

## 1. The Farm Bill

The Farm Bill is an omnibus bill which decides overall spending and policies for the next four years. The 2012 bill has passed the Senate, but has only been reported out of the House Agriculture Committee. The Senate version of the Farm Bill includes an authorization of the IPM Centers. The House bill does not. IPM Voice successfully organized support by farm organizations and land grants for the Center authorization in both the House and the Senate. The House Committee took a strong position against earmarks (programs or funding for specific projects.) Presumably it considered the Centers authorization to be an earmark – even though the text does not mention any particular locations. The Chairwoman of the Senate Agriculture Committee indicates that she “fully supports” the authorization of the Centers which is in the Senate bill. Sooner or later the bills will be consolidated.

How and if a Farm Bill is completed this year depends on factors unrelated to IPM. Two websites provide up-to-date reports related to the status and prospects of the Farm Bill. They are <http://sustainableagriculture.net/> and <http://farmpolicy.com/>

## 2. Agricultural Appropriations Bill

At the same time that the Congress is considering the Farm Bill it is also working on legislation which provides funding for specific activities for 2013. Two elements are relevant to IPM. First, neither the House nor the Senate Bill approved of NIFA’s proposal to merge IPM, IR-4 and several other programs into a new program called “Crop Protection.” The Senate bill makes no mention of the Crop Protection proposal, but implicitly rejects it by continuing to provide line-item spending amounts for EIDSS, PMAP, Regional Centers and IPM Extension.

The House version of the bill took the same position. However, it is clear that the House Appropriations Committee will continue to push for some type of consolidation. The House Committee stated in its report on the current 2013 bill:

*Program Consolidation and Streamlining.—The Committee appreciates the agency’s efforts and proposals to consolidate and streamline its programs and operations to achieve administrative efficiencies and reduce costs. .... The Committee is concerned that the proposal to consolidate the pest management programs was not developed with sufficient input from land-grant universities, grower associations, industry, and other interested parties. The Committee encourages NIFA to continue its efforts, working with all interested parties, to design a broadly supported and effective pest management research, education, and extension program that is responsive to the needs of today and the future.*

The Appropriations Committee uses its “Committee Report” to influence policy changes. “Report language” is not binding on the Administration, but it is taken very seriously.

If the Congress does not enact an appropriations bill by the end of the fiscal year it will pass a “Continuing Resolution.” This means that programs will continue to be funded at 2012 levels.

## Spending Levels

The chart below compares the Administration's 2013 Request, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees funding actions with the 2012 levels.

<b>2012-2013 Budget Comparison</b>				
	<b>Admin. Req.</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>House</b>	<b>Senate</b>
Centers	0	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
EIPMDDS	0	\$0.15	\$0.15	\$0.15
IPM	0	\$2.36	\$2.32	\$2.36
PMAP	0	\$1.40	\$1.37	\$1.40
NIFA IPM Research	0	\$3.92	\$3.84	\$3.92
Ext IPM	0	\$9.92	\$9.65	\$9.92
IPM NIFA, Ctrs, and Ext.		\$17.84	\$17.49	\$17.84
IR-4		\$11.91	\$11.68	\$11.91
Total Imp Pest Control Congressional Inc. IR-4		\$29.75	\$29.16	\$29.75
USDA Proposed Crop Protection Program	\$29.06			
Methyl Bromide		\$1.20	\$2.00	\$2.00
Total Program	\$29.06	\$31.74	\$31.16	\$31.74
AFRI	\$325,000	\$264,470	\$276,515	\$279,956

As this chart indicates, IPM spending is likely to be about the same level next year as it now is.

If the Administration's budget had been adopted, it would have been \$2.688 million lower. The comparison above does not include the effect of the consolidation of the IPM Extension program into the new program. Moving IPM Extension funding to the Crop Protection Program would subject it to indirect costs. This would mean an additional \$3-4 million would not be available for IPM activities.

The line for AFRI spending is included to illustrate that some programs are increasing while IPM is being straight-lined or reduced. The Administration was even more generous to AFRI, requesting \$325 million. The Specialty Crop Research Initiative is at the same level as last year --\$50 million.

### 3. The Drought Bill

The decisions made on the drought bill are very unlikely to affect IPM programs. There is a slight probability that the House might insist on offsetting the cost of the bill by an across-the-board cut in USDA's programs.

**Thanks to you!** Many of you have supported IPM Voice's efforts to support and protect IPM funding. IPM Voice works because you have worked with it in this common effort.