of nonperformance for future procurements and succession planning.

Selected Past Accomplishments toward Achievement of the Key Outcome:

In 2011, each USDA contracting activity collaborated with OPPM to examine opportunities for increased efficiencies in procurement activities for USDA and its agencies. The following findings highlight the group's conclusions: 1) procurement efficiencies can be realized by minimizing redundant contract actions and by leveraging USDA buying power; and 2) the knowledge and experience of the USDA procurement workforce can be leveraged to implement a new operating environment while maintaining satisfactory levels of mission support and customer service.

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the 2013 Proposed Resource Level:

In 2013, USDA's acquisition workforce will continue to participate in necessary and mandatory training in order to meet our goal of a ninety-three percent certified workforce by 2014. Training will be offered for Program Managers, Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives (COTR), and for GS-1102 contracting staff to meet the Federal Acquisition Certification program requirements. This funding will ensure that additional acquisition personnel obtain the required training for certification. As in 2012, additional training will be offered on such topics as debarment and suspensions, leadership, past performance, strategic sourcing opportunities, and compliance areas. System improvements such as the Acquisition Workforce training tracking system will keep track of completion of courses and certification programs for the acquisition workforce. USDA also plans to provide hands-on web-based (webinar) procurement training for those in the field. Training and system improvements will result in a certified and well-trained acquisition workforce and will reduce the risk of non-performance and poor results in future procurements. USDA acquisition personnel will be better equipped to identify additional contract saving opportunities, avoid unnecessary costs and ensure that past performance evaluations are conducted. The addition of a knowledge management system will continue to improve communications, leverage best practices, create consistency with guidance, and generally improve the overall knowledge and effectiveness of the acquisition workforce.

Further cost avoidances will be realized through the use of strategic sourcing initiatives, better negotiations skills attained through training and improved contract monitoring that will reduce contract cost overruns. The development of new policies and revision of existing policies will result in consistent acquisition practices, improved contract integrity, better contract performance monitoring and an expedited procurement process, thus ensuring that contracts are awarded when needed at a fair cost.

Key Outcome 2: Transform USDA into a sustainable, high-performing organization that attracts, develops and sustains a talented, diverse and collaborative workforce.

Selected Past Accomplishments toward Achievement of the Key Outcome:

OHRM led USDA in the implementation of the President's Hiring Reform Initiative overhauling the way Departments and Agencies recruit and hire for Federal jobs establishing milestones and monitoring the progress of component agencies to assist them in identifying and removing obstacles under the following six initiatives: Elimination of narrative Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities at the initial stage of the application process; allowing an applicant to apply for a Federal position with a resume and cover letter; implement category rating; increase hiring managers' accountability; improve the quality and speed of hiring; and notifying applicant's about their status at four key stages in the application process.

OHRM implemented the Equal Opportunity Accountability Initiative to ensure there is a department-wide awareness of the significance and consequences of employee action or inaction resulting in a finding of liability against USDA. Requires agencies to forward to OHRM copies of settlement agreements, final agency decisions, administrative law judge decisions, and third-party decisions in program, individual, and employee complaints of discrimination in which there is a finding of liability against the USDA. Approximately 151 cases have been reviewed to date with 70 employees receiving disciplinary or adverse action.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

USDA implemented electronic filing (E-filing) which enables USDA's 700 Public Financial Disclosure Report filers to easily and securely submit required ethics reports electronically and instantaneously from anywhere across the globe.

USDA has undertaken an unprecedented effort to address large scale budgetary reductions affecting our workforce through use of Voluntary Early Retirement Authority (VERA) and Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments (VSIP) authority to minimize the impact on the workforce, increase efficiencies and effectively meet associated challenges. We have made and received OPM approval for two requests for 14 agencies in 2011.

For the first time since the implementation of the SES Pay-for-Performance in 2005, USDA has received full certification of our SES performance appraisal system from OPM and OMB, signifying USDA's effective management in key executive performance requirements to include methodology and accountability, alignment, measureable results, balanced measures of customer and employee perspective, performance and pay differentiation. Standardized Cultural Transformation performance language was incorporated into all 2011 USDA senior executive service performance plans, and Agency specific performance measures addressing Cultural Transformation were incorporated into their performance plans.

USDA formed 45 labor-management forums/partnership committees across all mission areas dedicated to improving government services by advance labor-management relationships, employee satisfaction and engagement, and mission and service delivery. Conducted an enterprise-wide labor relations survey and developed metrics to determine baselines against which labor-management forums/partnership committees set goals and developed plans for improvements.

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the 2013 Proposed Resource Level:

A new law, The Federal Internship Improvement Act was signed by the President in December 2011. The Law encourages Agencies to hire more interns. With the number of contracting professionals close to retirement, an internship program will allow for succession planning. Interns would also be able to capitalize on the expertise, training and experience of those contract professions retiring in the next five years or so.

USDA will: 1) have a diverse and talented group of leaders who can meet the succession planning needs of USDA on an ongoing basis; 2) hold employees accountable for discrimination actions resulting in liability against USDA in a consistent, fair, and equitable manner; 3) implement a hiring process that enhances recruitment and retention of a highly skilled employee group as well as deal with budgetary cuts to address a changing workforce; 4) develop and monitor the Labor/Management Relations Program to promote cooperation that benefits Labor, the Employee and contribute to the improvement of services provided to the American people by USDA; 5) have oversight for all executive resources as well as provide operational support for the continued success of top USDA officials; 6) implement a Strategic HR Plan that will provide employee succession as well as hold sub-components of USDA accountable for their human resource decisions; 7) develop and implement a consistent Employee Relations Program across USDA; and 8) implement a One USDA interagency project to provide a cost-effective, standardized HR line of business.

The benefits to USDA and program participants are as follows: 1) USDA will have a diverse group of individuals who are being developed to fill succession planning needs for senior executives as well as USDA Mission Areas, Agencies, and Staff Offices. This will result in greater diversity among USDA leaders and this greater diversity will reflect the population that USDA serves. A more diverse leadership will have a better understanding of the overall scope of program needs and will better connect with the full range of program participants. 2) USDA senior leaders will have regular networking and education activities so that they maintain their competitive edge for senior leadership positions leading to greater performance in serving the public. 3) Employee satisfaction will increase as a result of development of fair and consistent policies and practices for a wide range of activities that will result in providing better performance that will have a positive impact on customer service to USDA program participants, and

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

4) USDA agencies will have a regular pipeline of talented and successful employees to meet succession planning needs related to managing and leading human resources programs. These human resources programs are critical to ensure that USDA continues to have the talent that is needed to accomplish its mission effectively and serve its customer needs.

Strategic Goal Funding Matrix

(Dollars in thousands)

	2010	2011	2012		2013
Program / Program Items	Actual	Actual	Estimate	Change	Estimate

Agency Strategic Goal: Provide effective policy, services, and coordination; ensure that all USDA programs and activities are accessible and accountable; and transform Department Management into a sustainable, high performance organization.

Departmental Administration a/.....	\$30,218	\$31,432	\$26,165	+3,482	\$29,647
Staff Years.....	152	183	144	+39	183

a/ Appropriations for 2010 provided \$41.3 million, of which \$13 million is shown under the Foreign Agricultural Service for comparability.

Summary of Budget and Performance
Statement of Agency Goals and Objectives

Agency Strategic Goal: Provide effective policy, services, and coordination; ensure that all USDA programs and activities are accessible and accountable; and transform Departmental Management into a sustainable, high-performing organization.

Key Outcome 1: Improve contract performance, ensure high quality services, and reduce risks of nonperformance for future procurements.

Key Performance Measures:

- Measure # 1.1: Increase the number of USDA GS-1102 contracting staff with Federal Acquisition Certification Contracting (FAC-C) certifications to 93 percent by FY 2014.
- Measure #1.2: Implement succession planning initiatives for the acquisition career field.

Key Performance Targets:

Performance Measure	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Target	2013 Target
a. Increase the number of certified GS-1102 Contracting Staff	N/A	N/A	60%	72%	84%	87%	90%
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$600	\$600
a. Implement succession planning for the acquisition career field	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	15
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$600	\$600

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Key Outcome 2: Transform USDA into a sustainable, high-performing organization that attracts, develops, and sustains a talented, diverse and collaborative workforce.

Key Performance Measures:

- Measure #2.1: Improve employee accountability for disciplinary actions against USDA.
- Measure #2.2: Ensure Ethics Compliance in all aspects of USDA.
- Measure #2.3: Implement hiring reform and address a changing workplace.
- Measure #2.4: Implement and monitor a USDA Labor Relations Program.
- Measure #2.5: Provide policy, guidance and operational support for Executive Resources employees.
- Measure #2.6: Implement and provide a Strategic HR Planning and Accountability Plan.
- Measure #2.7: Develop and implement an employee relations program.
- Measure #2.8: Implement One-USDA interagency project to develop standard Human Resource line of business.
- Measure #2.9: Percent of all new hires that are veterans.
- Measure #2.10: Percent of all new hires who are minorities.

Key Performance Targets:

Performance Measures	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Target	2013 Target
a. Improve accountability for disciplinary actions against USDA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	5
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$600
a. Ensure Ethics Compliance in all aspects of USDA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	31
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,900
a. Implement hiring reform and address a changing workplace	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	10
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,300
a. Implement and monitor USDA labor relations program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	5
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$500
a. Provide policy, guidance and support for Executive Resources employees	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	10
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,100
a. Implement a Strategic HR Plan and Accountability Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	10
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$3,100
a. Develop and implement an Employee Relations Program	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	4
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$400
a. Implement One-USDA standard line of business	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Set baseline	6
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$400
a. Percent of all new hires that are veterans	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7%	17%	17%
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,000	\$1,000
a. Percent of all new hires who are minorities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	21%	35%	35%
b. Dollars (in thousands)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,000	\$1,000

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Full Cost by Agency Strategic Goal

(Dollars in thousands)

Agency Strategic Goal: Provide effective policy, services, and coordination; ensure that all USDA programs and activities are accessible and accountable; transform Departmental Management into a sustainable, high performance organization.

Program/ Program Items	2010	2011	2012	2013
	Actual	Actual	Estimate	Estimate
Salaries and Benefits.....	\$20,008	\$24,209	\$19,017	\$24,312
Administrative costs (direct).....	10,210	7,223	7,148	5,335
Total Costs.....	30,218	31,432	26,165	29,647
FTEs.....	152	183	144	183
Performance Measures:				
1.1 Increase the number of certified contracting staff.....	72%	84%	87%	90%
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	\$600	\$600
1.2 Implement succession planning for acquisition field.....	N/A	N/A	10	15
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	\$600	\$600
2.1 Improve employee accountability for disciplinary actions.....	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$600
2.2 Ensure Ethics Compliance in all aspects of USDA.....	N/A	N/A	N/A	31
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,900
2.3 Implement hiring reform and address a changing workplace....	N/A	N/A	N/A	10
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,300
2.4 Implement and monitor USDA Labor Relations Program.....	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$500
2.5 Provide policy, guidance and operation support for Executive Resources employees.....	N/A	N/A	N/A	10
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1,100
2.6 Implement a Strategic HR Plan & Accountability Plan.....	N/A	N/A	N/A	10
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$3,100
2.7 Develop and implement an Employee Relations Program.....	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$400
2.8 Implement One-USDA interagency HR line of business	N/A	N/A	N/A	6
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$400
2.9 Percent of all new hires that are veterans.....	N/A	7%	17%	17%
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	\$1,000	\$1,000
2.10 Percent of all new hires who are minorities.....	N/A	21%	35%	35%
Cost per measure (unit cost).....	N/A	N/A	\$1,000	\$1,000

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 2010 - 2012.

USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEES			
Policy Area and Committee Title	2010 Allocation	2011 Allocation	2012 Allocation
FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES:			
National Advisory Council on Maternal, Infant and Fetal Nutrition	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$75,000
FY 2010 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee	285,000	0	0
FOOD SAFETY:			
National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection	67,000	68,000	50,000
National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods.	40,000	160,000	200,000
RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS:			
Forestry Research Advisory Council.....	65,000	65,000	0
Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21 st Century Agriculture.....	286,000	286,000	274,000
Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics.....	35,000	35,000	70,000
USDA/Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities	23,000	23,000	20,941
MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS:			
National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee	24,000	24,000	43,600
General Conference Committee on the National Poultry Improvement Plan	10,000	8,500	33,000
Advisory Committee on Foreign Animal and Poultry Disease.....	0	35,000	45,000
National Organic Standards Board	190,000	90,000	190,000
Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee.....	70,000	70,000	96,000
Federal Grain Inspection Advisory Committee	45,000	47,000	40,000
FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES:			
Edward Madigan Award Advisory Committee	0	0	20,000
Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for Trade.....	14,000	18,520	50,550
Agricultural Technical Advisory Committees for Trade.....	84,000	111,120	124,300

USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEES			
Policy Area and Committee Title	2010 Allocation	2011 Allocation	2012 Allocation
Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets.....	25,000	25,000	20,000
Consultative Group on Child Labor and Forced Labor.....	14,000	14,000	0
Dairy Industry Advisory Committee	0	100,000	0
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT:			
Agricultural Air Quality Task Force	150,000	180,000	150,000
OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH:			
Native American Advisory Committee.	0	0	84,000
Minority Farmer Advisory Committee.....	0	80,000	101,000
Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers.	80,000	80,000	112,000
Total Advisory Committees	1,557,000	1,570,140	1,799,391
Contingencies/Reserve	243,000	229,860	609
TOTAL, ADVISORY COMMITTEES LIMITATION.....	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STATUS OF PROGRAM

From 1983 through 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 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 2011.

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's budget of \$50,000 has remained unchanged since 1978. The Council's expenses are unique to include the cost of childcare for low-income members.

The Council met in July of 2011 and will submit a status report of recommendations to the Food and Nutrition Service Administrator during 2012.

FOOD SAFETY:National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI)

The National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI) was established in 1971 under the authority of the Federal Meat and Inspection Act (FMIA) and the Poultry Products Inspection Act (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 current charter reestablishing the NACMPI became effective on June 25, 2010. The new members of the NACMPI were announced on July 15, 2010 with each member serving a 2-year term. This Committee is as equally diverse as the previous Committee and includes members representing the Asian American, African American, and Hispanic communities. Moreover, the 20 Committee members represent all stakeholders affiliated with the meat and poultry inspection including academia, consumers, industry, and state and local government.

The Committee made great strides in 2011. In summary, their discussions involved:

Pre-harvest Salmonella

- The agency, in collaboration with stakeholders, should identify the Salmonella strains of highest public health concern and prioritize their control in pre and post harvest consideration. These may include Salmonella Enteritidis (SE), Antibiotic Resistant and/or others and identified by outbreak, recall, sampling information, and available baselines. The agency should consider animal species, class, and product types when prioritizing how to develop intervention strategies.
- The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) should partner with appropriate institutions to improve testing methodologies for rapid identification of serotypes, genetic fingerprinting (pulsed field gel electrophoresis, etc.) and virulence markers, and antibiotic resistance status.

- FSIS should determine whether it can take a leadership role in tracking new technologies for pre-harvest (interventions) that are currently moving through the regulatory process and on a quarterly basis report their movement and what FSIS is doing with other agencies to move them forward.
- In light of recent recalls, FSIS require all establishments to reassess their Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) plans for Salmonella control. FSIS could do Food Safety Assessments to verify.
- FSIS should hold public meetings with stakeholders including the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Agricultural Research Service (ARS), Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and develop pre-harvest best practices and compliance guidelines for livestock and poultry producers. FSIS should also incorporate the information about the effectiveness of the interventions they have investigated. Include lessons learned by FDA in implementing SE shell egg rules. FSIS should consider foreign country experiences especially Canada, Australia, Denmark, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.
- The Committee:
 1. Supports FSIS's proposal and believes one letter for the Salmonella serotypes and another for pulse field gel electrophoresis information would be appropriate to get information out to poultry slaughter and processing establishments as quickly as possible;
 2. Discussed having FSIS supply the establishments with drug resistant information on the FDA risk classifications of critical health importance to humans; and
 3. Discussed having FSIS complete its data sharing Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with ARS and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) as quickly as possible.

The NACMPI HACCP Systems Validation Subcommittee discussed having FSIS clearly and concisely explain the difference between validation and verification and include this discussion in all materials, with representative samples, to be made available to all stakeholders, including the public and processors.

The principles identified in the Agency's Guidance would be further strengthened by providing additional specific examples of strategies for efficiently and safely grouping product categories for the purpose of validation. Keeping the needs of small and very small processors in mind, the goal should be to provide sufficient practical examples to illustrate how: typical products can be grouped into a workable number of product categories; and "worst case" products within a grouping can be selected for validation purposes.

In the case of atypical products and/or extenuating circumstances, FSIS Headquarters would need to provide additional validation guidance on a case-by-case basis.

More comprehensive information about the NACMPI, meeting transcripts, reports and comments can be viewed on the FSIS website 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 in 1988, as a discretionary committee reporting to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. NACMCF is managed through an interagency food safety partnership between the USDA, FSIS; the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), FDA, CDC; the Department of Commerce (DoC), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); and the Department of Defense (DoD), Veterinary Services Activity (VSA). However, the Committee is controlled and operated by FSIS in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The current NACMCF charter runs through November 1, 2012. The current NACMCF membership term runs through May 11, 2012.

The activities of the NACMCF are carried out, in part, by Subcommittees that are focused on specific areas being considered by the full Committee. The NACMCF has made important contributions to a broad range of critical food safety issues. The NACMCF has developed reference documents emphasizing the role of regulatory agencies, industry, and consumers to control specific foodborne pathogens. The NACMCF was instrumental in formulating and standardizing the principles of HACCP systems. NACMCF reports provide current information and scientific

advice to Federal food safety agencies and serve as a foundation for regulations and programs aimed at reducing foodborne disease and enhancing public health.

NACMCF held four Subcommittee meetings and one plenary meeting in 2011.

Plenary Meeting:

- September 30, 2011, Washington, DC

Subcommittee Meetings

- April 5-7, 2011: Subcommittee on Study of Microbiological Criteria as Indicators of Process Control or Insanitary Conditions, Washington, DC;
- June 7-9, 2011: Subcommittee on Control Strategies for Reducing Foodborne Norovirus Infections, Washington, DC; and
- September 27-29, 2011: Subcommittee on Study of Microbiological Criteria as Indicators of Process Control or Insanitary Conditions and Subcommittee on Control Strategies for Reducing Foodborne Norovirus Infections, Washington, DC.

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

RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS:

Forestry Research Advisory Council (FRAC)

The Forestry Research Advisory Council (FRAC) met August 16 and 17, 2011 in Washington, DC. FRAC was authorized for the purpose of providing the Secretary of Agriculture with advice on regional and national planning for forestry research supported by the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Research Program. FRAC is administered by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), and co-managed by the Forest Service. The Council also provides advice related to the Forest Service Research Program, authorized by the Forest and Rangelands Renewable Resources Act of 1978. The Council is comprised of up to 20 members appointed by the Secretary and drawn from Federal, State, industry, academic and non-governmental organizations. At this meeting, the Council discussed emerging forestry and natural resource research issues, including:

- In light of the 50th anniversary of the McIntire-Stennis Act, USDA should undertake an assessment of the effectiveness of the Cooperative Forestry Research Program and how it could be strengthened or updated to address changes in research and/or sustainability needs of forestland/watershed lands now and into the future.
- In response to recommendations in the recent report from the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, "Sustaining Environmental Capital: Protecting Society and the Economy," assess the existing research effort on ecosystem services, and invest in social science and decision-support research to expand understanding of governance, collaboration, and partnerships to improve forest and watershed management in a context of increasing complexity, conflict and changing climate, rural community economics, and globalization.
- Continue to invest in the U.S. Forest Service Experimental Forest and Rangelands system to ensure continued long term research capacity, and increase Forest Service collaborative relationships with non-Federal partners to develop efficiencies and enhancements of shared research infrastructure and capacity.
- Strengthen recognition and impact of USDA's unique expertise in evaluation of ecosystem functions and services and ensure that decisions such as the assessment of the carbon neutrality of wood-based biofuels by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should only be made with full technical and scientific input from the Forest Service and NIFA.
- Expand the use of U.S. Forest Service synthesis reports and technology transfer programs to enable translation of research findings and decision tools for use by natural resource professionals, and strengthen linkages between Forest Service and NIFA's Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) and K-16 education programs and those that engage in field-based education that integrate environmental and working lands education.

- Use the Feedstock Readiness Level Tool (FSRT) model to prioritize both internal and cooperative research and technology transfer investment plans. FSRT was recently developed for tracking progress of new feedstocks towards commercial production, and provides an excellent framework for strategic evaluation of USDA technology development and feedstock programs for bioenergy and advanced biofuels.

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. AC21's charter was approved and members were appointed in 2011. Under its Charter, the AC21 can have 20-25 members, and past members have included 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 five government agencies and departments and a representative from State Departments of Agriculture.

The first meeting, under the current charter, was held in August 2011. The Committee was given presentations from USDA representatives and guidance on its organization and charge.

While an official Committee report is expected in FY 2012, the 2011 minutes and other handouts are available at: <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentid=AC21Main.xml&contentidonly=true>.

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 1997 when responsibility for the Census of Agriculture transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Agriculture.

The Committee 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 20 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.

The Committee met in 2011 and discussed these ideas:

- Consider adding criteria for reducing NASS's report frequency rather than report elimination.
- Reduce the burden on respondents and investigate expanded use of previously reported data, where appropriate.
- Glacial Lake Cranberries proposed that NASS consider the nature of the unique cranberry industry to have statistics that more accurately reflect the nature of the industry.
- Support the reinstatement of the Census of Aquaculture survey as early as possible.
- Do not release Census of Agriculture data to National Archives and Records Administration and maintain control of the confidential data collected by the agency.
- Expand outreach and education efforts to reach all operators, regardless of size or location, by continuing to work with land-grant institutions, and both non-government and community-based organizations.
- Pursue measurement of agricultural value added sales.
- Support the recently restored Agriculture Chemical Use Survey which includes fertilizer and pesticides.
- Implement a program to monitor the loss of land used in agriculture production annually.

- Investigate providing the NASS Advisory Committee with survey performance metrics which will help the Committee to advise NASS on the efficiency of its services.

For more information on the proceedings of the meeting, please see the following website:
http://www.nass.usda.gov/About_NASS/Advisory_Committee_on_Agriculture_Statistics/index.asp.

USDA/Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU)

The USDA/HACU Leadership Group, consisting of 8 members, is a national body of USDA and Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) leaders appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the President HACU that recommends policies and programs to strengthen USDA partnerships with HSIs and provides leadership and strategic direction on issues related to Hispanic education. The Leadership Group provides guidance to the Secretary on issues relating to Hispanic-Serving Institutions and Hispanic higher education.

MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS:

National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee (NWSAC)

The Charter for the Secretary's National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee (NWSAC) was re-established on March 1, 2011. An aggressive outreach strategy has been in progress to solicit applications for membership and begin meeting on an annual basis in 2012. The 20 Committee members will be selected to represent a broad range of agricultural, environmental, and conservation groups, academia, and other interest groups.

According to the Charter, the NWSAC advises the Secretary of Agriculture on policies, program issues and research needs necessary to manage damage caused by depredating wildlife to protect America's agricultural, industrial, and natural resources and to safeguard public health and safety.

General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan

The purpose of the General Conference Committee (GCC) of the National Poultry Improvement Plan is to provide an avenue for industry representatives to advise the APHIS and the Secretary on matters pertaining to poultry health and to the administration of the National Poultry Improvement Plan (NPIP). The Committee represents seven cooperating State agencies and poultry industry members and meets at least annually. The GCC meets in conjunction with the NPIP Biennial Conference in the even years.

The NPIP was started in 1935 and has been a very successful cooperative program for the control of specific poultry diseases in the U.S. The purpose of the NPIP is to promote new technology for the improvement of poultry and poultry products.

The last meeting was held on January 26, 2011 in Atlanta, Georgia. The GCC:

- Granted interim approval of three *Salmonella enteritidis* molecular tests.
- Approved the equivalent use of NPIP Environmental Isolation of *Salmonella* for FDA testing, as authorized under the Egg Rule.
- Documented support for the National Chicken Council's participation in the U.S. *Salmonella enteritidis* Monitoring Program.
- Announced the release of new educational materials on human *Salmonella* infections.

Advisory Committee on Animal Health

The Secretary's Advisory Committee on Animal Health (SACAH) advises the Secretary on strategies, policies, and programs to prevent, control and/or eradicate diseases of national significance. The Committee contributes to a dialogue on public health concerns relative to animal health (e.g., food safety); conservation of natural resources;

profitability and stability of livestock economies; animal health policy and regulations relative to outbreaks, practices, production of animals, trade, and preventing and managing foreign animal diseases.

The Committee's focus has been on the Proposed Rule on Traceability for Livestock Moving Interstate. Immediately following its first meeting in 2011, SACAH conducted a series of teleconferences to discuss these topics:

1. Extension the public comment period from 90 to 120 days; and
2. Incorporation of concrete provisions to ensure the program will not result in an unfunded mandate on producers, States, and other impacted individuals.

The Secretary extended the public comment period to 120 days to ensure that there was adequate time for stakeholders to review and offer comments on the proposed rule. The concept embodied by the second topic will be considered a rulemaking process.

The Committee has also commented on the combined brucellosis/tuberculosis framework which will form the basis of a new rule. The working group tasked with crafting the new framework has held several public outreach meetings and sought the Committee's insight on several key areas of the framework. The Committee deliberated on several areas of the framework during its most recent meeting and sought additional information on most issues. The Committee discussed having an indemnification appeal process outlined in the TB/brucellosis framework.

The November 1-2, 2011 meeting focused on animal disease traceability. There were several others topics including the National Animal Health Laboratory Network and foreign animal disease research, specifically the development of vaccines, immunological management tools, and other countermeasures for preventing, diagnosing, and controlling Foot-and-Mouth Disease and other foreign animal diseases. The official report of recommendations from the Committee is under review.

The Committee will direct the efforts of the newly-formed Subcommittee on Aquatic Animal Health (SAAH). SAAH will consider issues of all aquatic animals with a focus on farmed and wild finfish, molluscan shellfish, and crustaceans. SAAH will look at programs' efforts to ensure the health, safety and sustainability of the nation's living aquatic resources and to consider policies and programs to meet the needs of the commercial industry and of environmental, consumer, academic, tribal, governmental, and other national interests.

National Organic Standards Board (NOSB)

Title XXI of the 1990 Farm Bill, known as the Organic Foods Production Act (OFPA), established the National Organic Program (NOP), a USDA program responsible for implementing and enforcing organic standards and facilitating the work of the National Organic Standards Board (NOSB), an advisory board to the Secretary of Agriculture. 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 and serve rotating five year terms.

The NOSB has the sole authority granted through OFPA to recommend additions to or deletions from the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances. The NOSB drafts recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture based on needs of the industry and considers public and industry input. The Board's main functions are to make recommendations about whether a substance should be allowed or prohibited in organic production or handling; assist in the development of standards for substances to be used in organic production; and advise the Secretary on other aspects of implementing OFPA and NOP regulations.

Five NOSB members' terms expired during 2011. A broad outreach effort was implemented to solicit nominations to fill the vacancies, yielding a pool of 37 applicants. Secretary Vilsack appointed five new NOSB members during the fall of 2011.

In 2011, during the course of two public meetings, the NOSB deliberated on a variety of topics related to organic agriculture.

During the April 2011 meeting:

- The NOSB Crops Committee discussed two petitioned materials, nickel and tetracycline, and the classification of corn steep liquor as a synthetic or non-synthetic input.
- The Crops Committee also discussed the 22 remaining material listings on the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances otherwise scheduled to expire in 2012. All materials on the National List must go through NOSB "Sunset" review every five years, after which the board may recommend the listing be removed, extended for another five years, or further restricted or clarified via annotation.
- The Crops Committee formally responded to the NOP's memo on one of the Sunset 2012 materials, sodium nitrate, as it concerns the organic equivalency arrangement between the United States and Canada.
- The Livestock Committee discussed two issues on animal welfare: stocking rates and animal handling, transit, and slaughter; as well as presenting a discussion document on omnivorous diets for poultry.
- The Handling Committee discussed four petitioned materials: attapulgite, calcium acid pyrophosphate, silicon dioxide, and sodium acid pyrophosphate. Other Committee discussions will address the remaining six material listings scheduled to sunset in 2012, the chlorine materials annotation, and the nutrient vitamins and minerals listing.
- The Materials Committee presented a guidance document representing further work on materials classification, including processes by which the NOSB makes determinations about synthetic versus non-synthetic substances or agricultural versus non-agricultural substances.
- The Compliance, Accreditation, and Certification Committee presented a discussion document on the evaluation of material review organizations, such as the Organic Materials Review Institute or the Washington State Department of Agriculture. These organizations verify inputs used in organic production or handling for their compliance with the organic regulations.
- Finally, the Policy Development Committee discussed three sections of the NOSB policy and procedures manual pertaining to the review of vice chair and policy development committee roles, clarification of committee purview, and NOSB member and leadership transition.

At the October 2010 meeting in Madison, Wisconsin, the NOSB:

- Voted to renew 56 materials listings that were scheduled to Sunset in 2012.
- Voted against listing three materials petitioned for use in organic crop production: ethylene glycol, tall oils, and tetramethyl-decynediol.
- Voted to list formic acid on § 205.603 as a parasiticide for use in honeybee hives.
- Voted to reaffirm their prior Sunset 2012 recommendations from the April 2010 meeting.
- Passed multiple recommendations that define organic apiculture standards, clarify § 205.238(c)(2) to promote the humane treatment of animals during routine care, define engineered nanomaterials and prohibit their use in organic agriculture, and clarify § 205.101(b) to reduce mislabeling in the organic marketplace.
- Voted to update their New Member Guide and three sections of their Policy and Procedures Manual: Section IV, establishing ad-hoc committees; Section V, outlining the scope of NOP/NOSB Collaboration; and Section VII, allowing annotation changes during Sunset Review under certain circumstances.

Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee

The Fruit and Vegetable Industry Advisory Committee, consisting of 25 members provides recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture on issues facing the industry as a whole, as well on ways the USDA can tailor its programs to better meet the stakeholder's needs. These recommendations are related to issues such as food safety, commodities purchasing, Child Nutrition Programs and other Federal feeding programs, agricultural labor, local farming initiatives including Know Your Farmer/Know Your Food, and input for the upcoming Farm Bill.

Throughout its existence, the Committee has placed particular emphasis in developing ways to increase fruit and vegetable consumption in USDA's National School Lunch Program, as well as for all consumers.

When the Committee met in February 2011, it discussed:

- Revisions to the Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food Report.

- The USDA's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Women, Infants, and Children purchases should be measured and analyzed so expenditures can be identified by product category.
- The Department should continue to fund programs like the Healthy Incentives Pilot to study the factors that prevent or distract consumers from using their food nutrition assistance dollars on fruits and vegetables.
- Establish a centralized database to collect and warehouse test results for agricultural products being generated by multiple jurisdictions including the USDA, FDA, CDC and various State and local officials.
- Commission an independent study to correlate the data collected by the USDA through the Microbiological Data Program with foodborne illness data collected by the CDC to determine if the historical data collected over the past ten years indicates there is a "reasonable probability" of risk to the public health resulting from a single positive test obtained through the Microbiological Data Program sampling.

Federal Grain Inspection Advisory Committee

The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) Grain Inspection Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) was established under section 21 of the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) on September 29, 1981. The Advisory Committee is charged with advising the Secretary on implementing the USGSA and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, or more simply, on implementing GIPSA's grain inspection and weighing programs. The Advisory 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 the USGSA (7 U.S.C. 71-87k).

The Advisory Committee advises the Secretary on various important issues affecting GIPSA operations and the official grain inspection and weighing system delivery during biannual meetings.

Among the Committee discussions in 2011, the following ideas were given in-depth attention.

- Implemented new Diverter-Type (D/T) check testing procedures at both the export and domestic markets and replacing the current procedures with procedures that focus on safety and reliability such as drop, visual, and installation certification.
- Reported concern that the newly formed Domestic Inspection Operations Office (DIOO) is currently understaffed to properly perform their required duties (equipment, Federal appeals, testing, SIMS samples, AMA) and supervise approximately thirty (30) agencies in the domestic market. Evaluate the number of personnel under the DIOO banner, including what steps will be taken to ensure that GIPSA will be able to facilitate the marketing of grain in the domestic market under the increased workload of DIOO.
- Continued support of marketing to Asian markets through the Collateral Duty Officer program and explore ways to expand the program and suggested that the agency work with industry, if possible and appropriate, to look at ways this may be accomplished.
- Identifying new and improved current rapid technology in the area of protein quality (visco-elastic test) and ensure that the results correlate with end users.
- Continued work on sorghum odor and reach out for industry and end-user feedback to set a storage musty sorghum odor reference that refers to end uses.
- Export user-fees collected and maintained as retained earnings be solely used to support services that facilitate the export of grain and grain related products and not be subject to use for any other purpose.
- Continued evaluation and adoption of the 149 MHZ technology as the new official standard for grain moisture measurement.
- Expedited review of the barley standards considering the needs of all stakeholders.

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 the ATACs are jointly administered by the USDA and the United States Trade Representative (USTR). The APAC and ATACs were re-chartered in May of 2007 for four years. Members were appointed in 2011 and more will be appointed in 2012. The APAC and ATAC charters were each renewed in 2011.

The APAC and ATACs are authorized by sections 135(c)(1) and (2) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (Pub. L. No. 93-618, 19 U.S.C. 2155). Congress established these Committees to ensure that trade policy and trade negotiations objectives adequately reflect private sector U.S. commercial and economic interests. The Committees provide a formal mechanism to ensure liaison between the Federal Government and private sector regarding international agricultural trade matters. Specifically, the Committees provide the Secretary of Agriculture and 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 APAC provides policy advice, while the ATACs provide detailed commodity technical advice. The members on the APAC and on the ATACs are important to advancing the Administration's trade agenda to liberalize agricultural trade, expand access for U.S. food and agricultural products in overseas markets, and reduce unfair competition.

All Committee 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.

Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets

Section 1542(d)(1) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (the Act), as amended, directs the Secretary to make available to emerging markets the expertise of the United States to "identify and carry out specific opportunities and projects," including potential reductions in trade barriers, "in order to develop, maintain, or expand markets for United States agricultural exports." The Act also requires the Secretary to establish an Advisory Committee (Section 1542(d)(1)(F)), composed of representatives of food and rural business sectors of the United States to provide information and advice on developing strategies for providing technical assistance and for enhancing markets for U.S. agricultural products in developing market economies.

The purpose of the Committee is to provide information and advice, based upon the knowledge and expertise of the members, useful to USDA in implementing the Emerging Markets Program (EMP), which assists U.S. entities in developing, maintaining, or expanding exports of U.S. agricultural commodities and products by funding activities that improve emerging markets' food and rural business systems, including reducing potential trade barriers in such markets. The Committee also advises USDA on ways to increase the involvement of the U.S. private sector in cooperative work with emerging markets in food and rural business systems. One of the principal functions of the Committee is to review qualified proposals submitted to EMP for funding and advice on funding recommendations.

The process to re-establish the Committee's charter began in 2011.

Consultative Group on Child Labor and Forced Labor

The Consultative Group to Eliminate the Use of Child Labor and Forced Labor in Imported Agricultural Products ("Group") was established by section 3205 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Pub. Law 110-246 or "Farm Bill"). The Group is charged with developing recommendations relating to a standard set of practices for

independent, third party monitoring and verification for the production, processing, and distribution of agricultural products or commodities to reduce the likelihood that agricultural products or commodities imported into the United States are produced with the use of forced labor or child labor. Within one year following receipt of these recommendations, the Secretary of Agriculture was mandated to release guidelines for a voluntary initiative to enable entities to address issues raised by the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

On September 23, 2009 members were appointed to the Group. As required under section 3205(d) of the Farm Bill, the Group is composed of a total of 13 members, including two officials from USDA; the Department of Labor's Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs; and one representative from the Department of State. Non-government members include three individuals representing agriculture-related enterprises; two individuals representing institutions of higher learning and research institutions; one individual representing an organization that provides independent, third-party certification services for labor standards, and three individuals representing charitable organizations with expertise on the issues of international child labor and forced labor.

The Group held its first meeting on November 16, 2009. It then met monthly from January through May of 2010 to hear presentations about various monitoring, verification and certification models and to discuss how to interpret and implement the Group's mandate. A public meeting was held on March 29, 2010, to provide an opportunity for public input. On December 21, 2010, the Group submitted its recommendations to the Secretary, at which time the Secretary elected to issue guidelines based on those recommendations, without change. On April 12, 2011, USDA published a Federal Register Notice to inform the public and seek comments on Guidelines for Eliminating Child and Forced Labor in Agricultural Supply Chains (Guidelines). A public meeting was scheduled to hear views on the Guidelines, but was cancelled due to lack of participation. Following the close of the comment period, the Consultative Group agreed that a new phase of activities should be undertaken to explore whether there is a lasting role for the Guidelines in the larger discussion about how to address child and forced labor in international agricultural supply chains. USDA is in discussion with the Departments of Labor and State, which have ongoing mandates and significant expertise to address these issues. A letter reporting these developments was sent to Congress on November 22, 2011.

Dairy Industry Advisory Committee

The Dairy Industry Advisory Committee (DIAC) was established in August 2009 by the Secretary of Agriculture to review the issues of farm milk price volatility and dairy farmer profitability. The Committee has completely met its charge to provide recommendations to the Secretary on how to best meet the dairy industry's needs. The Committee made 23 recommendations that are described in the *Report of the Dairy Industry Advisory Committee* (2011). The recommendations fall under the following themes: existing programs and authorities; price protection; stabilization and regulation; income protection and stabilization; and profitability and enhancing the development of dairy markets.

To read the full DIAC Report, please visit the following website:
http://www.fsa.usda.gov/Internet/FSA_File/diac_final_rpt_0302.pdf

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT:

Agricultural Air Quality Task Force (AAQTF or The Task Force)

AAQTF was created in accordance with Section 391 of the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on issues related to agricultural air quality. In 1996, Congress found that various studies alleged that agriculture is a source of Particulate Matter (PM) emissions and that many of these studies have often been based on erroneous data. Congress also cited ongoing research by USDA and declared that Federal policy in regard to air pollution be based on sound scientific findings that are subject to adequate peer review and take into account economic feasibility.

The Task Force's mandate is to strengthen and coordinate USDA's air quality research effort and identify cost effective ways for the agriculture industry to improve air quality and meet Federal and local air quality emissions requirements.

Chaired by the Chief of the USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service, the AAQTF has 25 members and consists of leaders in farming, industry, health, and science. The Task Force also includes representatives from USDA's Forest Service, ARS, NIFA, and Economic Research Service.

Task Force meetings are held two to three times a year at locations around the country in order to witness regional agricultural air quality related concerns in various places nationally and to hear from concerned citizens about the impacts of air quality issues, concerns and regulations. The 2011 meetings included Subcommittee meetings. While the Task Force will produce its own set of recommendations in 2012, the subcommittees' discussed:

- EPA should retain the current 24-hour PM₁₀ National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) of 150 µg/m³ not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over a 3-year period. This idea follows the guidance of EPA staff and the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee that the current standard adequately protects the health and welfare of the public, and it avoids both, basing a standard on health effects data, and negative implications to agricultural producers and processors that would result from adoption of a more restrictive standard with a 98th percentile form.
- Given the wide-spread use of the NAAQS by State and local air pollution regulatory agencies as property line concentrations that are not to be exceeded, the Secretary of Agriculture should request that EPA consider the consequences of changes to the level of a NAAQS on the New Source Review process in future Policy Assessments. The New Source Review (NSR) process has significant design and economic implications for both major and minor sources of air pollution. Given the direct linkage between the NAAQS and the NSR program, it is appropriate that these implications be considered when assessing EPA's policy with regards to implementing a new or revised NAAQS.
- The Secretary of Agriculture should support research to determine the constituents of PM that have the largest impact on public health and the differences in the PM composition of local and regional environments. Most exposure studies quantifying the health effects of PM exposure have been conducted in urban areas, where the morphological properties of PM vary substantially from the largely crustal PM emitted from agricultural operations and to which rural communities are more commonly exposed. EPA's Clean Air Science Advisory Committee has recommended that monitoring be conducted to explore the concentrations and composition of PM in rural areas, and the Secretary should support such research to inform future NAAQS reviews.
- Long-term investment in science for food and agriculture is essential for maintaining the Nation's food, economic, environmental and national security. Funding for agricultural knowledge systems (Research, Education and Extension programs) should be maintained and further cuts avoided.

For additional information and minutes from the meetings, including copies of presentations made before the Task Force, please visit the following web site: <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/air/taskforce>.

OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH:

Minority Farmer Advisory Committee

Under section 14008 of the Food Conservation Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246), the Secretary established the Committee to provide advice on: (1) the implementation of section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to provide outreach and assistance to socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers; (2) methods of maximizing the participation of minority farmers and ranchers in USDA programs; and (3) civil rights activities within the USDA as such activities relate to participants in such programs.

Committee members are appointed according to the following: (1) not less than four socially disadvantage farmers or ranchers (as defined in section 2501 (e) (2) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 CFR U.S.C. 2279 (e) (2))); (2) not less than two representatives of nonprofit organizations with a history of working

with minority farmers and ranchers; (3) not less than two civil rights professionals; (4) not less than two representatives of institutions of higher education with demonstrated experience working with minority farmers and ranchers; and (5) such other persons as the Secretary considers appropriate.

The Minority Farmer Advisory Committee met for the first time in 2011 to discuss efforts to increase minority participation in Department programs and services within the following offices or agencies: Risk Management Agency, Office of the Assistant Secretary on Civil Rights, Rural Development, Farm Service Agency, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Further, several Subcommittees were formed that focus on each USDA office or agency. Efforts were made to determine which kinds of topics fit the mission of the Committee; could be deferred to other USDA problem-solving efforts; and/or could be presented to Subcommittees.

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 ways to develop programs to provide coordinated assistance to beginning farmers and ranchers while maximizing new farming and ranching opportunities. They will work to enhance and expand Federal partnerships to provide financing for beginning farmers and ranchers.

The Committee's 2011 discussion topics are summarized as follows:

- Continue funding for the Office of Advocacy and Outreach and empower the office to work across all USDA agencies, requesting that each develop an action plan addressing how they will work, individually and collectively, with beginning farmers and ranchers.
- Designate a beginning farmer and rancher specialist in each State to work across all USDA agencies to improve outreach and technical assistance to beginning farmers and ranchers.
- Use average size farm in lieu of median size farm in determining eligibility for beginning farmer loans and opportunities. Further, we request that these calculations should be standardized between the FSA loan program and the NASS Ag Census.
- Support and promote legislative changes in the 2012 Farm Bill that would permanently fund the FSA loan programs by treating them as a revolving loan fund. This would help meet the growing demand for beginning farmer and rancher loans.
- Count the time beginning farmers and ranchers have invested in mentorship programs, internships, apprenticeships, and as a farm worker toward the three year experience requirement for obtaining beginning farmer and rancher loans through FSA.
- Continually evaluate and enhance the business and financial management training requirements for beginning farmers and ranchers obtaining FSA loans.
- Commission a review of the eligibility standards for the FSA loan program in relation to those of commercial lenders to ensure and promote increased program participation by the aforementioned target groups.
- Consider less reliance on credit history, and more reliance on business planning and managerial ability to qualify for FSA Loans.
- Support legislative changes to the Youth Loan Program in the 2012 Farm Bill that would make the loans available in every locale, not just in rural areas.
- Fully fund the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program (BFRDP) and support the reauthorization, growth and expansion of this program in the 2012 Farm Bill. Evaluate the program's impact or effectiveness, including on-site audits of grant recipients to ensure that BFRDP funds are being utilized in line with the application approved and ensure that clients are receiving the training as proposed in the grant application.
- Consider accepting grant proposals under BFRDP for establishing a mentoring program/training center/workforce development center that utilize technical schools and community organizations to provide beginning farmers and ranchers a course curriculum to assist with development of financial and other skills needed to successfully get started in agriculture, as well as help established and retiring farmers learn skills necessary to assist beginning farmers and ranchers.

- Support legislation in the Farm Bill that would eliminate the match requirement for the BFRDP since this match imposes undue hardship on potential applicants.
- Support the full \$25 million funding for the Section 2501 Program, conduct appropriate evaluation of the program's impact or effectiveness, including on-site audits of grant recipients to ensure that 2501 funds are being utilized in accordance with the approved proposal and ensure that clients are receiving the training and benefits as proposed in the grant application.
- Authorize the Office of Advocacy and Outreach to (a) discourage multiple requests for funding from a single organization for the Section 2501 Program; and (b) verify that the applicant's capacity and demonstrated experience in providing outreach and technical assistance to socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers has been determined for both the applicant organization and project personnel prior to reviewing any request for funding.
- Deploy a new strike force-type initiative, applying it to beginning farmer and rancher issues in areas that are affected by both depopulation and poverty.
- Investigate strategies and devise a plan to deliver services to groups of beginning and socially -disadvantaged farmers and ranchers to increase their participation and qualification for all USDA programs, including loans and crop insurance.
- Conduct an all-agency review for possible barriers for beginning farmers and ranchers seeking to participate in programs that currently require a 3-5 year production history and find policy option solutions to address any such barriers.
- Conduct a full evaluation and status update of the beginning farmer and rancher provisions from the 2008 Farm Bill.

AUTHORITY AND COMPOSITION OF USDA ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN EXISTENCE BETWEEN
2011 AND 2012

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. 454a-4	20
National Advisory Committee on Microbiological Criteria for Foods	FSIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-28	30
RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS:			
Forestry Research Advisory Council	NIFA	S 16 U.S.C. 582a-4	20
Advisory Committee on Biotechnology and 21 st Century Agriculture	ARS	Departmental Regulation 1043-049	20-25
Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics	NASS	Departmental Regulation 1042-130	20
USDA/Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities Leadership Group	REE	Memorandum of Agreement dated 10/96	8
National Genetic Resources Advisory Council	REE	Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C.A. 5843)	9
MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS:			
National Wildlife Services Advisory Committee	APHIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-27	20
General Conference Committee of the National Poultry Improvement Plan	APHIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-8	7
Advisory Committee on Animal Health	APHIS	Departmental Regulation 1043-31	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
2011 AND 2012

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	37
Agricultural Technical Advisory Committees for Trade:			
Animals & Animal Products	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	32
Fruits and Vegetables	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	31
Grains, Feed & Oilseeds	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	34
Sweeteners and Sweetener Products	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	23
Tobacco, Cotton, Peanuts and Planting Seeds	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	23
Processed Foods	FAS	Departmental Regulation 1042-68	32
Advisory Committee on Emerging Markets	FAS	7 U.S.C. 1421	20
Consultative Group on Child Labor and Forced Labor	FAS	22 U.S.C. 7101	13
Dairy Industry Advisory Committee	FSA	Departmental Regulation 1043-051	17
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT:			
Agricultural Air Quality Task Force	NRCS	7 U.S.C. 5405	25
OFFICE OF ADVOCACY AND OUTREACH:			
Minority Farmer Advisory Committee	OAo	7 CFR U.S.C 2279	15
Advisory Committee on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers	OAo	7 U.S.C. 1929	20