



**Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources
Policy Committee**
CSAC Legislative Conference
Thursday, May 18, 2017 — 10:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Sacramento, Regency A
Sacramento County, California

Supervisor Bruce Gibson, San Luis Obispo County, Chair
Supervisor Sherri Brennan, Tuolumne County, Vice Chair
Supervisor Phil Serna, Sacramento County, Vice Chair

- 10:45 a.m. I. **Welcome and Introductions**
Supervisor Bruce Gibson, San Luis Obispo County, Chair
Supervisor Sherri Brennan, Tuolumne County, Vice Chair
Supervisor Phil Serna, Sacramento County, Vice Chair
- 10:50 a.m. II. **CSAC Policy Platform – Cannabis Language (ACTION ITEM)**
Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Representative
Betsy Hammer, CSAC Legislative Analyst
- 11:30 a.m. III. **New Life for Williamson Act? An Update from the Department of Conservation**
Ben Turner, Assistant Director for Governmental and Environmental Relations, California Department of Conservation
- 11:45 a.m. IV. **Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA): Regulatory Deadlines Ahead**
Sam Boland-Brien, Groundwater Management Program, State Water Resources Control Board
- 12:00 p.m. V. **State and Federal Legislative and Budget Update**
Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Representative
Betsy Hammer, CSAC Legislative Analyst
Hasan Sarsour, Senior Legislative Associate, Waterman & Associates
- 12:15 p.m. VI. **Closing Comments and Adjournment**
Supervisor Bruce Gibson, San Luis Obispo County, Chair
Supervisor Sherri Brennan, Tuolumne County, Vice Chair
Supervisor Phil Serna, Sacramento County, Vice Chair

ATTACHMENTS

CSAC Policy Platform – Cannabis Language

Attachment One Memo on Cannabis Platform Language
Attachment Two Draft Cannabis Platform Language

New Life for Williamson Act? An Update from the Department of Conservation

Attachment Three Memo on Williamson Act

State and Federal Legislative and Budget Update

Attachment Four Memo on State and Federal Legislative and
Budget Update
Attachment Five Memo on Fiscal Year 2017 Omnibus
Appropriations Act

CSAC Policy Platform – Cannabis Language
Attachment One
Memo on Cannabis Platform Language



May 4, 2017

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: Members, Agriculture, Environment, and Natural Resources Committee

From: Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Representative & Federal Affairs Manager
Betsy Hammer, CSAC Legislative Analyst

RE: **CSAC Policy Platform – Cannabis Language (ACTION ITEM)**

Recommendation. Approve draft policy language on cannabis.

Background. The CSAC Cannabis Working Group, co-chaired by Supervisors Nate Miley, James Gore, Estelle Fennell and alternate Judy Morris, is proposing an amendment to the CSAC Policy Platform related to cannabis policy.

The language is in response to the passage of Proposition 64: The Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA) and the Medical Cannabis and Regulatory Safety Act (MCRSA). As the state regulatory agencies begin to draft regulations to implement both laws, CSAC needs additional policy direction to help guide advocacy efforts. CSAC currently has a very narrow medical cannabis policy focused solely on respecting local control and supporting the enforcement of environmental regulations with respect to cannabis cultivation. Additional policy in a number of areas is needed to address the multitude of issues facing cannabis regulation implementation.

The attached draft policy was developed by the CSAC Cannabis Working Group, which includes broad representation from Supervisors, Agricultural Commissioners, County Counsels, Environmental Health Directors, Planning Directors and Public Health, among others. The attached language also includes feedback received from members of the Agriculture, Environment, and Natural Resources Policy Committee following an email request for feedback in mid-April. The CSAC Executive Committee received a briefing on the draft language in April.

At the 2017 CSAC Legislative Conference, the CSAC Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources Policy Committee will have the opportunity to review, discuss, edit, and approve the draft language. Following committee action, the language will be considered by the CSAC Board of Directors at their May meeting.

Materials. Draft policy language.

Staff Contacts. Please contact Cara Martinson (cmartinson@counties.org or 916-327-7500, ext. 504) or Betsy Hammer (bhammer@counties.org or 916-327-7500, ext. 531) for additional information.

CSAC Policy Platform – Cannabis Language
Attachment Two
Draft Cannabis Platform Language



CSAC Cannabis Policy

Introduction

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814
Telephone
916.327.7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

On November 8, 2016, voters passed Proposition 64, the Adult Use of Marijuana Act (AUMA), legalizing the adult use of cannabis in California. AUMA contains broad local regulatory and taxation authority, allowing local governments to decide how best to regulate – and impose local taxes on – the retail sale and cultivation of cannabis in their respective communities while integrating local regulatory programs within a larger state licensing system. AUMA provides guidelines for several state agencies to develop specific regulations that taken together will create a statewide licensing and regulatory framework for the cultivation, manufacture, transportation, testing, and sale of adult use cannabis. In addition to AUMA, the Governor signed into law the Medical Cannabis and Regulatory Safety Act (MCRSA) in 2015. MCRSA established a similar statewide licensing and regulatory framework specific to medical cannabis. While substantially similar, these two laws contain several differences. As a result, the Legislature and regulatory agencies are working to reconcile several inconsistencies between AUMA and MSCRA as they work to implement both laws.

AUMA and MCRSA respect local police powers and contain explicit county taxing authority. However, counties have a stake in shaping the broader statewide landscape of cannabis regulation in California as it will undoubtedly have a significant impact on local government operations. As the Legislature and regulatory agencies work to develop regulations to implement both the medical and adult use cannabis laws, counties put forth the following policy principles to guide CSAC positions and advocacy on cannabis regulation in California.

Policy Principles

I. Licensing, Regulation, and Local Control

Local government police powers and authority over taxation and fees must be respected in the development of any regulations implementing both medical and adult use cannabis laws. This includes support for existing local land use authority and counties' ability to ban the commercial adult use or medical cannabis retail sale and/or cultivation within the unincorporated area.

The MCRSA and AUMA outline categories of different types of licenses for the cultivation, sale, manufacture, distribution, and testing of cannabis. Both laws contain different types of restrictions on how many licenses can be held by a single entity. Counties support existing prohibitions on the cross-ownerships of licenses within the medical cannabis laws, and support restrictions on the cross-ownership of licenses within AUMA.

Counties support:

1. The development of a dual licensing system, which requires the verification of a local license as a condition precedent to the issuance of a state license for both medical and adult use commercial cannabis licensees, and the development of a strong license revocation policy and procedure for violations of license requirements.
2. Limitations and/or phase-in of unlimited acreage licenses, or Type Five licenses. (Proposition 64 allows for an unlimited acreage cultivation license - Type 5 - after the law has been in effect for five years).
3. State development of uniform regulations, when feasible, for adult use and medical cannabis.

II. Cultivation and Environmental Impacts

Counties support:

1. Uniform pesticide and other contaminant standards for adult use and medical cannabis.
2. Integration with GIS systems at the local level, especially with respect to cultivation sites. This should include integration and consultation with resource conservation districts and enable integration with Integrated Watershed Management Plans.
3. Action to reduce environmental degradation and incentivize the responsible use of resources, including water and electricity, in cannabis cultivation.
4. Strong coordination between local and state agencies to ensure uniform application in environmental enforcement efforts. This includes providing clear guidance and adequate resources to responsible agencies to regulate and enforce existing environmental laws when they are applied to the cultivation of cannabis.
5. The ability to grow industrial hemp as an agricultural product.

III. Enforcement and Public Safety

Counties strongly urge the state to fully enforce all state aspects of cannabis regulations, and to provide resources to local governments for enforcement efforts undertaken by local governments.

Counties support:

1. The development of enforceable standards for impaired driving.
2. Employer rights to maintain a drug-free workplace and the ability to impose restrictions on cannabis use by employees, while respecting AUMA and MCRSA protections for qualified cannabis users.
3. Action and assistance to aid local government and law enforcement's ability to stop unlicensed commercial activity and diversion of cannabis and cannabis products.

4. Dedicated resources for the active enforcement of illegal cannabis cultivation on state and federal lands.
5. State standards governing worker safety and security in the cannabis industry.
6. Inspections of cannabis retail establishments, sales locations, or cultivation sites to ensure adherence to state and local laws and policies.

IV. Labeling, Testing, and Advertising

Counties urge the state:

1. To develop packaging requirements that are designed to display no appeal for children and to require childproof containers, where appropriate.
2. To allow counties to use state-run labs for pesticide, heavy metal, and biological testing for enforcement purposes.
3. To develop uniform potency standards for cannabis products to ensure consumer health and safety.

Counties support:

4. Standards for the recognition of a particular appellation of origin of cannabis cultivated in a certain geographical region.
5. Strict labeling and testing requirements of all adult use and medical cannabis products.

V. Resources, Revenue Collection, and Banking

Counties urge:

1. The federal government to continue to respect states' rights with respect to cannabis regulation and enforcement.
2. The federal government to allow banking services for the cannabis industry to help reduce the public safety issues posed by a cash-based industry.
3. The federal government to declassify cannabis as a Schedule I drug.

Counties support:

4. Interim solutions to encourage tax compliance in the absence of adequate banking solutions.
5. Revenue sharing or grants from state revenues to manage the impacts of cannabis growth.
6. Sufficient resources for local code enforcement and environmental health and other departments.
7. Sufficient funding for adequate staffing at the state and local level to conduct regular inspections for dispensaries, cultivation, and manufacturing facilities, to conduct

investigations and enforcement activity, and to quickly respond to and resolve complaints in a timely manner.

8. Actions that would provide state funding and resources to local governments for public education efforts concerning responsible use of cannabis.

VI. Public Education, Outreach, and Research

Counties support:

1. Methods of sharing best practices, lessons learned, and model ordinances on cannabis regulation and taxation.
2. The development of strong, effective substance abuse prevention and education campaigns at the state level with input from counties, and resources for local education.
3. Statewide data collection and additional research and monitoring of trends regarding the impacts of cannabis – including impacts to public health, enforcement issues, and other impacts. Counties urge the state to share such data and research with local governments.
4. Continued collaboration between local and state agencies, including ongoing dialogue about implementation efforts, tax rates, enforcement issues, and other issues of significance.
5. Adequate local representation on the state Cannabis Advisory Committee to help inform state regulatory agencies and other stakeholders about local conditions, concerns and issues of significance.
6. Widespread communication on the impacts of cannabis on public health, especially related to impaired driving.

New Life for Williamson Act? An Update from the Department of
Conservation

Attachment Three
Memo on Williamson Act



May 4, 2017

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: Members, Agriculture, Environment, and Natural Resources Committee

From: Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Representative & Federal Affairs Manager
Betsy Hammer, CSAC Legislative Analyst

RE: Williamson Act Update – INFORMATIONAL

Background. The Williamson Act – formally known as the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 – is a program that allows local governments and private landowners to voluntarily limit land use to agriculture and open space purposes. In return, the landowners receive a reduced property tax assessment based upon the restricted use of their property, rather than potential market value. The program was funded by the state for nearly 40 years through the Open Space Subvention Act, but the subventions (payments from the state to the local governments to offset the property tax revenue lost by restricting assessments) ended with 2009 payments, due to state budget constraints.

When the state released its first budget without Williamson Act funding, they noted that the program would “thus be a local program” and many local governments continue to participate. According to the latest report from the Department of Conservation, approximately 15.4 million acres statewide were enrolled in the Williamson Act in 2013. An optional alternative mechanism allowed counties to reduce the length of time lands would be held under Williamson Act contracts and to recapture a small percentage of the property tax savings to the landowners.

Legislators have introduced several bills related to the Williamson Act this session:

- AB 925 (Frazier) would create Farmland Security Zone (FSZ) contracts of 30, 40, and 50 years and would expand the property tax relief benefits in exchange for longer contracts. AB 925 failed to meet an initial deadline and is now a two-year bill.
- AB 1564 (Arambula) limits the evaluation criteria for propose easements, requires the local governing board to adopt rules for partial cancellations and partial renewals, and makes clarifying changes. The author presents AB 1564 as a noncontroversial starting point for stakeholder consensus regarding the future of the Williamson Act.
- SB 435 (Dodd) reestablishes subvention payments to local governments with some caveats and restrictions, including limits on annual pay rates and an agreement to accept new applications and consider proposed solar-use easement recissions. SB 435 also provides additional subvention payments if the local government applies to the Department of Natural Resources with summaries of many different aspects of conservation, environmental planning, and agricultural viability.

Additional programs to protect and conserve farmland and open space are currently active:

The California Farmland Conservancy Program (CFCP) offers grants to local governments in certain areas to secure agricultural conservation easements, land acquisition, land

improvement and planning grants, and technical assistance. This program has funded easements on more than 58,000 acres between 1996 and 2006. CFCP has multiple types of grant applications with specific funding sources; applications are currently being accepted for \$7.5 million in grant funding for farmland conservation easements in specific counties. The deadline to apply for Round II is May 22.

The Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Program is funded through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. SALC offers grants to design and implement a local or regional agricultural land conservation strategy that reduces greenhouse gas emissions through the long-term protection of agricultural lands under threat of conversion by promoting regional growth within certain boundaries. It also offers grants for permanent agricultural easements to protect important agricultural lands under the threat of conversion. The SALC is currently accepting applications for both agricultural conservation easement grants and agricultural land strategy and outcome grants, with a pre-proposal deadline of June 1 and an application deadline of August 1.

The Ecosystem Restoration on Agricultural Lands Program is offered by the California Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) with bond funding from Proposition 84 (2006). The grants can be used to assist farmers in integrating agricultural activities with ecosystem restoration and wildlife protection like enhanced water corridors, habitat restoration, wildlife buffers, development of wetland areas, fencing to protect and enhance native habitats, and habitat management activities. Applications for this program are accepted on a continuous basis, and the WCB meets four times per year.

Staff Contacts. Please contact Cara Martinson (cmartinson@counties.org or 916-327-7500, ext. 504) or Betsy Hammer (bhammer@counties.org or 916-327-7500, ext. 531) for additional information.

State and Federal Legislative and Budget Update
Attachment Four
Memo on State and Federal Legislative and Budget Update



May 4, 2017

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: Members, Agriculture, Environment, and Natural Resources Committee

From: Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Representative & Federal Affairs Manager
Betsy Hammer, CSAC Legislative Analyst

RE: State and Federal Legislative and Budget Update – INFORMATIONAL

Recommendation. This is an informational item only.

Background. The 2016-17 legislative session convened on January 4, 2017. CSAC legislative staff had reviewed hundreds of introduced and amended bills concerning a wide range of topics that include cannabis, water, energy, solid waste disposal, climate change, and more.

Several key deadlines are approaching as we reach peak time for the state budget process and bill deadlines:

- June 2: House of Origin deadline for each house to pass bills introduced in their house
- June 15: Constitutional deadline for Legislature to pass budget
- July 21: Summer Recess begins
- August 21: Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess
- September 15: Final day for any bill to be passed

Materials. Bill reports will be provided at the committee meeting on May 18 to ensure members have the most up-to-date and accurate information since legislation is moving rapidly.

Staff Contacts. Please contact Cara Martinson (cmartinson@counties.org or 916-327-7500, ext. 504) or Betsy Hammer (bhammer@counties.org or 916-327-7500, ext. 531) for additional information.

State and Federal Legislative and Budget Update
Attachment Five
Memo on Fiscal Year 2017 Omnibus Appropriations Act



MEMORANDUM

TO: Cara Martinson, CSAC Federal Affairs Manager

FROM: Joe Krahn, Tom Joseph, and Hasan Sarsour
CSAC Washington Representatives

CC: Matt Cate, CSAC Executive Director
DeAnn Baker, CSAC Deputy Executive Director, Legislative Affairs

DATE: May 1, 2017

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2017 Omnibus Appropriations Act

Members of Congress are set to vote on a fiscal year 2017 omnibus appropriations package after negotiators struck a long-awaited deal to keep the federal government open through the end of September. Although GOP congressional leaders made the decision last year to delay consideration of the 2017 budget in order to give the Trump administration sufficient opportunity to mold the legislation, the final spending agreement rejects many of the priorities sought by the president. By way of illustration, the \$1.1 trillion funding bill does not include the \$18 billion in fiscal year 2017 cuts proposed by the White House or money for a border wall. Also left out of the legislation were a bevy of policy riders that Democrats considered to be “poison pill” amendments.

At the same time, congressional Republicans and President Trump were able to secure several notable wins. For example, the budget package provides a \$15 billion boost for the Pentagon, with \$2.5 billion of the funding contingent on the administration delivering a new plan to combat the Islamic State. The bill also includes \$1.5 billion for border security, although funding cannot be used for additional Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, or, as previously noted, for the construction of a border wall.

All told, the final fiscal year 2017 budget represents a victory for California’s counties. Faced with the possibility of significant spending cuts in the current year, Congress ultimately rebuffed many of the programmatic funding reductions that were being aggressively pursued by the White House.

Looking ahead, and although Republicans control both houses of Congress and the White House, the freshly minted budget reflects the fact that the GOP will be forced to rely on Democratic cooperation to advance most legislation of consequence. With the possible exception of health care reform – which could potentially move through Congress via the expedited budget reconciliation process – most bills, including

appropriations measures, will need 60 votes to clear the Senate. Accordingly, and given the 52-48 split in the upper chamber, Republicans and the Trump administration will need to continue to work with congressional Democrats if they want to see legislation enacted into law.

To follow are charts that compare fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 funding levels for a number of key programs. The numbers in the charts are in millions of dollars.

KEY PROGRAMMATIC FUNDING LEVELS

HEALTH PROGRAMS			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
MEDICAID	\$243,545	\$262,003	+\$18,458
RYAN WHITE HIV/AIDS PROGRAM	\$2,322	\$2,318	-\$4
MATERNAL & CHILD HEALTH BLOCK GRANT	\$638	\$642	+\$4
PREVENTIVE HLTH/HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT	\$160	\$160	---
PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND	\$892	\$891	-\$1

HUMAN SERVICES			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
TANF	\$16,500	\$16,500	---
SSBG	\$1,700	\$1,700	---
LIHEAP	\$3,390	\$3,390	---
CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT	\$4,070	\$4,276	+\$206
HEAD START	\$9,168	\$9,253	+\$85
CHILD CARE DEVELOPMENT FUND	\$4,772	\$4,992	+\$220
OLDER AMERICANS ACT PROGRAMS	\$1,381	\$1,387	+\$6
ELDER JUSTICE ACT	\$10	\$10	---
COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT	\$715	\$715	---
SNAP/FOOD STAMPS	\$80,849	\$78,480	-\$2,369*
WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT PROGRAMS	\$2,709	\$2,709	---

*The decrease in SNAP is due to lower caseloads and does not reflect a cut in the program.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE*			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (SCAAP)	\$210	\$210	---
VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VOCA)	\$3,042	\$2,573	-\$469
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT	\$480	\$481.5	+\$1.5
VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING GRANTS	\$45	\$45	---
COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES (COPS)	\$212	\$221.5	+\$9.5

BYRNE/JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT (JAG)	\$476	\$403	-\$73
SECOND CHANCE ACT	\$68	\$68	---
METHAMPHETAMINE ENFORCEMENT (LAB CLEANUP AND TASK FORCE)	\$18	\$17	-\$1
OPIOID INITIATIVE (COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION & RECOVERY ACT (CARA))	\$83**	\$103	+\$20
JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS	\$270	\$247	-\$23

* The omnibus includes the Rohrabacher-Farr medical marijuana rider, which prohibits DOJ from prosecuting businesses and individuals that are acting in compliance with state-legal medical marijuana laws.

**Congress provided \$83 million for various opioid-related programs in fiscal year 2016 by way of several existing programs. The FY 17 omnibus spending package boosts several existing programs while also funding initiatives authorized under CARA.

HOMELAND SECURITY			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
STATE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM	\$467	\$467	---
URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE	\$600	\$605	+\$5
ASSISTANCE TO FIREFIGHTER GRANTS	\$345	\$345	---
STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE FIRE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE (SAFER) GRANTS	\$345	\$345	---
EMERGENCY MGMT PERFORMANCE GRANTS	\$350	\$350	---
NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND	\$100	\$100	---

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY OBLIGATION LIMIT	\$42,361	\$43,266	+\$905
TRANSIT FORMULA PROGRAM	\$9,347	\$9,733	+\$386
CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS	\$2,177	\$2,412	+\$235
TIGER GRANTS	\$500	\$500	---
HIGH SPEED RAIL	\$0	\$0	---
GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORT OBLIGATION LIMIT	\$3,350	\$3,350	---
ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICES (EAS) PROGRAM	\$283	\$263	-\$20
SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (SCASDP)	\$5	\$10	+\$5

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)	\$3,000	\$3,000	---
HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM	\$950	\$950	---
CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE	\$125	\$137.5	+\$12.5
HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS	\$2,250	\$2,250	---

INTERIOR-ENVIRONMENT			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
PAYMENTS-IN-LIEU-OF-TAXES (PILT)	\$452	\$465	+\$13
WILDLAND FIREFIGHTING AND PREVENTION	\$4,203	\$4,183	-\$20
WILDLAND FIRE SUPPRESSION	\$1,103	\$1,643	+\$540
HAZARDOUS FUELS MANAGEMENT	\$545	\$570	+\$25
BIOMASS UTILIZATION GRANTS	---	\$15	+\$15
LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND	\$450	\$400	-\$50

WATER RESOURCES/AIR QUALITY			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION	\$37	\$36	-\$1
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROJECTS	\$23.4	\$34.4	+\$11
WATERSMART GRANTS	\$23.4	\$24	+\$600K
CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND	\$1,394	\$1,394	---
DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND	\$863	\$863	---
DIESEL EMISSIONS GRANTS	\$50	\$60	+\$10
TARGETED AIR SHED GRANTS	\$20	\$30	+\$10
STATE AND LOCAL AIR QUALITY GRANTS	\$228	\$228	---

AGRICULTURE			
	FY 2016 ENACTED	FY 2017 OMNIBUS	CHANGE
USDA RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS	\$2,771	\$2,937	+\$166
RURAL WATER & WASTE PROGRAM LOANS	\$1,250	\$1,250	---
RURAL WATER & WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS	\$522	\$571	+\$49
RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES LOANS	2,200	\$2,600	+\$400
RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANTS	\$25	\$30	+\$5
RURAL BROADBAND GRANTS	\$10.4	\$34.5	+\$24.1
DISTANCE LEARNING AND TELEMEDICINE	\$22	\$26.6	+\$4.6

We hope this information is useful to you. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.