Impacts of The American Farmland Trust Conservation Reserve Program Recommendations: Preliminary Estimates and Description of a CRP Policy Impacts Simulator

Charles Benbrook
for
The American Farmland Trust

June 6, 1995

Impacts of The American Farmland Trust Conservation Reserve Program Recommendations: Preliminary Estimates and Description of a CRP Policy Impacts Simulator

Charles Benbrook
for
The American Farmland Trust

June 6, 1995

American Farmland Trust is a national, nonprofit, membership organization founded in 1980 to protect the nation's agricultural resources. AFT works to stop the loss of productive farmland and to promote farming practices that lead to a healthy environment. Its action oriented programs include public education, technical assistance in policy development and direct farmland protection projects.

AMERICAN FARMLAND TRUST
1920 N Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-5170 (202) 659-8339 Fax

FOREWORD

This analysis of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is a work in progress. As the farm bill process unfolds, the simulation model will be refined and applied, to the extent possible, to policy proposals taking shape in the Congress.

The competitive bidding process now used to select land for enrollment in the CRP is working well and should be retained. But by it's nature, a competitive bid process makes it difficult to predict where and at what price land will be enrolled. Many factors will affect producer willingness to offer land for the reserve -- crop prices and demand, what Congress does to the commodity programs, and whether conservation compliance is retained, strengthened or weakened. What is clear though is that the public will get the most for their CRP tax dollars through a wide-open competitive bid process.

The estimates of enrollments and payments reported herein are, therefor, just that -- a set of preliminary estimates based on what might be expected to occur, under one set of assumptions, if the policy reforms recommended by the American Farmland Trust (AFT) were adopted as discussed in this paper. The estimates from this type of model are of greatest value in predicting the general impact of various policy proposals on state and regional enrollment and payment patterns, and on how budget savings can be achieved so additional land can be enrolled within a given budget baseline. But such models are not reliable in predicting point estimates, for example, how many acres of land in Kentucky contributing principally to wildlife habitat improvement will be among the new enrollments in the CRP.

With time, the provisions of the new CRP, budget baselines and environmental benefits index criteria will be known. The model can then be modified and CRP program results re-estimated. As the program is implemented in the years ahead actual enrollments can be compared to estimated enrollments, providing insights regarding how the model can be improved.

Many people have helped in compiling the data and developing the model. Ms. Marjorie Harper of the NRCS Natural Resources Inventory Division provided valuable data from the National Resource Inventories. Mr. Tim Osborn, ERS/USDA deserves thanks for sharing his extensive knowledge of the CRP and help in structuring the model. Data on land now in the CRP was obtained from Mr. Osborn's FTP site. Thanks also to Dr. Bruce Babcock and colleagues at Iowa State University for sharing Excel files with state level data from their recent analyses. Mr. John Evans, Technical Director of HillNet, performed many minor miracles on tight deadlines in downloading large data-sets over the Internet, working data into Excel spreadsheets and making all needed calculations on a personal computer.

Impacts of AFT's Conservation Reserve Program Recommendations: Preliminary Estimates and Description of a CRP Policy Impacts Simulator

INTRODUCTION and SUMMARY

While the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is bound to be re-authorized, it's size and impacts across the landscape are likely to change markedly and it can and should be made more cost-effective. The American Farmland Trust (AFT) has proposed a set of policy reforms that would maintain the program's size, broaden the range of environmental problems it addresses and improve the environmental benefits achieved with each dollar spent.

AFT's farm bill proposals also call for capping total commodity and conservation program spending, placing all key U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) program missions on equal footing in the budget process, initiation of a major environmental stewardship incentives program based on integrated farm planning to achieve water quality and other environmental goals, and helping states and local communities retain unique and valuable cropland in agricultural production.

AFT's Proposal The American Farmland Trust's CRP, commodity program, and environmental stewardship proposals are set forth in "Agricultural Policy Reform Proposals for the 1995 Farm Bill" (AFT White Paper, March, 1995; a copy can be obtained from AFT [202-659-5170], through the AFT World Wide Web home-page: http://farm.fic.niu.edu/aft/afthome.html or through the Benbrook Consulting Service "Farmbill Web Page": http://www.hillnet.com/farmbill/ [look under "Major Reform Proposals"]).

AFT calls upon Congress to re-authorize the CRP but with several important reforms --

* Restructure the Conservation Reserve Program and Reduce Program Costs by Targeting, Transfer of Base, Limited Economic Use and Longer Term Contracts.

Contract holders would be given the option to retain, move or sell base associated with land enrolled in the CRP or wetland reserve, under certain defined circumstances. Economic use (haying, grazing or biomass production) of land in the CRP or wetland reserve should be authorized and allowed, taking into account the need to minimize adverse impact on wildlife populations and habitat.

* Extend and Reform the Farms for the Future Act and Consolidate it with the CRP.

By even the most conservative estimates, the Nation has lost nearly 20 million acres since the 1970s. Hundreds of state, local and private farmland protection programs have protected hundreds of thousands of acres of prime farmland, but federal leadership and funding assistance is now needed to meet local and state goals.

* Reduce Federal Administrative Costs and Encourage State and Local Participation.

* Establish a Resource Conservation Fund to Provide Matching Grants to State Partners.

Better targeting, new bid procedures, partial economic use and base transfer options, and partial field enrollments will lower the cost of enrolling and protecting land through the CRP. Cost savings can be split between deficit reduction and a new state-federal Natural Resources Conservation Fund (described below) whose purpose would be to provide a mechanism for an expanded role for state and local governments in targeting land for enrollment, setting the terms of enrollment, and stretching state plus federal dollars as far as possible.

A CRP policy simulator has been developed to estimate the economic implications of various combinations of policy reforms and is applied herein to AFT's programmatic recommendations. This paper also discusses a range of policy, administrative issues and assumptions that have to be settled in a preliminary fashion before estimates can be made.

A. IMPACTS OF AFT'S CRP RECOMMENDATIONS

Much has been learned regarding how to administer a cost-effective long-term land retirement program since creation of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) in the 1985 farm bill. Experts generally agree on how a wide variety of program objectives could be achieved, especially how to target the CRP to maximize erosion-related benefits at a given level of expenditure. There is less concurrence regarding what the CRP ought to accomplish, how much funding taxpayers should invest in it and where and how money should be allocated. Given fiscal pressures, the CRP will face steadily more probing questions regarding the program's costs and benefits.

Current 10-year contracts covering the bulk of land in the CRP come to an end in 1996, 1997 and 1998 -- just under 30 million acres. Major decisions must soon be made regarding whether and under what terms land leaving the reserve will be re-enrolled and whether the CRP will be used to address new and ongoing conservation and environmental problems -- decisions with significant economic consequences both nationally and regionally.

The politics of the CRP are complex. Re-authorization is clearly a "big ticket" item both for the agriculture and budget committees. Most members of Congress representing districts now receiving substantial CRP dollars will work to keep expenditure patterns roughly as they are; other members feel their constituencies have missed out and will work to assure that CRP dollars are dispersed more widely and accomplish more in meeting national needs, like protecting water quality.

A senior Senate agriculture committee aid wondered outloud recently: will sound policy triumph over politics as the CRP is pushed and pulled in different directions? AFT has offered a set of CRP reform proposals that reflect sound policy and are responsive to the basic goals everyone hopes the CRP will help achieve.

Impacts on Enrollments and Expenditures The impacts of AFT's proposal are summarized in Table 1, which shows first the USDA and Congressional Budget Office baselines by year for 1996-2000, followed by what would happen with enrollments, expenditures and per acre payment rates under the AFT proposal.

Table 1. USDA, CBO and American Farmland Trust Baselines, 1996-2000.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Program Years, 1996-2000 (1) Annual Ave.	Total
USDA Baseline							
- Acres	37.40	35.60	34.40	33.50	32.80	34.7	
- Billion Dollars	$1.88	$1.81	$1.83	$1.88	$1.87	$1.85	$9.27
- Dollars/Acre (2)	$50.27	$50.79	$53.20	$56.10	$57.01	$53.47	
CBO Baseline							
- Acres	36.40	38.00	29.70	24.60	21.40	30.02	
- Billion Dollars	$1.83	$1.93	$1.58	$1.38	$1.22	$1.59	$7.93
- Dollars/Acre (2)	$50.27	$50.79	$53.20	$56.10	$57.01	$53.47	
AFT Baseline							
- Acres	36.42	33.16	32.68	32.89	33.10	33.6	
- Billion Dollars	$1.83	$1.51	$1.40	$1.36	$1.34	$1.49	$7.44
- Dollars/Acre	$50.24	$45.66	$42.78	$41.48	$40.39	$44.24	

1. First five years of the CRP after passage of the 1995 Farm Bill. Payment estimates are for existing contracts, re-enrollments, new enrollments and total payments, and are all lagged one year from the year of enrollment. USDA, CBO, and AFT baseline acreage is the average over 1996-2000.
2. USDA baseline dollars calculated using average per acre payment rate from CBO baseline.

Under AFT's CRP reform proposal, acreage in the CRP would gradually decline from 36.4 million acres in 1996 to 33.1 million acres in 2000, averaging over the five program years 33.6 million acres at a total cost of $7.44 billion, or $44.24 per acre enrolled per year. Current law, as embodied in the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) baseline, would result in a smaller CRP -- on average 30 million acres and trending down to 21.4 million acres in 2000. The five-year cost of the CRP in the CBO baseline is $7.93 billion, just over the AFT baseline of $7.44 billion. The explanation why there is more land in the AFT baseline at less cost is the 20 percent difference in CBO's estimated per acre costs, $53.47 per acre, compared to AFT's, $44.24 per acre.

The aggressive targeting, pro-competitive bid procedures and economic use provisions in AFT's reform proposal lower per acre payment costs enough over the five year period to keep, on average, about 3 million more acres enrolled in the CRP while remaining within the CBO baseline, despite also attracting into the CRP significant acreage of relatively higher cost cropland east of the Mississippi River.

Re-enrollments Over the next five years, 25.05 million of the 36.4 million acres leaving the reserve would be eligible for re-enrollment on account of ongoing erosion hazard and wildlife habitat improvement benefits. Just under 20 million acres would be re-enrolled at an average per acre payment rate of $33.16 per acre, costing on average $420 million per year over the period 1996-2000. Total expenditures on re-enrollments would equal $1.68 billion over the four years during which payments would be made between 1996 and 2000. Four payments would be made -- not five -- because the first payment on land re-enrolled (or newly enrolled) in 1996 will be made in 1997.

New Enrollments New enrollments would bring about 12.6 million acres into the CRP for the first time: 4.1 million acres principally to reduce water erosion, 5.6 million to meet water quality goals, 2.8 million to enhance wildlife habitat and 340,000 under the Farms for the Future program. The average cost per acre is estimated at $59.08, resulting in total expenditures on new enrollments of $1.86 billion, slightly over expenditures on re-enrollments.

An important difference in AFT's projections compared to USDA's and CBO's arises from when new enrollments are made. As a matter of policy, it is desirable to spread CRP enrollment patterns out more evenly over time. Since so many acres are coming out of the CRP in 1996, 1997 and 1998, much of which will be re-enrolled, AFT recommends that Congress delay a significant portion of new enrollments until later in the period 1996-2000.

Accordingly, AFT assumes that 30 percent of total new enrollments will be made in 1996, 25 percent in 1997, 20 percent in 1998, 15 percent in 1999 and 10 percent in 2000. As a result, the acreage in the reserve under AFT's baseline comes down faster than under the USDA and CBO baselines, but stabilizes earlier and rises modestly from 32.68 million acres in 1998 to 33.65 million acres in 2000. Under the USDA baseline acreage declines steadily from 1996, and under the CBO baseline acreage first rises to 38 million in 1997 but then drops quickly to 21.4 million in 2000.

Regional Distribution of Acres and Payments Members of Congress are understandably concerned about changes in the regional distribution of enrollments and payments. Table 2 presents summarizes what would happen with acres, payments, and per acre payment rates between the CRP in 1994, reflecting the outcome of the first 12 signup periods, and the CRP in 2001 under AFT's proposals.

The first four columns present data on the CRP today; the next four columns present the same data in year 2001; and the last two columns show the percentage change from 1994 to 2001. Nationwide, acreage in the CRP falls 5.3 percent and expenditures decline by 20.9 percent. Average per acre payments fall from $50.00 to $42.00.

Some regional shifts are significant, but generally expected given the prominence of highly erodible land in the Mountain, Northern Plains and Southern Plains regions in the first 12 signups. Note that large percentage changes in some states reflect very small CRP enrollments in 1994. The magnitude of regional shifts were reduced by two assumptions --

* About 6.4 million acres currently in the CRP were added to the eligible pool for re-enrollment on account of wildlife habitat improvement, increasing the pool of land eligible for re-enrollment from 18.7 million acres to 25.1 million; and

* The lowest average state per acre payment rate for all re- and new enrollments was set at $30.00, despite the fact that per acre cropland rental rates in several states suggest that lower bid rates will be offered and accepted;

Impacts on Productive Capacity In an average year in the last decade, over 60 million acres have been idled by the CRP, acreage reduction programs (ARPs), the 0/85-92 and 50/85-92 provisions and other government programs. In recent years the CRP has accounted for about one-half the total acreage idled. Holding so much land out of production has hampered the agricultural industry's ability to aggressively compete for export sales. It has also cost taxpayers billions and left farmers and rural communities, politicians and the public wondering whether all that money could have been better spent on research and education, rural infrastructure, conservation, deficit reduction, even social services.

Farm commodity markets are strong and U.S. export sales are at record levels, with more growth expected as global markets open (see the forthcoming analysis of AFT's commodity program proposals by Dr. John Schnittker). The next five years may indeed prove a rewarding time to bring back into production a significant portion of the nation's idled land resources, as long as mistakes of the past are not repeated.

AFT's commodity program proposals include an immediate end to all ARPs and other land retirement programs, resulting in some 20 million acres returning to production of program and non-program crops, hay, or other uses as early as 1996. As this land returns to production, both the patterns and levels of public and private sector investments in resource conservation and environmental protection will need to change, especially if progress since 1985 in resource conservation and in lessening agriculture's adverse impacts on water quality and natural ecosystems is to be sustained.

Our CRP recommendations will result in about one-third of the 36.4 million acres currently in the CRP returning to production, most of it within the next three years. Over the next 10 years the size of the CRP will gradually decline from today's 36 million acres to about 33.6 million. Some 12.5 million acres of new cropland will be enrolled for the first time.

AFT projects that about half of all land in the CRP by 2001 will be enrolled under an economic use and/or base transfer option resulting in about a 20 percent reduction in per acre payment rates. Economic uses allowed on land enrolled in the CRP will include haying and grazing and trees, and possibly the production of selected non-erosive crops as a feed-stock for energy or industrial chemical production.

Grass forage is likely to be harvested from between 10 million to 15 million acres in the CRP, saving on average about $6.00 per acre. In years of widespread drought or other problems leading to reduced forage supplies, relatively more farmers are likely to exercise the option of buying back the right to hay or graze some or all of their CRP acreage. Forage produced on cropland in the

Table 2. Distribution and Changes in Acreage Enrolled, Annual Expenditures and Annual Per Acre Payment Rates Between the CRP in 1994 and the CRP in 2001, Following Enrollments Between 1996-2000 Under AFT Recommended Reforms

REGION / STATE	CRP in 1994 (12 Signup)					CRP in 2001 (Enrollments Over 1996-2000)					% Change 1994 to 2001	
	Acres	% Acres	Dollars	% Dollars	$/Acre	Acres*	% Acres	Dollars	% Dollars	$/Acre	Acres**	Dollars**
PACIFIC												
ALASKA	25,348	0.07%	$928,312	0.05%	$37	42,391	0.12%	$1,554,583	0.11%	$37	67.2%	67.5%
CALIFORNIA	187,499	0.51%	$9,111,130	0.50%	$49	291,373	0.84%	$16,586,564	1.16%	$57	55.4%	82.0%
HAWAII	85	0.00%	$6,800	0.00%	$80	10,060	0.03%	$704,427	0.05%	$70	11734.7%	10259.2%
OREGON	530,766	1.46%	$26,040,138	1.44%	$49	445,369	1.29%	$23,596,514	1.65%	$53	-16.1%	-9.4%
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	2.87%	$52,645,308	2.91%	$50	712,514	2.07%	$31,048,457	2.17%	$44	-31.9%	-41.0%
Total	1,790,727	4.92%	$88,731,687	4.90%	$50	1,501,706	4.36%	$73,490,543	5.13%	$49	-16.1%	-17.2%
MOUNTAIN												
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	57,210	0.17%	$1,720,963	0.12%	$30	100.0%	100.0%
COLORADO	1,978,391	5.43%	$81,220,151	4.49%	$41	1,555,770	4.51%	$43,496,211	3.04%	$28	-21.4%	-46.4%
IDAHO	877,059	2.41%	$40,084,388	2.22%	$46	696,554	2.02%	$26,891,751	1.88%	$39	-20.6%	-32.9%
MONTANA	2,854,308	7.84%	$106,295,808	5.88%	$37	2,277,693	6.61%	$64,206,812	4.49%	$28	-20.2%	-39.6%
NEVADA	3,124	0.01%	$124,940	0.01%	$40	78,541	0.23%	$2,188,201	0.15%	$28	2414.5%	1651.4%
NEW MEXICO	483,181	1.33%	$18,280,620	1.01%	$38	399,811	1.16%	$11,091,355	0.77%	$28	-17.3%	-39.3%
UTAH	233,978	0.64%	$9,365,115	0.52%	$40	239,810	0.70%	$6,776,879	0.47%	$28	2.5%	-27.6%
WYOMING	257,224	0.71%	$9,885,106	0.55%	$38	258,154	0.75%	$7,064,911	0.49%	$27	0.4%	-28.5%
Total	6,687,264	18.36%	$265,256,128	14.66%	$40	5,563,542	16.13%	$163,437,083	11.42%	$29	-16.8%	-38.4%
NORTHERN PLAINS												
KANSAS	2,937,863	8.07%	$155,183,524	8.58%	$53	2,377,644	6.90%	$67,808,661	4.74%	$29	-19.1%	-56.3%
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	3.91%	$79,369,368	4.39%	$56	1,432,223	4.15%	$56,053,495	3.92%	$39	0.5%	-29.4%
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	8.73%	$121,998,974	6.74%	$38	2,246,969	6.52%	$61,755,494	4.31%	$27	-29.4%	-49.4%
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	5.82%	$87,956,400	4.86%	$41	1,639,619	4.75%	$45,255,578	3.16%	$28	-22.7%	-48.5%
Total	9,664,111	26.53%	$444,508,265	24.57%	$46	7,696,455	22.32%	$230,873,228	16.13%	$30	-20.4%	-48.1%
SOUTHERN PLAINS												
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	3.27%	$50,657,221	2.80%	$42	997,154	2.89%	$27,851,302	1.95%	$28	-16.4%	-45.0%
TEXAS	4,150,485	11.40%	$164,086,588	9.07%	$40	3,440,481	9.98%	$95,779,681	6.69%	$28	-17.1%	-41.6%
Total	5,342,989	14.67%	$214,743,809	11.87%	$40	4,437,635	12.87%	$123,630,983	8.64%	$28	-16.9%	-42.4%
LAKE STATES												
MICHIGAN	332,853	0.91%	$19,650,397	1.09%	$59	601,002	1.74%	$28,745,795	2.01%	$48	80.6%	46.3%
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	5.30%	$106,950,708	5.91%	$55	1,449,959	4.20%	$59,011,195	4.12%	$41	-24.8%	-44.8%
WISCONSIN	746,530	2.05%	$49,857,815	2.76%	$67	913,222	2.65%	$39,292,589	2.75%	$43	22.3%	-21.2%
Total	3,008,337	8.26%	$176,458,920	9.75%	$59	2,964,182	8.60%	$127,049,579	8.88%	$43	-1.5%	-28.0%
CORNBELT STATES												
ILLINOIS	811,926	2.23%	$62,620,088	3.46%	$77	1,151,401	3.34%	$99,793,068	6.97%	$87	41.8%	59.4%
INDIANA	462,649	1.27%	$34,216,492	1.89%	$74	547,710	1.59%	$42,603,101	2.98%	$78	18.4%	24.5%
IOWA	2,224,834	6.11%	$183,132,034	10.12%	$82	2,241,781	6.50%	$183,920,774	12.85%	$82	0.8%	0.4%
MISSOURI	1,726,835	4.74%	$109,367,542	6.04%	$63	1,847,518	5.36%	$96,192,604	6.72%	$52	7.0%	-12.0%
OHIO	377,089	1.04%	$26,775,202	1.48%	$71	508,803	1.48%	$33,148,849	2.32%	$65	34.9%	23.8%
Total	5,603,333	15.38%	$416,111,359	23.00%	$74	6,297,213	18.26%	$455,658,397	31.84%	$72	12.4%	9.5%
DELTA												
ARKANSAS	260,006	0.71%	$12,669,755	0.70%	$49	337,415	0.98%	$16,651,499	1.16%	$49	29.8%	31.4%
LOUISIANNA	146,571	0.40%	$6,457,573	0.36%	$44	312,653	0.91%	$15,372,139	1.07%	$49	113.3%	138.0%
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	2.31%	$36,146,073	2.00%	$43	651,086	1.89%	$24,959,667	1.74%	$38	-22.7%	-30.9%
Total	1,248,403	3.43%	$55,273,401	3.05%	$44	1,301,154	3.77%	$56,983,305	3.98%	$44	4.2%	3.1%
SOUTHEASTERN												
ALABAMA	573,191	1.57%	$24,428,081	1.35%	$43	417,205	1.21%	$14,166,177	0.99%	$34	-27.2%	-42.0%
FLORIDA	134,860	0.37%	$5,622,822	0.31%	$42	313,171	0.91%	$23,145,592	1.62%	$74	132.2%	311.6%
GEORGIA	706,459	1.94%	$30,421,773	1.68%	$43	419,255	1.22%	$12,553,721	0.88%	$30	-40.7%	-58.7%
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	0.76%	$11,780,641	0.65%	$42	211,516	0.61%	$6,063,030	0.42%	$29	-23.9%	-48.5%
Total	1,692,580	4.65%	$72,253,317	3.99%	$43	1,361,147	3.95%	$55,928,519	3.91%	$41	-19.6%	-22.6%
APPALACHIAN												
KENTUCKY	451,317	1.24%	$26,769,111	1.48%	$59	624,487	1.81%	$31,927,952	2.23%	$51	38.4%	19.3%
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	0.41%	$6,902,672	0.38%	$46	414,142	1.20%	$14,464,547	1.01%	$35	174.3%	109.5%
TENNESEE	475,625	1.31%	$24,638,904	1.36%	$52	740,329	2.15%	$32,378,069	2.26%	$44	55.7%	31.4%
VIRGINIA	79,556	0.22%	$4,158,345	0.23%	$52	245,878	0.71%	$8,892,609	0.62%	$36	209.1%	113.8%
WEST VIRGINIA	618	0.00%	$30,159	0.00%	$49	99,291	0.29%	$4,028,217	0.28%	$41	15963.9%	13256.7%
Total	1,158,124	3.18%	$62,499,191	3.45%	$54	2,124,127	6.16%	$91,691,394	6.41%	$43	83.4%	46.7%
NORTHEASTERN												
CONNECTICUT	10	0.00%	$500	0.00%	$50	29,672	0.09%	$1,548,060	0.11%	$52	296622.5%	309512.1%
DELAWARE	995	0.00%	$65,700	0.00%	$66	23,140	0.07%	$1,149,646	0.08%	$50	2224.7%	1649.9%
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	38,490	0.11%	$1,905,202	0.11%	$49	94,982	0.28%	$3,463,861	0.24%	$36	146.8%	81.8%
MARYLAND	20,392	0.06%	$1,487,282	0.08%	$73	170,201	0.49%	$9,771,347	0.68%	$57	734.7%	557.0%
MASSACHUSETTES	32	0.00%	$1,520	0.00%	$48	31,946	0.09%	$1,748,353	0.12%	$55	100045.6%	114923.2%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	52,460	0.15%	$2,500,925	0.17%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	723	0.00%	$38,209	0.00%	$53	62,656	0.18%	$3,981,853	0.28%	$64	8566.1%	10321.3%
NEW YORK	64,498	0.18%	$3,531,638	0.20%	$55	276,359	0.80%	$10,092,762	0.71%	$37	328.5%	185.8%
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	0.28%	$6,379,534	0.35%	$63	390,393	1.13%	$14,502,072	1.01%	$37	286.2%	127.3%
RHODE ISLAND	455	0.00%	$27,465	0.00%	$60	6,436	0.02%	$281,750	0.02%	$44	1314.6%	925.9%
VERMONT	193	0.00%	$9,670	0.00%	$50	96,927	0.28%	$3,456,016	0.24%	$36	50017.1%	35639.6%
Total	226,866	0.62%	$13,446,718	0.74%	$59	1,235,172	3.58%	$52,496,645	3.67%	$43	444.5%	290.4%
US Total	36,422,733	100.00%	$1,809,282,795	100.00%	$50	34,482,335	100.00%	$1,431,239,678	100.00%	$42	-5.3%	-20.9%

* Sum of estimated enrollments over 1996-2000 includes re-enrollments and new enrollments for water erosion, water quality, and wildlife habitat (see other tables).

** Note that the large percentage change in some states reflects low CRP enrollments in 1994. Also note that U.S. total acreage declines by 5.3%, and expenditures decline 20.9%, so any state/region with reductions less than 5.3% and 20.9% represent a gain in relative share of acres or dollars (or in some cases, both).

Source: Data on the CRP in 1994 from ERS/USDA data; CRP in 2001 data from calculations made by Benbrook Consulting Services based on AFT recommended reforms, drawing on NRI data from NRCS/USDA (see other tables).

CRP will contribute to significantly to meeting the nation's food needs. Pounds of beef and milk produced with forages off CRP land will free-up grain and oilseeds for export and domestic consumption, and will also help diversify rural economic activity and increase gross and net agricultural income.

Dr. John Schnittker has completed an analysis of the impacts of AFT's commodity program reform proposals. He estimates that about 12 million additional acres will be needed over the next five years to increase production of major commodities. The end of set-asides and other land diversion programs will likely free up as many as 20 million acres, some of which will return to production. Coupled with the approximate 10 million acres of the CRP that will soon also return to production, there is clearly ample available land to meet projected food and fiber demand.

A Caveat AFT's analysis is based on one possible set of CRP policies, priorities and spending levels. Several key assumptions are made regarding how the program will be administered. Our findings highlight the gains possible through aggressive management of the enrollment bid process, by expanding farmer-options for enrollment and use of land in the CRP, and through institutional changes designed to enhance state and local roles in program implementation.

Such reforms will enable the CRP to accomplish more in the decade ahead while remaining within probable budget caps. Farmers, conservationists and government agencies will, as a result, have key new tools and resources to draw upon in confronting regional resource stewardship and environmental challenges in an era of strong markets and expanding production.

Charles Benbrook
for
The American Farmland Trust

June 6, 1995

B. ESTIMATING THE IMPACTS OF CRP PROGRAM OPTIONS AND POLICIES

Some changes in CRP program administration are both politically inevitable and substantively desirable. In particular, we assume that Congress will lay the groundwork for an expanded state and local role in shaping, administering and funding the CRP. Ideally, for the CRP to attain its full potential over the next five to ten years, several states will step forward and become equal partners with USDA in administering the program, and will provide a share of the cost of enrolling certain lands into the reserve, especially those considered crucial in meeting state program goals.

In the analysis reported herein, we do not include estimates of the reduction in federal expenditures that might result from states covering a share of the cost of new enrollments. Some states have already offered to share part of the cost of administering the CRP, and several others might be willing to cover up to one-quarter of the cost of new enrollments in return for an expanded role in setting priorities and targeting land to maximize environmental benefits. If states cost-shared 25 percent of annual payments covering one-half of the 12.6 million acres of new enrollments, the federal cost for enrolling about 6.3 million acres would be reduced about $14.80 per acre, or about $93.2 million per year. This reduction would make it possible to enroll about 2 million more acres in the program within the same budget baseline.

1. Assumptions and Analytical Methods

AFT analyzed it's proposals under as realistic a set of assumptions as possible, anticipating both what Congress is likely to adopt and how USDA is likely to administer the program. In many key respects though, the devil will be in the details.

Bidding Process and Timing The bidding process for re-enrollments and new enrollments should proceed together. We assume USDA will offer farmers with land leaving the CRP the opportunity to re-bid land into the CRP during the 10th year of existing contracts, and that re-enrollment decisions will be made in the 10th year. New 10 year contract periods will, as a result, be continuous; there will be no need to cost-share establishment of cover on land re-enrolled. It is assumed that land entering the reserve in a given year, 1987 for example, will have 1987 as its first contract year, and hence will leave the reserve at the end of 1996 and be re-enrolled, if eligible and accepted, in 1996.

Land first enrolled in 1987 received its first CRP payment one year later in 1988 and will receive its last in 1997. In our analysis, we assume that payment and expenditure estimates are all lagged by one year relative to enrollment estimates. Land exiting the reserve that is not re-enrolled will return to crop production or other uses the year following the last contract year.

It is hard to incorporate in an impacts analysis the shape and consequences of inter-related programmatic, budget and institutional reforms. As a point of departure, AFT **recommends and assumes** that --

* Congress will set a budget cap on annual CRP expenditures but not specify acreage targets (nationwide, regional or state minimum or maximum), nor require that money or acreage be divided in a particular way between re- and new enrollments;

* The basic elements of the current EBI will be retained, and an additional parameter reflecting wildlife habitat benefits will be added;

* Three new priority targets for enrollments will be defined: partial field enrollments involving filter strips, grassed waterways and riparian area enhancement to protect water quality; enrollments to assure high quality and contiguous wildlife habitat; and enrollment of unique or valuable farmlands threatened by development;

* Congress will mandate pro-competitive bid procedures to lower program costs and allow USDA's rankings of benefits to govern the regional distribution of enrollments and expenditures.

Many factors will influence the accuracy of estimates on the impacts of CRP policy reforms. Until Congress passes the 1995 farmbill, assumptions have to be made on both possible procedural and substantive program changes. Total land enrolled in the CRP in each year from 1996 through 2005 will be the sum of land currently in the reserve under contracts not yet expired, plus land with expiring contracts that is re-enrolled, plus new land brought into the reserve.

Decision-Making in the Last Three Signups While relatively little is known about the detailed decision-criteria and data-bases the USDA used over the last three signup periods, it is known that during the last three signups --

* After bids were reviewed at county offices to determine eligibility, all bids were transmitted to Washington for consideration in a national bid pool;

* Bid rates were compared to productivity adjusted rental rates for each soil type, and no bid was accepted that exceeded the applicable rental-rate determined bid cap;

* For all remaining bids, "priority bids" were automatically accepted covering land on which windbreaks, filter strips or grassed waterways were to be installed, or well-head protection areas;

* Eligible "standard" bids that remain were then ranked according to the ratio of environmental benefits to cost to the government (the environmental benefits index includes seven criteria;

cost to the government includes annual rental rates plus estimated cost-share expenditures to establish permanent cover);

* Available funds in each signup period were allocated down the list of ranked bids until all funds were committed, without regard to other factors.

The USDA has not disclosed how it applied the EBI or set maximum bid rate caps in recent signups, making it harder to accurately estimate future enrollment patterns. The model discussed herein uses a series of proxies for the EBI and other targeting criteria. As the farmbill process unfolds, proxy variables and assumptions can be replaced with actual values and calculated variables, improving the accuracy of model estimates.

Importance of Bid Caps USDA is yet to disclose how they set bid rate caps based on productivity adjusted rental rates by soil type. It is also not clear how the seven components of the Environmental Benefits Index (EBI) were weighted and integrated. The seven components of the EBI, as summarized by ERS analyst Tim Osborn, are --

* surface water quality improvement;

* potential ground water quality improvement;

* preservation of soil productivity;

* assistance to farmers most impacted by conservation compliance;

* encouragement of tree planting;

* enrollment in Hydrologic Unit Areas identified in the President's Water Quality initiative;

* enrollment in conservation priority areas established by Congress in the 1990 Farm Act.

USDA has been reticent to disclose these details because such information would provide landowners some sense of how USDA might rank an offered tract of land, hence helping landowners come closer to proposing payment rates near the maximum of what USDA would be expected to accept. USDA has chosen to not disclose this information to maximize competition among landowners, with the hope of lowering average bid rates.

There is some evidence the Department's strategy is working. Recent signups have resulted in greater geographical dispersion of enrollments and a more competitive process. More cropland in the eastern half of the United States with relatively higher per acre water quality benefits have been selected, despite higher average bid rates; relatively few additional low-cost but low-benefit acres in the western U.S. were enrolled in recent signups.

Need to Disclose Bid Caps We think the policy reasons in favor of disclosure of bid caps now exceed the reasons to not disclose them, if done as we suggest below. In disclosing bid caps, USDA/CFSA should widely communicate to farmers the purpose of reporting the caps and how they

were derived from county-level productivity-adjusted rental rates. USDA should make it clear that contracts accepted from within a geographic region, if any, will be those that are under the bid cap, **and** which offer the maximum environmental benefits per dollar. Another reason to disclose the caps is the need to strive toward cost-effective and time-efficient program implementation. Publishing the caps will appropriately discourage some farmers from investing their time in compiling and submitting, and the Department's time in reviewing an application for enrollment that is going to be quickly rejected on the grounds of exceeding the cap.

By combining these messages clearly, the release of bid caps will serve to push downward the distribution of bid offers, especially in areas where re-enrollment bid rates will need to drop significantly to have much of a chance of acceptance. To make sure the process triggers the desired response, USDA should make a special effort to explain to applicants how the process will and is working, and it's outcome. After each signup period and well before the next, USDA should disseminate through the farm press and CFSA offices basics statistics within a state, region and the nation regarding bids submitted, bids accepted and bids not accepted.

The basic statistics should include local area productivity-adjusted rental rate caps, the number of contracts/acres offered, average bid rates on all acres offered, the number of contracts/acres accepted, and the average and range of bid rates among acres accepted and among acres not accepted. This basic information could be made available nationwide through the Internet and other USDA/ERS/CFSA information sources. Once analysts and farmers review these data following a few signup periods the competitive nature of a national bid pool will become obvious. Insights will emerge regarding why some tracts of land rank high relative to priority EBI categories and why others rank not high enough to be accepted. Such insights will help achieve three major goals -- reducing per acre payment rates, targeting expenditures to land with high environmental benefits, and stretching the program as far as possible.

2. Re-Enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP

Since erosion hazard was the primary criterion governing eligibility for initial enrollment into the reserve, erosion hazard should remain the key eligibility criterion for **re-enrollment to address erosion hazard**. Land in the CRP will be eligible for re-enrollment if found to have an Erosion Index value (EI) greater than 8, assuming the land is not planted to trees or other permanent cover that render conversion to cultivated crop uses unlikely. Policies and equity issues governing land in trees should be dealt with separately and are discussed below.

Table 3 presents data on the regional distribution of acres that have an Erodibility Index (EI) value greater than 8 and greater than 15. This information is presented for the 417.6 million acres of cropland in the 1992 National Resources Inventory, which includes cropland in the CRP. The same data is shown for the 381.2 million acres of cropland in 1992, which excludes the CRP. The last four columns presents the same data on the 36.4 million acres now in the CRP.

Table 3. Alternative Methods to Estimate the Pool of Land Eligible for Enrollment in the CRP to Address Erosion Hazard*

REGION / STATE	All Cropland in 1992 (Includes CRP)			Cropland in 1992 (Excludes CRP)			CRP (12 Signups)			
	Acres	EI>8	EI>15	Acres	EI>8	EI>15	Acres	EI>8	EI>15	LCC 4-8
PACIFIC										
ALASKA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25,348	N/A	N/A	1,412
CALIFORNIA	10,239,399	887,100	595,200	10,051,900	784,400	509,700	187,499	102,700	85,500	172,616
HAWAII	274,385	87,000	55,500	274,300	87,000	55,500	85	0	0	85
OREGON	4,306,266	1,166,000	554,800	3,775,500	864,900	454,900	530,766	301,100	99,900	163,663
WASHINGTON	7,792,029	2,999,600	1,600,700	6,745,000	2,704,900	1,522,000	1,047,029	294,700	78,700	730,337
Total	22,637,427	5,139,700	2,806,200	20,846,700	4,441,200	2,542,100	1,790,727	698,500	264,100	1,068,113
MOUNTAIN										
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,197,600	964,900	744,200	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	10,918,591	8,503,500	5,498,600	8,940,200	6,843,700	4,639,600	1,978,391	1,659,800	859,000	1,558,644
IDAHO	6,477,259	2,619,900	1,174,300	5,600,200	2,337,000	1,087,200	877,059	282,900	87,100	448,444
MONTANA	17,889,008	11,489,500	4,691,300	15,034,700	9,505,900	3,998,000	2,854,308	1,983,600	693,300	1,386,409
NEVADA	765,424	387,400	119,000	762,300	387,400	119,000	3,124	0	0	2,329
NEW MEXICO	2,374,781	2,127,800	1,681,500	1,891,600	1,706,700	1,414,400	483,181	421,100	267,100	449,958
UTAH	2,048,978	608,800	309,200	1,815,000	566,400	305,500	233,978	42,400	3,700	183,474
WYOMING	2,528,724	1,371,200	743,000	2,271,500	1,132,400	665,600	257,224	238,800	77,400	101,447
Total	44,200,364	28,073,000	14,961,100	37,513,100	23,444,400	12,973,500	6,687,264	4,628,600	1,987,600	4,130,704
NORTHERN PLAINS										
KANSAS	29,503,163	10,222,100	3,002,600	26,565,300	8,549,400	2,583,300	2,937,863	1,672,700	419,300	1,024,453
NEBRASKA	20,664,523	6,941,400	3,435,500	19,239,100	6,059,700	3,072,600	1,425,423	881,700	362,900	954,788
NORTH DAKOTA	27,923,669	5,931,900	1,801,900	24,743,100	4,625,200	1,598,500	3,180,569	1,306,700	203,400	1,386,574
SOUTH DAKOTA	18,556,555	2,832,700	530,000	16,436,300	2,308,800	453,200	2,120,255	523,900	76,800	742,558
Total	96,647,911	25,928,100	8,770,000	86,983,800	21,543,100	7,707,600	9,664,111	4,385,000	1,062,400	4,108,372
SOUTHERN PLAINS										
OKLAHOMA	11,273,104	3,106,800	1,369,900	10,080,600	2,544,600	1,193,200	1,192,504	562,200	176,700	422,198
TEXAS	32,411,885	12,531,000	7,420,600	28,261,400	10,275,800	6,385,800	4,150,485	2,255,200	1,034,800	898,322
Total	43,684,989	15,637,800	8,790,500	38,342,000	12,820,400	7,579,000	5,342,989	2,817,400	1,211,500	1,320,519
LAKE STATES										
MICHIGAN	9,318,053	641,800	321,000	8,985,200	602,500	308,100	332,853	39,300	12,900	53,565
MINNESOTA	23,284,554	1,911,800	742,100	21,355,600	1,492,000	643,800	1,928,954	419,800	98,300	452,012
WISCONSIN	11,559,830	3,459,700	2,466,800	10,813,300	3,083,000	2,181,600	746,530	376,700	285,200	326,640
Total	44,162,437	6,013,300	3,529,900	41,154,100	5,177,500	3,133,500	3,008,337	835,800	396,400	832,216
CORNBELT STATES										
ILLINOIS	24,911,726	4,030,300	2,430,300	24,099,800	3,692,700	2,209,400	811,926	337,600	220,900	243,668
INDIANA	13,975,149	2,058,600	1,357,500	13,512,500	1,914,300	1,274,600	462,649	144,300	82,900	163,822
IOWA	27,212,634	8,268,400	6,141,000	24,987,800	7,068,500	5,235,000	2,224,834	1,199,900	906,000	662,700
MISSOURI	15,074,235	6,145,200	4,640,000	13,347,400	5,080,500	3,916,800	1,726,835	1,064,700	723,200	302,497
OHIO	12,305,789	2,289,100	1,557,100	11,928,700	2,212,300	1,523,200	377,089	76,800	33,900	30,286
Total	93,479,533	22,791,600	16,125,900	87,876,200	19,968,300	14,159,000	5,603,333	2,823,300	1,966,900	1,402,972
DELTA										
ARKANSAS	7,989,906	366,800	178,200	7,729,900	302,500	157,900	260,006	64,300	20,300	38,941
LOUISIANNA	6,118,171	280,400	139,700	5,971,600	254,800	124,300	146,571	25,600	15,400	27,030
MISSISSIPPI	6,567,826	1,281,700	899,600	5,726,000	931,900	640,700	841,826	349,800	258,900	229,993
Total	20,675,903	1,928,900	1,217,500	19,427,500	1,489,200	922,900	1,248,403	439,700	294,600	295,964
SOUTHEASTERN										
ALABAMA	3,720,091	1,067,300	455,900	3,146,900	835,600	402,800	573,191	231,700	53,100	114,145
FLORIDA	3,132,260	133,500	30,400	2,997,400	118,500	27,200	134,860	15,000	3,200	18,687
GEORGIA	5,879,259	700,900	384,900	5,172,800	618,800	355,400	706,459	82,100	29,500	121,667
SOUTH CAROLINA	3,260,571	381,600	218,800	2,982,500	330,400	197,800	278,071	51,200	21,000	32,506
Total	15,992,180	2,283,300	1,090,000	14,299,600	1,903,300	983,200	1,692,580	380,000	106,800	287,005
APPALACHIAN										
KENTUCKY	5,543,217	2,943,700	2,223,000	5,091,900	2,649,600	2,022,500	451,317	294,100	200,500	85,547
NORTH CAROLINA	6,110,608	1,548,500	1,050,200	5,959,600	1,452,300	1,002,200	151,008	96,200	48,000	24,908
TENNESEE	5,332,325	2,393,900	1,625,100	4,856,700	2,128,900	1,461,200	475,625	265,000	163,900	173,710
VIRGINIA	2,980,656	1,341,300	1,011,200	2,901,100	1,298,500	991,100	79,556	42,800	20,100	8,961
WEST VIRGINIA	915,318	501,800	424,300	914,700	501,200	423,700	618	600	600	269
Total	20,882,124	8,729,200	6,333,800	19,724,000	8,030,500	5,900,700	1,158,124	698,700	433,100	293,394
NORTHEASTERN										
CONNECTICUT	228,510	64,000	41,200	228,500	64,000	41,200	10	0	0	0
DELAWARE	500,095	26,000	12,600	499,100	26,000	12,600	995	0	0	215
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	485,990	135,100	85,800	447,500	115,900	80,400	38,490	19,200	5,400	1,322
MARYLAND	1,693,492	562,600	402,300	1,673,100	560,400	400,100	20,392	2,200	2,200	6,297
MASSACHUSETTES	272,332	69,200	54,600	272,300	69,200	54,600	32	0	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	141,500	39,500	28,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	650,423	167,600	115,200	649,700	167,600	115,200	723	0	0	79
NEW YORK	5,680,598	1,732,700	1,145,000	5,616,100	1,705,800	1,133,800	64,498	26,900	11,200	6,947
PENNSYLVANIA	5,696,878	3,521,800	2,644,500	5,595,800	3,467,800	2,613,400	101,078	54,000	31,100	17,757
RHODE ISLAND	25,355	4,900	800	24,900	4,900	800	455	0	0	440
VERMONT	634,793	199,000	133,500	634,600	199,000	133,500	193	0	0	0
Total	15,282,366	6,432,400	4,609,700	15,055,500	6,330,100	4,559,800	226,866	102,300	49,900	33,056
US Total	417,645,233	122,957,300	68,234,600	381,222,500	105,148,000	60,461,300	36,422,733	17,809,300	7,773,300	13,772,315

* Erosion Hazard measured using the Erodibility Index (EI), and in the case of the CRP, Land Capability Classes (LCC) IV-VIII.

In making re-enrollment decisions, we assume that --

* USDA will apply a productivity-adjusted rental rate cap to all offered bids, will announce the caps prior to the next signup, and only those bids below the cap will be ranked according to EBI value;

* available funds (or acreage targets) will be allocated to all eligible land (re- or new enrollments) in accord with an EBI ranking and priority scores;

* a highly competitive bid process will be used with the stated goal of:
    + lowering average bids, especially in areas where average 12-signup payment rates exceed cropland rental rates, and
    + more effectively targeting the program to highly erodible land that also renders relatively high environmental benefits;

* any cropland base acreage associated with land re-enrolled will be forfeited after 20 years in the CRP;

* transfer of base to other parts of a farm's whole farm base will be allowed (or even its sale to another farmer) under certain special circumstances:
    + producers willing to develop and adhere to a performance standard-based integrated farm plan which calls for the installation and maintenance of needed grassed-waterways, field edge filter-strips or well-head protection systems, especially if the farmer is willing to accept a long-term obligation to maintain the conservation practices on that part of the landscape once enrolled in commodity programs.

Table 4 presents AFT's estimate of the pool of land that will be eligible in each state and region for re-enrollment, as well as re-enrollments by basic option over the period 1996-2000. The table includes economic use and/or base transfer as the basic option. Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5 present more detailed information over the 1996-2000 period (Appendix Table 1.0) and by program year, beginning in 1996 (Appendix Tables 1.1 through 1.5).

Table 4. Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP, 1996-2000.

REGION STATE	Eligible Pool Erosion*	 Wildlife	 Total	Projected Re-enrollment	Projected Acres Re-enrolled	% Acres EconUse/BT**	Acres In EconUse/BT	Acres Not EconUse/BT
PACIFIC								
ALASKA	25,348	20,000	45,348	70%	31,744	35%	11,110	20,633
CALIFORNIA	105,369	60,000	165,369	70%	115,758	35%	40,515	75,243
HAWAII	85	0	85	70%	60	35%	21	39
OREGON	299,875	50,000	349,875	70%	244,913	35%	85,719	159,193
WASHINGTON	304,765	150,000	454,765	70%	318,336	35%	111,418	206,918
Total	735,443	280,000	1,015,443	70%	710,810	35%	248,783	462,026
MOUNTAIN								
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,703,611	0	1,703,611	82%	1,396,961	40%	558,784	838,177
IDAHO	308,409	200,000	508,409	82%	416,895	40%	166,758	250,137
MONTANA	1,994,060	300,000	2,294,060	82%	1,881,129	40%	752,452	1,128,677
NEVADA	3,124	0	3,124	82%	2,561	40%	1,025	1,537
NEW MEXICO	420,494	0	420,494	82%	344,805	40%	137,922	206,883
UTAH	69,695	120,000	189,695	82%	155,550	40%	62,220	93,330
WYOMING	244,124	0	244,124	82%	200,182	40%	80,073	120,109
Total	4,743,517	620,000	5,363,517	82%	4,398,084	40%	1,759,234	2,638,850
NORTHERN PLAINS								
KANSAS	1,704,066	800,000	2,504,066	80%	2,003,253	50%	1,001,626	1,001,626
NEBRASKA	896,724	250,000	1,146,724	80%	917,379	50%	458,690	458,690
NORTH DAKOTA	1,570,023	900,000	2,470,023	80%	1,976,018	50%	988,009	988,009
SOUTH DAKOTA	872,744	900,000	1,772,744	80%	1,418,196	50%	709,098	709,098
Total	5,043,557	2,850,000	7,893,557	80%	6,314,846	50%	3,157,423	3,157,423
SOUTHERN PLAINS								
OKLAHOMA	574,896	400,000	974,896	77%	750,670	45%	337,802	412,869
TEXAS	2,300,498	1,200,000	3,500,498	77%	2,695,384	45%	1,212,923	1,482,461
Total	2,875,395	1,600,000	4,475,395	77%	3,446,054	45%	1,550,724	1,895,330
LAKE STATES								
MICHIGAN	64,457	60,000	124,457	75%	93,343	75%	70,007	23,336
MINNESOTA	555,271	200,000	755,271	75%	566,453	75%	424,840	141,613
WISCONSIN	334,002	100,000	434,002	75%	325,501	75%	244,126	81,375
Total	953,730	360,000	1,313,730	75%	985,297	75%	738,973	246,324
CORNBELT STATES								
ILLINOIS	328,450	20,000	348,450	70%	243,915	60%	146,349	97,566
INDIANA	143,672	20,000	163,672	70%	114,570	60%	68,742	45,828
IOWA	1,187,264	40,000	1,227,264	70%	859,085	60%	515,451	343,634
MISSOURI	1,039,980	40,000	1,079,980	70%	755,986	60%	453,592	302,394
OHIO	91,163	20,000	111,163	70%	77,814	60%	46,689	31,126
Total	2,790,530	140,000	2,930,530	70%	2,051,371	60%	1,230,823	820,548
DELTA								
ARKANSAS	70,349	30,000	100,349	75%	75,262	30%	22,579	52,683
LOUISIANNA	41,307	40,000	81,307	75%	60,980	30%	18,294	42,686
MISSISSIPPI	227,990	100,000	327,990	75%	245,993	30%	73,798	172,195
Total	339,646	170,000	509,646	75%	382,235	30%	114,670	267,564
SOUTHEASTERN								
ALABAMA	160,805	30,000	190,805	80%	152,644	30%	45,793	106,851
FLORIDA	37,605	40,000	77,605	80%	62,084	30%	18,625	43,459
GEORGIA	202,365	60,000	262,365	80%	209,892	30%	62,968	146,925
SOUTH CAROLINA	80,423	40,000	120,423	80%	96,338	30%	28,902	67,437
Total	481,198	170,000	651,198	80%	520,959	30%	156,288	364,671
APPALACHIAN								
KENTUCKY	299,136	30,000	329,136	80%	263,309	35%	92,158	171,151
NORTH CAROLINA	42,043	20,000	62,043	80%	49,634	35%	17,372	32,262
TENNESEE	249,571	30,000	279,571	80%	223,657	35%	78,280	145,377
VIRGINIA	22,601	20,000	42,601	80%	34,081	35%	11,928	22,153
WEST VIRGINIA	578	0	578	80%	463	35%	162	301
Total	613,930	100,000	713,930	80%	571,144	35%	199,900	371,243
NORTHEASTERN								
CONNECTICUT	3	0	3	75%	2	65%	1	1
DELAWARE	299	300	599	75%	449	65%	292	157
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	19,019	15,000	34,019	75%	25,514	65%	16,584	8,930
MARYLAND	5,290	10,000	15,290	75%	11,468	65%	7,454	4,014
MASSACHUSETTES	22	0	22	75%	16	65%	11	6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	198	300	498	75%	374	65%	243	131
NEW YORK	27,769	20,000	47,769	75%	35,827	65%	23,288	12,539
PENNSYLVANIA	56,266	30,000	86,266	75%	64,700	65%	42,055	22,645
RHODE ISLAND	455	0	455	75%	341	65%	222	119
VERMONT	187	0	187	75%	141	65%	91	49
Total	109,509	75,600	185,109	75%	138,832	65%	90,241	48,591
US Total	18,686,454	6,365,600	25,052,054	77%	19,519,631	48%	9,427,571	10,092,060

* Derivation of acres eligible for erosion control is presented in Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options.

Reducing Average Bid Rates and Administrative Costs At the field level, farmers interested in re-enrolling land should first request a finding from NRCS that a tract meets the erodibility hazard criterion. If it does, farmers and/or landowners should then inquire about productivity-adjusted bid caps applicable to the track. If they would accept a contract payment rate at or below the cap, they should then consider submitting a bid to re-enroll the land.

They should be given information about the EBI and the ranking procedure. Local CFSA and NRCS staff should highlight some of the factors in the region likely to result in a relatively high environmental benefit index ranking for a given field, emphasizing what farmers can do to raise a field's ranking, by installing a filter strip or offering to improve wildlife habitat for example. By requiring potential applicants to go through these steps and encouraging applicants to consider how a particular track's EBI value might be estimated, time and effort can be saved, both on the part of farmers/landowners and the government. Frustration among unsuccessful applicants can also be limited.

CRP Land in Trees CRP policies governing land in trees are not a dominant concern driving the re-authorization debate but in some states and regions in the southeast, a third or more of CRP land is in trees. Clearly policies governing re-enrollment of CRP land growing trees will be followed closely by the Congressional delegations in some states.

AFT believes that re-enrollment decisions should be driven by the need to control erosion and has based its programmatic recommendations on this judgment. Land now producing trees is not likely to return to crop production and hence there is no need to re-enroll land in trees to control erosion, at least not now. Farmers who have established trees on CRP land, in contrast to all other CRP contract holders, are earning future income each year as trees grow. Once they reach maturity trees will provide landowners significant economic returns.

If Congress authorizes ongoing payment to CRP contract holders with land now in trees, the public should expect some additional environmental benefit, such as a permanent easement restricting certain highly erosive land uses or requiring certain conservation practices, like field edge filter strips for example. Any commodity program bases on such land should be permanently retired or transferred. Tree harvest methods should also be chosen and managed to minimize environmental damage and the loss of sediment.

Estimating Re-Enrollment Rates Once the pool of land leaving the CRP that is eligible for re-enrollment is established, the portion of this pool of land actually re-enrolled has to be estimated along with average accepted payment rates. Several factors will determine what portion of the eligible land in a county is re-enrolled -- money available, announced bid caps, crop prices, rental rate and land value trends, perceived difficulty of meeting conservation compliance goals, and how the components of the Environmental Benefit Index translate into benefit-cost rankings across all bids offered.

In the last three signups USDA selected new enrollments from a national bid pool. In terms of cost-effective program administration, this is the best approach and provides USDA the opportunity to target CRP dollars to where the highest environmental benefits can be attained.

AFT and SWCS farmer surveys have generally found less than 75 percent of current contract holders expressed interest in re-enrolling land, especially at lower contract payment rates. These surveys, however, have not included the above downward adjustment in the pool of land eligible for re-enrollment nor changes in the likely level of commodity program payments. The surveys make it clear that farmers --

* are more likely to want to return to crop production those parts of their land in the CRP that are subject to relatively lower rates of erosion (i.e. most land with EI<8 and a portion of land with EI<15);

* want to keep in the CRP those fields subject to relatively high rates of soil loss on which profitable crop production is difficult, especially in future years when producers will have to meet conservation compliance erosion control goals;

* are relatively unresponsive to probable changes in crop and livestock prices; and

* perceive the opportunity to make limited economic use of land in the CRP as a significant factor affecting their decision to enroll and the payment rate they would accept.

When less erosive and generally more productive land is removed from the eligible pool, the percentage of eligible land actually re-enrolled will go up. The differences will, in fact, likely be dramatic in many regions (for example within a given area, a re-enrollment rate of say 40 percent relative to all land now in the reserve; versus a re-enrollment rate of 75 percent of the land found eligible for re-enrollment). In most areas, the stricter the erodibility criterion or filter, the higher the portion of eligible land likely to be re-enrolled. The proportion of eligible land re-enrolled will change in accord with the size of the reserve, funding available and how program objectives and EBI components are ranked.

Table 4, column three presents preliminary AFT estimates of the percent of land that will be re-enrolled by state and region. Appendix Tables 2.1 through 2.5 present the same information by year. Regional differences in re-enrollment rates reflect several factors, including the perceived value of crop acreage bases associated with land in the CRP. Where base acreage allotments are relatively high as a percent of land in the CRP, we would expect more land to return to crop production, especially now that market conditions seem to be improving. The differences in regional re-enrollment rates also reflect expected shifts toward water quality among EBI criteria and the availability of other profitable uses of the land.

Estimating Expenditures To project CRP expenditures, an estimate must be made by state of average accepted bid rates for land re-enrolled. AFT's recommendations and assumptions significantly narrow the pool of land eligible for re-enrollment and are designed to promote a highly competitive bid process. As a result, we expect average payment rates to come down in those areas where CRP rental rates were high in contrast to county rental rates and land values.

The best way to estimate re-enrollment payment rates would be to develop a projected distribution of bid rates likely to be offered, by studying bids offered in the 12th signup. This is an example of an important model refinement that warrants further work. Adding into the model productivity-adjusted rental rate caps established by the Consolidated Farm Service Agency (CFSA) would also be helpful.

County or regional pool bid caps would, of course, be based on current rental rates, not rates that were in effect when the land was first enrolled in the CRP. It is worth noting that trends in state average cropland rental rates vary markedly across the country. For example, between 1990 and 1994, rates in most northeastern states rose $7.00 to $12.00 per acre, or about 30 percent, whereas average rents in the Corn Belt and Southeast were relatively stable. (Rent data from Table 1.4.2--Cropland rented for cash, page 37, Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators, ERS/USDA, December, 1994).

In a few states with large CRP acreages, average rents actually fell between 1990 and 1994 (e.g. South Dakota, down from $36.20 to $32.20 per acre). Reduction in commodity program spending levels may lead to some additional reductions in rental rates, increasing the chance that land will be enrolled in the CRP at substantial per acre savings in contrast to signups 1 through 9.

In our re-enrollment expenditure estimates, we assume that the **average** accepted bid rate will be 80 percent of the state average cropland rental rate in 1994, but in no state less than $30.00. We chose 80 percent of 1994 rental rates after reviewing AFT and SWCS farmer survey results and a series of analyses that have been carried out in specific areas. Coupled with the assumption that no state will **average** less than a $30.00 payment rate, we believe this level is conservative as especially if Congress directs USDA to aggressively manage the bid process, as we hope it will.

Table 5 presents AFT's estimates of average bid rates for land re-enrolled over 1996-2000, the portion of the eligible pool re-enrolled, expenditures on land in either the economic use or base transfer option, on land not in exercising either option, and total expenditures. Appendix Tables 3.0 through 3.5 presents more detailed information on these estimates over the period 1996-2000 and for individual program years.

Table 5. Estimated Annual Payment Rates and Annual Expenditures For Land Re-enrolled in the CRP, 1996-2000.

REGION STATE	Projected Acres Re-enrolle	Payment Rate	Payment Rate Econ Use/BT	Expenditures Econ Use/BT	Expenditures Other	Total Expenditures
PACIFIC						
ALASKA	31,744	$40.00	$32.00	$355,531	$825,339	$1,180,870
CALIFORNIA	115,758	$55.00	$44.00	$1,782,673	$4,138,348	$5,921,022
HAWAII	60	$80.00	$64.00	$1,333	$3,094	$4,427
OREGON	244,913	$49.52	$39.62	$3,395,862	$7,883,252	$11,279,114
WASHINGTON	318,336	$44.72	$35.78	$3,986,074	$9,253,385	$13,239,459
Total	710,810	$47.84	$38.27	$9,521,473	$22,103,419	$31,624,891
MOUNTAIN						
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,396,961	$30.00	$24.00	$13,410,826	$25,145,298	$38,556,124
IDAHO	416,895	$38.24	$30.59	$5,101,466	$9,565,248	$14,666,714
MONTANA	1,881,129	$30.00	$24.00	$18,058,837	$33,860,320	$51,919,157
NEVADA	2,561	$30.00	$24.00	$24,588	$46,103	$70,691
NEW MEXICO	344,805	$30.00	$24.00	$3,310,129	$6,206,493	$9,516,622
UTAH	155,550	$30.00	$24.00	$1,493,282	$2,799,904	$4,293,186
WYOMING	200,182	$30.00	$24.00	$1,921,747	$3,603,276	$5,525,024
Total	4,398,084	$30.78	$24.62	$43,320,876	$81,226,642	$124,547,518
NORTHERN PLAINS						
KANSAS	2,003,253	$30.00	$24.00	$24,039,031	$30,048,789	$54,087,821
NEBRASKA	917,379	$40.24	$32.19	$14,766,134	$18,457,667	$33,223,801
NORTH DAKOTA	1,976,018	$30.00	$24.00	$23,712,220	$29,640,275	$53,352,494
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,418,196	$30.00	$24.00	$17,018,347	$21,272,934	$38,291,281
Total	6,314,846	$31.49	$25.19	$79,535,732	$99,419,665	$178,955,397
SOUTHERN PLAINS						
OKLAHOMA	750,670	$30.00	$24.00	$8,107,237	$12,386,056	$20,493,293
TEXAS	2,695,384	$30.00	$24.00	$29,110,145	$44,473,832	$73,583,977
Total	3,446,054	$30.00	$24.00	$37,217,381	$56,859,888	$94,077,270
LAKE STATES						
MICHIGAN	93,343	$39.20	$31.36	$2,195,429	$914,762	$3,110,191
MINNESOTA	566,453	$39.20	$31.36	$13,322,975	$5,551,240	$18,874,215
WISCONSIN	325,501	$40.96	$32.77	$7,999,520	$3,333,133	$11,332,654
Total	985,297	$39.78	$31.83	$23,517,924	$9,799,135	$33,317,059
CORNBELT STATES						
ILLINOIS	243,915	$85.84	$68.67	$10,050,090	$8,375,075	$18,425,164
INDIANA	114,570	$72.32	$57.86	$3,977,151	$3,314,292	$7,291,443
IOWA	859,085	$85.60	$68.48	$35,298,085	$29,415,071	$64,713,155
MISSOURI	755,986	$51.84	$41.47	$18,811,349	$15,676,124	$34,487,473
OHIO	77,814	$56.40	$45.12	$2,106,589	$1,755,491	$3,862,080
Total	2,051,371	$71.34	$57.07	$70,243,263	$58,536,052	$128,779,315
DELTA						
ARKANSAS	75,262	$40.56	$32.45	$732,630	$2,136,839	$2,869,469
LOUISIANNA	60,980	$38.64	$30.91	$565,505	$1,649,389	$2,214,894
MISSISSIPPI	245,993	$35.20	$28.16	$2,078,147	$6,061,262	$8,139,409
Total	382,235	$36.80	$29.44	$3,376,282	$9,847,490	$13,223,772
SOUTHEASTERN						
ALABAMA	152,644	$30.00	$24.00	$1,099,036	$3,205,521	$4,304,557
FLORIDA	62,084	$58.48	$46.78	$871,363	$2,541,477	$3,412,840
GEORGIA	209,892	$30.00	$24.00	$1,511,225	$4,407,740	$5,918,965
SOUTH CAROLINA	96,338	$30.00	$24.00	$693,636	$2,023,106	$2,716,742
Total	520,959	$33.39	$26.72	$4,175,261	$12,177,843	$16,353,104
APPALACHIAN						
KENTUCKY	263,309	$47.20	$37.76	$3,479,890	$8,078,315	$11,558,205
NORTH CAROLINA	49,634	$30.48	$24.38	$423,601	$983,358	$1,406,959
TENNESEE	223,657	$39.60	$31.68	$2,479,905	$5,756,922	$8,236,827
VIRGINIA	34,081	$30.00	$24.00	$286,280	$664,579	$950,859
WEST VIRGINIA	463	$30.00	$24.00	$3,886	$9,022	$12,908
Total	571,144	$41.73	$33.38	$6,673,562	$15,492,197	$22,165,758
NORTHEASTERN						
CONNECTICUT	2	$50.00	$40.00	$59	$39	$98
DELAWARE	449	$47.84	$38.27	$11,169	$7,517	$18,686
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	25,514	$35.52	$28.42	$471,263	$317,196	$788,459
MARYLAND	11,468	$48.64	$38.91	$290,048	$195,225	$485,272
MASSACHUSETTES	16	$50.00	$40.00	$428	$288	$716
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	374	$56.88	$45.50	$11,053	$7,439	$18,492
NEW YORK	35,827	$30.56	$24.45	$569,333	$383,205	$952,539
PENNSYLVANIA	64,700	$33.52	$26.82	$1,127,740	$759,056	$1,886,796
RHODE ISLAND	341	$50.00	$40.00	$8,873	$5,972	$14,844
VERMONT	141	$32.40	$25.92	$2,368	$1,594	$3,962
Total	138,832	$34.52	$27.62	$2,492,332	$1,677,531	$4,169,864
US Total	19,519,631	$36.74	$29.40	$280,074,085	$367,139,862	$647,213,948

C. Identifying and Selecting New Enrollments

Farm program policy changes, economic factors like interest and cropland rental rates, and the marketplace should be allowed to determine enrollment and re-enrollment patterns across the country. The split between re-enrollments and new enrollments in any county, state, or the nation could be a policy-driven control variable, but by doing so, Congress will reduce the benefits achieved per dollar spent and increase the complexity of program administration.

AFT recommends that land should be enrolled in the CRP in accord with a cost-benefit assessment, driven by the ratio of estimated environmental benefits to the acceptable bid price. The EBI should have components addressing --

* Rainfall erosion hazard;

* Water quality: places on the landscape in need of filter strips, grassed waterways and other conservation measures and systems to both reduce erosion rates, increase the portion of sediment, nutrients and chemicals in run-off caught within fields or at their borders;

* Wildlife habitat improvement; and

* Unique or highly valuable farmlands, as identified under the "Farms for the Future" program authorized in the 1990 farmbill.

Each of these categories of enrollment are discussed below, as is the important role of a new state-federal Natural Resources Conservation Fund (NRCF) that Congress should establish (see below).

1. Rainfall Erosion Hazard

AFT believes that the same erodibility criteria and the same EBI index and ranking process should govern re- and new enrollment into the CRP. A basic erosion reduction benefit measure should be cost per ton of reduction in erosion, weighted in some fashion using productivity-adjusted rental rates. Erosion reduction should be derived by estimating pre- and post contract erosion rates in tons/acre and then dividing by the accepted bid rate, producing an average cost per ton of erosion reduction.

Table 6 presents AFT's preliminary assessment of new enrollments of land primarily qualifying for the CRP as a result of benefits stemming from sheet and rill erosion reduction. Data on the distribution of acreage eroding over 20 tons per acre was obtained from Dr. Bruce Babcock, Dr. P.G. Lakshminarayan, and JunLie Wu of Iowa State University (see The Economic, Environmental, and Fiscal Impacts of a Targeted Renewal of CRP Contracts, Working Paper 95-WP 129, February, 1995, CARD/Iowa State University).

Wind erosion is not included in AFT's estimate or this table because of the high level of enrollments in the first 12 signups in regions principally subject to wind erosion, and the substantial

acreage of new enrollments targeting wildlife habitat improvement, much of which will fall in the Northern and Southern Plains and Mountain regions.

2. Protecting Water Quality through Partial Field Enrollments

AFT recommends that the CRP be used to establish filter strips and grassed waterways through partial field enrollments. Estimates of the miles of stream in need of protection vary widely. Solid, nationally consistent data is not available. High-end estimates are on the order of 5.4 million acres of cropland within a 100' of surface water, and have been derived from the 1992 NRI. This figure includes all miles of stream already protected by strips, as well as larger rivers protected by levies or other flood management installations that would render filter strips unnecessary or ineffective.

Research by a team at Purdue used a different methodology and reached an estimate of 2 million acres, again not corrected for land already in strips and levies. Analysis by NRCS specialists suggest that about one-half of the cropland within 150 feet of water is already covered with grass, trees or some non-cropland use.

All estimates to date, however, miss a factor likely to lead to higher estimates -- intermittent, usually small streams that contribute heavily to spring and early summer run-off in relatively drier regions of the country. In many watersheds such streams contribute the vast majority of sediment reaching lakes, reservoirs or larger streams and rivers, and are often among the easiest to protect with proven conservation and run-off control practices. There will often be high benefit-cost ratios associated with the enrollment of land along these intermittent streams.

Since the 6th signup in February, 1988 farmers have had the option of enrolling land within 66' to 99' of a permanent water body regardless of degree of erodibility. Only 5,200 miles of filter strips have been established through this provision -- covering some 41,600 acres based on a filter strip taking up 8 acres per mile, per side of a stream.

Congress should strive to enroll 75 percent of the land on which filter strips are needed within the CRP over the next five years. Because of the multiple benefits stemming from establishing filter strips, enrollment of properly selected land will clearly exceed the benefits associated with enrollment of most other lands and Congress was right to direct the USDA to treat such applications as "priority" bids.

Data is lacking to accurately predict where the land in need of partial field enrollments might fall across the country. As a proxy, we used twice the cropland acreage within 100 feet of surface water. Effort is underway to develop a more accurate estimate based on acreage within 100 feet of water and acreage of palustrine wetlands.

High Phosphorous Soils In some regions certain fields have excessively elevated soil phosphorus levels (soil P). Phosphorous loadings into surface water are highly correlated with erosion rates and sediment delivery ratios. In watersheds where P run-off to surface water is a priority target

Table 6. New Enrollments and Annual Expenditures for Land Enrolled Primarily to Reduce Water Erosion, 1996-2000.

REGION STATE	Non-CRP Land Eroding >20	% Acres Enrolled	Acres Enrolled	% Acres Econ Use/BT**	Payment Rate	Payment Rate Econ Use/BT	Expenditures Econ Use/BT	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures*
PACIFIC									
ALASKA	0	70%	0	50%	$40.00	$30.00	$0	$0	$0
CALIFORNIA	71,500	70%	50,050	50%	$55.00	$41.25	$1,032,281	$1,376,375	$2,408,656
HAWAII	0	70%	0	50%	$80.00	$60.00	$0	$0	$0
OREGON	37,200	70%	26,040	50%	$49.52	$37.14	$483,563	$644,750	$1,128,313
WASHINGTON	143,500	70%	100,450	50%	$44.72	$33.54	$1,684,547	$2,246,062	$3,930,609
Total	252,200	70%	176,540	50%	$47.84	$35.88	$3,200,391	$4,267,187	$7,467,578
MOUNTAIN									
ARIZONA	0	60%	0	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	38,600	60%	23,160	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$295,290	$347,400	$642,690
IDAHO	35,100	60%	21,060	50%	$38.24	$32.50	$342,267	$402,667	$744,934
MONTANA	48,600	60%	29,160	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$371,790	$437,400	$809,190
NEVADA	0	60%	0	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$0	$0	$0
NEW MEXICO	0	60%	0	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$0	$0	$0
UTAH	11,400	60%	6,840	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$87,210	$102,600	$189,810
WYOMING	0	60%	0	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$0	$0	$0
Total	133,700	60%	80,220	50%	$30.78	$26.16	$1,096,557	$1,290,067	$2,386,624
NORTHERN PLAINS									
KANSAS	94,500	65%	61,425	50%	$30.00	$24.00	$737,100	$921,375	$1,658,475
NEBRASKA	512,100	50%	256,050	50%	$40.24	$32.19	$4,121,381	$5,151,726	$9,273,107
NORTH DAKOTA	16,400	65%	10,660	50%	$30.00	$24.00	$127,920	$159,900	$287,820
SOUTH DAKOTA	53,700	65%	34,905	50%	$30.00	$24.00	$418,860	$523,575	$942,435
Total	676,700	54%	363,040	50%	$31.49	$25.19	$5,405,261	$6,756,576	$12,161,837
SOUTHERN PLAINS									
OKLAHOMA	22,700	60%	13,620	50%	$30.00	$24.00	$163,440	$204,300	$367,740
TEXAS	60,700	50%	30,350	50%	$30.00	$24.00	$364,200	$455,250	$819,450
Total	83,400	53%	43,970	50%	$30.00	$24.00	$527,640	$659,550	$1,187,190
LAKE STATES									
MICHIGAN	61,700	70%	43,190	50%	$39.20	$27.44	$592,567	$846,524	$1,439,091
MINNESOTA	173,900	75%	130,425	50%	$39.20	$27.44	$1,789,431	$2,556,330	$4,345,761
WISCONSIN	207,100	70%	144,970	50%	$40.96	$28.67	$2,078,290	$2,968,986	$5,047,276
Total	442,700	72%	318,585	50%	$39.78	$27.85	$4,460,288	$6,371,840	$10,832,127
CORNBELT STATES									
ILLINOIS	675,100	60%	405,060	50%	$85.84	$64.38	$13,038,881	$17,385,175	$30,424,057
INDIANA	204,300	60%	122,580	50%	$72.32	$54.24	$3,324,370	$4,432,493	$7,756,862
IOWA	1,269,200	60%	761,520	50%	$85.60	$64.20	$24,444,792	$32,593,056	$57,037,848
MISSOURI	711,300	70%	497,910	50%	$51.84	$38.88	$9,679,370	$12,905,827	$22,585,198
OHIO	135,900	70%	95,130	50%	$56.40	$42.30	$2,012,000	$2,682,666	$4,694,666
Total	2,995,800	63%	1,882,200	50%	$71.34	$53.50	$52,499,413	$69,999,217	$122,498,630
DELTA									
ARKANSAS	17,800	50%	8,900	50%	$40.56	$34.48	$153,418	$180,492	$333,910
LOUISIANNA	13,300	50%	6,650	50%	$38.64	$32.84	$109,206	$128,478	$237,684
MISSISSIPPI	180,100	65%	117,065	50%	$35.20	$29.92	$1,751,292	$2,060,344	$3,811,636
Total	211,200	63%	132,615	50%	$36.80	$31.28	$2,013,917	$2,369,314	$4,383,231
SOUTHEASTERN									
ALABAMA	102,900	60%	61,740	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$787,185	$926,100	$1,713,285
FLORIDA	3,800	60%	2,280	50%	$58.48	$49.71	$56,667	$66,667	$123,334
GEORGIA	147,600	60%	88,560	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$1,129,140	$1,328,400	$2,457,540
SOUTH CAROLINA	24,100	60%	14,460	50%	$30.00	$25.50	$184,365	$216,900	$401,265
Total	278,400	60%	167,040	50%	$33.39	$28.38	$2,157,357	$2,538,067	$4,695,424
APPALACHIAN									
KENTUCKY	251,600	60%	150,960	50%	$47.20	$42.48	$3,206,390	$3,562,656	$6,769,046
NORTH CAROLINA	285,400	60%	171,240	50%	$30.48	$27.43	$2,348,728	$2,609,698	$4,958,425
TENNESEE	415,200	60%	249,120	50%	$39.60	$35.64	$4,439,318	$4,932,576	$9,371,894
VIRGINIA	124,700	60%	74,820	50%	$30.00	$27.00	$1,010,070	$1,122,300	$2,132,370
WEST VIRGINIA	9,300	60%	5,580	50%	$30.00	$27.00	$75,330	$83,700	$159,030
Total	1,086,200	60%	651,720	50%	$41.73	$37.56	$11,079,837	$12,310,930	$23,390,766
NORTHEASTERN									
CONNECTICUT	7,700	70%	5,390	50%	$50.00	$37.50	$101,063	$134,750	$235,813
DELAWARE	0	70%	0	50%	$47.84	$35.88	$0	$0	$0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	0	70%	0	50%	$35.52	$26.64	$0	$0	$0
MARYLAND	56,000	70%	39,200	50%	$48.64	$36.48	$715,008	$953,344	$1,668,352
MASSACHUSETTES	2,700	70%	1,890	50%	$50.00	$37.50	$35,438	$47,250	$82,688
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1,000	70%	700	50%	$50.00	$37.50	$13,125	$17,500	$30,625
NEW JERSEY	23,400	70%	16,380	50%	$56.88	$42.66	$349,385	$465,847	$815,233
NEW YORK	70,000	70%	49,000	50%	$30.56	$22.92	$561,540	$748,720	$1,310,260
PENNSYLVANIA	184,400	70%	129,080	50%	$33.52	$25.14	$1,622,536	$2,163,381	$3,785,916
RHODE ISLAND	0	70%	0	50%	$50.00	$37.50	$0	$0	$0
VERMONT	3,400	70%	2,380	50%	$32.40	$24.30	$28,917	$38,556	$67,473
Total	348,600	70%	244,020	50%	$34.52	$25.89	$3,427,011	$4,569,348	$7,996,359
US Total	6,508,900	62%	4,059,950	50%	$36.74	$29.40	$85,867,671	$111,132,096	$196,999,767

* Expenditures is an estimate of a single year of payments starting in 2001 following signups over the period 1996-2000.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options. The reduction in payment rates by state and region are estimated based on the expected value of forage production and the extent of crop acreage bases in the region.

for non-point pollution control programs, states or regional agencies could designate "Soil P Management Areas" for special consideration in the CRP and through the newly proposed "Conservation Farm Option".

According to a summary of soil tests run on samples from around the country by Brookside Laboratories, 13.6 percent of all samples test "Extremely High", which Brookside defines as any soil P level above 500 pounds per acre as P_2O_5. In general, soil scientists consider soil P levels to be "very high" when levels are above 88 pounds elemental, or actual P per acre; or over 400 pounds per acre of P measured as P_2O_5. (These pound per acre estimates correspond to a concentration of 44 parts per million P).

In terms of risk to water quality, the NRCS considers a soil with 700 pounds of P as P_2O_5 to pose such risks. Depending on what level of P is judged a risk to water quality, there are about 10 million to 20 million acres nationwide with excessively high soil P levels. NRCS has developed a soil phosphorous index to help identify areas where erosion, run-off and manure management and fertilization practices need special attention to reduce loadings to surface water. The U.S.G.S. NAWQUA program has made much progress in identifying water-sheds where excessively elevated soil P levels are accounting for a significant share of total P pollutant loadings reaching impaired water bodies.

Most cropland with highly elevated P levels is intensively farmed, relatively non-erosive and highly productive. Payment rates for such land enrolled will be markedly higher than average and as a result, **priority should be given to partial field enrollments** focusing on just those parts of the landscape where surface water flows concentrate and leave fields. In designating high soil P management areas, USDA should take into account average natural soil P levels, since there are a few regions where soil P levels are naturally very high. In such areas, aquatic ecosystems have evolved in the presence of high levels of soil P and there is evidence that additional loadings of P from agricultural operations have caused only modest adverse environmental impacts.

Research by the Leopold Center at Iowa State has found that a 66' wide multi-species riparian buffer strips, or MSRBS's, with properly designed and located settling ponds can be highly effective in reducing nitrogen and phosphorous run-off, sedimentation, and pesticide run-off to surface water. In general, only 1 acre of settling pond per 100 acres of cropland is needed to substantially increase the effectiveness of a MSRBS.

New Incentives Needed Enrollment of riparian area lands has been low because of a lack of economic incentives and unwillingness among farmers to give up the right to farm their most highly productive soils (Lant, Kraft JSWC article). Analysts at Southern Illinois University, Lant and Kraft, found that up to 75 percent of riparian zone land could be brought into the reserve before acceptable bid prices per acre would have to rise steeply. AFT's most recent survey clearly documented the substantial interest among farmers in retaining limited economic use of CRP land for haying and grazing of filter strips and grassed waterways on more highly productive land..

Also, AFT is aware that a relatively higher percentage of actively farmed cropland in riparian areas is now covered by commodity program base acres allotments. Based on these factors and considerations, AFT recommends that Congress and USDA strive to attain our suggested 75 percent enrollment goal by offering contract holders certain special financial incentives and by altering the applicable county-level bid caps --

* accept higher county-level bid caps;

* allow economic use for haying and or grazing, and occasional harvest of trees in filter strips wide enough to support tree plantings;

* offer the right to transfer base acres to other non-HEL parts of the farm's whole farm base, or one-time transfer to another farm and producer in return for a one-time cash payment; and

* offer payments for 15 years, instead of 10, for landowners willing to accept permanent easements calling for the maintenance of grassed waterways, filter strips, sediment ponds and other essential elements of erosion control and run-off control systems.

Table 7 presents estimates of the land enrolled, payment rates and expenditures for new partial field enrollments principally meeting water quality objectives. It should be noted that establishment of filter strips along streams often also constitutes high quality wildlife habitat, especially when multiple species are planted, including grasses, shrubs and trees.

3. Extending the Benefits of Wildlife Habitat Enhancement

Wildlife advocates and several members of Congress are concerned that application of the current Environmental Benefits Index in the context of a national bid pool will shift CRP acreage away from the Northern and Southern Plains states faster than desirable and trigger a decline in wildlife populations. Others worry about the farm income consequences of a possible rapid change in the supply and price of wheat.

Many landowners and wildlife groups express interest in using the CRP as a vehicle to further improve wildlife habitat through incorporation of special cover and feed plantings on parts of the landscape, creation of large contiguous tracts and corridors to facilitate the safe movement of wildlife, and special efforts to improve habitat in riparian areas. To fully take advantage of private sector commitment to further enhance the value of the CRP in habitat improvement, AFT recommends that USDA develop and incorporate in the EBI a new term reflecting the value of what landowners are proposing to do in the next 10-years to further improve wildlife habitat, beyond just maintaining permanent vegetative cover or what was done in the first 10-year contract period.

Willingness to commit to "higher level" habitat or water quality improvement practices without receipt of any additional cost-share funds should be given significant weight in evaluating bids. Likewise, landowner willingness to commit to the maintenance of additional long-term

Table 7. New Enrollments and Annual Expenditure Estimates Needed to Enhance Water Quality: Grassed Waterways, Filter Strips, High Phosphorous Soils and High Priority Watersheds, 1996-2000.

REGION STATE	Twice Cropland Within 100' of Water***	% Acres Enrolled	Acreage	Payment Rate*	Payment Rate Econ Use/BT	% Acres Econ Use/BT	Expenditures Econ Use/BT	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures**
PACIFIC									
ALASKA	0	50%	0	$60.00	$45.00	50%	$0	$0	$0
CALIFORNIA	252,800	40%	101,120	$80.00	$60.00	50%	$3,033,600	$4,044,800	$7,078,400
HAWAII	0	50%	0	$70.00	$52.50	50%	$0	$0	$0
OREGON	243,000	60%	145,800	$77.38	$58.03	50%	$4,230,478	$5,640,638	$9,871,116
WASHINGTON	110,800	65%	72,020	$69.88	$52.41	50%	$1,887,149	$2,516,199	$4,403,348
Total	606,600	53%	318,940	$76.51	$57.39	50%	$9,151,227	$12,201,636	$21,352,863
MOUNTAIN									
ARIZONA	20,600	35%	7,210	$50.00	$42.50	50%	$153,213	$180,250	$333,463
COLORADO	70,600	50%	35,300	$36.00	$30.60	50%	$540,090	$635,400	$1,175,490
IDAHO	145,200	50%	72,600	$59.75	$50.79	50%	$1,843,586	$2,168,925	$4,012,511
MONTANA	237,800	35%	83,230	$30.13	$25.61	50%	$1,065,604	$1,253,652	$2,319,256
NEVADA	2,800	35%	980	$40.00	$34.00	50%	$16,660	$19,600	$36,260
NEW MEXICO	7,400	35%	2,590	$40.00	$34.00	50%	$44,030	$51,800	$95,830
UTAH	64,400	40%	25,760	$35.25	$29.96	50%	$385,917	$454,020	$839,937
WYOMING	22,200	35%	7,770	$20.13	$17.11	50%	$66,458	$78,186	$144,643
Total	571,000	41%	235,440	$41.13	$34.96	50%	$4,115,558	$4,841,833	$8,957,390
NORTHERN PLAINS									
KANSAS	210,600	65%	136,890	$43.38	$34.70	50%	$2,375,042	$2,968,802	$5,343,843
NEBRASKA	294,000	45%	132,300	$62.88	$50.30	50%	$3,327,345	$4,159,181	$7,486,526
NORTH DAKOTA	95,600	70%	66,920	$39.88	$31.90	50%	$1,067,374	$1,334,218	$2,401,592
SOUTH DAKOTA	72,600	70%	50,820	$40.25	$32.20	50%	$818,202	$1,022,753	$1,840,955
Total	672,800	58%	386,930	$49.03	$39.22	50%	$7,587,963	$9,484,953	$17,072,916
SOUTHERN PLAINS									
OKLAHOMA	147,400	65%	95,810	$31.50	$25.20	50%	$1,207,206	$1,509,008	$2,716,214
TEXAS	285,600	65%	185,640	$25.25	$20.20	50%	$1,874,964	$2,343,705	$4,218,669
Total	433,000	65%	281,450	$27.38	$21.90	50%	$3,082,170	$3,852,713	$6,934,883
LAKE STATES									
MICHIGAN	463,200	60%	277,920	$61.25	$42.88	50%	$5,957,910	$8,511,300	$14,469,210
MINNESOTA	606,400	75%	454,800	$61.25	$42.88	50%	$9,749,775	$13,928,250	$23,678,025
WISCONSIN	231,200	65%	150,280	$64.00	$44.80	50%	$3,366,272	$4,808,960	$8,175,232
Total	1,300,800	68%	883,000	$61.72	$43.20	50%	$19,073,957	$27,248,510	$46,322,467
CORNBELT STATES									
ILLINOIS	760,200	40%	304,080	$134.13	$100.59	50%	$15,294,274	$20,392,365	$35,686,639
INDIANA	481,600	40%	192,640	$113.00	$84.75	50%	$8,163,120	$10,884,160	$19,047,280
IOWA	653,000	50%	326,500	$133.75	$100.31	50%	$16,376,016	$21,834,688	$38,210,703
MISSOURI	642,400	50%	321,200	$81.00	$60.75	50%	$9,756,450	$13,008,600	$22,765,050
OHIO	385,800	50%	192,900	$88.13	$66.09	50%	$6,374,742	$8,499,656	$14,874,398
Total	2,923,000	46%	1,337,320	$111.60	$83.70	50%	$55,964,602	$74,619,469	$130,584,070
DELTA									
ARKANSAS	281,000	60%	168,600	$63.38	$53.87	50%	$4,541,136	$5,342,513	$9,883,648
LOUISIANNA	503,400	40%	201,360	$60.38	$51.32	50%	$5,166,772	$6,078,555	$11,245,327
MISSISSIPPI	266,200	50%	133,100	$55.00	$46.75	50%	$3,111,213	$3,660,250	$6,771,463
Total	1,050,600	48%	503,060	$59.96	$50.96	50%	$12,819,120	$15,081,318	$27,900,437
SOUTHEASTERN									
ALABAMA	198,600	60%	119,160	$45.63	$38.78	50%	$2,310,587	$2,718,338	$5,028,924
FLORIDA	517,400	40%	206,960	$91.38	$77.67	50%	$8,037,162	$9,455,485	$17,492,647
GEORGIA	25,000	70%	17,500	$40.00	$34.00	50%	$297,500	$350,000	$647,500
SOUTH CAROLINA	68,800	70%	48,160	$29.25	$24.86	50%	$598,689	$704,340	$1,303,029
Total	809,800	48%	391,780	$67.53	$57.40	50%	$11,243,938	$13,228,163	$24,472,101
APPALACHIAN									
KENTUCKY	291,400	50%	145,700	$73.75	$66.38	50%	$4,835,419	$5,372,688	$10,208,106
NORTH CAROLINA	278,600	50%	139,300	$47.63	$42.86	50%	$2,985,373	$3,317,081	$6,302,454
TENNESEE	478,200	40%	191,280	$61.88	$55.69	50%	$5,325,953	$5,917,725	$11,243,678
VIRGINIA	278,400	40%	111,360	$46.75	$42.08	50%	$2,342,736	$2,603,040	$4,945,776
WEST VIRGINIA	195,600	40%	78,240	$46.13	$41.51	50%	$1,623,969	$1,804,410	$3,428,379
Total	1,522,200	44%	665,880	$57.11	$51.40	50%	$17,113,449	$19,014,944	$36,128,393
NORTHEASTERN									
CONNECTICUT	23,800	60%	14,280	$70.00	$52.50	50%	$374,850	$499,800	$874,650
DELAWARE	12,800	60%	7,680	$74.75	$56.06	50%	$215,280	$287,040	$502,320
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0	60%	0	$0.00	$0.00	50%	$0	$0	$0
MAINE	47,000	60%	28,200	$55.50	$41.63	50%	$586,913	$782,550	$1,369,463
MARYLAND	167,000	60%	100,200	$76.00	$57.00	50%	$2,855,700	$3,807,600	$6,663,300
MASSACHUSETTES	33,400	60%	20,040	$70.00	$52.50	50%	$526,050	$701,400	$1,227,450
NEW HAMPSHIRE	19,600	60%	11,760	$70.00	$52.50	50%	$308,700	$411,600	$720,300
NEW JERSEY	51,400	60%	30,840	$88.88	$66.66	50%	$1,027,839	$1,370,453	$2,398,292
NEW YORK	269,400	60%	161,640	$47.75	$35.81	50%	$2,894,366	$3,859,155	$6,753,521
PENNSYLVANIA	280,000	60%	168,000	$52.38	$39.28	50%	$3,299,625	$4,399,500	$7,699,125
RHODE ISLAND	1,800	60%	1,080	$50.00	$37.50	50%	$20,250	$27,000	$47,250
VERMONT	74,000	60%	44,400	$50.63	$37.97	50%	$842,906	$1,123,875	$1,966,781
Total	980,200	60%	588,120	$58.73	$44.05	50%	$12,952,479	$17,269,973	$30,222,452
US Total	10,870,000	51%	5,591,920	$70.40	$56.32	50%	$153,104,463	$196,843,509	$349,947,972

* Payment rate is 125% of 1994 average state cropland rental rate.

** Expenditures is an estimate of a single year of payments starting in 2001 following signups over the period 1996-2000.

*** Data on cropland in the CRP within 100 feet of water provided by Dr. Bruce Babcock and Dr. P.G. Lakshminarayan, Iowa State University. Acres in this column are twice the cropland within 100 feet.

habitat improvement practices beyond the 10 years during which payments will be made should be given consideration in ranking bids.

Difficult to Project Enrollment Patterns Except in limited areas where research has been carried out, no well-defined method exists to estimate the portion of CRP land needed to support wildlife populations at a given level, or to estimate optimal patterns in the distribution of habitat across the landscape. Considerable additional analysis and research will be needed to develop such a method.

While better information is developed, one indicator of at least the perceived importance of the CRP in enhancing wildlife benefits is the portion of currently enrolled CRP land managed in a way to produce tangible additional wildlife habitat benefits, beyond just establishing permanent vegetative cover. An estimate of this portion of CRP acreage can be made at the county level by calculating from the Osborn/ERS dataset the portion of land enrolled that is treated or covered by a set of wildlife habitat related practices -- CP4B ("Permanent wildlife habitat"), CP9B ("Shallow water for wildlife"), CP12B ("Wildlife food plots") and WL2B ("Shallow water for wild water fowl").

In several states over 10 percent of CRP acreage was treated with one or more of these wildlife habitat practices -- 27 percent in South Dakota, 19 percent in Nebraska, 16 percent in Wyoming, 13 percent in North Dakota. Some states with significant CRP acreage had less than 5 percent of land treated with special wildlife habitat practices.

A "new acre" of land enrolled in the CRP principally to enhance wildlife habitat should entail a EBI value including the benefits associated with at least one of the wildlife habitat improvement practices noted above. A significant acreage now in the CRP in the Northern and Southern Plains and Mountain regions will not meet the erosion hazard criteria, and another sizeable acreage will be subject to a bid rate cap lower than what landowners are willing to accept. For this reason such land may need to include additional habitat improvement practices to elevate EBI scores and improve the chances of competing successfully within the national pool of land under review in any signup period.

Table 8 projects new enrollments and expenditures on land principally ranking high under the EBI because of wildlife habitat benefits.

4. Unique or Highly Valuable Farmland

AFT recommends that the Congress reform the "Farms for the Future Act" (FFA) first passed in the 1990 farm bill and authorize funding for a pilot program patterned after the successful wetlands reserve pilot program. The purpose of this program would be to provide states an opportunity to draw upon the CRP as a mechanism to help share part of the cost of protecting unique and valuable farmland threatened by development. AFT recommends that Congress direct USDA to move ahead with a pilot FFA program component within the CRP, by including the protection of uniquely valuable farmland as one of the new environmental benefits "priority" criteria governing the enrollment of new land into the CRP.

Table 8. New Enrollments and Annual Expenditures for Land Principally Meeting a Wildlife Habitat Criteria, 1996-2000.

REGION STATE	Wildlife Habitat Improvement	Payment Rate***	Reduction in Payment Rate	Payment Rate EconUse/BT	Expenditures EconUse/BT	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures*
PACIFIC							
ALASKA	10,000	$40.00	75%	$30.00	$150,000	$200,000	$350,000
CALIFORNIA	20,000	$55.00	75%	$41.25	$412,500	$550,000	$962,500
HAWAII	10,000	$80.00	75%	$60.00	$300,000	$400,000	$700,000
OREGON	15,000	$49.52	75%	$37.14	$278,550	$371,400	$649,950
WASHINGTON	150,000	$44.72	75%	$33.54	$2,515,500	$3,354,000	$5,869,500
Total	205,000	$47.56	75%	$35.67	$3,656,550	$4,875,400	$8,531,950
MOUNTAIN							
ARIZONA	50,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$637,500	$750,000	$1,387,500
COLORADO	75,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$956,250	$1,125,000	$2,081,250
IDAHO	100,000	$38.24	85%	$32.50	$1,625,200	$1,912,000	$3,537,200
MONTANA	150,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$1,912,500	$2,250,000	$4,162,500
NEVADA	75,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$956,250	$1,125,000	$2,081,250
NEW MEXICO	50,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$637,500	$750,000	$1,387,500
UTAH	50,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$637,500	$750,000	$1,387,500
WYOMING	50,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$637,500	$750,000	$1,387,500
Total	600,000	$31.37	85%	$26.67	$8,000,200	$9,412,000	$17,412,200
NORTHERN PLAINS							
KANSAS	100,000	$30.00	80%	$24.00	$1,200,000	$1,500,000	$2,700,000
NEBRASKA	50,000	$40.24	80%	$32.19	$804,800	$1,006,000	$1,810,800
NORTH DAKOTA	150,000	$30.00	80%	$24.00	$1,800,000	$2,250,000	$4,050,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	100,000	$30.00	80%	$24.00	$1,200,000	$1,500,000	$2,700,000
Total	400,000	$31.28	80%	$25.02	$5,004,800	$6,256,000	$11,260,800
SOUTHERN PLAINS							
OKLAHOMA	100,000	$30.00	80%	$24.00	$1,200,000	$1,500,000	$2,700,000
TEXAS	300,000	$30.00	80%	$24.00	$3,600,000	$4,500,000	$8,100,000
Total	400,000	$30.00	80%	$24.00	$4,800,000	$6,000,000	$10,800,000
LAKE STATES							
MICHIGAN	50,000	$39.20	70%	$27.44	$686,000	$980,000	$1,666,000
MINNESOTA	200,000	$39.20	70%	$27.44	$2,744,000	$3,920,000	$6,664,000
WISCONSIN	150,000	$40.96	70%	$28.67	$2,150,400	$3,072,000	$5,222,400
Total	400,000	$39.86	70%	$27.90	$5,580,400	$7,972,000	$13,552,400
CORNBELT STATES							
ILLINOIS	20,000	$85.84	75%	$64.38	$643,800	$858,400	$1,502,200
INDIANA	20,000	$72.32	75%	$54.24	$542,400	$723,200	$1,265,600
IOWA	40,000	$85.60	75%	$64.20	$1,284,000	$1,712,000	$2,996,000
MISSOURI	50,000	$51.84	75%	$38.88	$972,000	$1,296,000	$2,268,000
OHIO	20,000	$56.40	75%	$42.30	$423,000	$564,000	$987,000
Total	150,000	$68.71	75%	$51.54	$3,865,200	$5,153,600	$9,018,800
DELTA							
ARKANSAS	50,000	$40.56	85%	$34.48	$861,900	$1,014,000	$1,875,900
LOUISIANNA	30,000	$38.64	85%	$32.84	$492,660	$579,600	$1,072,260
MISSISSIPPI	40,000	$35.20	85%	$29.92	$598,400	$704,000	$1,302,400
Total	120,000	$38.29	85%	$32.55	$1,952,960	$2,297,600	$4,250,560
SOUTHEASTERN							
ALABAMA	30,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$382,500	$450,000	$832,500
FLORIDA	30,000	$58.48	85%	$49.71	$745,620	$877,200	$1,622,820
GEORGIA	60,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$765,000	$900,000	$1,665,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	40,000	$30.00	85%	$25.50	$510,000	$600,000	$1,110,000
Total	160,000	$35.34	85%	$30.04	$2,403,120	$2,827,200	$5,230,320
APPALACHIAN							
KENTUCKY	30,000	$47.20	90%	$42.48	$637,200	$708,000	$1,345,200
NORTH CAROLINA	40,000	$30.48	90%	$27.43	$548,640	$609,600	$1,158,240
TENNESEE	30,000	$39.60	90%	$35.64	$534,600	$594,000	$1,128,600
VIRGINIA	20,000	$30.00	90%	$27.00	$270,000	$300,000	$570,000
WEST VIRGINIA	15,000	$30.00	90%	$27.00	$202,500	$225,000	$427,500
Total	135,000	$36.10	90%	$32.49	$2,192,940	$2,436,600	$4,629,540
NORTHEASTERN							
CONNECTICUT	10,000	$50.00	75%	$37.50	$187,500	$250,000	$437,500
DELAWARE	15,000	$47.84	75%	$35.88	$269,100	$358,800	$627,900
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	40,000	$35.52	75%	$26.64	$532,800	$710,400	$1,243,200
MARYLAND	15,000	$48.64	75%	$36.48	$273,600	$364,800	$638,400
MASSACHUSETTES	10,000	$50.00	75%	$37.50	$187,500	$250,000	$437,500
NEW HAMPSHIRE	40,000	$50.00	75%	$37.50	$750,000	$1,000,000	$1,750,000
NEW JERSEY	15,000	$56.88	75%	$42.66	$319,950	$426,600	$746,550
NEW YORK	20,000	$30.56	75%	$22.92	$229,200	$305,600	$534,800
PENNSYLVANIA	20,000	$33.52	75%	$25.14	$251,400	$335,200	$586,600
RHODE ISLAND	5,000	$50.00	75%	$37.50	$93,750	$125,000	$218,750
VERMONT	50,000	$32.40	75%	$24.30	$607,500	$810,000	$1,417,500
Total	240,000	$32.80	75%	$24.60	$3,702,300	$3,936,400	$7,638,700
US Total	2,810,000	$36.42	80%	$28.98	$41,158,470	$51,166,800	$92,325,270

* Expenditures is an estimate of a single year of payments starting in 2001 following signups over the period 1996-2000.

** EconUse is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enr under economic use or base transfer options. The reduction in payment rates by state and region are estimated based on the expected value of forage produ crop acreage bases in the region.

*** Payment rate is 80% of 1994 cropland rental rate.

Reforms Needed The "Farms for the Future" program authorizes 10-year loans to states to help support cost-share payments to landowners who have secured contracts from qualifying state farmland preservation programs. Only Vermont has used the provision to date because of cumbersome loan procedures in current law that do not meet most state needs. For more states to use the program, matching loans needed to be converted to matching grants or direct cost-shares for the purchase of perpetual conservation easements, in accord with state-sanctioned or local government programs.

To assure state commitment and involvement in the identification of land eligible for the program, and to stretch federal dollars, AFT recommends that states and the federal government share the cost of enrollments 50-50. A land owner wishing to submit a bid for enrollment of a farm under the CRP's FFA component would first write the state lead agency administering or overseeing state farmland protection activities and seek two findings: first, that the land is or has been designated as "unique or highly valuable" under a state or county farmland protection program; and, second that the land is vulnerable to development in an area recognized by state or local public policy as important to retain agriculture. In order for the landowner to submit a bid to the CRP, these findings would need to be obtained first, as well as a firm commitment from a state, local, or nonprofit organization to provide the other 50 percent of the cost of the easement, if the bid offered to enroll in the CRP is accepted. An exception should be made for demonstration projects in states now developing farmland protection programs. NRCS should be given discretion to provide 100 percent cost-sharing for such projects, provided that no more than 10 percent of total program funding is used for this purpose.

Land enrolled in the FFA would, unlike other CRP acreage, remain in production agriculture. The land targeted by this program would include unique farmland capable of producing fruits, vegetables and other specialty crops, as well as land having prime soils or other characteristics making its protection highly valuable for regional agricultural production, environmental enhancement or efficient community growth. Under state farmland protection laws and programs, the easement value per acre is based on the difference between the development value of the property and its long-term agricultural value. The goal of farmland protection programs is to stabilize agricultural land use by permanently retiring the development potential of especially valuable, strategically located farmland, thus assuring that urban encroachment will not fragment and disrupt agricultural production. For this reason, the cost per acre for retirement of the development potential of farmland protected for agriculture production tends to be higher than for land being retired from production because of its marginal quality or environmental sensitivity. This higher cost is justified both by the high quality of the land being protected and the perpetual -- versus 10-year -- commitment being made by landowners. (In some states, the farmland protection commitment made by landowners is at least 25 years rather than strictly perpetual). Land protected through a FFA easement will continue to be subject to conservation compliance and should be farmed in accord with an integrated farm plan including clear stewardship performance objectives.

Table 9 presents a preliminary projection of a possible distribution of land enrolled in the CRP through FFA. Estimates are based on those states with active farmland protection programs that would be in a position to meet the state-match for funding. Easement rates are derived from

recent contracts let through state programs. Estimates are provided of total easement costs, and the federal and state share of costs.

Table 9. Projected Enrollments -- "Farms for the Future", 1996-2000.

Region	Acres(1)	Payment Rate(2) ($)	Program Cost (Million $) Total	State	Federal	Federal Cost/Acre
Pacific	38,000	$2,700	$103	$51	$51	$1,350
Mountain	30,000	$1,500	$45	$23	$23	$750
Plains/Corn Belt	22,000	$1,500	$33	$17	$17	$750
Lake States	30,000	$2,000	$60	$30	$30	$1,000
Southeast/Delta	33,000	$1,500	$50	$25	$25	$750
Appalachian	32,000	$1,000	$32	$16	$16	$500
Northeast	155,000	$2,300	$357	$178	$178	$1,150
U.S. Total	340,000		$679	$339	$339	$1,000

(1) Annual acreage enrollment targets.
(2) Projected average price paid per acre for perpetual easements based on historic data.

5. Roles for a Natural Resources Conservation Fund

In the last three signup periods at the national level, USDA ranked all bids submitted for enrollment to the CRP through application of an Environmental Benefits Index (EBI). Bids were selected for funding based on the benefits achieved per dollar spent. Certain factors, however, altered rankings. Bids in "priority conservation areas" were ranked higher than they would otherwise have been, and bids including certain practices -- filter strips and grassed waterways -- were automatically accepted if the bid rate was below applicable county rental rate caps.

Over the next 10-year cycle of the CRP, a gradually growing share of CRP and wetlands reserve program dollars should be devoted to the enrollment of land in "priority conservation areas" or land which requires special "priority" conservation treatment to meet state and local water quality, wildlife habitat, or farmland protection needs. New priority-setting, decision-making and funding mechanisms are needed for these sorts of enrollments. They should be administered cooperatively at the state or regional level, and in some cases at the county level, since state and local units of government will have access to much better information and expertise. Two of the five "priority" conservation and environmental needs AFT discusses below -- high P soils and "Farms for the Future" -- would be candidates for implementation through such a mechanism.

To support state-federal cooperation and finance jointly-run programs, AFT recommends that Congress establish a state-federal Natural Resources Conservation Fund (NRCF) and use it initially to administer certain categories of new enrollments into the CRP and/or wetlands reserve. There would be one fund established with up to 50 accounts, one for each state.

The NRCF should be used to pay for the enrollment of land into CRP and wetlands reserve that has been identified by states and local governments as critical in achieving local and state water

quality, wildlife habitat or farmland protection goals. Landowners might first submit a bid for a tract of land to the national CRP pool, and if not selected, submit the same or a similar bid in a subsequent round to a state or regional bid pool, where a different set and/or ranking of environmental benefits would be used in the selection process.

The NRCF could also be used for special state-federal programs in high priority watersheds, to help pay for practices called for through the "Conservation Farm Option" proposed by the Administration, or for other purposes. To assure a high level of state-federal cooperation and commitment to projects funded through the NRCF, Congress should establish a minimum state and/or federal share of the cost of any activity funded from the NRCF -- we think 25 percent would be an appropriate minimum during the first years of operation. In cases where a program addresses important national needs, like meeting water quality goals in the Great Lakes (in light of U.S.-Canada commitments) a state's share of costs might be only 25 percent; when a program addresses principally a local priority, like protecting a unique tract of farmland, a higher state and/or local cost-share rate would be appropriate.

Once established, a state wanting to use the NRCF to carry out an eligible cooperative program, like a watershed protection program or "Farms for the Future", would request from USDA that a grant dedicated to the given program activity be made to the state's account in the NRCF. At the time USDA funding is requested, the state would also commit its share of funding to the program or project account, and submit an appropriate memorandum of understanding setting forth the way all government agencies and private organizations will work together in the project.

Each year as it administers funding appropriated by Congress to the CRP, wetlands reserve and possibly other programs, USDA would continue to hold signups and commit funds to newly enrolled lands that compete successfully on a nationwide basis, but it would also review and approve requests for transfer of federal funds to state NRCF accounts as qualifying requests are made, until all program funds are allocated through one mechanism or another in a given year. This approach would, obviously, serve as a strong inducement for state-federal cooperation and the delegation of responsibility toward the state and local levels of government. It would give USDA maximum flexibility to direct limited dollars to the programs and priorities that will deliver the greatest benefits by drawing upon the strengths of state and local institutions. It will also preclude the need for Congress to micro-manage cooperative state-federal efforts through the CRP or appropriations process.

This mechanism would, in essence, codify the approach used successfully to foster state-federal cooperation and the pooling of conservation funds in the Chesapeake Bay program. Establishing the NRCF and making it possible for USDA to run significant resources through it could revolutionize the delivery of conservation and environment program services and cost-share support.

6. Summary: New Enrollments

Table 10 presents a summary over program years 1996 and 2000 of new enrollments according to each of the four principal environmental benefits index criteria discussed above. Note that expenditures for newly enrolled land do not begin until 1997, the year after the first 3.77 million acres of new enrollments are made in 1996.

Table 10. New Enrollments and Expenditures* by Principal Environmental Benefit Index Criteria, 1996-2000.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Five-Year 1995 Farm Bill Period
USLE Erosion						
- Acres by Year	1,217,985	1,014,988	811,990	608,993	405,995	4,059,950
- Cumulative Acres	1,217,985	2,232,973	3,044,963	3,653,955	4,059,950	4,059,950
- Dollars/Acre	$48.52	$48.52	$48.52	$48.52	$48.52	$48.52
- Dollars by Year	$0	$59,099,930	$49,249,942	$39,399,953	$29,549,965	$177,299,790
- Cumulative Dollars	$0	$59,099,930	$108,349,872	$147,749,825	$177,299,790	$492,499,417
Water Quality						
- Acres by Year	1,677,576	1,397,980	1,118,384	838,788	559,192	5,591,920
- Cumulative Acres	1,677,576	3,075,556	4,193,940	5,032,728	5,591,920	5,591,920
- Dollars/Acre	$62.58	$62.58	$62.58	$62.58	$62.58	$62.58
- Dollars by Year	$0	$104,984,392	$87,486,993	$69,989,594	$52,492,196	$314,953,175
- Cumulative Dollars	$0	$104,984,392	$192,471,385	$262,460,979	$314,953,175	$874,869,930
Farms for Future						
- Acres by Year	40,000	55,000	75,000	85,000	85,000	340,000
- Cumulative Acres	40,000	95,000	170,000	255,000	340,000	340,000
- Dollars/Acre	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00
- Dollars by Year**	$0	$40,000,000	$55,000,000	$75,000,000	$85,000,000	$255,000,000
- Cumulative Dollars	$0	$40,000,000	$95,000,000	$170,000,000	$255,000,000	$255,000,000
Wildlife Habitat						
- Acres by Year	843,000	702,500	562,000	421,500	281,000	2,810,000
- Cumulative Acres	843,000	1,545,500	2,107,500	2,529,000	2,810,000	2,810,000
- Dollars/Acre	$32.86	$32.86	$32.86	$32.86	$32.86	$32.86
- Dollars by Year	$0	$27,697,581	$23,081,318	$18,465,054	$13,848,791	$83,092,743
- Cumulative Dollars	$0	$27,697,581	$50,778,899	$69,243,953	$83,092,743	$230,813,175
New Enrollments						
- Acres by Year	3,778,561	3,170,468	2,567,374	1,954,281	1,331,187	12,801,870
- Cumulative Acres	3,778,561	6,949,029	9,516,403	11,470,683	12,801,870	12,801,870
- Dollars/Acre	$76.49	$76.49	$76.49	$76.49	$76.49	$76.49
- Dollars by Year	$0	$293,781,903	$244,818,252	$195,854,602	$146,890,951	$881,345,708
- Cumulative Dollars	$0	$231,781,903	$446,600,155	$649,454,757	$830,345,708	$1,853,182,522

* Based on the assumptions that the new enrollments will be divided by year according to: 30% in 1996, 25% in 1997, 20% in 1998, 15% in 1999, and 10% in 2000. Expenditures are lagged by one year after enrollment.

** One time payment is equivalent to $100 per year.

D. Options to Lower Costs

AFT recommends that Congress authorize USDA to offer farmers and landowners various options in enrolling or re-enrolling land into the CRP. The two major options would be buying back limited economic use, transfer commodity program base to other non-highly erodible land in a farm's Whole Farm Base under defined circumstances. To limit administrative cost and complications, economic use and base transfer options would be offered to all farmers with accepted bids on defined terms, following straightforward rules.

Other options would involve the length of contracts; requirements to maintain certain practices, installations or land use beyond the end of the contract period; and, allowing current contract holders to re-bid their parcels, seeking another 10-year term, under the new rules provided for in the 1995 or future farm bills but before the end of existing 10-year contract periods.

1. Economic Use

AFT's White Paper recommends limited haying and grazing on land enrolled in the CRP for several reasons -- to reduce per acre bid rates; lessen the reduction in economic activity and in the production of foodstuffs; establish a stock of forage to meet emergency feed needs in times of drought or other weather-induced shortages (a key need if Congress decides to end annual set-asides, as also recommended, since livestock farmers rely on set-aside acres as a major source of emergency feeds); facilitate the transition toward mixed crop-livestock operations based on sustainable uses of cropland.

In order to retain significant wildlife habitat benefits, policy is likely to place several constraints on when forage can be harvested or grazed and how the landscape must be managed. In areas placing a high premium on retaining or increasing wildlife habitat benefits, it is assumed that haying and grazing will be delayed longer and more significantly limited than in areas where there are ample other lands contributing to high quality wildlife habitat. Hence the reduction in average accepted bid rates in such areas will be less relative to areas where few restrictions are placed on how forage can be harvested.

2. Transfer of Base

AFT recommends Congress allow USDA to offer farmers the option of transferring their commodity program bases to other non-highly erodible land, under certain special circumstances. We think the circumstances when base transfers would be allowed should be limited and clearly defined, because this option could be complex to administer and could also prove costly, if commodity program payment levels remain largely unchanged in the 1995 farmbill. In any event, base acres would be forfeited at the end of a second 10-year CRP contract.

Transfer of base acreage (or sale to other producers in the area) should, in particular, be allowed when a farmer is willing to accept permanent or long-term easements on certain parts of a

field which need to remain in grass, filter strips or sediment catchment ponds in order to limit sediment and agrichemicals reaching surface waters.

Few farmers would be willing to place and maintain eligible land in permanent filter strips, grassed waterways, wildlife plantings, sediment settling ponds or riparian areas without some additional economic incentives; transfer of base would clearly be a significant incentive. Once farmers have successfully bid land into the reserve, they should be able to request from the CFSA permission to transfer their base to other non-highly erodible land, if certain conditions are met. As part of this added conservation incentive, farmers might be required to develop an integrated farm plan addressing the way the filter strips, grassed waterways, or specially managed areas will be integrated with ongoing farming operations.

USDA Watershed Proposals Two innovative proposals in the USDA's 1995 farmbill proposals could be combined to provide states and local units of government powerful new tools and resources to address priority conservation and environmental challenges. The "Conservation Farm Option" would build on and expand the Integrated Crop Management option authorized in the 1990 farmbill (see pages 7-9, "1995 Farm Bill: Guidance of the Administration"). It would provide a foundation for farmers in priority watersheds or other sensitive areas to re-negotiate their relationship with essentially all USDA commodity and conservation program requirements and payments.

Coupled with the "Coordinated Conservation Assistance" proposal (see pages 45-46), USDA will have new options for working with state and local partners to craft targeted solutions to local and regional needs. For decades, USDA programs and expenditures have, in some regions, subsidized environmentally damaging farming systems affordable only if backed by the government. Through the proposed reforms, USDA programs and funding could become fully and cost-effectively a part of resource conservation solutions instead of just a drain, or an impediment to innovation in the design of conservation systems.

As an added incentive for farmers considering the Conservation Farm Option, USDA should allow transfer of base from land enrolled in the CRP or wetlands reserve to other parts of a farm's whole farm base. In some regions this opportunity to transfer base could substantially increase a farmers willingness and ability to accept the environmental stewardship responsibilities inherent in the Conservation Farm Option.

3. Longer-term Agreements, Easements and Re-bidding Contracts

As the variety of conservation installations and systems called for through the CRP (and wetlands reserve) expands, so too will the effective life of systems and practices. In some cases, a practice or installation should remain in perpetuity. A farmer willing to agree to a very long run (30 year), or even permanent maintenance contract for a filter strip or grassed waterway should receive credit for such willingness in the ranking of bids, and perhaps qualify for one-time bonus payments. One such bonus would be the right to transfer crop acreage base to other parts of a farm.

The vast majority of new land brought into the CRP during its second decade will likely be bid in during 1996-1998. Some farmers with contracts expiring after this period may wish to have their parcels considered for re-enrollment during these years when the chances of getting selected is likely to be greater. Congress should include in the CRP re-authorization an "early re-bid" provision, which would allow a current contract holder to submit an offer to re-enroll land, while perhaps upgrading the level of conservation and wildlife habitat treatments on the land. Since average accepted bid rates are going to drop in most states, this provision will increase the environmental benefits attained per dollar spent faster than if existing contracts had to come to an end before landowners seek to re-bid land.

E. Future Refinements and Applications

Congress will appropriately consider a wide array of policy options in re-authorizing the CRP. A compromise will be sought between conservation, environment, farm income, and budget needs, and between politics and policy. In order to provide a mechanism to sort through the implications of alternative policies, the simulator under development by AFT needs to be refined and additional parameters added to it. Some pressing needs are discussed below.

There are several key parameters in the simulator which are now set at assigned values reflecting little more than educated guesses. Several can be calculated by drawing upon the 1993 Soil and Water Conservation Survey and the 1995 AFT Survey, by assessing state and county level rental rate and crop returns data, and through other means.

1. Multiple Scenarios

A number of policy and enrollment options and scenarios need to be studied. Based on lessons learned since 1985, Congress should set certain key program variables -- overall spending, program objectives, bid procedures and rules, maximum payment rates -- and should then let the bid process and market mechanisms work out other variables like participation rates, regional patterns, the types of land enrolled and benefits attained, etc. Congress should resist the temptation to mandate certain minimal acreage targets by state, region, or type of enrollment, nor should it insist upon a given split between acreage and/or expenditures on re-enrollments versus new enrollments. Analyses of policy constrained options show that the cost per acre enrolled, or per unit of environmental benefit achieved can rise sharply. Moreover, USDA will have a difficult time remaining true to the competitive bid process which has proved so effective if it has to figure out some way to assure that a prescribed outcome is reached. Experience shows that the sort of steps USDA generally takes in an effort to comply with such mandates generally create new problems and leave no one fully satisfied.

Plausible scenarios that need to be studied include --

* a 20 million acre CRP, reflecting a budget-constrained scenario;

* a reserve ending up at about 30 million acres in 2001, as called for in AFT's proposals;

* a 35 to 40 million acre CRP with significant emphasis on partial field enrollments, economic use, and expansion of the environmental and policy criteria governing eligibility, including in particular water quality and enrollment of unique and valuable agricultural lands through the Farms for the Future program.

2. Improving the Accuracy of the Estimate of the Eligible Pool for Re-Enrollments

Two adjustments are now used to estimate the eligible pool: one subtracts out land in trees, the second land which does not meet an erodibility criterion. The accuracy of these adjustments could be improved and/or other methods considered to make them. Ease and fairness of implementation in the field should be weighted heavily as a factor, since staff resources in NRCS and CFSA field offices are already stretched thin and local USDA offices may have several new programs to implement as a result of the farm bill.

CRP Land in Trees Trees play a key role in the CRP in about 10 states. In deciding whether additional payments should be offered landowners wishing to re-enroll land with trees on it, Congress will need information on when the trees are likely to be ready for harvest and the estimated gross and net value of the trees that will be harvested per acre. Some consideration should also be given, if contracts are extended, to imposing compliance provisions addressing tree harvesting practices and related conservation systems.

Alternative policy scenarios governing this land might include re-enrollment at a significantly reduced rate, say 50 percent of the existing payment rate, permanent retirement of any commodity program bases associated with the land, and acceptance of permanent easements to retain filter strips and grassed waterways, or other appropriate sediment and run-off reduction practice on those parts to fields in the CRP that adjoin surface waterways or serve as channels for field run-off.

Erosion Hazard The preferred method to determine erosion hazard is the erodibility index. For recent signups, land with an EI>8 has been eligible for the reserve. Prior to the CRP, cropland with an EI=8 would be expected to erode between 12 and 15 tons per acre if farmed with moderately effective conservation systems. Based on analysis of the 1992 NRI and using an erosion rate greater than 20 tons per acre, Babcock and colleagues at Iowa State University estimate that there would be 32.2 million acres of land eligible for the CRP nationwide, of which 16.7 million is now in the reserve.

Clearly, the CRP is not going to reach a size sufficient to enroll all acres eroding at 20 tons or greater. Such land probably has EI values on the order of 12 to 18. While the use of a stricter EI, or other erosion hazard criteria will more effectively target enrollments to the most erosive acres, it will also narrow the pool of eligible acres and hence possibly rule out some land with other benefits or which could be drawn into the reserve at a low per acre payment rate. This trade-off needs to be assessed to work toward a basis for estimating the minimal eligible pool of land needed to assure a high level of competition among bidders.

3. Enrollment Rates

Currently we assume a given percent of the eligible pool will be re-enrolled by region, based on educated guesses. These guesses need to be replaced by calculated values based on county and state bid caps, trends in rental rates and crop prices, likely EBI values, and by assessing producer intentions as expressed in the AFT and SWCS surveys.

4. Payment Rates

The model now assumes that the average accepted bid rate for re-enrollments will be 80 percent of the state's average cropland rental rate in 1994. Payment rates for new enrollments are estimated at various percentages of 1994 rental rates. These assumption should be replaced with calculated values. The rates will surely be lower on some lands and higher on others, as a function of the perceived value of commodity program base, the difficulty and cost of meeting compliance, and other factors.

Producer surveys suggest that payment rates can be reduced at least 20 percent while retaining about 50 percent of the land now in the reserve. Since a national re-enrollment rate around 50 percent seems likely, average accepted bids will probably not exceed 80 percent of current bids and will trend close to 80 percent of 1994 cropland rental rates.

5. Adjustments in Payment Rates for Economic Use and Base Transfer

The model currently assumes that bids for re- and new enrollments would be done without consideration of base transfer or economic use, and that these options would be available to all successful bidders, triggering known changes in payment rates. Farmers electing to retain economic use would accept a given percent reduction in accepted payment rates; base transfer would be accompanied by another given percent reduction, or no reduction in the event the producer is agreeing to accept other stewardship obligations that are largely unpaid.

The size of these adjustments should vary across the country in accord with a number of factors, the extent of limitations or future obligations associated with these options, the value of deficiency payments associated with base acres, and many other factors. Accordingly, assumed reductions in payment rates and the number of acres under these options should be replaced by calculated values, or some method to approximate the likely impact of these options under various formulations.

Economic Use The average 12-signup payment rate nationwide is just under $50.00 per acre. The 1993 SWCS survey found that respondents would accept about a $6.20 reduction in payment rates, on average, in return for retaining haying and grazing rights, about a 12 percent reduction. In regions where forage is in short supply and demand strong, haying and grazing rights would likely be worth up to 20 percent of existing average payment rates; in regions where there are ample stocks of forage and few practical ways to harvest it, haying and grazing rights might be worth perhaps no more than $5.00 per acre. But in drought years when the value of

forage is artificially elevated, the right to hay/graze CRP land might be worth twice as much, or perhaps as much as 20 percent to 30 percent of a contract's payment rate.

A method is needed to establish a fair and realistic adjustment for economic use that takes into account all program objectives. The adjustment should be significantly less than the full value of forage that could be harvested because program rules will restrict the timing for harvest operations or grazing, the extent of harvesting, and what must be done to minimize adverse impacts on wildlife habitat. A method is needed to calculate the net value of forage and the portion of this value a farmer will be able to take advantage of, given restrictions to sustain wildlife habitat benefits.

As recommended by AFT one major purpose of adopting an economic use provision is to provide a low-cost emergency source of feed for the nation's livestock producers. By keeping the price of retaining economic use rights low, contract holders and livestock operators would benefit, but at some expense to wildlife habitat. For this reason AFT has also recommended that one-half the per acre reduction in CRP payments associated with economic use be dedicated to wildlife enhancement efforts within the region.

Base Transfer Clearly, base transfers make the most sense in cases where a farmer is willing to accept a permanent easement on a whole field, or the portions of a field on which grassed waterways and filter strips are needed to reduce sediment flows and run-off. An estimate should be made of the acreage likely to fall in these categories, and a given portion of such land might be covered by base transfer. There would, of course, need to be some incentive to the farmer to make the transfer. The incentive would be the opportunity to receive deficiency payments on a higher percentage of a farm's whole farm base.

6. Estimating the Portion of Acres Enrolled by Option

The model now assumes that varying percentages of eligible acreage will be enrolled with the economic use and/or base transfer options across regions. Better methods are needed to more accurately estimate what farmers are likely to do in response to these options.

Clearly the appeal of either or both options will be driven by their economic consequences, and these consequences will, in turn, drive political debate on them. For example, cattle producers are likely to resist economic use if they assume that such a provision would encourage producers to purchase their own cattle and expand overall meat supplies. But if Congress restricted economic use so that a given contract holder could buy back haying and grazing rights no more than two years in a row, and no more than 5 years in a 10 year contract, cattlemen would view the program as far less of a threat, and indeed as a substantial benefit in times of reduced forage supplies, since few contract holders would expand beef herds lacking a steady supply of grass.

Appendix 1. Statistical Tables

Table 1.0-1.5: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control: 1996-2000 Summary Table; and 1996 through 2000 by year.

Table 2.1-2.5: Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP: 1996 through 2000 by year.

Table 3.0-3.5: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-Enrolled: 1996-2000 Summary Table; and 1996 through 2000 by year.

Table 4: USDA and CBO Baselines and Impacts of the American Farmland Trust CRP Reform Recommendations: 1996-2000 Summary Table.

Appendix Table 1.0: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control, 1996-2000.**

			Adjustments For Acres in Trees			*Erosion Hazard*					
REGION (STATES)	Total Acres Enrolled (12 Signups)	SUMMARY Acres Out 1996-2000	Acres Trees (12 Signups)	% Acres Trees	Approx. Acres Trees (Acres Out)	EI<8 (12 Signups)	% Acres (EI<8)	Approx. Acres EI<8 (Acres Out)	Trees and Erosion Ineligible Total	Eligible Pool	% Acres Out Eligible
PACIFIC											
ALASKA	25,348	25,348	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	25,348	100%
CALIFORNIA	187,499	183,054	1,572	0.84%	1,535	78,000	42%	76,151	77,686	105,369	58%
HAWAII	85	85	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	85	100%
OREGON	530,766	519,886	3,215	0.61%	3,149	221,400	42%	216,862	220,011	299,875	58%
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	983,557	1,496	0.14%	1,405	721,100	69%	677,386	678,791	304,765	31%
Total	1,790,727	1,711,930	6,283	0.35%	6,089	1,020,500	57%	975,595	981,685	735,443	43%
MOUNTAIN											
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,978,390	1,954,598	642	0.03%	634	253,400	13%	250,353	250,987	1,703,611	87%
IDAHO	877,059	810,611	2,869	0.33%	2,652	540,500	62%	499,551	502,202	308,409	38%
MONTANA	2,854,307	2,769,301	1,238	0.04%	1,201	797,800	28%	774,040	775,241	1,994,060	72%
NEVADA	3,123	3,124	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	3,124	100%
NEW MEXICO	483,181	480,795	0	0.00%	0	60,600	13%	60,301	60,301	420,494	87%
UTAH	233,978	232,318	0	0.00%	0	183,500	78%	182,198	182,198	69,695	30% *
WYOMING	257,224	257,022	8	0.00%	8	12,900	5%	12,890	12,898	244,124	95%
Total	6,687,262	6,507,769	4,757	0.07%	4,495	1,848,700	28%	1,799,079	1,803,574	4,743,517	73%
NORTHERN PLAINS											
KANSAS	2,937,863	2,870,598	3,067	0.10%	2,997	1,190,800	41%	1,163,536	1,166,532	1,704,066	59%
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	1,359,450	4,182	0.29%	3,988	481,000	34%	458,738	462,726	896,724	66%
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	3,150,998	1,312	0.04%	1,300	1,594,500	50%	1,579,675	1,580,975	1,570,023	50%
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	2,088,767	1,254	0.06%	1,235	1,233,100	58%	1,214,787	1,216,023	872,744	42%
Total	9,664,110	9,469,814	9,815	0.10%	9,520	4,499,400	47%	4,408,940	4,418,460	5,043,557	53%
SOUTHERN PLAINS											
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	1,161,097	1,857	0.16%	1,808	600,200	50%	584,392	586,200	574,896	50%
TEXAS	4,150,485	3,960,407	21,075	0.51%	20,110	1,718,500	41%	1,639,798	1,659,908	2,300,498	58%
Total	5,342,989	5,121,503	22,932	0.43%	21,918	2,318,700	43%	2,222,582	2,244,500	2,875,395	56%
LAKE STATES											
MICHIGAN	332,853	214,097	17,342	5.21%	11,155	215,300	65%	138,485	149,639	64,457	30%
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	1,850,902	51,974	2.69%	49,871	1,391,100	72%	1,334,812	1,384,683	555,271	30% *
WISCONSIN	746,530	635,830	66,278	8.88%	56,449	288,100	39%	245,379	301,828	334,002	53%
Total	3,008,337	2,700,829	135,593	4.51%	117,475	1,894,500	63%	1,700,847	1,818,322	953,730	35%
CORNBELT STATES											
ILLINOIS	811,926	661,984	35,580	4.38%	29,009	373,500	46%	304,524	333,533	328,450	50%
INDIANA	462,649	379,647	18,066	3.90%	14,825	269,500	58%	221,150	235,975	143,672	38%
IOWA	2,224,834	2,007,381	15,957	0.72%	14,397	893,000	40%	805,719	820,116	1,187,264	59%
MISSOURI	1,726,835	1,537,280	20,920	1.21%	18,624	537,700	31%	478,677	497,300	1,039,980	68%
OHIO	377,089	273,397	12,450	3.30%	9,027	238,900	63%	173,207	182,234	91,163	33%
Total	5,603,333	4,859,688	102,973	1.84%	85,882	2,312,600	41%	2,005,684	2,091,565	2,790,530	57%
DELTA											
ARKANSAS	260,006	234,498	150,862	58.02%	136,062	170,200	65%	153,502	289,564	70,349	30% *
LOUISIANNA	146,571	137,689	79,244	54.07%	74,442	116,000	79%	108,971	183,413	41,307	30% *
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	759,968	514,798	61.15%	464,740	427,800	51%	386,201	850,941	227,990	30% *
Total	1,248,403	1,132,155	744,904	59.67%	675,243	714,000	57%	647,514	1,322,757	339,646	30% *
SOUTHEASTERN											
ALABAMA	573,190	536,016	311,130	54.28%	290,952	303,400	53%	283,723	574,675	160,805	30% *
FLORIDA	134,860	125,351	122,967	91.18%	114,296	108,400	80%	100,756	215,053	37,605	30% *
GEORGIA	706,459	674,552	645,931	91.43%	616,757	519,300	74%	495,846	1,112,603	202,365	30% *
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	268,077	217,537	78.23%	209,718	211,000	76%	203,416	413,134	80,423	30% *
Total	1,692,580	1,603,995	1,297,565	76.66%	1,231,724	1,142,100	67%	1,082,325	2,314,049	481,198	30% *
APPALACHIAN											
KENTUCKY	451,317	423,560	3,878	0.86%	3,639	128,700	29%	120,785	124,424	299,136	71%
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	140,144	88,503	58.61%	82,136	42,200	28%	39,164	121,300	42,043	30% *
TENNESEE	475,625	440,208	30,275	6.37%	28,021	175,700	37%	162,617	190,637	249,571	57%
VIRGINIA	79,556	75,337	29,713	37.35%	28,137	30,900	39%	29,261	57,399	22,601	30% *
WEST VIRGINIA	618	610	32	5.18%	32	0	0%	0	32	578	95%
Total	1,158,124	1,079,859	152,401	13.16%	141,965	377,500	33%	351,989	493,954	613,930	57%
NORTHEASTERN											
CONNECTICUT	10	10	10	100.00%	10	0	0%	0	10	3	30% *
DELAWARE	995	995	173	17.39%	173	900	90%	900	1,073	299	30% *
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	38,490	37,501	2,569	6.67%	2,503	16,400	43%	15,979	18,481	19,019	51%
MARYLAND	20,392	17,634	1,853	9.09%	1,602	16,400	80%	14,182	15,784	5,290	30% *
MASSACHUSETTES	32	32	10	31.25%	10	0	0%	0	10	22	69%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	723	661	27	3.73%	25	600	83%	548	573	198	30% *
NEW YORK	64,498	57,644	3,627	5.62%	3,242	29,800	46%	26,633	29,875	27,769	48%
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	94,417	2,242	2.22%	2,094	38,600	38%	36,056	38,150	56,266	60%
RHODE ISLAND	455	455	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	455	100%
VERMONT	193	187	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	187	100%
Total	226,866	209,536	10,511	4.63%	9,659	101,800	45%	94,024	103,682	109,509	52%
US Total	36,422,731	34,397,078	2,487,734	6.83%	2,303,970	16,229,800	45%	15,327,178	17,631,148	18,686,454	54%

** If the sum of acres ineligible is 70% or more of acres out in any year, the acres eligible for re-enrollment is set at 30%.*

*** Some land now in the CRP that is found ineligible for re-enrollment on the basis of erosion hazard may be re-enrolled to preserve wildlife habitat or improve water quality (through partial field enrollments).*

Appendix Table 1.1: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control**, 1996

REGION (STATES)	Total Acres Enrolled (12 Signups)	1996 Acres Out (In:1987)	Adjustments For Acres in Trees: Acres Trees (12 Signups)	% Acres Trees	Approx. Acres Trees (Acres Out)	Erosion Hazard: EI<8 (12 Signups)	% Acres (EI<8)	Approx. Acres EI<8 (Acres Out)	Trees and Erosion Ineligible Total	Eligible Pool	% Acres Out Eligible
PACIFIC											
ALASKA	25,348	20,573	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	20,573	100%
CALIFORNIA	187,499	124,324	1,572	0.84%	1,042	78,000	42%	51,719	52,762	71,563	58%
HAWAII	85	85	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	85	100%
OREGON	530,766	390,752	3,215	0.61%	2,367	221,400	42%	162,995	165,362	225,389	58%
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	538,056	1,496	0.14%	769	721,100	69%	370,565	371,334	166,722	31%
Total	1,790,727	1,073,790	6,283	0.35%	4,178	1,020,500	57%	611,932	616,110	484,333	45%
MOUNTAIN											
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,978,390	1,311,107	642	0.03%	425	253,400	13%	167,932	168,357	1,142,750	87%
IDAHO	877,059	477,399	2,869	0.33%	1,562	540,500	62%	294,204	295,765	181,633	38%
MONTANA	2,854,307	819,230	1,238	0.04%	355	797,800	28%	228,981	229,336	589,894	72%
NEVADA	3,123	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
NEW MEXICO	483,181	425,563	0	0.00%	0	60,600	13%	53,374	53,374	372,190	87%
UTAH	233,978	169,953	0	0.00%	0	183,500	78%	133,288	133,288	50,986	30% *
WYOMING	257,224	115,835	8	0.00%	4	12,900	5%	5,809	5,813	110,023	95%
Total	6,687,262	3,319,088	4,757	0.07%	2,346	1,848,700	28%	917,565	919,911	2,447,475	74%
NORTHERN PLAINS											
KANSAS	2,937,863	978,083	3,067	0.10%	1,021	1,190,800	41%	396,445	397,466	580,617	59%
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	695,513	4,182	0.29%	2,041	481,000	34%	234,696	236,737	458,776	66%
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	631,273	1,312	0.04%	260	1,594,500	50%	316,473	316,734	314,540	50%
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	407,665	1,254	0.06%	241	1,233,100	58%	237,090	237,331	170,334	42%
Total	9,664,110	2,712,534	9,815	0.10%	3,563	4,499,400	47%	1,262,897	1,266,460	1,524,266	56%
SOUTHERN PLAINS											
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	524,666	1,857	0.16%	817	600,200	50%	264,070	264,887	259,779	50%
TEXAS	4,150,485	1,968,477	21,075	0.51%	9,995	1,718,500	41%	815,044	825,039	1,143,437	58%
Total	5,342,989	2,493,142	22,932	0.43%	10,812	2,318,700	43%	1,081,950	1,092,763	1,403,216	56%
LAKE STATES											
MICHIGAN	332,853	72,323	17,342	5.21%	3,768	215,300	65%	46,781	50,549	21,774	30%
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	1,142,888	51,974	2.69%	30,794	1,391,100	72%	824,214	855,008	342,866	30% *
WISCONSIN	746,530	233,247	66,278	8.88%	20,708	288,100	39%	90,014	110,722	122,525	53%
Total	3,008,337	1,448,458	135,593	4.51%	55,270	1,894,500	63%	912,166	967,436	487,165	34%
CORNBELT STATES											
ILLINOIS	811,926	273,113	35,580	4.38%	11,968	373,500	46%	125,637	137,605	135,508	50%
INDIANA	462,649	149,321	18,066	3.90%	5,831	269,500	58%	86,982	92,813	56,508	38%
IOWA	2,224,834	1,254,283	15,957	0.72%	8,996	893,000	40%	503,442	512,438	741,845	59%
MISSOURI	1,726,835	882,952	20,920	1.21%	10,697	537,700	31%	274,933	285,629	597,322	68%
OHIO	377,089	104,225	12,450	3.30%	3,441	238,900	63%	66,031	69,472	34,753	33%
Total	5,603,333	2,663,894	102,973	1.84%	40,933	2,312,600	41%	1,099,439	1,140,372	1,565,938	59%
DELTA											
ARKANSAS	260,006	94,116	150,862	58.02%	54,608	170,200	65%	61,608	116,217	28,235	30% *
LOUISIANNA	146,571	45,502	79,244	54.07%	24,601	116,000	79%	36,011	60,612	13,651	30% *
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	396,117	514,798	61.15%	242,236	427,800	51%	201,299	443,535	118,835	30% *
Total	1,248,403	535,735	744,904	59.67%	321,445	714,000	57%	306,403	627,848	160,721	30% *
SOUTHEASTERN											
ALABAMA	573,190	310,776	311,130	54.28%	168,690	303,400	53%	164,499	333,190	93,233	30% *
FLORIDA	134,860	51,734	122,967	91.18%	47,172	108,400	80%	41,584	88,755	15,520	30% *
GEORGIA	706,459	262,677	645,931	91.43%	240,171	519,300	74%	193,087	433,258	78,803	30% *
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	134,310	217,537	78.23%	105,071	211,000	76%	101,914	206,986	40,293	30% *
Total	1,692,580	759,496	1,297,565	76.66%	561,104	1,142,100	67%	512,484	1,073,588	227,849	30% *
APPALACHIAN											
KENTUCKY	451,317	283,857	3,878	0.86%	2,439	128,700	29%	80,946	83,385	200,472	71%
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	62,122	88,503	58.61%	36,408	42,200	28%	17,360	53,769	18,637	30% *
TENNESEE	475,625	253,749	30,275	6.37%	16,152	175,700	37%	93,737	109,889	143,860	57%
VIRGINIA	79,556	26,814	29,713	37.35%	10,015	30,900	39%	10,415	20,429	8,044	30% *
WEST VIRGINIA	618	312	32	5.18%	16	0	0%	0	16	296	95%
Total	1,158,124	626,853	152,401	13.16%	65,030	377,500	33%	204,328	269,358	371,308	59%
NORTHEASTERN											
CONNECTICUT	10	0	10	100.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
DELAWARE	995	155	173	17.39%	27	900	90%	140	167	47	30% *
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	38,490	14,508	2,569	6.67%	968	16,400	43%	6,182	7,150	7,358	51%
MARYLAND	20,392	2,760	1,853	9.09%	251	16,400	80%	2,220	2,470	828	30% *
MASSACHUSETTES	32	25	10	31.25%	8	0	0%	0	8	17	69%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	723	234	27	3.73%	9	600	83%	195	203	70	30% *
NEW YORK	64,498	25,738	3,627	5.62%	1,447	29,800	46%	11,892	13,339	12,399	48%
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	35,856	2,242	2.22%	795	38,600	38%	13,693	14,488	21,368	60%
RHODE ISLAND	455	228	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	228	100%
VERMONT	193	184	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	184	100%
Total	226,866	79,688	10,511	4.63%	3,505	101,800	45%	35,758	39,263	42,499	53%
US Total	36,422,731	15,712,679	2,487,734	6.83%	1,068,187	16,229,800	45%	7,001,497	8,069,684	8,714,769	55%

** If the sum of acres ineligible is 70% or more of acres out in any year, the acres eligible for re-enrollment is set at 30%.*

*** Some land now in the CRP that is found ineligible for re-enrollment on the basis of erosion hazard may be re-enrolled to preserve wildlife habitat or improve water quality (through partial field enrollments).*

Appendix Table 1.2: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control**, 1997

REGION (STATES)	Total Acres Enrolled (12 Signups)	1997 Acres Out (in:1988)	*Adjustments For Acres in Trees* Acres Trees (12 Signups)	% Acres Trees	Approx. Acres Trees (Acres Out)	*Erosion Hazard* EI<8 (12 Signups)	% Acres (EI<8)	Approx. Acres EI<8 (Acres Out)	Trees and Erosion Ineligible Total	Eligible Pool	% Acres Out Eligible
PACIFIC											
ALASKA	25,348	3,990	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	3,990	100%
CALIFORNIA	187,499	32,509	1,572	0.84%	273	78,000	42%	13,524	13,797	18,713	58%
HAWAII	85	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
OREGON	530,766	96,329	3,215	0.61%	583	221,400	42%	40,182	40,765	55,563	58%
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	283,190	1,496	0.14%	405	721,100	69%	195,036	195,440	87,749	31%
Total	1,790,727	416,018	6,283	0.35%	1,261	1,020,500	57%	237,080	238,341	166,015	40%
MOUNTAIN											
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,978,390	322,691	642	0.03%	105	253,400	13%	41,332	41,436	281,255	87%
IDAHO	877,059	174,758	2,869	0.33%	572	540,500	62%	107,697	108,268	66,489	38%
MONTANA	2,854,307	1,044,571	1,238	0.04%	453	797,800	28%	291,965	292,418	752,153	72%
NEVADA	3,123	2,073	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	2,073	100%
NEW MEXICO	483,181	37,939	0	0.00%	0	60,600	13%	4,758	4,758	33,181	87%
UTAH	233,978	45,944	0	0.00%	0	183,500	78%	36,032	36,032	13,783	30% *
WYOMING	257,224	93,128	8	0.00%	3	12,900	5%	4,670	4,673	88,455	95%
Total	6,687,262	1,721,103	4,757	0.07%	1,132	1,848,700	28%	475,800	476,933	1,237,387	72%
NORTHERN PLAINS											
KANSAS	2,937,863	1,054,646	3,067	0.10%	1,101	1,190,800	41%	427,478	428,579	626,067	59%
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	315,314	4,182	0.29%	925	481,000	34%	106,401	107,326	207,988	66%
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	984,459	1,312	0.04%	406	1,594,500	50%	493,534	493,940	490,518	50%
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	481,846	1,254	0.06%	285	1,233,100	58%	280,232	280,517	201,329	42%
Total	9,664,110	2,836,264	9,815	0.10%	2,717	4,499,400	47%	1,320,503	1,323,220	1,525,901	54%
SOUTHERN PLAINS											
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	365,116	1,857	0.16%	569	600,200	50%	183,767	184,335	180,781	50%
TEXAS	4,150,485	1,073,697	21,075	0.51%	5,452	1,718,500	41%	444,562	450,014	623,683	58%
Total	5,342,989	1,438,813	22,932	0.43%	6,020	2,318,700	43%	624,402	630,423	804,463	56%
LAKE STATES											
MICHIGAN	332,853	54,812	17,342	5.21%	2,856	215,300	65%	35,454	38,310	16,502	30%
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	341,002	51,974	2.69%	9,188	1,391,100	72%	245,919	255,107	102,300	30% *
WISCONSIN	746,530	173,317	66,278	8.88%	15,387	288,100	39%	66,886	82,273	91,043	53%
Total	3,008,337	569,131	135,593	4.51%	27,431	1,894,500	63%	358,410	385,841	209,846	37%
CORNBELT STATES											
ILLINOIS	811,926	116,495	35,580	4.38%	5,105	373,500	46%	53,590	58,695	57,800	50%
INDIANA	462,649	67,910	18,066	3.90%	2,652	269,500	58%	39,559	42,211	25,700	38%
IOWA	2,224,834	238,673	15,957	0.72%	1,712	893,000	40%	95,798	97,510	141,163	59%
MISSOURI	1,726,835	392,979	20,920	1.21%	4,761	537,700	31%	122,365	127,126	265,853	68%
OHIO	377,089	43,452	12,450	3.30%	1,435	238,900	63%	27,529	28,963	14,489	33%
Total	5,603,333	859,510	102,973	1.84%	15,664	2,312,600	41%	354,736	370,400	505,005	59%
DELTA											
ARKANSAS	260,006	53,395	150,862	58.02%	30,981	170,200	65%	34,952	65,933	16,018	30% *
LOUISIANNA	146,571	34,679	79,244	54.07%	18,749	116,000	79%	27,446	46,195	10,404	30% *
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	146,491	514,798	61.15%	89,583	427,800	51%	74,444	164,026	43,947	30% *
Total	1,248,403	234,564	744,904	59.67%	139,313	714,000	57%	134,154	273,467	70,369	30% *
SOUTHEASTERN											
ALABAMA	573,190	116,097	311,130	54.28%	63,018	303,400	53%	61,452	124,470	34,829	30% *
FLORIDA	134,860	36,625	122,967	91.18%	33,395	108,400	80%	29,439	62,835	10,988	30% *
GEORGIA	706,459	176,741	645,931	91.43%	161,598	519,300	74%	129,918	291,516	53,022	30% *
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	60,343	217,537	78.23%	47,206	211,000	76%	45,788	92,994	18,103	30% *
Total	1,692,580	389,805	1,297,565	76.66%	305,218	1,142,100	67%	263,028	568,246	116,942	30% *
APPALACHIAN											
KENTUCKY	451,317	74,011	3,878	0.86%	636	128,700	29%	21,105	21,741	52,270	71%
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	40,631	88,503	58.61%	23,813	42,200	28%	11,355	35,168	12,189	30% *
TENNESEE	475,625	94,466	30,275	6.37%	6,013	175,700	37%	34,896	40,910	53,556	57%
VIRGINIA	79,556	23,091	29,713	37.35%	8,624	30,900	39%	8,969	17,593	6,927	30% *
WEST VIRGINIA	618	205	32	5.18%	11	0	0%	0	11	195	95%
Total	1,158,124	232,405	152,401	13.16%	39,097	377,500	33%	75,754	114,851	125,137	54%
NORTHEASTERN											
CONNECTICUT	10	10	10	100.00%	10	0	0%	0	10	3	30% *
DELAWARE	995	297	173	17.39%	52	900	90%	268	320	89	30% *
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	38,490	13,996	2,569	6.67%	934	16,400	43%	5,963	6,898	7,098	51%
MARYLAND	20,392	3,921	1,853	9.09%	356	16,400	80%	3,153	3,509	1,176	30% *
MASSACHUSETTES	32	0	10	31.25%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	723	129	27	3.73%	5	600	83%	107	112	39	30% *
NEW YORK	64,498	16,353	3,627	5.62%	920	29,800	46%	7,556	8,475	7,878	48%
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	23,999	2,242	2.22%	532	38,600	38%	9,165	9,697	14,302	60%
RHODE ISLAND	455	152	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	152	100%
VERMONT	193	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
Total	226,866	58,857	10,511	4.63%	2,809	101,800	45%	26,410	29,219	30,737	52%
US Total	36,422,731	8,756,467	2,487,734	6.83%	540,662	16,229,800	45%	3,901,841	4,442,503	4,791,803	55%

** If the sum of acres ineligible is 70% or more of acres out in any year, the acres eligible for re-enrollment is set at 30%.*

*** Some land now in the CRP that is found ineligible for re-enrollment on the basis of erosion hazard may be re-enrolled to preserve wildlife habitat or improve water quality (through partial field enrollments).*

Appendix Table 1.3: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control**, 1998

REGION (STATES)	Total Acres Enrolled (12 Signups)	1998 Acres Out (In:1989)	*Adjustments For Acres in Trees* Acres Trees (12 Signups)	% Acres Trees	Approx. Acres Trees (Acres Out)	*Erosion Hazard* EI<8 (12 Signups)	% Acres (EI<8)	Approx. Acres EI<8 (Acres Out)	Trees and Erosion Ineligible Total	Eligible Pool	% Acres Out Eligible	
PACIFIC												
ALASKA	25,348	138	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	138	100%	
CALIFORNIA	187,499	18,940	1,572	0.84%	159	78,000	42%	7,879	8,038	10,902	58%	
HAWAII	85	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	
OREGON	530,766	22,192	3,215	0.61%	134	221,400	42%	9,257	9,392	12,801	58%	
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	73,708	1,496	0.14%	105	721,100	69%	50,763	50,869	22,839	31%	
Total	1,790,727	114,978	6,283	0.35%	399	1,020,500	57%	65,524	65,922	46,680	41%	
MOUNTAIN												
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
COLORADO	1,978,390	158,965	642	0.03%	52	253,400	13%	20,361	20,413	138,553	87%	
IDAHO	877,059	93,116	2,869	0.33%	305	540,500	62%	57,384	57,688	35,427	38%	
MONTANA	2,854,307	521,287	1,238	0.04%	226	797,800	28%	145,704	145,930	375,357	72%	
NEVADA	3,123	324	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	324	100%	
NEW MEXICO	483,181	14,880	0	0.00%	0	60,600	13%	1,866	1,866	13,014	87%	
UTAH	233,978	13,555	0	0.00%	0	183,500	78%	10,631	10,631	4,067	30% *	
WYOMING	257,224	22,401	8	0.00%	1	12,900	5%	1,123	1,124	21,276	95%	
Total	6,687,262	824,528	4,757	0.07%	583	1,848,700	28%	227,942	228,524	588,018	71%	
NORTHERN PLAINS												
KANSAS	2,937,863	427,889	3,067	0.10%	447	1,190,800	41%	173,436	173,882	254,007	59%	
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	191,269	4,182	0.29%	561	481,000	34%	64,543	65,104	126,166	66%	
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	794,082	1,312	0.04%	328	1,594,500	50%	398,094	398,421	395,661	50%	
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	503,290	1,254	0.06%	298	1,233,100	58%	292,704	293,002	210,288	42%	
Total	9,664,110	1,916,531	9,815	0.10%	1,633	4,499,400	47%	892,295	893,928	986,122	51%	
SOUTHERN PLAINS												
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	148,640	1,857	0.16%	231	600,200	50%	74,812	75,044	73,596	50%	
TEXAS	4,150,485	575,591	21,075	0.51%	2,923	1,718,500	41%	238,322	241,245	334,346	58%	
Total	5,342,989	724,231	22,932	0.43%	3,154	2,318,700	43%	314,295	317,449	407,943	56%	
LAKE STATES												
MICHIGAN	332,853	44,665	17,342	5.21%	2,327	215,300	65%	28,891	31,218	13,447	30%	
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	220,812	51,974	2.69%	5,950	1,391,100	72%	159,243	165,192	66,244	30% *	
WISCONSIN	746,530	107,549	66,278	8.88%	9,548	288,100	39%	41,505	51,053	56,495	53%	
Total	3,008,337	373,026	135,593	4.51%	17,825	1,894,500	63%	234,913	252,738	136,186	37%	
CORNBELT STATES												
ILLINOIS	811,926	145,948	35,580	4.38%	6,396	373,500	46%	67,139	73,534	72,414	50%	
INDIANA	462,649	93,289	18,066	3.90%	3,643	269,500	58%	54,342	57,985	35,304	38%	
IOWA	2,224,834	282,883	15,957	0.72%	2,029	893,000	40%	113,543	115,572	167,311	59%	
MISSOURI	1,726,835	155,044	20,920	1.21%	1,878	537,700	31%	48,277	50,156	104,888	68%	
OHIO	377,089	57,520	12,450	3.30%	1,899	238,900	63%	36,441	38,340	19,180	33%	
Total	5,603,333	734,685	102,973	1.84%	15,845	2,312,600	41%	303,218	319,063	399,097	54%	
DELTA												
ARKANSAS	260,006	48,964	150,862	58.02%	28,410	170,200	65%	32,052	60,462	14,689	30% *	
LOUISIANNA	146,571	27,642	79,244	54.07%	14,945	116,000	79%	21,876	36,821	8,293	30% *	
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	105,212	514,798	61.15%	64,340	427,800	51%	53,467	117,807	31,564	30% *	
Total	1,248,403	181,818	744,904	59.67%	107,695	714,000	57%	103,987	211,682	54,545	30% *	
SOUTHEASTERN												
ALABAMA	573,190	72,993	311,130	54.28%	39,621	303,400	53%	38,637	78,258	21,898	30% *	
FLORIDA	134,860	24,479	122,967	91.18%	22,320	108,400	80%	19,676	41,996	7,344	30% *	
GEORGIA	706,459	159,959	645,931	91.43%	146,254	519,300	74%	117,582	263,836	47,988	30% *	
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	47,454	217,537	78.23%	37,124	211,000	76%	36,008	73,132	14,236	30% *	
Total	1,692,580	304,885	1,297,565	76.66%	245,319	1,142,100	67%	205,727	451,046	91,466	30% *	
APPALACHIAN												
KENTUCKY	451,317	40,258	3,878	0.86%	346	128,700	29%	11,480	11,826	28,432	71%	
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	23,058	88,503	58.61%	13,514	42,200	28%	6,444	19,957	6,917	30% *	
TENNESEE	475,625	57,468	30,275	6.37%	3,658	175,700	37%	21,229	24,887	32,581	57%	
VIRGINIA	79,556	16,498	29,713	37.35%	6,162	30,900	39%	6,408	12,570	4,949	30% *	
WEST VIRGINIA	618	78	32	5.18%	4	0	0%	0	4	74	95%	
Total	1,158,124	137,360	152,401	13.16%	23,683	377,500	33%	44,773	68,457	72,953	53%	
NORTHEASTERN												
CONNECTICUT	10	0	10	100.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	
DELAWARE	995	413	173	17.39%	72	900	90%	374	446	124	30% *	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
MAINE	38,490	7,293	2,569	6.67%	487	16,400	43%	3,107	3,594	3,699	51%	
MARYLAND	20,392	5,132	1,853	9.09%	466	16,400	80%	4,127	4,594	1,540	30% *	
MASSACHUSETTES	32	7	10	31.25%	2	0	0%	0	2	5	69%	
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
NEW JERSEY	723	132	27	3.73%	5	600	83%	110	115	40	30% *	
NEW YORK	64,498	9,052	3,627	5.62%	509	29,800	46%	4,182	4,691	4,361	48%	
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	20,516	2,242	2.22%	455	38,600	38%	7,835	8,290	12,226	60%	
RHODE ISLAND	455	60	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	60	100%	
VERMONT	193	3	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	3	100%	
Total	226,866	42,607	10,511	4.63%	1,996	101,800	45%	19,119	21,115	22,056	52%	
US Total	36,422,731	5,354,649	2,487,734	6.83%	418,132	16,229,800	45%	2,386,007	2,804,139	2,805,066	52%	

** If the sum of acres ineligible is 70% or more of acres out in any year, the acres eligible for re-enrollment is set at 30%.*

*** Some land now in the CRP that is found ineligible for re-enrollment on the basis of erosion hazard may be re-enrolled to preserve wildlife habitat or improve water quality (through partial field enrollments).*

Appdenix Table 1.4: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control**, 1999

REGION (STATES)	Total Acres Enrolled (12 Signups)	1999 Acres Out (In:1990)	*Adjustments For Acres in Trees* Acres Trees (12 Signups)	% Acres Trees	Approx. Acres Trees (Acres Out)	*Erosion Hazard* EI<8 (12 Signups)	% Acres (EI<8)	Approx. Acres EI<8 (Acres Out)	Trees and Erosion Ineligible Total	Eligible Pool	% Acres Out Eligible
PACIFIC											
ALASKA	25,348	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
CALIFORNIA	187,499	7,280	1,572	0.84%	61	78,000	42%	3,029	3,090	4,191	58%
HAWAII	85	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
OREGON	530,766	7,877	3,215	0.61%	48	221,400	42%	3,286	3,334	4,544	58%
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	80,367	1,496	0.14%	115	721,100	69%	55,350	55,464	24,903	31%
Total	1,790,727	95,524	6,283	0.35%	224	1,020,500	57%	54,437	54,661	33,637	35%
MOUNTAIN											
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,978,390	160,279	642	0.03%	52	253,400	13%	20,529	20,581	139,697	87%
IDAHO	877,059	45,789	2,869	0.33%	150	540,500	62%	28,218	28,368	17,421	38%
MONTANA	2,854,307	335,045	1,238	0.04%	145	797,800	28%	93,648	93,793	241,252	72%
NEVADA	3,123	727	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	727	100%
NEW MEXICO	483,181	2,383	0	0.00%	0	60,600	13%	299	299	2,084	87%
UTAH	233,978	2,866	0	0.00%	0	183,500	78%	2,248	2,248	860	30% *
WYOMING	257,224	25,658	8	0.00%	1	12,900	5%	1,287	1,288	24,371	95%
Total	6,687,262	572,747	4,757	0.07%	348	1,848,700	28%	158,337	158,684	426,413	74%
NORTHERN PLAINS											
KANSAS	2,937,863	401,168	3,067	0.10%	419	1,190,800	41%	162,605	163,024	238,144	59%
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	146,834	4,182	0.29%	431	481,000	34%	49,548	49,979	96,855	66%
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	727,385	1,312	0.04%	300	1,594,500	50%	364,656	364,956	362,428	50%
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	691,756	1,254	0.06%	409	1,233,100	58%	402,312	402,721	289,035	42%
Total	9,664,110	1,967,142	9,815	0.10%	1,559	4,499,400	47%	915,859	917,418	986,462	50%
SOUTHERN PLAINS											
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	117,028	1,857	0.16%	182	600,200	50%	58,902	59,084	57,945	50%
TEXAS	4,150,485	303,613	21,075	0.51%	1,542	1,718,500	41%	125,710	127,252	176,361	58%
Total	5,342,989	420,642	22,932	0.43%	1,724	2,318,700	43%	182,546	184,270	234,306	56%
LAKE STATES											
MICHIGAN	332,853	24,505	17,342	5.21%	1,277	215,300	65%	15,850	17,127	7,378	30%
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	125,970	51,974	2.69%	3,394	1,391,100	72%	90,846	94,240	37,791	30% *
WISCONSIN	746,530	89,948	66,278	8.88%	7,986	288,100	39%	34,712	42,698	47,249	53%
Total	3,008,337	240,423	135,593	4.51%	12,656	1,894,500	63%	151,406	164,063	92,418	38%
CORNBELT STATES											
ILLINOIS	811,926	98,025	35,580	4.38%	4,296	373,500	46%	45,093	49,389	48,636	50%
INDIANA	462,649	54,209	18,066	3.90%	2,117	269,500	58%	31,577	33,694	20,515	38%
IOWA	2,224,834	194,319	15,957	0.72%	1,394	893,000	40%	77,995	79,389	114,930	59%
MISSOURI	1,726,835	73,439	20,920	1.21%	890	537,700	31%	22,867	23,757	49,682	68%
OHIO	377,089	48,932	12,450	3.30%	1,616	238,900	63%	31,000	32,616	16,316	33%
Total	5,603,333	468,923	102,973	1.84%	10,311	2,312,600	41%	193,533	203,844	250,078	53%
DELTA											
ARKANSAS	260,006	28,879	150,862	58.02%	16,756	170,200	65%	18,904	35,660	8,664	30% *
LOUISIANNA	146,571	25,085	79,244	54.07%	13,562	116,000	79%	19,853	33,415	7,525	30% *
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	79,078	514,798	61.15%	48,358	427,800	51%	40,186	88,544	23,723	30% *
Total	1,248,403	133,041	744,904	59.67%	78,676	714,000	57%	76,090	154,767	39,912	30% *
SOUTHEASTERN											
ALABAMA	573,190	19,664	311,130	54.28%	10,674	303,400	53%	10,409	21,082	5,899	30% *
FLORIDA	134,860	10,175	122,967	91.18%	9,278	108,400	80%	8,179	17,457	3,053	30% *
GEORGIA	706,459	63,779	645,931	91.43%	58,315	519,300	74%	46,882	105,197	19,134	30% *
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	23,407	217,537	78.23%	18,312	211,000	76%	17,761	36,073	7,022	30% *
Total	1,692,580	117,026	1,297,565	76.66%	96,578	1,142,100	67%	78,965	175,543	35,108	30% *
APPALACHIAN											
KENTUCKY	451,317	18,673	3,878	0.86%	160	128,700	29%	5,325	5,485	13,188	71%
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	11,229	88,503	58.61%	6,581	42,200	28%	3,138	9,719	3,369	30% *
TENNESEE	475,625	23,670	30,275	6.37%	1,507	175,700	37%	8,744	10,251	13,419	57%
VIRGINIA	79,556	7,535	29,713	37.35%	2,814	30,900	39%	2,927	5,741	2,261	30% *
WEST VIRGINIA	618	14	32	5.18%	1	0	0%	0	1	14	95%
Total	1,158,124	61,122	152,401	13.16%	11,064	377,500	33%	19,923	30,987	32,250	53%
NORTHEASTERN											
CONNECTICUT	10	0	10	100.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
DELAWARE	995	119	173	17.39%	21	900	90%	108	129	36	30% *
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	38,490	1,426	2,569	6.67%	95	16,400	43%	608	703	723	51%
MARYLAND	20,392	4,246	1,853	9.09%	386	16,400	80%	3,415	3,801	1,274	30% *
MASSACHUSETTES	32	0	10	31.25%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	723	165	27	3.73%	6	600	83%	137	143	49	30% *
NEW YORK	64,498	3,463	3,627	5.62%	195	29,800	46%	1,600	1,795	1,668	48%
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	12,095	2,242	2.22%	268	38,600	38%	4,619	4,887	7,208	60%
RHODE ISLAND	455	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
VERMONT	193	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
Total	226,866	21,514	10,511	4.63%	971	101,800	45%	9,654	10,625	10,958	51%
US Total	36,422,731	4,098,104	2,487,734	6.83%	214,111	16,229,800	45%	1,826,096	2,040,207	2,141,542	52%

** If the sum of acres ineligible is 70% or more of acres out in any year, the acres eligible for re-enrollment is set at 30%.*

*** Some land now in the CRP that is found ineligible for re-enrollment on the basis of erosion hazard may be re-enrolled to preserve wildlife habitat or improve water quality (through partial field enrollments).*

Appendix Table 1.5: Estimate of Land in the CRP Eligible for Re-enrollment for Erosion Control**, 2000

REGION (STATES)	Total Acres Enrolled (12 Signups)	2000 Acres Out (In:1991)	*Adjustments For Acres in Trees* Acres Trees (12 Signups)	% Acres Trees	Approx. Acres Trees (Acres Out)	*Erosion Hazard* EI<8 (12 Signups)	% Acres (EI<8)	Approx. Acres EI<8 (Acres Out)	Trees and Erosion Ineligible Total	Eligible Pool	% Acres Out Eligible
PACIFIC											
ALASKA	25,348	648	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	648	100%
CALIFORNIA	187,499	0	1,572	0.84%	0	78,000	42%	0	0	0	0%
HAWAII	85	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
OREGON	530,766	2,736	3,215	0.61%	17	221,400	42%	1,141	1,158	1,578	58%
WASHINGTON	1,047,029	8,236	1,496	0.14%	12	721,100	69%	5,672	5,684	2,552	31%
Total	1,790,727	11,620	6,283	0.35%	28	1,020,500	57%	6,622	6,650	4,778	41%
MOUNTAIN											
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,978,390	1,556	642	0.03%	1	253,400	13%	199	200	1,356	87%
IDAHO	877,059	19,551	2,869	0.33%	64	540,500	62%	12,048	12,112	7,438	38%
MONTANA	2,854,307	49,168	1,238	0.04%	21	797,800	28%	13,743	13,764	35,403	72%
NEVADA	3,123	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
NEW MEXICO	483,181	29	0	0.00%	0	60,600	13%	4	4	26	87%
UTAH	233,978	0	0	0.00%	0	183,500	78%	0	0	0	0%
WYOMING	257,224	0	8	0.00%	0	12,900	5%	0	0	0	0%
Total	6,687,262	70,304	4,757	0.07%	86	1,848,700	28%	19,435	19,521	44,224	63%
NORTHERN PLAINS											
KANSAS	2,937,863	8,812	3,067	0.10%	9	1,190,800	41%	3,572	3,581	5,231	59%
NEBRASKA	1,425,423	10,521	4,182	0.29%	31	481,000	34%	3,550	3,581	6,940	66%
NORTH DAKOTA	3,180,569	13,799	1,312	0.04%	6	1,594,500	50%	6,918	6,924	6,876	50%
SOUTH DAKOTA	2,120,255	4,210	1,254	0.06%	2	1,233,100	58%	2,449	2,451	1,759	42%
Total	9,664,110	37,342	9,815	0.10%	48	4,499,400	47%	17,386	17,434	20,806	56%
SOUTHERN PLAINS											
OKLAHOMA	1,192,504	5,647	1,857	0.16%	9	600,200	50%	2,842	2,851	2,796	50%
TEXAS	4,150,485	39,029	21,075	0.51%	198	1,718,500	41%	16,160	16,358	22,671	58%
Total	5,342,989	44,676	22,932	0.43%	207	2,318,700	43%	19,388	19,595	25,467	57%
LAKE STATES											
MICHIGAN	332,853	17,792	17,342	5.21%	927	215,300	65%	11,508	12,435	5,357	30%
MINNESOTA	1,928,954	20,230	51,974	2.69%	545	1,391,100	72%	14,589	15,134	6,069	30% *
WISCONSIN	746,530	31,770	66,278	8.88%	2,821	288,100	39%	12,261	15,081	16,689	53%
Total	3,008,337	69,792	135,593	4.51%	4,293	1,894,500	63%	43,952	48,244	28,114	40%
CORNBELT STATES											
ILLINOIS	811,926	28,403	35,580	4.38%	1,245	373,500	46%	13,066	14,311	14,093	50%
INDIANA	462,649	14,917	18,066	3.90%	583	269,500	58%	8,690	9,272	5,645	38%
IOWA	2,224,834	37,222	15,957	0.72%	267	893,000	40%	14,940	15,207	22,015	59%
MISSOURI	1,726,835	32,867	20,920	1.21%	398	537,700	31%	10,234	10,632	22,235	68%
OHIO	377,089	19,267	12,450	3.30%	636	238,900	63%	12,207	12,843	6,425	33%
Total	5,603,333	132,677	102,973	1.84%	3,128	2,312,600	41%	54,758	57,887	70,412	53%
DELTA											
ARKANSAS	260,006	9,144	150,862	58.02%	5,306	170,200	65%	5,986	11,292	2,743	30% *
LOUISIANNA	146,571	4,782	79,244	54.07%	2,585	116,000	79%	3,784	6,370	1,435	30% *
MISSISSIPPI	841,826	33,070	514,798	61.15%	20,223	427,800	51%	16,806	37,029	9,921	30% *
Total	1,248,403	46,996	744,904	59.67%	28,114	714,000	57%	26,879	54,993	14,099	30% *
SOUTHEASTERN											
ALABAMA	573,190	16,487	311,130	54.28%	8,949	303,400	53%	8,727	17,676	4,946	30% *
FLORIDA	134,860	2,338	122,967	91.18%	2,132	108,400	80%	1,879	4,011	701	30% *
GEORGIA	706,459	11,396	645,931	91.43%	10,419	519,300	74%	8,377	18,796	3,419	30% *
SOUTH CAROLINA	278,071	2,563	217,537	78.23%	2,005	211,000	76%	1,945	3,950	769	30% *
Total	1,692,580	32,783	1,297,565	76.66%	23,505	1,142,100	67%	22,121	45,626	9,835	30% *
APPALACHIAN											
KENTUCKY	451,317	6,761	3,878	0.86%	58	128,700	29%	1,928	1,986	4,775	71%
NORTH CAROLINA	151,008	3,103	88,503	58.61%	1,819	42,200	28%	867	2,686	931	30% *
TENNESEE	475,625	10,856	30,275	6.37%	691	175,700	37%	4,010	4,701	6,155	57%
VIRGINIA	79,556	1,399	29,713	37.35%	522	30,900	39%	543	1,066	420	30% *
WEST VIRGINIA	618	0	32	5.18%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
Total	1,158,124	22,120	152,401	13.16%	3,090	377,500	33%	7,210	10,300	12,280	56%
NORTHEASTERN											
CONNECTICUT	10	0	10	100.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
DELAWARE	995	11	173	17.39%	2	900	90%	10	12	3	30% *
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	38,490	278	2,569	6.67%	19	16,400	43%	119	137	141	51%
MARYLAND	20,392	1,575	1,853	9.09%	143	16,400	80%	1,267	1,410	473	30% *
MASSACHUSETTES	32	0	10	31.25%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	723	0	27	3.73%	0	600	83%	0	0	0	0%
NEW YORK	64,498	3,039	3,627	5.62%	171	29,800	46%	1,404	1,575	1,464	48%
PENNSYLVANIA	101,078	1,952	2,242	2.22%	43	38,600	38%	745	789	1,163	60%
RHODE ISLAND	455	15	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	15	100%
VERMONT	193	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
Total	226,866	6,870	10,511	4.63%	378	101,800	45%	3,083	3,461	3,259	47%
US Total	36,422,731	475,179	2,487,734	6.83%	62,878	16,229,800	45%	211,738	274,615	233,274	49%

** If the sum of acres ineligible is 70% or more of acres out in any year, the acres eligible for re-enrollment is set at 30%.*

*** Some land now in the CRP that is found ineligible for re-enrollment on the basis of erosion hazard may be re-enrolled to preserve wildlife habitat or improve water quality (through partial field enrollments).*

Appendix Table 2.1. Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP, 1996.

REGION STATE	Eligible Pool Erosion*	 Wildlife	 Total	Projected Re-enrollment	Projected Acres Re-enrolled	% Acres EconUse/BT**	Acres In EconUse/BT	Acres Not EconUse/BT
PACIFIC								
ALASKA	20,573	16,232	36,805	70%	25,764	35%	9,017	16,746
CALIFORNIA	71,563	40,750	112,313	70%	78,619	35%	27,517	51,102
HAWAII	85	0	85	70%	60	35%	21	39
OREGON	225,389	37,581	262,970	70%	184,079	35%	64,428	119,651
WASHINGTON	166,722	82,058	248,780	70%	174,146	35%	60,951	113,195
Total	484,333	184,397	660,953	70%	462,667	35%	161,933	300,734
MOUNTAIN								
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,142,750	0	1,142,750	82%	937,055	40%	374,822	562,233
IDAHO	181,633	117,787	299,421	82%	245,525	40%	98,210	147,315
MONTANA	589,894	88,748	678,642	82%	556,486	40%	222,594	333,892
NEVADA	0	0	0	82%	0	40%	0	0
NEW MEXICO	372,190	0	372,190	82%	305,196	40%	122,078	183,117
UTAH	50,986	87,786	138,772	82%	113,793	40%	45,517	68,276
WYOMING	110,023	0	110,023	82%	90,218	40%	36,087	54,131
Total	2,447,475	319,897	2,741,797	82%	2,248,273	40%	899,309	1,348,964
NORTHERN PLAINS								
KANSAS	580,617	272,580	853,197	80%	682,557	50%	341,279	341,279
NEBRASKA	458,776	127,903	586,679	80%	469,343	50%	234,672	234,672
NORTH DAKOTA	314,540	180,307	494,846	80%	395,877	50%	197,939	197,939
SOUTH DAKOTA	170,334	175,653	345,987	80%	276,789	50%	138,395	138,395
Total	1,524,266	861,328	2,385,595	80%	1,824,567	50%	912,284	912,284
SOUTHERN PLAINS								
OKLAHOMA	259,779	180,748	440,527	77%	339,206	45%	152,643	186,563
TEXAS	1,143,437	596,447	1,739,884	77%	1,339,711	45%	602,870	736,841
Total	1,403,216	780,813	2,184,029	77%	1,678,917	45%	755,513	923,404
LAKE STATES								
MICHIGAN	21,774	20,268	42,043	75%	31,532	75%	23,649	7,883
MINNESOTA	342,866	123,495	466,362	75%	349,771	75%	262,328	87,443
WISCONSIN	122,525	36,684	159,208	75%	119,406	75%	89,555	29,852
Total	487,165	183,888	671,053	75%	500,709	75%	375,532	125,177
CORNBELT STATES								
ILLINOIS	135,508	8,251	143,759	70%	100,632	60%	60,379	40,253
INDIANA	56,508	7,866	64,375	70%	45,062	60%	27,037	18,025
IOWA	741,845	24,993	766,839	70%	536,787	60%	322,072	214,715
MISSOURI	597,322	22,974	620,297	70%	434,208	60%	260,525	173,683
OHIO	34,753	7,624	42,378	70%	29,665	60%	17,799	11,866
Total	1,565,938	78,563	1,644,500	70%	1,146,353	60%	687,812	458,541
DELTA								
ARKANSAS	28,235	12,041	40,275	75%	30,206	30%	9,062	21,145
LOUISIANNA	13,651	13,219	26,869	75%	20,152	30%	6,046	14,106
MISSISSIPPI	118,835	52,123	170,958	75%	128,219	30%	38,466	89,753
Total	160,721	80,444	241,164	75%	178,577	30%	53,573	125,004
SOUTHEASTERN								
ALABAMA	93,233	17,394	110,626	80%	88,501	30%	26,550	61,951
FLORIDA	15,520	16,509	32,029	80%	25,623	30%	7,687	17,936
GEORGIA	78,803	23,365	102,168	80%	81,734	30%	24,520	57,214
SOUTH CAROLINA	40,293	20,041	60,333	80%	48,267	30%	14,480	33,787
Total	227,849	80,495	308,344	80%	244,125	30%	73,237	170,887
APPALACHIAN								
KENTUCKY	200,472	20,105	220,577	80%	176,461	35%	61,761	114,700
NORTH CAROLINA	18,637	8,865	27,502	80%	22,002	35%	7,701	14,301
TENNESEE	143,860	17,293	161,153	80%	128,922	35%	45,123	83,799
VIRGINIA	8,044	7,118	15,163	80%	12,130	35%	4,246	7,885
WEST VIRGINIA	296	0	296	80%	237	35%	83	154
Total	371,308	60,481	431,789	80%	339,752	35%	118,913	220,839
NORTHEASTERN								
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
DELAWARE	47	47	93	75%	70	65%	45	24
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	7,358	5,803	13,161	75%	9,871	65%	6,416	3,455
MARYLAND	828	1,565	2,393	75%	1,795	65%	1,167	628
MASSACHUSETTES	17	0	17	75%	13	65%	8	5
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	70	106	177	75%	133	65%	86	46
NEW YORK	12,399	8,930	21,329	75%	15,997	65%	10,398	5,599
PENNSYLVANIA	21,368	11,393	32,760	75%	24,570	65%	15,971	8,600
RHODE ISLAND	228	0	228	75%	171	65%	111	60
VERMONT	184	0	184	75%	138	65%	90	48
Total	42,499	29,339	71,838	75%	52,757	65%	34,292	18,465
US Total	8,714,769	2,968,714	11,683,483	77%	8,676,698	48%	4,190,663	4,486,035

* Derivation of acres eligible for erosion control is presented in Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options.

Appendix Table 2.2. Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP, 1997.

REGION / STATE	Eligible Pool: Erosion*	Eligible Pool: Wildlife	Eligible Pool: Total	Projected Re-enrollment	Projected Acres Re-enrolled	% Acres EconUse/BT**	Acres In EconUse/BT	Acres Not EconUse/BT
PACIFIC								
ALASKA	3,990	3,148	7,138	70%	4,996	35%	1,749	3,248
CALIFORNIA	18,713	10,656	29,369	70%	20,558	35%	7,195	13,363
HAWAII	0	0	0	70%	0	35%	0	0
OREGON	55,563	9,264	64,828	70%	45,379	35%	15,883	29,497
WASHINGTON	87,749	43,189	130,938	70%	91,657	35%	32,080	59,577
Total	166,015	63,206	232,272	70%	162,590	35%	56,907	105,684
MOUNTAIN								
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	281,255	0	281,255	82%	230,629	40%	92,252	138,377
IDAHO	66,489	43,117	109,607	82%	89,877	40%	35,951	53,926
MONTANA	752,153	113,159	865,312	82%	709,556	40%	283,822	425,733
NEVADA	2,073	0	2,073	82%	1,699	40%	680	1,020
NEW MEXICO	33,181	0	33,181	82%	27,208	40%	10,883	16,325
UTAH	13,783	23,732	37,515	82%	30,762	40%	12,305	18,457
WYOMING	88,455	0	88,455	82%	72,533	40%	29,013	43,520
Total	1,237,387	161,732	1,417,395	82%	1,162,264	40%	464,906	697,358
NORTHERN PLAINS								
KANSAS	626,067	293,917	919,983	80%	735,987	50%	367,993	367,993
NEBRASKA	207,988	57,986	265,973	80%	212,779	50%	106,389	106,389
NORTH DAKOTA	490,518	281,185	771,703	80%	617,363	50%	308,681	308,681
SOUTH DAKOTA	201,329	207,616	408,944	80%	327,156	50%	163,578	163,578
Total	1,525,901	862,252	2,388,154	80%	1,893,283	50%	946,642	946,642
SOUTHERN PLAINS								
OKLAHOMA	180,781	125,783	306,564	77%	236,054	45%	106,224	129,830
TEXAS	623,683	325,329	949,012	77%	730,739	45%	328,833	401,907
Total	804,463	447,640	1,252,103	77%	966,793	45%	435,057	531,736
LAKE STATES								
MICHIGAN	16,502	15,361	31,863	75%	23,897	75%	17,923	5,974
MINNESOTA	102,300	36,847	139,148	75%	104,361	75%	78,270	26,090
WISCONSIN	91,043	27,258	118,302	75%	88,726	75%	66,545	22,182
Total	209,846	79,210	289,056	75%	216,984	75%	162,738	54,246
CORNBELT STATES								
ILLINOIS	57,800	3,520	61,320	70%	42,924	60%	25,754	17,169
INDIANA	25,700	3,578	29,277	70%	20,494	60%	12,296	8,198
IOWA	141,163	4,756	145,919	70%	102,143	60%	61,286	40,857
MISSOURI	265,853	10,225	276,078	70%	193,255	60%	115,953	77,302
OHIO	14,489	3,179	17,668	70%	12,367	60%	7,420	4,947
Total	505,005	25,336	530,341	70%	371,183	60%	222,710	148,473
DELTA								
ARKANSAS	16,018	6,831	22,849	75%	17,137	30%	5,141	11,996
LOUISIANNA	10,404	10,075	20,478	75%	15,359	30%	4,608	10,751
MISSISSIPPI	43,947	19,276	63,223	75%	47,417	30%	14,225	33,192
Total	70,369	35,221	105,590	75%	79,913	30%	23,974	55,939
SOUTHEASTERN								
ALABAMA	34,829	6,498	41,327	80%	33,061	30%	9,918	23,143
FLORIDA	10,988	11,687	22,675	80%	18,140	30%	5,442	12,698
GEORGIA	53,022	15,721	68,743	80%	54,995	30%	16,498	38,496
SOUTH CAROLINA	18,103	9,004	27,107	80%	21,685	30%	6,506	15,180
Total	116,942	41,314	158,255	80%	127,881	30%	38,364	89,517
APPALACHIAN								
KENTUCKY	52,270	5,242	57,512	80%	46,010	35%	16,103	29,906
NORTH CAROLINA	12,189	5,799	17,988	80%	14,390	35%	5,037	9,354
TENNESEE	53,556	6,438	59,994	80%	47,995	35%	16,798	31,197
VIRGINIA	6,927	6,130	13,057	80%	10,446	35%	3,656	6,790
WEST VIRGINIA	195	0	195	80%	156	35%	54	101
Total	125,137	20,383	145,520	80%	118,997	35%	41,649	77,348
NORTHEASTERN								
CONNECTICUT	3	0	3	75%	2	65%	1	1
DELAWARE	89	89	178	75%	134	65%	87	47
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	7,098	5,598	12,697	75%	9,522	65%	6,190	3,333
MARYLAND	1,176	2,223	3,400	75%	2,550	65%	1,657	892
MASSACHUSETTES	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	39	59	98	75%	73	65%	48	26
NEW YORK	7,878	5,674	13,552	75%	10,164	65%	6,606	3,557
PENNSYLVANIA	14,302	7,625	21,927	75%	16,445	65%	10,689	5,756
RHODE ISLAND	152	0	152	75%	114	65%	74	40
VERMONT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
Total	30,737	21,219	51,956	75%	39,004	65%	25,353	13,652
US Total	4,791,803	1,632,343	6,424,146	77%	5,138,894	48%	2,481,978	2,656,916

* Derivation of acres eligible for erosion control is presented in Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options.

Appendix Table 2.3. Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP, 1998.

REGION / STATE	Eligible Pool: Erosion*	Eligible Pool: Wildlife	Eligible Pool: Total	Projected Re-enrollment	Projected Acres Re-enrolled	% Acres EconUse/BT**	Acres In EconUse/BT	Acres Not EconUse/BT
PACIFIC								
ALASKA	138	109	247	70%	173	35%	61	112
CALIFORNIA	10,902	6,208	17,110	70%	11,977	35%	4,192	7,785
HAWAII	0	0	0	70%	0	35%	0	0
OREGON	12,801	2,134	14,935	70%	10,455	35%	3,659	6,795
WASHINGTON	22,839	11,241	34,080	70%	23,856	35%	8,350	15,507
Total	46,680	17,772	66,373	70%	46,461	35%	16,261	30,199
MOUNTAIN								
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	138,553	0	138,553	82%	113,613	40%	45,445	68,168
IDAHO	35,427	22,974	58,401	82%	47,889	40%	19,156	28,733
MONTANA	375,357	56,471	431,829	82%	354,099	40%	141,640	212,460
NEVADA	324	0	324	82%	266	40%	106	159
NEW MEXICO	13,014	0	13,014	82%	10,671	40%	4,268	6,403
UTAH	4,067	7,002	11,068	82%	9,076	40%	3,630	5,446
WYOMING	21,276	0	21,276	82%	17,447	40%	6,979	10,468
Total	588,018	76,857	674,465	82%	553,062	40%	221,225	331,837
NORTHERN PLAINS								
KANSAS	254,007	119,247	373,254	80%	298,603	50%	149,302	149,302
NEBRASKA	126,166	35,174	161,340	80%	129,072	50%	64,536	64,536
NORTH DAKOTA	395,661	226,809	622,470	80%	497,976	50%	248,988	248,988
SOUTH DAKOTA	210,288	216,856	427,144	80%	341,715	50%	170,858	170,858
Total	986,122	557,235	1,543,357	80%	1,267,366	50%	633,683	633,683
SOUTHERN PLAINS								
OKLAHOMA	73,596	51,207	124,803	77%	96,098	45%	43,244	52,854
TEXAS	334,346	174,404	508,750	77%	391,737	45%	176,282	215,456
Total	407,943	226,998	634,940	77%	487,836	45%	219,526	268,310
LAKE STATES								
MICHIGAN	13,447	12,517	25,964	75%	19,473	75%	14,605	4,868
MINNESOTA	66,244	23,860	90,104	75%	67,578	75%	50,683	16,894
WISCONSIN	56,495	16,915	73,410	75%	55,057	75%	41,293	13,764
Total	136,186	51,406	187,592	75%	142,108	75%	106,581	35,527
CORNBELT STATES								
ILLINOIS	72,414	4,409	76,823	70%	53,776	60%	32,266	21,510
INDIANA	35,304	4,915	40,219	70%	28,153	60%	16,892	11,261
IOWA	167,311	5,637	172,948	70%	121,064	60%	72,638	48,425
MISSOURI	104,888	4,034	108,922	70%	76,246	60%	45,747	30,498
OHIO	19,180	4,208	23,388	70%	16,371	60%	9,823	6,549
Total	399,097	20,023	419,120	70%	295,610	60%	177,366	118,244
DELTA								
ARKANSAS	14,689	6,264	20,953	75%	15,715	30%	4,715	11,001
LOUISIANNA	8,293	8,030	16,323	75%	12,242	30%	3,673	8,569
MISSISSIPPI	31,564	13,844	45,408	75%	34,056	30%	10,217	23,839
Total	54,545	27,301	81,847	75%	62,013	30%	18,604	43,409
SOUTHEASTERN								
ALABAMA	21,898	4,085	25,983	80%	20,787	30%	6,236	14,551
FLORIDA	7,344	7,811	15,155	80%	12,124	30%	3,637	8,487
GEORGIA	47,988	14,228	62,216	80%	49,773	30%	14,932	34,841
SOUTH CAROLINA	14,236	7,081	21,317	80%	17,053	30%	5,116	11,937
Total	91,466	32,313	123,779	80%	99,737	30%	29,921	69,816
APPALACHIAN								
KENTUCKY	28,432	2,851	31,283	80%	25,026	35%	8,759	16,267
NORTH CAROLINA	6,917	3,291	10,208	80%	8,166	35%	2,858	5,308
TENNESEE	32,581	3,916	36,497	80%	29,198	35%	10,219	18,979
VIRGINIA	4,949	4,380	9,329	80%	7,463	35%	2,612	4,851
WEST VIRGINIA	74	0	74	80%	59	35%	21	39
Total	72,953	11,883	84,836	80%	69,913	35%	24,470	45,444
NORTHEASTERN								
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
DELAWARE	124	125	248	75%	186	65%	121	65
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	3,699	2,917	6,615	75%	4,962	65%	3,225	1,737
MARYLAND	1,540	2,910	4,450	75%	3,338	65%	2,169	1,168
MASSACHUSETTES	5	0	5	75%	4	65%	2	1
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	40	60	100	75%	75	65%	49	26
NEW YORK	4,361	3,141	7,501	75%	5,626	65%	3,657	1,969
PENNSYLVANIA	12,226	6,519	18,745	75%	14,058	65%	9,138	4,920
RHODE ISLAND	60	0	60	75%	45	65%	29	16
VERMONT	3	0	3	75%	2	65%	2	1
Total	22,056	15,227	37,283	75%	28,295	65%	18,392	9,903
US Total	2,805,066	955,555	3,760,621	77%	3,052,401	48%	1,474,245	1,578,156

* Derivation of acres eligible for erosion control is presented in Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options.

Appendix Table 2.4. Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP, 1999.

REGION STATE	Eligible Pool Erosion*	 Wildlife	 Total	Projected Re-enrollment	Projected Acres Re-enrolled	% Acres EconUse/BT**	Acres In EconUse/BT	Acres Not EconUse/BT
PACIFIC								
ALASKA	0	0	0	70%	0	35%	0	0
CALIFORNIA	4,191	2,386	6,577	70%	4,604	35%	1,611	2,993
HAWAII	0	0	0	70%	0	35%	0	0
OREGON	4,544	758	5,301	70%	3,711	35%	1,299	2,412
WASHINGTON	24,903	12,257	37,159	70%	26,011	35%	9,104	16,907
Total	33,637	12,806	49,037	70%	34,326	35%	12,014	22,312
MOUNTAIN								
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	139,697	0	139,697	82%	114,552	40%	45,821	68,731
IDAHO	17,421	11,297	28,719	82%	23,549	40%	9,420	14,130
MONTANA	241,252	36,296	277,548	82%	227,589	40%	91,036	136,554
NEVADA	727	0	727	82%	596	40%	238	358
NEW MEXICO	2,084	0	2,084	82%	1,709	40%	684	1,026
UTAH	860	1,480	2,340	82%	1,919	40%	768	1,151
WYOMING	24,371	0	24,371	82%	19,984	40%	7,994	11,990
Total	426,413	55,734	475,486	82%	389,898	40%	155,959	233,939
NORTHERN PLAINS								
KANSAS	238,144	111,800	349,945	80%	279,956	50%	139,978	139,978
NEBRASKA	96,855	27,002	123,857	80%	99,086	50%	49,543	49,543
NORTH DAKOTA	362,428	207,758	570,187	80%	456,149	50%	228,075	228,075
SOUTH DAKOTA	289,035	298,061	587,096	80%	469,677	50%	234,838	234,838
Total	986,462	557,427	1,543,889	80%	1,304,868	50%	652,434	652,434
SOUTHERN PLAINS								
OKLAHOMA	57,945	40,317	98,261	77%	75,661	45%	34,047	41,614
TEXAS	176,361	91,995	268,356	77%	206,634	45%	92,985	113,649
Total	234,306	130,378	364,684	77%	282,295	45%	127,033	155,262
LAKE STATES								
MICHIGAN	7,378	6,867	14,245	75%	10,684	75%	8,013	2,671
MINNESOTA	37,791	13,612	51,403	75%	38,552	75%	28,914	9,638
WISCONSIN	47,249	14,146	61,396	75%	46,047	75%	34,535	11,512
Total	92,418	34,885	127,303	75%	95,283	75%	71,462	23,821
CORNBELT STATES								
ILLINOIS	48,636	2,962	51,598	70%	36,118	60%	21,671	14,447
INDIANA	20,515	2,856	23,370	70%	16,359	60%	9,816	6,544
IOWA	114,930	3,872	118,802	70%	83,161	60%	49,897	33,264
MISSOURI	49,682	1,911	51,593	70%	36,115	60%	21,669	14,446
OHIO	16,316	3,580	19,896	70%	13,927	60%	8,356	5,571
Total	250,078	12,546	262,624	70%	185,680	60%	111,408	74,272
DELTA								
ARKANSAS	8,664	3,695	12,358	75%	9,269	30%	2,781	6,488
LOUISIANNA	7,525	7,287	14,813	75%	11,110	30%	3,333	7,777
MISSISSIPPI	23,723	10,405	34,129	75%	25,597	30%	7,679	17,918
Total	39,912	19,977	59,889	75%	45,975	30%	13,792	32,182
SOUTHEASTERN								
ALABAMA	5,899	1,101	7,000	80%	5,600	30%	1,680	3,920
FLORIDA	3,053	3,247	6,300	80%	5,040	30%	1,512	3,528
GEORGIA	19,134	5,673	24,807	80%	19,845	30%	5,954	13,892
SOUTH CAROLINA	7,022	3,493	10,515	80%	8,412	30%	2,524	5,888
Total	35,108	12,403	47,511	80%	38,897	30%	11,669	27,228
APPALACHIAN								
KENTUCKY	13,188	1,323	14,510	80%	11,608	35%	4,063	7,545
NORTH CAROLINA	3,369	1,603	4,971	80%	3,977	35%	1,392	2,585
TENNESEE	13,419	1,613	15,033	80%	12,026	35%	4,209	7,817
VIRGINIA	2,261	2,000	4,261	80%	3,409	35%	1,193	2,216
WEST VIRGINIA	14	0	14	80%	11	35%	4	7
Total	32,250	5,253	37,503	80%	31,031	35%	10,861	20,170
NORTHEASTERN								
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
DELAWARE	36	36	72	75%	54	65%	35	19
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	723	570	1,294	75%	970	65%	631	340
MARYLAND	1,274	2,408	3,682	75%	2,761	65%	1,795	966
MASSACHUSETTES	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	49	75	124	75%	93	65%	61	33
NEW YORK	1,668	1,201	2,870	75%	2,152	65%	1,399	753
PENNSYLVANIA	7,208	3,843	11,051	75%	8,288	65%	5,387	2,901
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
VERMONT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
Total	10,958	7,565	18,523	75%	14,319	65%	9,307	5,012
US Total	2,141,542	729,523	2,871,065	77%	2,422,572	48%	1,170,051	1,252,521

* Derivation of acres eligible for erosion control is presented in Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options.

Appendix Table 2.5. Estimated Re-enrollment of Land Currently in the CRP, 2000.

REGION / STATE	Eligible Pool: Erosion*	Eligible Pool: Wildlife	Eligible Pool: Total	Projected Re-enrollment	Projected Acres Re-enrolled	% Acres EconUse/BT**	Acres In EconUse/BT	Acres Not EconUse/BT
PACIFIC								
ALASKA	648	511	1,158	70%	811	35%	284	527
CALIFORNIA	0	0	0	70%	0	35%	0	0
HAWAII	0	0	0	70%	0	35%	0	0
OREGON	1,578	263	1,841	70%	1,289	35%	451	838
WASHINGTON	2,552	1,256	3,808	70%	2,666	35%	933	1,733
Total	4,778	1,819	6,808	70%	4,766	35%	1,668	3,098
MOUNTAIN								
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	1,356	0	1,356	82%	1,112	40%	445	667
IDAHO	7,438	4,824	12,262	82%	10,055	40%	4,022	6,033
MONTANA	35,403	5,326	40,730	82%	33,398	40%	13,359	20,039
NEVADA	0	0	0	82%	0	40%	0	0
NEW MEXICO	26	0	26	82%	21	40%	8	13
UTAH	0	0	0	82%	0	40%	0	0
WYOMING	0	0	0	82%	0	40%	0	0
Total	44,224	5,780	54,374	82%	44,587	40%	17,835	26,752
NORTHERN PLAINS								
KANSAS	5,231	2,456	7,687	80%	6,150	50%	3,075	3,075
NEBRASKA	6,940	1,935	8,874	80%	7,100	50%	3,550	3,550
NORTH DAKOTA	6,876	3,941	10,817	80%	8,654	50%	4,327	4,327
SOUTH DAKOTA	1,759	1,814	3,573	80%	2,859	50%	1,429	1,429
Total	20,806	11,757	32,562	80%	24,761	50%	12,381	12,381
SOUTHERN PLAINS								
OKLAHOMA	2,796	1,945	4,741	77%	3,651	45%	1,643	2,008
TEXAS	22,671	11,826	34,497	77%	26,562	45%	11,953	14,609
Total	25,467	14,171	39,638	77%	30,213	45%	13,596	16,617
LAKE STATES								
MICHIGAN	5,357	4,986	10,343	75%	7,757	75%	5,818	1,939
MINNESOTA	6,069	2,186	8,255	75%	6,191	75%	4,643	1,548
WISCONSIN	16,689	4,997	21,686	75%	16,264	75%	12,198	4,066
Total	28,114	10,612	38,727	75%	30,212	75%	22,659	7,553
CORNBELT STATES								
ILLINOIS	14,093	858	14,951	70%	10,466	60%	6,279	4,186
INDIANA	5,645	786	6,431	70%	4,502	60%	2,701	1,801
IOWA	22,015	742	22,757	70%	15,930	60%	9,558	6,372
MISSOURI	22,235	855	23,090	70%	16,163	60%	9,698	6,465
OHIO	6,425	1,409	7,834	70%	5,484	60%	3,290	2,194
Total	70,412	3,533	73,945	70%	52,544	60%	31,526	21,018
DELTA								
ARKANSAS	2,743	1,170	3,913	75%	2,935	30%	880	2,054
LOUISIANNA	1,435	1,389	2,824	75%	2,118	30%	635	1,482
MISSISSIPPI	9,921	4,351	14,272	75%	10,704	30%	3,211	7,493
Total	14,099	7,057	21,156	75%	15,757	30%	4,727	11,030
SOUTHEASTERN								
ALABAMA	4,946	923	5,869	80%	4,695	30%	1,408	3,286
FLORIDA	701	746	1,447	80%	1,158	30%	347	810
GEORGIA	3,419	1,014	4,432	80%	3,546	30%	1,064	2,482
SOUTH CAROLINA	769	382	1,151	80%	921	30%	276	645
Total	9,835	3,475	13,309	80%	10,320	30%	3,096	7,224
APPALACHIAN								
KENTUCKY	4,775	479	5,254	80%	4,203	35%	1,471	2,732
NORTH CAROLINA	931	443	1,374	80%	1,099	35%	385	714
TENNESEE	6,155	740	6,894	80%	5,516	35%	1,930	3,585
VIRGINIA	420	371	791	80%	633	35%	221	411
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	0	80%	0	35%	0	0
Total	12,280	2,000	14,281	80%	11,451	35%	4,008	7,443
NORTHEASTERN								
CONNECTICUT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
DELAWARE	3	3	7	75%	5	65%	3	2
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	141	111	253	75%	189	65%	123	66
MARYLAND	473	893	1,366	75%	1,024	65%	666	358
MASSACHUSETTES	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
NEW YORK	1,464	1,054	2,518	75%	1,888	65%	1,228	661
PENNSYLVANIA	1,163	620	1,783	75%	1,338	65%	869	468
RHODE ISLAND	15	0	15	75%	11	65%	7	4
VERMONT	0	0	0	75%	0	65%	0	0
Total	3,259	2,250	5,509	75%	4,456	65%	2,896	1,560
US Total	233,274	79,466	312,740	77%	229,066	48%	110,634	118,432

* Derivation of acres eligible for erosion control is presented in Appendix Tables 1.0 through 1.5.

** Econ Use is Economic Use; BT is Base Transfer. Enrollment and expenditure estimates are based on the assumption that on average one half of the land enrolled will be under economic use or base transfer options.

Appendix Table 3.0: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-enrolled, 1996-2000.

REGION (STATES)	Payment Per Acre (12 Signups)	Weighted Avg. Rent (1987-89)**	Est. Excess Payment (12 Signups)	Est. Payment Rate Re-enroll	% Reduction EconUse	Adj. Payment EconUse	Expendit. EconUse (1997-2000)	Expendit. Other (1997-2000)	Total Expenditures (1997-2000)
PACIFIC									
ALASKA	$37	$40	($3)	$40	75%	$30	$333,310	$825,339	$1,158,649
CALIFORNIA	$49	$112	($63)	$49	75%	$36	$1,476,568	$3,656,263	$5,132,830
HAWAII	$80	N/A	N/A	$80	75%	$60	$1,250	$3,094	$4,344
OREGON	$49	$49	($0)	$50	75%	$37	$3,183,621	$7,883,252	$11,066,873
WASHINGTON	$50	$46	$4	$45	75%	$34	$3,736,944	$9,253,385	$12,990,329
Total	$50	$54	($4)	$47	75%	$35	$8,731,692	$21,621,333	$30,353,025
MOUNTAIN									
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	$41	$26	$16	$23	85%	$20	$10,943,234	$19,311,589	$30,254,823
IDAHO	$46	$35	$11	$38	85%	$33	$5,420,307	$9,565,248	$14,985,556
MONTANA	$37	$22	$15	$19	85%	$16	$12,331,176	$21,760,899	$34,092,075
NEVADA	$40	N/A	N/A	$40	85%	$34	$34,833	$61,470	$96,304
NEW MEXICO	$38	N/A	N/A	$38	85%	$32	$4,454,882	$7,861,557	$12,316,440
UTAH	$40	$26	$14	$23	85%	$19	$1,193,132	$2,105,528	$3,298,660
WYOMING	$38	$13	$26	$13	85%	$11	$876,637	$1,547,007	$2,423,644
Total	$40	$23	$14	$24	85%	$20	$35,254,202	$62,213,298	$97,467,501
NORTHERN PLAINS									
KANSAS	$53	$30	$23	$28	80%	$22	$22,244,117	$27,805,146	$50,049,263
NEBRASKA	$56	$48	$7	$40	80%	$32	$14,766,134	$18,457,667	$33,223,801
NORTH DAKOTA	$38	$29	$9	$26	80%	$20	$20,171,195	$25,213,994	$45,385,189
SOUTH DAKOTA	$41	$27	$15	$26	80%	$21	$14,613,087	$18,266,359	$32,879,447
Total	$48	$32	$14	$28	80%	$23	$71,794,533	$89,743,166	$161,537,700
SOUTHERN PLAINS									
OKLAHOMA	$42	$25	$18	$20	80%	$16	$5,448,063	$8,323,430	$13,771,493
TEXAS	$40	$21	$18	$16	80%	$13	$15,680,665	$23,956,571	$39,637,236
Total	$40	$22	$18	$17	80%	$14	$21,128,728	$32,280,001	$53,408,728
LAKE STATES									
MICHIGAN	$59	$43	$16	$39	70%	$27	$1,921,000	$914,762	$2,835,762
MINNESOTA	$55	$43	$13	$39	70%	$27	$11,657,603	$5,551,240	$17,208,843
WISCONSIN	$67	$47	$19	$41	70%	$29	$6,999,580	$3,333,133	$10,332,714
Total	$59	$44	$15	$40	70%	$28	$20,578,183	$9,799,135	$30,377,318
CORNBELT STATES									
ILLINOIS	$77	$91	($13)	$86	75%	$64	$9,421,959	$8,375,075	$17,797,034
INDIANA	$74	$79	($5)	$72	75%	$54	$3,728,579	$3,314,292	$7,042,871
IOWA	$82	$89	($7)	$86	75%	$64	$33,091,954	$29,415,071	$62,507,025
MISSOURI	$63	$55	$8	$52	75%	$39	$17,635,640	$15,676,124	$33,311,764
OHIO	$71	$67	$4	$56	75%	$42	$1,974,927	$1,755,491	$3,730,418
Total	$74	$77	($2)	$71	75%	$54	$65,853,059	$58,536,052	$124,389,111
DELTA									
ARKANSAS	$49	$50	($1)	$41	85%	$34	$778,420	$2,136,839	$2,915,259
LOUISIANNA	$44	$47	($3)	$39	85%	$33	$600,849	$1,649,389	$2,250,238
MISSISSIPPI	$43	$37	$6	$35	85%	$30	$2,208,031	$6,061,262	$8,269,293
Total	$44	$41	$3	$37	85%	$31	$3,587,300	$9,847,490	$13,434,790
SOUTHEASTERN									
ALABAMA	$43	$30	$13	$29	85%	$25	$1,136,586	$3,120,041	$4,256,627
FLORIDA	$42	$108	($67)	$58	85%	$50	$925,824	$2,541,477	$3,467,300
GEORGIA	$43	$31	$12	$26	85%	$22	$1,370,177	$3,761,272	$5,131,449
SOUTH CAROLINA	$42	$24	$18	$19	85%	$16	$459,881	$1,262,418	$1,722,299
Total	$43	$35	$7	$29	85%	$25	$3,892,468	$10,685,208	$14,577,675
APPALACHIAN									
KENTUCKY	$59	$57	$3	$47	90%	$42	$3,914,876	$8,078,315	$11,993,191
NORTH CAROLINA	$46	$36	$10	$30	90%	$27	$476,551	$983,358	$1,459,909
TENNESEE	$52	$45	$6	$40	90%	$36	$2,789,893	$5,756,922	$8,546,815
VIRGINIA	$52	$37	$15	$30	90%	$27	$321,206	$662,807	$984,013
WEST VIRGINIA	$49	$33	$16	$30	90%	$27	$4,302	$8,877	$13,180
Total	$54	$48	$6	$42	90%	$38	$7,506,828	$15,490,280	$22,997,108
NORTHEASTERN									
CONNECTICUT	$50	N/A	N/A	$50	75%	$38	$55	$39	$94
DELAWARE	$66	$56	$10	$48	75%	$36	$10,471	$7,517	$17,988
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	$49	$36	$14	$36	75%	$27	$441,809	$317,196	$759,005
MARYLAND	$73	$52	$21	$49	75%	$36	$271,920	$195,225	$467,144
MASSACHUSETTES	$48	N/A	N/A	$48	75%	$36	$385	$276	$661
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	$53	$61	($8)	$57	75%	$43	$10,362	$7,439	$17,801
NEW YORK	$55	$34	$21	$31	75%	$23	$533,750	$383,205	$916,955
PENNSYLVANIA	$63	$44	$19	$34	75%	$25	$1,057,257	$759,056	$1,816,313
RHODE ISLAND	$60	N/A	N/A	$60	75%	$45	$9,982	$7,166	$17,148
VERMONT	$50	$40	$10	$32	75%	$24	$2,220	$1,594	$3,814
Total	$59	$40	$19	$35	75%	$26	$2,338,209	$1,678,714	$4,016,923
US Total	$50	$39	$9	$32	80%	$25	$240,665,203	$311,894,676	$552,559,879

* Estimated Payment Rate for states without data on 1994 cropland rental rates is set at the average rate for land in first 12 signups.

** Weighted Avg. for California, Nevada and New Mexico is 50% of rental rate for irrigated land from table 1.4.3 of USDA's "Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators." Estimate of average cropland rental rates during years of heavy CRP enrollment, weighted as: [rent 1987 + (2 x 1988) + (2 x 1989)] divided by 5.

Appendix Table 3.1: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-enrolled, 1996.

REGION (STATES)	Payment Per Acre (12 Signups)	Weighted Avg. Rent (1987-89)**	Est. Excess Payment (12 Signups)	Est. Payment Rate Re-enroll	% Reduction EconUse	Adj. Payment EconUse	Expendit. EconUse (1997)	Expendit. Other (1997)	Total Expenditures (1997)	Total Expenditures (1997-2000)
PACIFIC										
ALASKA	$37	$40	($3)	$40	75%	$30	$270,519	$669,856	$940,374	$3,761,497
CALIFORNIA	$49	$112	($63)	$49	75%	$36	$1,002,836	$2,483,212	$3,486,048	$13,944,192
HAWAII	$80	N/A	N/A	$80	75%	$60	$1,250	$3,094	$4,344	$17,374
OREGON	$49	$49	($0)	$50	75%	$37	$2,392,843	$5,925,134	$8,317,977	$33,271,907
WASHINGTON	$50	$46	$4	$45	75%	$34	$2,044,300	$5,062,076	$7,106,376	$28,425,502
Total	$50	$54	($4)	$47	75%	$35	$5,711,746	$14,143,372	$19,855,118	$79,420,471
MOUNTAIN										
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	$41	$26	$16	$23	85%	$20	$7,340,513	$12,953,847	$20,294,360	$81,177,440
IDAHO	$46	$35	$11	$38	85%	$33	$3,192,216	$5,633,322	$8,825,538	$35,302,152
MONTANA	$37	$22	$15	$19	85%	$16	$3,647,878	$6,437,433	$10,085,311	$40,341,244
NEVADA	$40	N/A	N/A	$40	85%	$34	$0	$0	$0	$0
NEW MEXICO	$38	N/A	N/A	$38	85%	$32	$3,943,126	$6,958,458	$10,901,584	$43,606,334
UTAH	$40	$26	$14	$23	85%	$19	$872,840	$1,540,305	$2,413,145	$9,652,580
WYOMING	$38	$13	$26	$13	85%	$11	$395,085	$697,209	$1,092,293	$4,369,173
Total	$40	$23	$14	$25	85%	$22	$19,391,658	$34,220,573	$53,612,231	$214,448,924
NORTHERN PLAINS										
KANSAS	$53	$30	$23	$28	80%	$22	$7,579,118	$9,473,897	$17,053,015	$68,212,059
NEBRASKA	$56	$48	$7	$40	80%	$32	$7,554,551	$9,443,189	$16,997,741	$67,990,963
NORTH DAKOTA	$38	$29	$9	$26	80%	$20	$4,041,113	$5,051,391	$9,092,504	$36,370,017
SOUTH DAKOTA	$41	$27	$15	$26	80%	$21	$2,852,036	$3,565,046	$6,417,082	$25,668,328
Total	$46	$32	$14	$30	80%	$24	$22,026,819	$27,533,523	$49,560,342	$198,241,367
SOUTHERN PLAINS										
OKLAHOMA	$42	$25	$18	$20	80%	$16	$2,461,820	$3,761,114	$6,222,935	$24,891,739
TEXAS	$40	$21	$18	$16	80%	$13	$7,793,902	$11,907,351	$19,701,253	$78,805,012
Total	$40	$22	$18	$17	80%	$14	$10,255,723	$15,668,465	$25,924,188	$103,696,752
LAKE STATES										
MICHIGAN	$59	$43	$16	$39	70%	$27	$648,927	$309,013	$957,939	$3,831,758
MINNESOTA	$55	$43	$13	$39	70%	$27	$7,198,292	$3,427,758	$10,626,050	$42,504,199
WISCONSIN	$67	$47	$19	$41	70%	$29	$2,567,714	$1,222,721	$3,790,435	$15,161,741
Total	$59	$44	$15	$40	70%	$28	$10,414,933	$4,959,492	$15,374,424	$61,497,697
CORNBELT STATES										
ILLINOIS	$77	$91	($13)	$86	75%	$64	$3,887,194	$3,455,284	$7,342,478	$29,369,913
INDIANA	$74	$79	($5)	$72	75%	$54	$1,466,508	$1,303,563	$2,770,071	$11,080,284
IOWA	$82	$89	($7)	$86	75%	$64	$20,677,040	$18,379,591	$39,056,631	$156,226,525
MISSOURI	$63	$55	$8	$52	75%	$39	$10,129,199	$9,003,733	$19,132,932	$76,531,727
OHIO	$71	$67	$4	$56	75%	$42	$752,886	$669,232	$1,422,119	$5,688,476
Total	$74	$77	($2)	$72	75%	$54	$36,912,828	$32,811,403	$69,724,231	$278,896,923
DELTA										
ARKANSAS	$49	$50	($1)	$41	85%	$34	$312,420	$857,622	$1,170,042	$4,680,167
LOUISIANNA	$44	$47	($3)	$39	85%	$33	$198,562	$545,072	$743,634	$2,974,534
MISSISSIPPI	$43	$37	$6	$35	85%	$30	$1,150,890	$3,159,305	$4,310,194	$17,240,777
Total	$44	$41	$3	$36	85%	$31	$1,661,871	$4,561,999	$6,223,870	$24,895,478
SOUTHEASTERN										
ALABAMA	$43	$30	$13	$29	85%	$25	$658,979	$1,808,961	$2,467,940	$9,871,761
FLORIDA	$42	$108	($67)	$58	85%	$50	$382,100	$1,048,902	$1,431,002	$5,724,008
GEORGIA	$43	$31	$12	$26	85%	$22	$533,560	$1,464,674	$1,998,233	$7,992,934
SOUTH CAROLINA	$42	$24	$18	$19	85%	$16	$230,406	$632,487	$862,893	$3,451,573
Total	$43	$35	$7	$29	85%	$25	$1,805,045	$4,955,024	$6,760,069	$27,040,276
APPALACHIAN										
KENTUCKY	$59	$57	$3	$47	90%	$42	$2,623,626	$5,413,831	$8,037,457	$32,149,828
NORTH CAROLINA	$46	$36	$10	$30	90%	$27	$211,242	$435,895	$647,137	$2,588,548
TENNESEE	$52	$45	$6	$40	90%	$36	$1,608,174	$3,318,454	$4,926,628	$19,706,511
VIRGINIA	$52	$37	$15	$30	90%	$27	$114,324	$235,907	$350,231	$1,400,926
WEST VIRGINIA	$49	$33	$16	$30	90%	$27	$2,202	$4,544	$6,746	$26,986
Total	$54	$48	$6	$43	90%	$38	$4,559,568	$9,408,632	$13,968,200	$55,872,799
NORTHEASTERN										
CONNECTICUT	$50	N/A	N/A	$50	75%	$38	$0	$0	$0	$0
DELAWARE	$66	$56	$10	$48	75%	$36	$1,630	$1,171	$2,801	$11,204
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	$49	$36	$14	$36	75%	$27	$170,920	$122,712	$293,631	$1,174,526
MARYLAND	$73	$52	$21	$49	75%	$36	$42,559	$30,555	$73,114	$292,455
MASSACHUSETTES	$48	N/A	N/A	$48	75%	$36	$302	$217	$518	$2,073
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	$53	$61	($8)	$57	75%	$43	$3,676	$2,639	$6,314	$25,258
NEW YORK	$55	$34	$21	$31	75%	$23	$238,318	$171,100	$409,418	$1,637,673
PENNSYLVANIA	$63	$44	$19	$34	75%	$25	$401,504	$288,259	$689,763	$2,759,051
RHODE ISLAND	$60	N/A	N/A	$60	75%	$45	$5,002	$3,591	$8,593	$34,371
VERMONT	$50	$40	$10	$32	75%	$24	$2,183	$1,567	$3,751	$15,003
Total	$59	$40	$19	$34	75%	$25	$866,093	$621,810	$1,487,903	$5,951,613
US Total	$50	$39	$9	$34	80%	$27	$113,606,283	$148,884,293	$262,490,575	$1,049,962,302

* Estimated Payment Rate for states without data on 1994 cropland rental rates is set at the average rate for land in first 12 signups.

** Weighted Avg. for California, Nevada and New Mexico is 50% of rental rate for irrigated land from table 1.4.3 of USDA's "Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators." Estimate of average cropland rental rates during years of heavy CRP enrollment, weighted as: [rent 1987 + (2 x 1988) + (2 x 1989)] divided by 5.

Appendix Table 3.2: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-enrolled, 1997.

REGION (STATES)	Payment Per Acre (12 Signups)	Weighted Avg. Rent (1987-89)**	Est. Excess Payment (12 Signups)	Est. Payment Rate Re-enroll	% Reduction EconUse	Adj. Payment EconUse	Expendit. EconUse (1998)	Expendit. Other (1998)	Total Expenditures (1998)	Total Expenditures (1997-2000)
PACIFIC										
ALASKA	$37	$40	($3)	$40	75%	$30	$52,461	$129,904	$182,366	$547,097
CALIFORNIA	$49	$112	($63)	$49	75%	$36	$262,230	$649,331	$911,561	$2,734,684
HAWAII	$80	N/A	N/A	$80	75%	$60	$0	$0	$0	$0
OREGON	$49	$49	($0)	$50	75%	$37	$589,888	$1,460,674	$2,050,562	$6,151,685
WASHINGTON	$50	$46	$4	$45	75%	$34	$1,075,956	$2,664,272	$3,740,228	$11,220,683
Total	$50	$54	($4)	$46	75%	$35	$1,980,535	$4,904,182	$6,884,717	$20,654,150
MOUNTAIN										
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	$41	$26	$16	$23	85%	$20	$1,806,853	$3,188,212	$4,994,865	$14,984,596
IDAHO	$46	$35	$11	$38	85%	$33	$1,168,549	$2,062,146	$3,230,695	$9,692,085
MONTANA	$37	$22	$15	$19	85%	$16	$4,651,279	$8,208,139	$12,859,417	$38,578,252
NEVADA	$40	N/A	N/A	$40	85%	$34	$23,113	$40,787	$63,899	$191,698
NEW MEXICO	$38	N/A	N/A	$38	85%	$32	$351,529	$620,345	$971,874	$2,915,623
UTAH	$40	$26	$14	$23	85%	$19	$235,957	$416,395	$652,352	$1,957,055
WYOMING	$38	$13	$26	$13	85%	$11	$317,836	$560,534	$878,169	$2,634,508
Total	$40	$23	$14	$22	85%	$18	$8,554,716	$15,096,557	$23,651,272	$70,953,817
NORTHERN PLAINS										
KANSAS	$53	$30	$23	$28	80%	$22	$8,172,395	$10,215,494	$18,387,889	$55,163,666
NEBRASKA	$56	$48	$7	$40	80%	$32	$3,424,887	$4,281,108	$7,705,995	$23,117,985
NORTH DAKOTA	$38	$29	$9	$26	80%	$20	$6,302,038	$7,877,547	$14,179,585	$42,538,755
SOUTH DAKOTA	$41	$27	$15	$26	80%	$21	$3,371,011	$4,213,763	$7,584,774	$22,754,322
Total	$46	$32	$14	$28	80%	$22	$21,270,330	$26,587,913	$47,858,243	$143,574,728
SOUTHERN PLAINS										
OKLAHOMA	$42	$25	$18	$20	80%	$16	$1,713,186	$2,617,367	$4,330,552	$12,991,657
TEXAS	$40	$21	$18	$16	80%	$13	$4,251,149	$6,494,811	$10,745,959	$32,237,878
Total	$40	$22	$18	$17	80%	$14	$5,964,334	$9,112,177	$15,076,512	$45,229,535
LAKE STATES										
MICHIGAN	$59	$43	$16	$39	70%	$27	$491,806	$234,193	$725,999	$2,177,998
MINNESOTA	$55	$43	$13	$39	70%	$27	$2,147,742	$1,022,734	$3,170,477	$9,511,431
WISCONSIN	$67	$47	$19	$41	70%	$29	$1,907,972	$908,558	$2,816,529	$8,449,588
Total	$59	$44	$15	$40	70%	$28	$4,547,520	$2,165,486	$6,713,006	$20,139,017
CORNBELT STATES										
ILLINOIS	$77	$91	($13)	$86	75%	$64	$1,658,058	$1,473,830	$3,131,888	$9,395,665
INDIANA	$74	$79	($5)	$72	75%	$54	$666,960	$592,853	$1,259,814	$3,779,441
IOWA	$82	$89	($7)	$86	75%	$64	$3,934,558	$3,497,385	$7,431,943	$22,295,830
MISSOURI	$63	$55	$8	$52	75%	$39	$4,508,248	$4,007,331	$8,515,579	$25,546,737
OHIO	$71	$67	$4	$56	75%	$42	$313,885	$279,009	$592,893	$1,778,679
Total	$74	$77	($2)	$66	75%	$50	$11,081,709	$9,850,408	$20,932,117	$62,796,352
DELTA										
ARKANSAS	$49	$50	($1)	$41	85%	$34	$177,244	$486,553	$663,798	$1,991,393
LOUISIANNA	$44	$47	($3)	$39	85%	$33	$151,332	$415,421	$566,753	$1,700,259
MISSISSIPPI	$43	$37	$6	$35	85%	$30	$425,618	$1,168,362	$1,593,980	$4,781,940
Total	$44	$41	$3	$37	85%	$31	$754,194	$2,070,337	$2,824,531	$8,473,592
SOUTHEASTERN										
ALABAMA	$43	$30	$13	$29	85%	$25	$246,175	$675,774	$921,949	$2,765,847
FLORIDA	$42	$108	($67)	$58	85%	$50	$270,509	$742,574	$1,013,083	$3,039,249
GEORGIA	$43	$31	$12	$26	85%	$22	$359,004	$985,502	$1,344,506	$4,033,517
SOUTH CAROLINA	$42	$24	$18	$19	85%	$16	$103,517	$284,163	$387,680	$1,163,039
Total	$43	$35	$7	$30	85%	$26	$979,205	$2,688,013	$3,667,217	$11,001,652
APPALACHIAN										
KENTUCKY	$59	$57	$3	$47	90%	$42	$684,070	$1,411,574	$2,095,644	$6,286,932
NORTH CAROLINA	$46	$36	$10	$30	90%	$27	$138,165	$285,102	$423,267	$1,269,800
TENNESEE	$52	$45	$6	$40	90%	$36	$598,693	$1,235,398	$1,834,091	$5,502,273
VIRGINIA	$52	$37	$15	$30	90%	$27	$98,450	$203,151	$301,601	$904,804
WEST VIRGINIA	$49	$33	$16	$30	90%	$27	$1,447	$2,987	$4,434	$13,303
Total	$54	$48	$6	$41	90%	$37	$1,520,826	$3,138,212	$4,659,037	$13,977,112
NORTHEASTERN										
CONNECTICUT	$50	N/A	N/A	$50	75%	$38	$55	$39	$94	$283
DELAWARE	$66	$56	$10	$48	75%	$36	$3,121	$2,241	$5,362	$16,085
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	$49	$36	$14	$36	75%	$27	$164,891	$118,383	$283,275	$849,824
MARYLAND	$73	$52	$21	$49	75%	$36	$60,457	$43,405	$103,862	$311,587
MASSACHUSETTES	$48	N/A	N/A	$48	75%	$36	$0	$0	$0	$0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	$53	$61	($8)	$57	75%	$43	$2,029	$1,457	$3,486	$10,458
NEW YORK	$55	$34	$21	$31	75%	$23	$151,420	$108,712	$260,131	$780,394
PENNSYLVANIA	$63	$44	$19	$34	75%	$25	$268,733	$192,936	$461,669	$1,385,006
RHODE ISLAND	$60	N/A	N/A	$60	75%	$45	$3,335	$2,394	$5,729	$17,186
VERMONT	$50	$40	$10	$32	75%	$24	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	$59	$40	$19	$34	75%	$26	$654,040	$469,567	$1,123,607	$3,370,822
US Total	$50	$39	$9	$29	80%	$23	$57,307,408	$76,082,851	$133,390,259	$400,170,777

* Estimated Payment Rate for states without data on 1994 cropland rental rates is set at the average rate for land in first 12 signups.

** Weighted Avg. for California, Nevada and New Mexico is 50% of rental rate for irrigated land from table 1.4.3 of USDA's "Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators." Estimate of average cropland rental rates during years of heavy CRP enrollment, weighted as: [rent 1987 + (2 x 1988) + (2 x 1989)] divided by 5.

Appendix Table 3.3: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-enrolled, 1998.

REGION (STATES)	Payment Per Acre (12 Signups)	Weighted Avg. Rent (1987-89)**	Est. Excess Payment (12 Signups)	Est. Payment Rate Re-enroll	% Reduction EconUse	Adj. Payment EconUse	Expendit. EconUse (1999)	Expendit. Other (1999)	Total Expenditures (1999)	Total Expenditures (1997-2000)
PACIFIC										
ALASKA	$37	$40	($3)	$40	75%	$30	$1,816	$4,497	$6,312	$12,625
CALIFORNIA	$49	$112	($63)	$49	75%	$36	$152,776	$378,303	$531,079	$1,062,158
HAWAII	$80	N/A	N/A	$80	75%	$60	$0	$0	$0	$0
OREGON	$49	$49	($0)	$50	75%	$37	$135,898	$336,510	$472,408	$944,816
WASHINGTON	$50	$46	$4	$45	75%	$34	$280,048	$693,451	$973,499	$1,946,997
Total	$50	$54	($4)	$47	75%	$35	$570,538	$1,412,760	$1,983,298	$3,966,596
MOUNTAIN										
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	$41	$26	$16	$23	85%	$20	$890,002	$1,570,591	$2,460,593	$4,921,186
IDAHO	$46	$35	$11	$38	85%	$33	$622,635	$1,098,768	$1,721,403	$3,442,806
MONTANA	$37	$22	$15	$19	85%	$16	$2,321,193	$4,096,222	$6,417,415	$12,834,829
NEVADA	$40	N/A	N/A	$40	85%	$34	$3,613	$6,376	$9,990	$19,979
NEW MEXICO	$38	N/A	N/A	$38	85%	$32	$137,872	$243,304	$381,176	$762,352
UTAH	$40	$26	$14	$23	85%	$19	$69,617	$122,854	$192,472	$384,944
WYOMING	$38	$13	$26	$13	85%	$11	$76,403	$134,828	$211,231	$422,462
Total	$40	$23	$14	$22	85%	$19	$4,121,335	$7,272,944	$11,394,279	$22,788,558
NORTHERN PLAINS										
KANSAS	$53	$30	$23	$28	80%	$22	$3,315,691	$4,144,613	$7,460,304	$14,920,607
NEBRASKA	$56	$48	$7	$40	80%	$32	$2,077,538	$2,596,923	$4,674,461	$9,348,921
NORTH DAKOTA	$38	$29	$9	$26	80%	$20	$5,083,337	$6,354,171	$11,437,508	$22,875,017
SOUTH DAKOTA	$41	$27	$15	$26	80%	$21	$3,521,035	$4,401,294	$7,922,329	$15,844,658
Total	$46	$32	$14	$28	80%	$22	$13,997,601	$17,497,001	$31,494,602	$62,989,203
SOUTHERN PLAINS										
OKLAHOMA	$42	$25	$18	$20	80%	$16	$697,444	$1,065,540	$1,762,984	$3,525,968
TEXAS	$40	$21	$18	$16	80%	$13	$2,278,972	$3,481,762	$5,760,734	$11,521,467
Total	$40	$22	$18	$17	80%	$14	$2,976,416	$4,547,302	$7,523,718	$15,047,435
LAKE STATES										
MICHIGAN	$59	$43	$16	$39	70%	$27	$400,759	$190,838	$591,597	$1,183,195
MINNESOTA	$55	$43	$13	$39	70%	$27	$1,390,751	$662,262	$2,053,013	$4,106,025
WISCONSIN	$67	$47	$19	$41	70%	$29	$1,183,955	$563,788	$1,747,744	$3,495,487
Total	$59	$44	$15	$40	70%	$28	$2,975,465	$1,416,888	$4,392,354	$8,784,707
CORNBELT STATES										
ILLINOIS	$77	$91	($13)	$86	75%	$64	$2,077,268	$1,846,460	$3,923,728	$7,847,456
INDIANA	$74	$79	($5)	$72	75%	$54	$916,211	$814,410	$1,730,620	$3,461,241
IOWA	$82	$89	($7)	$86	75%	$64	$4,663,371	$4,145,219	$8,808,590	$17,617,181
MISSOURI	$63	$55	$8	$52	75%	$39	$1,778,660	$1,581,031	$3,359,691	$6,719,382
OHIO	$71	$67	$4	$56	75%	$42	$415,506	$369,338	$784,844	$1,569,688
Total	$74	$77	($2)	$74	75%	$56	$9,851,015	$8,756,458	$18,607,473	$37,214,947
DELTA										
ARKANSAS	$49	$50	($1)	$41	85%	$34	$162,538	$446,183	$608,722	$1,217,443
LOUISIANNA	$44	$47	($3)	$39	85%	$33	$120,623	$331,122	$451,745	$903,490
MISSISSIPPI	$43	$37	$6	$35	85%	$30	$305,886	$839,139	$1,144,825	$2,289,651
Total	$44	$41	$3	$37	85%	$32	$588,848	$1,616,444	$2,205,292	$4,410,584
SOUTHEASTERN										
ALABAMA	$43	$30	$13	$29	85%	$25	$154,777	$424,879	$579,657	$1,159,313
FLORIDA	$42	$108	($67)	$58	85%	$50	$180,796	$496,302	$677,098	$1,354,196
GEORGIA	$43	$31	$12	$26	85%	$22	$324,916	$891,926	$1,216,842	$2,433,685
SOUTH CAROLINA	$42	$24	$18	$19	85%	$16	$81,407	$223,469	$304,876	$609,751
Total	$43	$35	$7	$29	85%	$25	$741,896	$2,036,577	$2,778,473	$5,556,945
APPALACHIAN										
KENTUCKY	$59	$57	$3	$47	90%	$42	$372,092	$767,809	$1,139,902	$2,279,803
NORTH CAROLINA	$46	$36	$10	$30	90%	$27	$78,407	$161,792	$240,198	$480,397
TENNESEE	$52	$45	$6	$40	90%	$36	$364,212	$751,550	$1,115,762	$2,231,524
VIRGINIA	$52	$37	$15	$30	90%	$27	$70,340	$145,147	$215,487	$430,975
WEST VIRGINIA	$48	$33	$16	$30	90%	$27	$552	$1,138	$1,690	$3,380
Total	$54	$48	$6	$40	90%	$36	$885,603	$1,827,436	$2,713,039	$5,426,079
NORTHEASTERN										
CONNECTICUT	$50	N/A	N/A	$50	75%	$38	$0	$0	$0	$0
DELAWARE	$66	$56	$10	$48	75%	$36	$4,347	$3,121	$7,467	$14,934
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	$49	$36	$14	$36	75%	$27	$85,915	$61,683	$147,598	$295,196
MARYLAND	$73	$52	$21	$49	75%	$36	$79,139	$56,818	$135,957	$271,913
MASSACHUSETTES	$48	N/A	N/A	$48	75%	$36	$83	$60	$143	$286
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	$53	$61	($8)	$57	75%	$43	$2,071	$1,487	$3,559	$7,117
NEW YORK	$55	$34	$21	$31	75%	$23	$83,814	$60,174	$143,988	$287,977
PENNSYLVANIA	$63	$44	$19	$34	75%	$25	$229,728	$164,933	$394,662	$789,323
RHODE ISLAND	$60	N/A	N/A	$60	75%	$45	$1,316	$945	$2,261	$4,523
VERMONT	$50	$40	$10	$32	75%	$24	$37	$26	$63	$126
Total	$59	$40	$19	$35	75%	$26	$486,451	$349,247	$835,698	$1,671,395
US Total	$50	$39	$9	$31	80%	$25	$37,195,168	$46,733,057	$83,928,225	$167,856,450

* Estimated Payment Rate for states without data on 1994 cropland rental rates is set at the average rate for land in first 12 signups.

** Weighted Avg. for California, Nevada and New Mexico is 50% of rental rate for irrigated land from table 1.4.3 of USDA's "Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators." Estimate of average cropland rental rates during years of heavy CRP enrollment, weighted as: [rent 1987 + (2 x 1988) + (2 x 1989)] divided by 5.

Appendix Table 3.4: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-enrolled, 1999.

REGION (STATES)	Payment Per Acre (12 Signups)	Weighted Avg. Rent (1987-89)**	Est. Excess Payment (12 Signups)	Est. Payment Rate Re-enroll	% Reduction EconUse	Adj. Payment EconUse	Expendit. EconUse (2000)	Expendit. Other (2000)	Total Expenditures (2000)	Total Expenditures (1997-2000)
PACIFIC										
ALASKA	$37	$40	($3)	$40	75%	$30	$0	$0	$0	$0
CALIFORNIA	$49	$112	($63)	$49	75%	$36	$58,726	$145,416	$204,142	$204,142
HAWAII	$80	N/A	N/A	$80	75%	$60	$0	$0	$0	$0
OREGON	$49	$49	($0)	$50	75%	$37	$48,237	$119,444	$167,681	$167,681
WASHINGTON	$50	$46	$4	$45	75%	$34	$305,348	$756,099	$1,061,446	$1,061,446
Total	$50	$54	($4)	$46	75%	$34	$412,310	$1,020,959	$1,433,269	$1,433,269
MOUNTAIN										
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	$41	$26	$16	$23	85%	$20	$897,353	$1,583,565	$2,480,918	$2,480,918
IDAHO	$46	$35	$11	$38	85%	$33	$306,178	$540,314	$846,493	$846,493
MONTANA	$37	$22	$15	$19	85%	$16	$1,491,893	$2,632,752	$4,124,645	$4,124,645
NEVADA	$40	N/A	N/A	$40	85%	$34	$8,108	$14,307	$22,415	$22,415
NEW MEXICO	$38	N/A	N/A	$38	85%	$32	$22,083	$38,970	$61,053	$61,053
UTAH	$40	$26	$14	$23	85%	$19	$14,718	$25,973	$40,691	$40,691
WYOMING	$38	$13	$26	$13	85%	$11	$87,514	$154,436	$241,950	$241,950
Total	$40	$23	$14	$21	85%	$18	$2,827,847	$4,990,318	$7,818,165	$7,818,165
NORTHERN PLAINS										
KANSAS	$53	$30	$23	$28	80%	$22	$3,108,627	$3,885,784	$6,994,411	$6,994,411
NEBRASKA	$56	$48	$7	$40	80%	$32	$1,594,883	$1,993,604	$3,588,488	$3,588,488
NORTH DAKOTA	$38	$29	$9	$26	80%	$20	$4,656,372	$5,820,465	$10,476,837	$10,476,837
SOUTH DAKOTA	$41	$27	$15	$26	80%	$21	$4,839,551	$6,049,439	$10,888,990	$10,888,990
Total	$46	$32	$14	$27	80%	$22	$14,199,433	$17,749,292	$31,948,725	$31,948,725
SOUTHERN PLAINS										
OKLAHOMA	$42	$25	$18	$20	80%	$16	$549,117	$838,929	$1,388,046	$1,388,046
TEXAS	$40	$21	$18	$16	80%	$13	$1,202,113	$1,836,561	$3,038,674	$3,038,674
Total	$40	$22	$18	$17	80%	$14	$1,751,230	$2,675,490	$4,426,720	$4,426,720
LAKE STATES										
MICHIGAN	$59	$43	$16	$39	70%	$27	$219,870	$104,700	$324,569	$324,569
MINNESOTA	$55	$43	$13	$39	70%	$27	$793,404	$377,811	$1,171,215	$1,171,215
WISCONSIN	$67	$47	$19	$41	70%	$29	$990,194	$471,521	$1,461,714	$1,461,714
Total	$59	$44	$15	$40	70%	$28	$2,003,467	$954,032	$2,957,499	$2,957,499
CORNBELT STATES										
ILLINOIS	$77	$91	($13)	$86	75%	$64	$1,395,176	$1,240,157	$2,635,333	$2,635,333
INDIANA	$74	$79	($5)	$72	75%	$54	$532,393	$473,238	$1,005,632	$1,005,632
IOWA	$82	$89	($7)	$86	75%	$64	$3,203,368	$2,847,438	$6,050,806	$6,050,806
MISSOURI	$63	$55	$8	$52	75%	$39	$842,486	$748,876	$1,591,362	$1,591,362
OHIO	$71	$67	$4	$56	75%	$42	$353,469	$314,195	$667,665	$667,665
Total	$74	$77	($2)	$76	75%	$57	$6,326,893	$5,623,905	$11,950,798	$11,950,798
DELTA										
ARKANSAS	$49	$50	($1)	$41	85%	$34	$95,863	$263,153	$359,017	$359,017
LOUISIANNA	$44	$47	($3)	$39	85%	$33	$109,465	$300,493	$409,958	$409,958
MISSISSIPPI	$43	$37	$6	$35	85%	$30	$229,755	$630,700	$860,455	$860,455
Total	$44	$41	$3	$37	85%	$32	$435,083	$1,194,346	$1,629,430	$1,629,430
SOUTHEASTERN										
ALABAMA	$43	$30	$13	$29	85%	$25	$41,696	$114,461	$156,157	$156,157
FLORIDA	$42	$108	($67)	$58	85%	$50	$75,153	$206,302	$281,454	$281,454
GEORGIA	$43	$31	$12	$26	85%	$22	$129,551	$355,629	$485,180	$485,180
SOUTH CAROLINA	$42	$24	$18	$19	85%	$16	$40,155	$110,228	$150,383	$150,383
Total	$43	$35	$7	$29	85%	$25	$286,554	$786,620	$1,073,174	$1,073,174
APPALACHIAN										
KENTUCKY	$59	$57	$3	$47	90%	$42	$172,593	$356,145	$528,738	$528,738
NORTH CAROLINA	$46	$36	$10	$30	90%	$27	$38,185	$78,794	$116,979	$116,979
TENNESEE	$52	$45	$6	$40	90%	$36	$150,013	$309,550	$459,562	$459,562
VIRGINIA	$52	$37	$15	$30	90%	$27	$32,127	$66,294	$98,422	$98,422
WEST VIRGINIA	$49	$33	$16	$30	90%	$27	$101	$208	$309	$309
Total	$54	$48	$6	$40	90%	$36	$393,019	$810,992	$1,204,010	$1,204,010
NORTHEASTERN										
CONNECTICUT	$50	N/A	N/A	$50	75%	$38	$0	$0	$0	$0
DELAWARE	$66	$56	$10	$48	75%	$36	$1,255	$901	$2,156	$2,156
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	$49	$36	$14	$36	75%	$27	$16,803	$12,063	$28,866	$28,866
MARYLAND	$73	$52	$21	$49	75%	$36	$65,478	$47,010	$112,488	$112,488
MASSACHUSETTES	$48	N/A	N/A	$48	75%	$36	$0	$0	$0	$0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	$53	$61	($8)	$57	75%	$43	$2,586	$1,856	$4,442	$4,442
NEW YORK	$55	$34	$21	$31	75%	$23	$32,063	$23,020	$55,083	$55,083
PENNSYLVANIA	$63	$44	$19	$34	75%	$25	$135,435	$97,235	$232,671	$232,671
RHODE ISLAND	$60	N/A	N/A	$60	75%	$45	$0	$0	$0	$0
VERMONT	$50	$40	$10	$32	75%	$24	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	$59	$40	$19	$36	75%	$27	$253,620	$182,086	$435,706	$435,706
US Total	$50	$39	$9	$30	80%	$24	$28,889,457	$35,988,039	$64,877,495	$64,877,495

* Estimated Payment Rate for states without data on 1994 cropland rental rates is set at the average rate for land in first 12 signups.

** Weighted Avg. for California, Nevada and New Mexico is 50% of rental rate for irrigated land from table 1.4.3 of USDA's "Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators." Estimate of average cropland rental rates during years of heavy CRP enrollment, weighted as: [rent 1987 + (2 x 1988) + (2 x 1989)] divided by 5.

Appendix Table 3.5: Estimated Average Payment Rates and Total Expenditures for Highly Erodible Land Re-enrolled, 2000.

REGION (STATES)	Payment Per Acre (12 Signups)	Weighted Avg. Rent (1987-89)**	Est. Excess Payment (12 Signups)	Est. Payment Rate Re-enroll	% Reduction EconUse	Adj. Payment EconUse	Expendit. EconUse (2001)	Expendit. Other (2001)	Total Expenditures (2001)	Total Expenditures (1997-2000)
PACIFIC										
ALASKA	$37	$40	($3)	$40	75%	$30	$8,514	$21,083	$29,597	$0
CALIFORNIA	$49	$112	($63)	$49	75%	$36	$0	$0	$0	$0
HAWAII	$80	N/A	N/A	$80	75%	$60	$0	$0	$0	$0
OREGON	$49	$49	($0)	$50	75%	$37	$16,756	$41,490	$58,246	$0
WASHINGTON	$50	$46	$4	$45	75%	$34	$31,293	$77,488	$108,781	$0
Total	$50	$54	($4)	$45	75%	$34	$56,563	$140,061	$196,623	$0
MOUNTAIN										
ARIZONA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
COLORADO	$41	$26	$16	$23	85%	$20	$8,712	$15,374	$24,087	$0
IDAHO	$46	$35	$11	$38	85%	$33	$130,729	$230,698	$361,427	$0
MONTANA	$37	$22	$15	$19	85%	$16	$218,934	$386,353	$605,287	$0
NEVADA	$40	N/A	N/A	$40	85%	$34	$0	$0	$0	$0
NEW MEXICO	$38	N/A	N/A	$38	85%	$32	$272	$481	$753	$0
UTAH	$40	$26	$14	$23	85%	$19	$0	$0	$0	$0
WYOMING	$38	$13	$26	$13	85%	$11	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	$40	$23	$14	$24	85%	$20	$358,647	$632,906	$991,553	$0
NORTHERN PLAINS										
KANSAS	$53	$30	$23	$28	80%	$22	$68,287	$85,359	$153,645	$0
NEBRASKA	$56	$48	$7	$40	80%	$32	$114,274	$142,843	$257,117	$0
NORTH DAKOTA	$38	$29	$9	$26	80%	$20	$88,335	$110,419	$198,754	$0
SOUTH DAKOTA	$41	$27	$15	$26	80%	$21	$29,454	$36,818	$66,272	$0
Total	$46	$32	$14	$30	80%	$24	$300,350	$375,438	$675,788	$0
SOUTHERN PLAINS										
OKLAHOMA	$42	$25	$18	$20	80%	$16	$26,496	$40,480	$66,975	$0
TEXAS	$40	$21	$18	$16	80%	$13	$154,529	$236,087	$390,616	$0
Total	$40	$22	$18	$17	80%	$13	$181,025	$276,566	$457,591	$0
LAKE STATES										
MICHIGAN	$59	$43	$16	$39	70%	$27	$159,638	$76,018	$235,657	$0
MINNESOTA	$55	$43	$13	$39	70%	$27	$127,415	$60,674	$188,088	$0
WISCONSIN	$67	$47	$19	$41	70%	$29	$349,746	$166,546	$516,291	$0
Total	$59	$44	$15	$40	70%	$28	$636,799	$303,237	$940,036	$0
CORNBELT STATES										
ILLINOIS	$77	$91	($13)	$86	75%	$64	$404,262	$359,344	$763,606	$0
INDIANA	$74	$79	($5)	$72	75%	$54	$146,506	$130,228	$276,734	$0
IOWA	$82	$89	($7)	$86	75%	$64	$613,617	$545,437	$1,159,053	$0
MISSOURI	$63	$55	$8	$52	75%	$39	$377,047	$335,153	$712,200	$0
OHIO	$71	$67	$4	$56	75%	$42	$139,181	$123,717	$262,898	$0
Total	$74	$77	($2)	$71	75%	$53	$1,680,613	$1,493,878	$3,174,492	$0
DELTA										
ARKANSAS	$49	$50	($1)	$41	85%	$34	$30,355	$83,327	$113,681	$0
LOUISIANNA	$44	$47	($3)	$39	85%	$33	$20,867	$57,282	$78,148	$0
MISSISSIPPI	$43	$37	$6	$35	85%	$30	$96,082	$263,756	$359,838	$0
Total	$44	$41	$3	$37	85%	$31	$147,304	$404,364	$551,668	$0
SOUTHEASTERN										
ALABAMA	$43	$30	$13	$29	85%	$25	$34,959	$95,965	$130,924	$0
FLORIDA	$42	$108	($67)	$58	85%	$50	$17,266	$47,397	$64,663	$0
GEORGIA	$43	$31	$12	$26	85%	$22	$23,147	$63,541	$86,688	$0
SOUTH CAROLINA	$42	$24	$18	$19	85%	$16	$4,397	$12,070	$16,467	$0
Total	$43	$35	$7	$30	85%	$26	$79,769	$218,973	$298,741	$0
APPALACHIAN										
KENTUCKY	$59	$57	$3	$47	90%	$42	$62,494	$128,956	$191,450	$0
NORTH CAROLINA	$46	$36	$10	$30	90%	$27	$10,553	$21,775	$32,328	$0
TENNESEE	$52	$45	$6	$40	90%	$36	$68,801	$141,971	$210,772	$0
VIRGINIA	$52	$37	$15	$30	90%	$27	$5,964	$12,307	$18,272	$0
WEST VIRGINIA	$49	$33	$16	$30	90%	$27	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	$54	$48	$6	$41	90%	$37	$147,812	$305,009	$452,821	$0
NORTHEASTERN										
CONNECTICUT	$50	N/A	N/A	$50	75%	$38	$0	$0	$0	$0
DELAWARE	$66	$56	$10	$48	75%	$36	$118	$85	$202	$0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAINE	$49	$36	$14	$36	75%	$27	$3,280	$2,355	$5,635	$0
MARYLAND	$73	$52	$21	$49	75%	$36	$24,287	$17,437	$41,724	$0
MASSACHUSETTES	$48	N/A	N/A	$48	75%	$36	$0	$0	$0	$0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NEW JERSEY	$53	$61	($8)	$57	75%	$43	$0	$0	$0	$0
NEW YORK	$55	$34	$21	$31	75%	$23	$28,135	$20,199	$48,334	$0
PENNSYLVANIA	$63	$44	$19	$34	75%	$25	$21,857	$15,692	$37,549	$0
RHODE ISLAND	$60	N/A	N/A	$60	75%	$45	$329	$236	$565	$0
VERMONT	$50	$40	$10	$32	75%	$24	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	$58	$40	$19	$36	75%	$27	$78,006	$56,004	$134,009	$0
US Total	$50	$39	$9	$39	80%	$31	$3,666,888	$4,206,437	$7,873,324	$0

* Estimated Payment Rate for states without data on 1994 cropland rental rates is set at the average rate for land in first 12 signups.

** Weighted Avg. for California, Nevada and New Mexico is 50% of rental rate for irrigated land from table 1.4.3 of USDA's "Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators." Estimate of average cropland rental rates during years of heavy CRP enrollment, weighted as: [rent 1987 + (2 x 1988) + (2 x 1989)] divided by 5.

Appendix Table 4. USDA and CBO Baselines and Impacts of the American Farmland Trust CRP Reform Recommendations, 1996-2000.

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Program Years, 1996-2000 (1) Annual Ave.	Total
Existing Baselines							
USDA Baseline							
- Acres	37.4	35.6	34.4	33.5	32.8	34.7	
- Billion Dollars	$1.88	$1.81	$1.83	$1.88	$1.87	$1.85	$9.27
- Dollars/Acre (4)	$50.27	$50.79	$53.20	$56.10	$57.01	$53.47	
CBO Baseline							
- Acres	36.4	38.0	29.7	24.6	21.4	30.0	
- Billion Dollars	$1.83	$1.93	$1.58	$1.38	$1.22	$1.59	$7.93
- Dollars/Acre (4)	$50.27	$50.79	$53.20	$56.10	$57.01	$53.47	
Impacts of AFT Reform Proposals							
12 Signup CRP							
- Acres Out (2)	15.71	8.76	5.35	4.10	0.48	6.88	34.4
- Acres In	36.40	20.69	11.93	6.58	2.48	15.61	78.1
- Expenditures	$1.83	$1.03	$0.59	$0.33	$0.12	$0.78	$3.90
Re-enrollments							
- Acres Eligible (3)	11.68	6.42	3.76	2.87	0.31	5.01	25.05
- Acres Re-enrolled	8.68	5.14	3.05	2.42	0.23	3.90	19.52
- Expenditures	$0.00	$0.26	$0.40	$0.48	$0.54	$0.42	$1.68
New Enrollments							
- Acres Enrolled	3.77	3.14	2.51	1.88	1.26	2.51	12.56
- Expenditures	$0.00	$0.22	$0.41	$0.56	$0.67	$0.46	$1.86
AFT Baseline							
AFT Baseline							
- Acres	36.42	33.16	32.68	32.89	33.10	33.65	
- Billion Dollars	$1.83	$1.51	$1.40	$1.36	$1.34	$1.49	$7.44
- Dollars/Acre	$50.24	$45.66	$42.78	$41.48	$40.39	$44.24	

1. First five years of the CRP after passage of the 1995 Farm Bill. Payment estimates are for existing contracts, re-enrollments, new enrollments and total payments, and are all lagged one year from the year of enrollment. USDA, CBO, and AFT baseline acreage is the average over 1996-2000.
2. Acres out represents the acreage in contracts expiring during the calender year. Acres out would be eligible for re-enrollment during the tenth of the existing contract, and are counted toward re-enrollment in the same year.
3. Acres eligible equals acres out minus acreage in trees (see text) and minus acreage with EI<8.
4. USDA baseline dollars calculated using average per acre payment rate from CBO baseline.