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Summary

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Farm Service Agency (FSA) in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) currently administer over 20 programs and subprograms that are directly or indirectly available to assist producers and landowners who wish to practice conservation on agricultural lands. The number, scope, and overall funding of these programs has grown in recent years. This growth can cause some confusion over which problems and conditions each program addresses, and specific program characteristics and performance. The programs are as follows:

- Agricultural Management Assistance (AMA) Program
- Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program
- Conservation Operations (CO); Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA)
- Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)
- CRP—Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)
- CRP—Farmable Wetlands Program
- Conservation Security Program
- Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)
- Emergency Conservation Program (ECP)
- Emergency Watershed Program (EWP)
- Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)
- EQIP—Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP)
- EQIP—Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG)
- Farmland Protection Program (FPP)
- Grassland Reserve Program (GRP)
- Healthy Forest Reserve Program (HFRP)
- Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Program
- Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations
- Watershed Rehabilitation Program
- Wetland Reserve Program (WRP)
- Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP)

This tabular presentation provides basic information introducing each of the programs. In each case, a brief program description is followed by information on major amendments in the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246); national scope and availability; states with the greatest participation; the backlog of applications or other measures of continuing interest; program funding authority; FY2010 estimated spending; the FY2011 Administration budget request; statutory authority; the authorization expiration date; and a link to the program’s website.
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Introduction

Currently, more than 20 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) agricultural conservation programs exist to assist private landowners with natural resource concerns. Though some similarities among these programs exist, each is administered with slight differences. These differences and the number of programs create some general confusion about the purpose, participation, and policies of the programs.

The number of agricultural conservation programs has steadily increased over the past 60 years. Early conservation efforts were focused on reducing high levels of soil erosion and providing water to agriculture in quantities and quality that enhanced farm production. Congress responded to these issues by creating and revising programs designed to reduce resource problems on the farm. By the early 1980s, however, concern was growing that these programs were not adequately dealing with environmental problems resulting from agricultural activities (especially off the farm). In 1985, conservation policy took a new direction when Congress passed the Food Security Act of 1985 (1985 farm bill, P.L. 99-198), which established the first conservation programs designed to deal with environmental issues resulting from agricultural activities.

Provisions enacted in subsequent farm bills, including in 1990, 1996, 2002, and 2008, reflect a rapid evolution of the conservation agenda, including the growing influence of environmentalists and other non-agricultural interests in the formulation of conservation policy, and a recognition that agriculture was not treated like other business sectors in many environmental laws. Congress also began funding many of these new programs through mandatory spending for the first time, using the borrowing authority of USDA’s Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) as the funding mechanism instead of annual appropriations. In addition to the original soil erosion and water quality and quantity issues, the conservation agenda has continued to expand to address other natural resource concerns, such as wildlife habitat, air quality, wetlands restoration and protection, energy efficiency, and sustainable agriculture.

Lead agricultural conservation agencies within USDA are the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), which provides technical assistance and administers most conservation programs, and the Farm Service Agency (FSA), which administers the largest program, the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). These agencies are supported by others in USDA that supply research and educational assistance, including the Agricultural Research Service (ARS), the Economic Research Service (ERS), and the Forest Service (FS). In addition, the conservation effort involves a large array of partners, including other federal agencies, state and local governments, and private organizations, among others, who provide funds, expertise, and other forms of assistance to the conservation effort.


2 The CCC is the funding mechanism for the mandatory payments that are administered by various agencies of USDA, including all of the farm commodity price and income support programs.

3 For more information on: ARS projects, see http://www.ars.usda.gov/Research/Research.htm; ERS projects, see http://www.ers.usda.gov/Browse/view.aspx?subject=NaturalResourcesEnvironment; and FS projects, see http://www.fs.fed.us/projects/.
Overview

USDA provides technical and financial assistance to attract interest and encourage participation in conservation programs. Participation in all USDA conservation programs is voluntary. These programs protect soil, water, wildlife, and other natural resources on privately owned agricultural lands to limit environmental impacts of production activities both on and off the farm, while maintaining or improving production of food and fiber. Some of these programs center on improving or restoring resources that have been degraded, while others create conditions to limit degradation in the future.

Though programs in this report are listed alphabetically, they can be grouped into the following categories based on similarities: working land programs, land retirement and easement programs, watershed programs, emergency programs, compliance and technical assistance programs, and other. Figure 1 illustrates the relative size of each group based on the amount of funding in FY2009.

Figure 1. FY2009 Funding for Conservation Programs


Notes: Technical assistance includes funding for compliance programs. Funding for extension and research is not included. Total funding for conservation programs is approximately $5.3 billion.
The majority of conservation programs are funded through USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) as mandatory spending. Congress authorizes mandatory programs at specified funding levels each year (or acreage enrollment levels for the Conservation Reserve, Conservation Stewardship, Wetlands Reserve, and Grasslands Reserve Programs). They are funded at these levels unless Congress limits funding to a lower amount through the appropriations or legislative process (or puts a ceiling on acreage that can be enrolled). Discretionary programs are funded each year through the annual appropriations process.

Despite a steady increase in mandatory funding authority, many conservation programs have been reduced or capped through annual appropriations acts since FY2003. Many of these spending reductions were at the request of the Bush Administration, though the Obama Administration has also requested reductions in the FY2011 proposal. The mix of programs and amounts of reduction has varied from year to year. Some programs, such as the CRP, have not been reduced by appropriators in recent years, while others, such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), have been repeatedly reduced below authorized levels. EQIP’s authorized mandatory funding was reduced by over $1.16 billion from FY2005 through FY2010. Even with these reductions, total mandatory funding for conservation programs has grown from a total of $3.6 billion in FY2005 to a total of $4.7 billion in FY2010.

Conservation Programs

The tabular presentation that follows provides basic information introducing each of the USDA agricultural conservation programs, including:

- administering agency or agencies within USDA;
- a brief program description;
- major amendments to the program in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-246), commonly referred to as the 2008 farm bill;
- national scope and availability, including participation levels and acres enrolled where available;
- states with the highest level of funds obligated or acres enrolled (where applicable);
- the volume of application backlog or public interest in each program;
- the authorized funding levels, whether it is mandatory spending or discretionary appropriations, and any funding restrictions where applicable;
- the FY2010 funding level provided by the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-80) or, if applicable, the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-246) authorized level;
- the FY2011 funding level requested by the Administration;
- statutory authority, recent amendments, and U.S. Code reference;
- the expiration date of program authority unless permanently authorized; and
- a link to the program’s website.
Information for the following tables is drawn from agency budget presentations, explanatory notes, and websites; written responses to questions published each year in hearing records of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees; and spending estimates from the Congressional Budget Office. Further information about these programs may be found on the NRCS website at http://www.nrcs.usda.gov and on the “conservation programs” page of the FSA website at http://www.fsa.usda.gov. For additional information about agricultural conservation in general, see CRS Report R40692, Agricultural Conservation Issues in the 111th Congress.

### USDA Agricultural Conservation Programs

**Working Lands Programs**—typically classified as programs that allow private land to remain in production, while implementing various conservation practices to address natural resource concerns specific to the area.

- Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)/Conservation Security Program, Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP), Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP), and Agricultural Management Assistance (AMA).

**Land Retirement and Easement Programs**—land retirement programs provide federal payments to private agricultural landowners for temporary changes in land use or management to achieve environmental benefits. Conversely, conservation easements impose a permanent land-use restriction that is voluntarily placed on the land in exchange for a government payment.

- Conservation Reserve Program (includes the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) and Farmable Wetlands), Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), Farmland Protection Program (FPP), Grassland Reserve Program (GRP), and Healthy Forests Reserve Program (HFRP).

**Watershed Programs**—NRCS partners with local sponsors to carry out activities for soil conservation; flood prevention; conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water; watershed surveys; and dam and flood structure rehabilitation.

- Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations (also referred to as the Small Watershed Programs, P.L. 566 and P.L. 534), Watershed Rehabilitation, and Watershed Surveys and Planning.

**Emergency Programs**—provide disaster assistance for farmland rehabilitation and impairments to watersheds. Programs are usually funded through supplemental appropriation acts.

- Emergency Conservation Program (ECP) and Emergency Watershed Program (EWP) (includes floodplain easements).

**Compliance**—prohibits a producer from receiving many federal farm program benefits (including conservation assistance) when conservation program requirements for highly erodible lands and wetlands are not met.

- Conservation Compliance, Sodbuster, Swampbuster, and Sodsaver.

**Technical Assistance Programs**—provides landowners with science-based conservation information and technical expertise (e.g., engineering and biological) unique to the region and land use type. Usually does not include financial assistance.


**Other Conservation Programs and Provisions**—Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program, Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative, Conservation Innovation Grants, Great Lakes Basin Program, Regional Equity, State Technical Committees, Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program, and Grassroots Source Water Protection Program.
Agricultural Management Assistance (AMA) Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS (conservation assistance), Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS, organic certification), and Risk Management Agency (RMA, production, price, or revenue risk reduction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>AMA provides cost-sharing assistance under contracts of 1 to 10 years to producers in 16 specified states where participation in the federal crop insurance program has been historically low. Producers use this assistance to construct or improve water management and irrigation structures, plant trees, control soil erosion, practice integrated pest management, practice organic farming, develop value-added processing, and enter into futures, hedging, or options contracts to reduce production, price, or revenue risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>Adds Hawaii as an eligible state; authorizes funding of $15 million annually from FY2008 through FY2012, and $10 million in subsequent years; and designates program funding for USDA agencies: 50% - NRCS, 10% - AMS, and 40% - RMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scope</td>
<td>Not available nationwide. Eligible states include: CT, DE, HI, MD, MA, ME, NV, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, UT, VT, WV, and WY. As of the end of FY2009, 723 contracts are being implemented within these states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading States</td>
<td>States with the most funds obligated in FY2009 include PA ($1.3 million), NY ($1.1 million), and WY ($0.9 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog/Interest</td>
<td>A backlog of 266 applications was pending at the end of FY2009, up from a backlog of 94 applications in FY2008. These applications would enroll more than 23,471 acres at a cost of $10.3 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding authority</td>
<td>Mandatory. Permanently authorized at $10 million for each fiscal year except FY2008-FY2012, which is authorized at $15 million for each fiscal year. Funding is split by law between the three USDA agencies: 50% - NRCS, 10% - AMS, and 40% - RMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding</td>
<td>$15 million ($7.5 million for conservation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request</td>
<td>$10 million ($2.5 million for conservation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization expires</td>
<td>Permanent authorization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program provides additional financial assistance through existing conservation programs for areas within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Law requires special consideration for producers in the Susquehanna, Shenandoah, Potomac, and Patuxent river basins. Program rules, contracts, and sign up depend on the program through which NRCS is providing the funds. In a notice published in the Federal Register on March 12, 2010 (75 FR 11832), NRCS announced that FY2010 funds are provided through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI), which includes EQIP and the Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP). EQIP and WHIP are discussed further below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</strong></td>
<td>Program created in the 2008 farm bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Scope</strong></td>
<td>Not available nationwide. The program applies to all tributaries, backwaters, and side channels, including watersheds draining into the Chesapeake Bay. This includes areas within DE, MD, NY, PA, VA, and WV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading States</strong></td>
<td>In FY2009, states with the most funding obligated were PA ($6.7 million), VA ($6.2 million), and MD ($5 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backlog/Interest</strong></td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding authority</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory. FY2009 - $23 million; FY2010 - $43 million; FY2011 - $72 million; and FY2012 - $50 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2010 funding</strong></td>
<td>$43 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2011 Administration request</strong></td>
<td>$72 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorization expires</strong></td>
<td>September 30, 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conservation Operations (CO)—Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Administering Agency(s)</strong></th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Description</strong></td>
<td>Conservation Operations (CO) is the primary account funding technical assistance within NRCS. More than 80% of CO funding is for Conservation Technical Assistance (CTA), which provides conservation planning and implementation assistance through field staff placed in almost all counties within the United States and territories. This assistance is provided to producers and land owners who voluntarily apply natural resource conservation systems, consisting of one or more practices, on private and other non-federal lands. Other components of CO include the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, soil surveys, snow surveys, and plant material centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</strong></td>
<td>Amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act include a definition of technical assistance and agriculture commodity. Other provisions indirectly affect this program, including allowing NRCS to approve qualified individuals and entities, referred to as third parties, to provide some types of technical assistance and retaining a cap on total funding for technical assistance provided through mandatory programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Scope</strong></td>
<td>Available nationwide. CTA was funded at $790.9 million and 5,624 staff years for FY2009, according to the FY2011 budget notes. Total CO spending for FY2009 was $887.6 million and 6,573 staff years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading States</strong></td>
<td>No data are available for the CTA subset in FY2010, but the three leading stats for total CO funding (estimate) are: TX ($47.3 million), IA ($23.7 million), and KS ($23.1 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backlog/Interest</strong></td>
<td>Not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding authority</strong></td>
<td>Discretionary. No amount specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2010 funding</strong></td>
<td>$756 million for CTA out of $887.6 million for all CO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration Agency(s)</th>
<th>FSA, technical assistance by NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>CRP provides annual rental payments, usually over 10 years, to producers to replace crops on highly erodible and environmentally sensitive land with long-term resource conserving plantings. Bids to enroll land are solicited during a limited time period, then compared using an Environmental Benefits Index (EBI). Those with the highest EBI scores are accepted. Imbedded in the CRP are several small and more focused programs that bypass the general bidding process, some established in law and others established administratively, to address specific resource topics, including more concentrated resource problems in a portion of a state, protection of small isolated agricultural wetlands, and improvement of habitat for upland game birds. All lands that qualify for these subprograms are automatically accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>Reduces enrollment ceiling from 39.2 million acres to 32 million acres; amends haying and grazing conditions; and authorizes incentives to assist socially disadvantaged and beginning farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scope</td>
<td>Available nationwide. According to the FY2011 budget proposal, a general CRP sign-up could be held in FY2010, pending the publication of an environmental impact statement (EIS). Nationally there are 734,648 active contracts on 411,959 farms with 31.2 million acres enrolled, according to FSA’s February 2010 monthly program summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading States</td>
<td>Leading states in terms of acres are TX (3.3 million), MT (3.1 million), and KS (2.8 million). Leading states in terms of number of contracts, are IA (102,759), IL (78,805), and MN (61,425).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog/Interest</td>
<td>General sign-ups were not held in FY2007, FY2008, or FY2009. Contract extensions were offered to contracts that expired September 30, 2009. Of the 1.5 million acres that were offered extensions, 1.1 million acres were extended. Under continuous sign-ups, a total of 4.4 million acre were under contract as of the end of FY2009. About 400,000 acres are projected to be enrolled under continuous sign-up in FY2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding authority</td>
<td>Mandatory. No more than 32 million acres enrolled at any one time. No funding amount specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding (est.)</td>
<td>$1.96 billion (based on the estimated number of acres that will be enrolled and includes technical assistance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request</td>
<td>$1.97 billion (based on the estimated number of acres that will be enrolled and includes technical assistance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Statutory authority**


**Authorization expires**

September 30, 2012.

**Program website**


**CRP—Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)**

**Administering Agency(s)**

FSA, technical assistance by NRCS

**Program Description**

This subprogram of CRP partners with states at their request. States propose sub-state areas, such as a watershed, where environmental or resource concerns are more concentrated and can be addressed by enrolling up to 100,000 acres per project. States contribute 20% of the funding so that larger payments can be made, in order to encouraging greater participation.

**Major 2008 farm bill amendments**

None.

**National Scope**

34 states have active CREP contracts (67,498) on 44,570 farms, enrolling a total of 1.18 million acres, according to FSA’s February 2010 monthly program summary.

**Leading States**

Leading states in terms of acres enrolled are PA (204,048), IL (126,631), and OH (103,093). States leading in number of contracts are OH (11,162), PA (10,961), and IL (6,624).

**Backlog/Interest**

Not applicable since any eligible land can be enrolled at any time; participation has been much higher in some states than in others, but that is due, reportedly, to how the program is promoted. Average rental payments are higher than for acreage under the general CRP sign up process.

**Funding authority**

Unspecified acreage subset of CRP.

**FY2010 funding**

Unspecified acreage subset of CRP.

**FY2011 Administration request**

Unspecified acreage subset of CRP.

**Statutory authority**

Authority derived from CRP statutory authority (see “Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)”).

**Authorization expires**

September 30, 2012.

**Program website**


**CRP—Farmable Wetlands Program**

**Administering Agency(s)**

FSA, technical assistance by NRCS

**Program Description**

This 1 million acre subprogram of the CRP enrolls small isolated agricultural wetlands. On a single tract of land, enrollment is now set at a maximum of 40 contiguous wetland acres. "Flooded farmland” has a 20-acre limit. Eligible lands include wetlands that were cropped 3 of the preceding 10 years, and buffers sufficient to protect them, on which the hydrology will be restored and a vegetative cover established.
Major 2008 farm bill amendments: Caps enrollment at 100,000 acres in any state and 1 million acres total. Expands enrollment of wetland and buffer acreage to include land that had been cropped during 3 of 10 crop years prior to 2002 and after 1990 and is subject to a natural overflow of a prairie wetland. Increases the maximum wetland size to 40 contiguous acres and makes all acres eligible for payment.

National Scope: Active contracts in 17 participating states, including: IL, IN, IA, KS, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, ND, OH, OK, SD, WI. According to FSA’s February 2010 monthly program summary, 12,815 contracts on 10,165 farms have enrolled a total of 213,411 acres.

Leading States: In terms of acres, the leading states are IA (75,698 acres), SD (57,013 acres), and MN (41,972 acres). The largest number of contracts are in IA (4,824), followed by MN (3,065) and SD (3,035).

Backlog/Interest: Not applicable since any eligible land can be enrolled at any time; participation has been much higher in some states than in others, but that is due, reportedly, to how the program is promoted.

Funding authority: Mandatory. No more than 1 million acres enrolled at any one time and no more than 100,000 acres in any state (may be increased to 150,000 acres after three years).

FY2010 funding: Unspecified acreage subset of CRP.
FY2011 Administration request: Unspecified acreage subset of CRP.


---

Conservation Security Program

Administering Agency(s): NRCS

Program Description: The 2008 farm bill terminated funding for new contracts under this program. The program was replaced by the “Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP),” discussed below. CSP provided financial and technical assistance for improvements in conserving environmental resources on farmland that meets soil and water quality criteria standards of NRCS. CSP supported producers who are already implementing and maintaining substantial conservation systems to protect soil, water, air, and wildlife, or who adopted more sustainable systems as part of the program. The maximum annual assistance through CSP increased with each of 3 progressive tiers of participation, each requiring greater conservation. Only producers in specified watersheds could participate each year.

Major 2008 farm bill amendments: The program was terminated and replaced with the “Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP),” discussed below. Payments on existing contracts are still authorized.

National Scope: Sign ups were held in FY2004, FY2005, FY2006, and FY2008 in designated watersheds. No new sign ups are allowed by law.

Leading States: For the FY2008 sign up, Ohio had the largest number of contracts (150), and Nebraska had the largest payments approved ($3,080,807). In FY2009, states with the most funds paid were MO ($29.5 million), OR ($24 million), and IA ($22.6 million).

Backlog/Interest: Not applicable.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding authority</th>
<th>Mandatory. Current law only allows payments on contracts entered into before September 30, 2008. No new contracts are allowed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding (est.)</td>
<td>$233.9 million (payment on existing contracts only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request</td>
<td>$212.4 million (payment on existing contracts only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/csp/">http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/csp/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>The new CSP replaces the Conservation Security Program and provides financial and technical assistance to promote the conservation and improvement of soil, water, air, energy, plant and animal life, and other conservation purposes on tribal and private working lands. Contracts (5 years in length with the option of extension) are based on meeting or exceeding a “stewardship threshold.” Payments are based on the actual costs of installing conservation measures, any foregone income, and the value of the expected environmental outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>The new CSP will continue to encourage conservation practices on working lands, but will be different from the former Conservation Security Program. It eliminates the three-tier approach, establishes 5-year rather than 10-year contracts, and requires direct attribution of payments, among other changes, thus requiring that USDA promulgate new rules for the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scope</td>
<td>The first CSP sign-up was held August 10, 2009. The first ranking period cut-off was September 30, 2009. During this period, over 21,200 applications were received, covering an estimated 33 million acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading States</td>
<td>During the FY2009 ranking period, NE had the most applications (2,683), followed by TX (1,879) and MO (1,821). TX had the most total acres apply (4.7 million), followed by NE (4.3 million) and NM (3.3 million). The most funding obligated in FY2009 was in TX ($766,575), MO ($482,455), and IA ($392,342).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog/Interest</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding authority</td>
<td>Mandatory. 12.5 million acres each fiscal year. No funding amount specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding (est.)</td>
<td>$469.4 million (based on the estimated number of acres enrolled).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request</td>
<td>$629.5 million (based on the estimated number of acres enrolled).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emergency Conservation Program (ECP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>FSA, technical assistance by NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>Provides emergency funding and technical assistance to producers to rehabilitate farmland damaged by natural disasters (e.g., hurricanes, floods, wind, and erosion) through activities such as removing debris, and implementing emergency water conservation measures in response to severe droughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scope</td>
<td>Available nationwide. Participation varies widely and unpredictably from year to year. An FY2009 consolidated appropriations act (P.L. 110-329) provided $115 million to be available until expended. An FY2009 supplemental (P.L. 111-32) redesignated prior ECP funding for current use to be available until expended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading States</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog/Interest</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding authority</td>
<td>Discretionary. No funding amount specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding to date</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emergency Watershed Program (EWP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS on private lands, U.S. Forest Service on National Forest Systems lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>EWP provides technical and financial assistance to reduce hazards to life and property in watersheds that have been damaged by natural disasters. Assistance includes disaster cleanup and recovery activities, and purchasing easements in flood plains that will benefit natural resources such as wetlands, while reducing the risk of exposure to future natural disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agricultural Conservation: A Guide to Programs

National Scope
Available nationwide. Participation varies widely and unpredictably from year to year. In FY2008 and FY2009, Congress provided two supplemental appropriations totaling almost $500 million for hurricane, flood, and fire recovery. An additional $145 million was provided for floodplain easements through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Leading States
Not applicable.

Backlog/Interest
Not applicable.

Funding authority
Discretionary. No funding amount specified.

FY2010 funding to date
$0

FY2011 Administration request
$0

Statutory authority

Authorization expires
Permanent authorization.

Program website

Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)

Administrating Agency(s)
NRCS

Program Description
EQIP provides financial and technical assistance to producers and land owners to plan and install structural, vegetative, and land management practices on eligible lands to alleviate natural resource problems. Eligible producers enter into contracts to receive payment for implementing conservation practices. Approved activities are carried out according to an EQIP plan developed in conjunction with the producer that identifies the appropriate conservation practice(s) to address resource concerns on the land. Sixty percent of the funds are targeted to livestock producers. EQIP is the largest working lands program.

Major 2008 farm bill amendments
Lowers the limitation on payments to a total of $300,000, down from $450,000; limits projects with organic production benefits to $20,000 annually or $80,000 in any six-year period; authorizes a new water enhancement program (see “EQIP—Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP)’’); reauthorizes the innovative grants program (see “EQIP—Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG)’’); retains the allocation of sixty percent of funding each year to practices related to livestock production.

National Scope
Available nationwide. In FY2009, EQIP allocated $1.1 billion for 31,960 contracts covering 12 million acres, according to information in the FY2011 budget notes.

Leading States
In FY2009, the top three state by contracts signed were TX (3,063), CA (1,743) and MS (1,684). The most funding obligated was in TX ($83.1 million), CA ($69.9 million), and MN ($34.8 million).

Backlog/Interest
In FY2009, 31,960 applications were funded and 54,329 applications went unfunded. Only 37% of valid applications were funded in FY2009, according to information in the FY2011 budget notes. The total estimated cost of this backlog is $1.36 billion. The most unfunded applications were submitted in OK (4,063), TX (3,944), and CA (3,853).

Funding authority
Mandatory. FY2009 - $1.377 billion, FY2010 - $1.45 billion, FY2011 - $1.588 billion, FY2012 - $1.75 billion.

FY2010 funding
$1.18 billion ($1.45 billion authorized).
## EQIP—Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>AWEP is a subprogram of EQIP. The program provides financial and technical assistance to producers and land owners to address water quality and quantity concerns on agricultural land. The program replaces the Ground and Surface Water Conservation program and the Klamath Basin program. AWEP addresses water quality and quantity concerns through eligible partners and established priority areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>Program created in the 2008 farm bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scope</td>
<td>Available nationwide, although not every state participated in FY2009. In FY2009, AWEP allocated $58 million to 1,687 contracts covering 488,380 acres, according to information in the FY2011 budget notes. A total of 63 project area proposals were approved in the national competition. Of these, 6 projects were with tribes, 2 were multi-state, and 24 were in a special priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading States</td>
<td>In FY2009, the top three states by contracts signed were CA (555), GA (263), and TX (225). The most funding obligated was in CA ($20.8 million), TX ($12.7 million), and ID ($7.9 million). States with the most total applications were CA (890), NE (703), and GA (576).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog/Interest</td>
<td>In FY2009, 1,687 contracts were funded and 1,155 applications went unfunded. The total estimated cost of this backlog is $40.6 million. The highest numbers of unfunded applications were in NE (412), GA (284), and AL (115).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding authority</td>
<td>Mandatory. FY2009 - $73 million, FY2010 - $73 million, FY2011 - $74 million, FY2012 and each year thereafter - $60 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding</td>
<td>$73 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request</td>
<td>$74 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization expires</td>
<td>Permanent authorization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/awep/">http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/awep/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQIP—Conservation Innovation Grants (CIG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Description</strong></td>
<td>CIG is a subprogram of EQIP that awards competitive grants to state and local agencies, non-governmental organizations, tribes, and individuals to implement innovative conservation techniques and practices. The program was first implemented in FY2004. Annual requests for proposals are published in the Federal Register and include separate funding categories for national, state, technology, and Chesapeake Bay competitions. Examples of eligible projects include market systems for pollution reduction, demonstrating precision agriculture, capturing nutrients through a community anaerobic digester, and establishing a tribal partnership for regional habitat conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</strong></td>
<td>Amends the grants to cover air quality concerns associated with agriculture (including greenhouse gas emissions); and expands the CIG objectives to include forest resource management and projects that provide conservation benefits through increased participation by producers of specialty crops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Scope</strong></td>
<td>Available nationwide with select states offering state competitions. CIG awarded a total of $18.4 million (55 projects) in FY2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading States</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backlog/Interest</strong></td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding authority</strong></td>
<td>Unspecified subset of EQIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2010 funding</strong></td>
<td>Unspecified subset of EQIP. For the past five years, approximately $20 million of EQIP’s authorized funding has been available for CIG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2011 Administration request</strong></td>
<td>Unspecified subset of EQIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorization expires</strong></td>
<td>September 30, 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program website</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/cig/">http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/cig/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Farmland Protection Program (FPP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Description</strong></td>
<td>FPP provides funds to state, tribal, and local governments, and non-governmental organizations to help them purchase conservation easements from willing sellers to limit conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. The length of time from when a land owner first offers to sell an easement to when it is recorded with the deed to the land can be considerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</strong></td>
<td>Changes the program’s purpose from protecting topsoil to protecting the land’s agricultural use by limiting nonagricultural uses. The program is also restructured to emphasize longer term and renewable cooperative agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 USDA calls this program the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP).
National Scope
Available nationwide; however, some states may not have existing farmland protection programs through which FPP is carried out. From the program’s inception in FY1996 through FY2009, $716 million was spent to acquire 2,380 easements on 456,600 acres, according to the FY2011 budget notes.

Leading States
In FY2009, the largest amount was obligated in NJ ($6.9 million), followed by MA ($6.1 million) and WA ($5.9 million).

Backlog/Interest
The FY2011 budget notes state that “The demand for the program has exceeded available funds by approximately 200 percent.”

Funding authority

FY2010 funding
$150 million.

FY2011 Administration request
$160 million ($175 million authorized).

Statutory authority

Authorization expires
September 30, 2012.

Program website
http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/frpp/

Grassland Reserve Program (GRP)

Administrating Agency(s)
Easements are administered by NRCS, agreements are administered by FSA, and NRCS provides technical assistance for both.

Program Description
GRP uses long-term rental agreements and easements to help land owners and producers restore and protect grasslands while maintaining them in a condition suitable for grazing using common management practices.

Major 2008 farm bill amendments
Directs 40% of funds to rental contracts (10-, 15-, and 20-year duration) and 60% for permanent easements; authorizes the enrollment of 1.22 million acres between FY2009 and FY2012; gives priority enrollment to certain expiring CRP lands; tribal lands are now eligible for the program.

National Scope
Available nationwide. In FY2009, a total of $40.5 million was obligated and committed, $24.3 million to GRP easements and $16.2 million to rental contracts. In FY2009, 511 new participants enrolled 146,269 acres, including 56,688 permanent easements, according to information in the FY2011 budget notes.

Leading States
In FY2009, states with the most funding obligated were TX ($333,475), NM ($232,312), and OK ($152,475).

Backlog/Interest
None identified.

Funding authority

FY2010 funding (est.)
$100.7 million (based on the estimated number of acres that will be enrolled).

FY2011 Administration request
$79.1 million (based on the estimated number of acres that will be enrolled).
Healthy Forests Reserve Program (HFRP)

Administering Agency(s) | NRCS
--- | ---
Program Description | Assists landowners in restoring and enhancing forest ecosystems using 10-year agreements, 30-year easements, and permanent easements.
Major 2008 farm bill amendments | Allows permanent easements; directs 40% of funds to cost-share agreements and 60% for 30-year or permanent easements; and authorizes mandatory funding through the CCC.
National Scope | Not available nationwide. Limited participation in AR, MS, OK, GA, IN, MN, ME, and OR.
Leading States | The program was initially introduced as a pilot program in AR, ME, and MS. In FY2009, nine applications were enrolled into easements in MS and AR. Eight are 30-year easements and one is a permanent easement.
Backlog/Interest | During the FY2009 sign-up, a total of 122 applications covering 19,426 acres were submitted. Nine easements were enrolled in two states, covering a total of 809 acres.
Funding authority | Mandatory. $9.75 million annually for FY2009-FY2012.
FY2010 funding | $9.75 million.
FY2011 Administration request | $9.75 million.
Program website | http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/HFRP/ProgInfo/Index.html

Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Program

Administering Agency(s) | NRCS
--- | ---
Program Description | The RC&D program provides support in the form of NRCS staff coordinators to authorized county and multi-county areas. Coordinators assist state and local units of government and non-profits to develop and carry out programs to conserve and improve natural resources and the use of land, and improve conditions in rural America.
Major 2008 farm bill amendments | Emphasizes the locally led planning process to provide assistance for implementing area plans.
### National Scope
375 authorized areas encompass approximately 2,696 counties, more than 85% of the national total, and more than 77% of the U.S. population, according to the FY2011 budget notes.

### Leading States
Not applicable.

### Backlog/Interest
38 application areas covering 231 additional counties have pending applications for the Secretary’s designation.

### Funding authority
Discretionary. No amount specified.

### FY2010 funding
$50.7 million.

### FY2011 Administration request
$0

### Statutory authority

### Authorization expires
Permanent authorization.

### Program website
http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/rcd/

---

### Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Program Description**
Also referred to as the Small Watershed Program, Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations are two separate authorizations under which more than 11,000 structures have been built in more than 1,500 active and completed projects. The P.L. 78-534 Flood Prevention Operations Program authorizes 11 projects, while the P.L. 83-566 Small Watershed Operations Program authorizes watershed projects generally. Projects may be authorized for any of 8 purposes; almost all projects have flood control as an authorized purpose. Under P.L. 566, NRCS provides technical and financial assistance to plan and install projects on private lands, in cooperation with local sponsors, states, and other public agencies. The small watershed project costs are shared with local partners. Projects are limited to a maximum size, including 25,000 acre-feet of total capacity and 250,000 acres in extent. Projects above a specified size require congressional committee authorization.

### Major 2008 farm bill amendments
None.

### National Scope
Available nationwide. A total of 397 work plans are complete under P.L. 534, and 1,360 are active or completed under P.L. 566, according to the FY2011 budget notes. Six new P.L. 566 projects were authorized for FY2009, the first new authorized projects since FY2005.

### Leading States
In FY2009 the state with the most obligations was MO ($43.1 million), followed by FL ($29.9 million) and LA ($28.2 million).

### Backlog/Interest
NRCS identifies a total of $1.25 billion in unfunded federal commitments for approximately 300 authorized projects; the greatest value of unfunded commitments is in OK ($271 million) and TX ($245 million), according to the FY2011 budget notes.

### Funding authority
Discretionary. No amount specified.

### FY2010 funding
$30 million.

### FY2011 Administration request
$0
### Watershed Rehabilitation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Administering Agency(s)</strong></th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Description</strong></td>
<td>The Watershed Rehabilitation Program provides technical and financial assistance for planning, design, and implementation to rehabilitate aging watershed dam projects (including upgrading or removing dams) in communities to address health and safety concerns. Only dams constructed under the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations program (see “Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations” above) are eligible. Small watershed project dams have a 50-year design life, and 1,344 reached or exceeded that time span by the end of 2008. By the end of 2015, this number will exceed 4,300, according to the FY2011 budget notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</strong></td>
<td>Reauthorizes both mandatory and discretionary funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Scope</strong></td>
<td>Only available for dams built through the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations program and the RC&amp;D program (see discussions above). In FY2009, a total of 82 projects were funded in 21 states, and 650 dam assessments were funded in 27 states, according to the FY2011 budget notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading States</strong></td>
<td>The largest number of funded dam projects (2000-2009) are in OK (44), MS (20), and TX (17); States with the most obligations in FY2009 were AZ ($7.2 million), OK ($6.8 million), and TX ($4.2 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backlog/Interest</strong></td>
<td>In FY2009, over $14 million in requests were received from public sponsors of 716 dams to have the condition of their dams assessed in consideration for rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2010 funding</strong></td>
<td>$40.2 million in discretionary funding and $0 in mandatory funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2011 Administration request</strong></td>
<td>$40.5 million in discretionary funding and $0 in mandatory funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorization expires</strong></td>
<td>September 30, 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program website</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/WSRehab/">http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/WSRehab/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>WRP funds the purchase of easements (30 years or permanent), restoration agreements (usually 10 years in length), and 30-year contracts to assist land owners in protecting and restoring wetlands. It provides technical and financial assistance, and emphasizes restoration to original natural conditions where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2008 farm bill amendments</td>
<td>Increases the WRP maximum enrollment cap to over 3.014 million acres (up from a previous cap of 2.275 million acres); expands eligible lands to include certain types of private and tribal wetlands, croplands, and grasslands, as well as lands that meet the habitat needs of specific wildlife species; changes the payment schedule for easements; limits wetland restoration payments; specifies criteria for ranking program applications; requires USDA conduct an annual survey of the Prairie Pothole Region starting with FY2008; and requires USDA to submit a report to Congress on long-term conservation easements under the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scope</td>
<td>Available nationwide. Through FY2009, 2.18 million acres have been enrolled, with easements closed and restored on 1.7 million acres. In 2009, more than 179,000 acres were enrolled in over 1,000 projects, according to the FY2011 budget notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading States</td>
<td>In FY2009, the top three states with the most funding obligated were FL ($77.5 million), MN ($31.5 million), and WI ($25.5 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog/Interest</td>
<td>Not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding authority</td>
<td>Mandatory. Maximum enrollment of 3.014 million acres at any one time. No funding amount specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 funding (est.)</td>
<td>$613.1 million (based on the estimated number of acres that will be enrolled).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Administration request (est.)</td>
<td>$502.2 million (based on the estimated number of acres that will be enrolled).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administering Agency(s)</th>
<th>NRCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description</td>
<td>WHIP provides technical and financial assistance to eligible participants to develop upland wildlife, wetland wildlife, threatened and endangered species, fish and other types of wildlife habitat. Participants enter into contracts, usually 5 to 10 years in duration, which pays up to 75% of the contract implementation cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Major 2008 farm bill amendments
Limits program eligibility to focus on “the development of wildlife habitat on private agricultural land, nonindustrial private forest land, and tribal lands,” thus potentially excluding some previously covered areas (i.e., non-agricultural lands). It also allows USDA to provide priority to projects that address issues raised by state, regional, and national conservation initiatives.

### National Scope
Available nationwide. In FY2009, over 3,700 agreements were enrolled on over 800,000 acres.

### Leading States
In FY2009, the largest number of contracts was in MS (298), followed by MN (207) and AL (142). The largest number of enrolled acres was in AZ (176,251 acres), NM (132,008 acres), and TX (78,558 acres). The greatest obligation of funding was in TX ($3.96 million), followed by AK ($2.08 million) and CA ($1.87 million).

### Backlog/Interest
In FY2009, WHIP had 2,207 unfunded applications at a total cost of $34.8 million. OK had the most unfunded applications (332), followed by VT (155) and WV (149). OK had the highest cost of these applications ($5.1 million), followed by WV ($2.2 million) and ND ($2.1 million).

### Funding authority
Mandatory. $85 million annually FY2009-FY2012.

### FY2010 funding
$85 million.

### FY2011 Administration request
$73 million ($85 million authorized).

### Statutory authority

### Authorization expires
September 30, 2012.

### Program website
http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/whip/

---
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