

# CRS Report for Congress

## Funding Levels for Conservation Programs in the 2007 Farm Bill

Updated January 1, 2008

Jeffrey Zinn  
Specialist in Natural Resources Policy  
Resources, Science, and Industry Division



Prepared for Members and  
Committees of Congress

# Funding Levels for Conservation Programs in the 2007 Farm Bill

## Summary

Future funding levels for USDA programs, including conservation programs, are among the most contentious issues Congress is addressing in the 2007 farm bill debate. The 110<sup>th</sup> Congress has adopted a “pay-as-you-go” approach government-wide, so that any increase in mandatory funding in one area has to be offset either by equivalent spending reductions in other programs or by revenue increases. Further constraining farm bill funding is the decline in the baseline from which future agriculture funding is projected because of high market prices, which are lowering projected outlays under the current structure of commodity programs.

In this funding environment, the many interests that are vigorously seeking new or additional funding for topics addressed in the farm bill other than commodity payments are finding this challenge to be daunting. The competition for increased funding is amplified by the fact that it involves not only conservation, which is discussed in this report, but also specialty crops, energy, and other areas.

Under the House-passed version of the farm bill (H.R. 2419), spending for conservation programs would remain at current levels or increase from the FY2007 authorized level, with one notable exception. This exception is the Conservation Security Program, where funding for additional enrollment would be suspended until FY2012. The largest increases would occur in the Wetland Reserve Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). In its analysis dated October 15, it concluded that conservation would grow by \$4.52 billion through FY2012 for mandatory funding, and an additional \$1.25 billion in discretionary funding would also be authorized for this time period.

Under the Senate-passed version (H.R. 2419, amended), a larger number of the conservation programs would remain at current funding levels. The bulk of additional funding would go to the Wetland Reserve Program and a new Comprehensive Stewardship Incentives Program. CBO, in an analysis dated October 24, concludes that conservation would grow by \$4.78 billion in mandatory funding by the end of FY2012.

This report consists of largely of two tables. The first table summarizes the annual funding provisions, by program, in (1) current law, (2) the House-passed version of H.R. 2419, and (3) the Senate-amended version of H.R. 2419. The second table compares FY2007 authorized and actual funding levels for programs authorized in the 2002 farm bill with FY2008 and FY2012 funding levels that would be authorized in the House and Senate bills. **Table 1** includes new conservation programs that would be authorized for the first time in either bill. **Table 2** is limited to existing programs that would be reauthorized in a new farm bill.

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
--------------------	---

## List of Tables

Table 1. Agriculture Conservation Funding: A Comparison of Current Law with Future Funding in the House- and Senate-Passed Farm Bills .....	5
Table 2. Comparison of FY2007 Funding Level Under Current Law with FY2008 and FY2012 Funding Levels Under the House- and Senate-Passed Farm Bills .....	12

# Funding Levels for Conservation Programs in the 2007 Farm Bill

## Introduction

Future funding levels for USDA programs, including conservation programs, are among the most contentious issues Congress is addressing in the 2007 farm bill debate. The 110<sup>th</sup> Congress has adopted a “pay-as-you-go” approach government-wide, so that any increase in mandatory funding authorized in one area must be offset either by equivalent reductions in other programs or by revenue increases. Further constraining farm bill funding is the decline in the baseline from which future agriculture funding is projected because of high farm commodity market prices, which are lowering projected outlays under the current structure of commodity programs. In this funding environment, many interests are vigorously defending at least a continuation of current funding levels in the next farm bill, and the competition for new or additional funding, not only for conservation, which is the topic of this report, but also for specialty crops, energy, and other topics addressed by the farm bill, is intense.

These considerations led the House Agriculture Committee to consider two alternative funding levels for several conservation programs as the subcommittee and full committee acted on these proposals, depending on how much money would be made available.<sup>1</sup> It was only as the bill reached the House floor that the authorization levels for programs were determined. Since additional funds were made available through actions by the House Budget Committee, the House-passed version of the farm bill (H.R. 2419) would increase funding for the larger conservation programs (with one notable exception), provide level funding to most of the smaller ones, and authorize funding for several new ones.<sup>2</sup> The exception is the Conservation Security Program, where provisions in H.R. 2419 would suspend additional enrollment until FY2012.

Supporters of conservation are concerned that the overall rate and amount of growth of conservation spending in H.R. 2419 would be insufficient and that additional enrollment into the Conservation Security Program should be funded before FY2012. Many of the alternative proposals that were offered in the House would have addressed these concerns in different ways, including increasing funding to certain programs by providing additional funds more rapidly or providing a larger

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on House development and consideration of farm bill legislation, see CRS Report RL33934, *Farm Bill Proposals and Legislative Action in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress*.

<sup>2</sup> For basic information about the entire suite of current agriculture conservation programs, see CRS Report RL32940, *Agriculture Conservation Programs: A Scorecard*.

total amount over the life of this farm bill; none of these alternatives were adopted during floor consideration.

The bill passed by the Senate (H.R. 2419, amended) provides small increases or level funding for most programs, while creating a major new program, the Comprehensive Stewardship Incentives Program. This new program combines aspects of two existing programs, the Conservation Stewardship Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program. It also authorizes a number of new small programs as “carve-outs” within larger existing programs. Supporters of conservation had raised the same concern about the overall rate and the amount of growth for conservation spending in this bill while it was being considered on the floor as they did with the House version. A large group of conservation and environmental organizations lobbied the Senate to authorize at least \$4.5 billion in additional mandatory funding.

One way to frame the funding challenge in the current policy setting is to consider farm bill funding at three distinct but interrelated levels. At the largest level, which considers the entire federal budget, this challenge involves determining the portion of the federal budget that will be allocated to agriculture. Questions at this level were largely answered through the FY2008 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 21), which assumes spending will continue at the current level, and reserves \$20 billion for new spending if comparable budget offsets are identified.

The middle level considers the allocation of funds throughout the array of eligible agricultural programs. Among the issues at this level are how much of the available funds will be allocated to the traditional commodity programs; whether any of the funds that have been allocated to commodity programs should be reallocated to other titles of the farm bill, especially at this time of high market prices; and how the funds that are not allocated to commodity programs are to be divided among all the many other activities and responsibilities in the agriculture portfolio, one of which is conservation.

The smallest level is the allocation of funds within each activity area in agriculture, such as conservation. Within the suite of conservation programs, funding decisions are based on many considerations, such as what approaches to conservation should be funded (retiring land or installing conservation practices on land in production, for example); which programs should receive discretionary rather than mandatory funding; how backlogs of interest in enrolling in programs might be addressed; and how funds will be allocated among producers to implement conservation and the activities that support conservation, including providing technical assistance and administrative support.

**Table 1** compares funding levels for programs authorized in the conservation title under current law with future funding under the House-passed and Senate-passed farm bills. It also includes new programs that either bill would authorize. In both chambers, several alternative bills and amendments were considered but not adopted. However, aspects of these bills and amendments influenced the contents of the legislation as passed, especially in the House bill.

Provisions in current law authorizing conservation funding for all but two programs expire in FY2007. The two exceptions are the Conservation Security Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program; expiration dates for both programs are noted in the table entries. Almost all programs authorized in both bills would expire in FY2012, except for the Conservation Security Program in the House-passed bill, where funding is authorized through FY2017.

This table presents only the approved funding levels in the House- and Senate-passed farm bills; it does not identify any other policy changes.<sup>3</sup> In some instances, these policy changes, if enacted, could alter how the program funds are actually spent, where they are spent, or the conservation benefits that result. Finally, this table is limited to the contents of the conservation title. Some provisions in other titles address conservation topics. Which provisions one might consider to be a part of the agriculture conservation effort depends, in part, on one's definition of conservation. Titles where these provisions can be found include the forestry and energy titles, but only the conservation title is addressed here.

**Table 2** provides data to explore the question of whether conservation funding is increased under the House- and Senate-passed versions of H.R. 2419, and if so, by how much. This table shows that in the House bill, three programs would increase: the Environmental Quality Incentives Program would increase by a total of about \$2.0 billion between FY2008 and FY2012; the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program would increase by a total of \$510 million between FY2008 and FY2012; and the Grasslands Reserve Program would increase by a total of \$430 million over the same time period. During the same time period, the acreage goals would remain the same for the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program (39.2 million acres and 250,000 acres per year, respectively), and funding for the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, as well as the renamed Ground and Surface Water Program would remain unchanged.

The Senate-passed bill would create a new Comprehensive Stewardship Incentives Program, which would receive a total of more than \$2 billion between FY2008 and FY2012 to enroll 13.3 million acres annually at an average cost of \$19 per acre. Other programs would be reauthorized at the same or slightly changed funding levels.

The Congressional Budget Office issued a detailed comparison of the House bill and the CBO baseline of March, 2007 on October 11, 2007. It found that total conservation funding — both mandatory and discretionary — would increase by a total of \$5.77 billion between FY2008 and FY2012. More specifically, mandatory conservation funding would increase by a total of \$4.52 billion. All mandatory programs would either remain at the current baseline or grow with one exception. The exception, as noted above, is the Conservation Security Program, where funding would decrease by a total of slightly more than \$700 million. CBO estimates that most of the increase, a total of almost \$4 billion would occur in two programs, the

---

<sup>3</sup> Two of these, the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program, are authorized by number of acres that can be enrolled rather than dollar amounts. A third, the Grasslands Reserve Program, is authorized by both acreage and dollar amounts.

Wetlands Reserve Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program. For the Wetlands Reserve Program, this increase is created by reestablishing the current annual enrollment cap for an additional five years. For discretionary programs, many of which are new or have not been funded recently, H.R. 2419 would authorize a total of \$1.25 billion in new appropriations.

The CBO estimated the Senate farm bill (S.Amdt. 3500) on November 11, 2007, as the Senate began deliberations. This estimate is limited to mandatory spending. It found that mandatory spending would increase by a total of \$4.78 billion between FY2008 and FY2012. Almost \$4 billion in this increase would be accounted for in the new Comprehensive Stewardship Incentives Program and the extension of the Wetland Reserve Program annual enrollment cap, and much of the remainder would come from new small programs within larger programs targeted to a specific place or topic.

It is important to remember that the authorized amount sets an upper limit on mandatory funding, and Congress has often acted subsequently through the appropriations process to allow less funding than was authorized.<sup>4</sup> However, with the exception of the Conservation Security Program, for which Congress has reduced the authorized funding level several times since enactment in 2002, most of these reductions have been for modest dollar amounts. Even if the reductions are modest, for some of the smaller conservation programs, they may be, nonetheless, a significant portion of the authorized level. The largest reductions most years between FY2003 and FY2007, by dollar amounts, have been in the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, and the largest reductions by lowering acreage enrollment ceilings have been in the Wetlands Reserve Program.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information on authorized spending levels and actual funding levels for each mandatory conservation program each year under provisions in the 2002 farm bill, see CRS Report RS22243, *Mandatory Funding for Agriculture Conservation Programs*.

<sup>5</sup> For more information on the conservation provisions in the House-passed farm bill, see CRS Report RL34060, *Conservation and the 2007 Farm Bill*.

**Table 1. Agriculture Conservation Funding: A Comparison of Current Law with Future Funding in the House- and Senate-Passed Farm Bills**

(programs authorized through FY2012 unless otherwise noted)

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
<b>Existing Programs</b>		
<b>Conservation Reserve Program (CRP):</b> Provides mandatory funding to enroll up to 39.2 million acres at any time through calendar year 2007, of which up to 1 million acres is in a program for small isolated wetlands. (Sec. 1231 of 1985 Food Security Act)	No change in total acres; numerous other changes could alter enrollment patterns in the future. (Sec. 2101)	No change in total acres; numerous other changes could alter enrollment patterns in the future; adds new sub-programs for flooded farmland and wildlife habitat. (Secs. 2311-2313)
<b>Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP):</b> Provides mandatory funding to enroll up to 2.275 million acres in total through calendar year 2007; up to 250,000 acres each calendar year. (Sec. 1237 of 1985 Food Security Act)	Enroll up to 3.605 million acres in total, and enroll 250,000 acres each fiscal year, with no more than 10,000 of that total in floodplain easements; numerous other changes could alter future enrollment patterns. (Sec. 2102)	Enroll 250,000 acres each fiscal year, with no enrollment after FY2012; authorizes a Wetlands Reserve Enhancement Program; other changes could alter future enrollment patterns. (Secs. 2321-2323)
<b>Healthy Forests Reserve Program:</b> No provisions in conservation title.	No provisions.	Move program to conservation title; authorizes "such sums as are necessary" from FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2331)
<b>Conservation Security Program (CSP):</b> Authorized to spend up to \$1,954 million in mandatory funding between FY2006 and FY2010, and \$5,650 million between FY2006 and FY2015. (Sec. 1241 of 1985 Food Security Act.)	All existing contracts to remain in effect for full term; no new contracts after September 30, 2007. (Sec. 2103) Authorizes \$1,454 million for FY2007 through FY2012, and \$1,927 million for FY2007 through FY2017 for funding for contracts signed before 9/30/07 and in effect before a new farm bill is enacted. For contracts dated after 10/1/12, \$5.1 billion is authorized from FY2012 through FY2017. (Sec. 2401)	Provides \$2.3 billion to administer contracts entered into before the date this farm bill is enacted. (Sec. 2401) Replaced by new Comprehensive Stewardship Incentives Program. (see below, under new programs) All existing contracts to remain in effect for full term; no new contracts after date of enactment (Sec. 2391)



CRS-6

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
<p><b>Farmland Protection Program (FPP):</b> Provides \$50 million in mandatory funding in FY2002; \$100 million in FY2003; \$125 million in FY2004 and FY2005; \$100 million in FY2006; and \$97 million in FY2007. (Sec. 1241 of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>Renames program Farm and Ranchland Protection Program. Provides \$125 million in FY2008, \$150 million in FY2009, \$200 million in FY2010, \$240 million in FY2011 and \$280 million in FY2012. (Sec. 2401)</p>	<p>Provides \$97 million annually for FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2401)</p>
<p><b>Grasslands Reserve Program:</b> Enroll 2 million acres in total. (Sec. 1238N of 1985 Food Security Program); provides up to a total of \$254 million in mandatory funding through FY2007. (Sec. 1241 of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>Enroll an additional 1.34 million acres (eliminates mandatory funding cap). Up to 10% of the land enrolled each year can be land that is enrolled in the CRP if it meets certain requirements. (Sec. 2104)</p>	<p>Provides \$240 million in total from FY2008 through FY2012 (eliminates acreage cap). (Sec. 2401)</p>
<p><b>Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP):</b> Provides mandatory funding of \$400 million in FY2002; \$700 million in FY2003; \$1,000 million in FY2004; \$1,200 million in FY2005 and FY2006; \$1,270 million in FY2007-09; and \$1,300 million in FY2010. (Sec. 1241 of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>Provides \$1,250 million in FY2008, \$1,600 million in FY2009, \$1,700 million in FY2010, \$1,800 million in FY2011, and \$2,000 million in FY2012. (Sec. 2401) Of the total each year, at least 5% is reserved for beginning farms and at least 5% is reserved for socially-disadvantaged and limited resource farmers. (Sec. 2105)</p>	<p>Provides \$1,270 million in FY2008 and FY2009, and \$1,300 million in FY2010 through FY2012. (Sec. 2401) Authorizes new subprogram to assist producers who wish to convert to organic production, with no amount specified. (Sec. 2360) Authorizes new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Conservation Program, funded with additional funds that total \$165 million between FY2008 and FY2012. (Sec. 2361)</p>
<p><b>EQIP — Conservation Innovation Grants:</b> Funded using an unspecified portion of EQIP funding. (Sec. 1240H of 1985 Food Security Act) (In FY2006, almost \$26 million was provided.)</p>	<p>Provides, from funds made available for EQIP, \$30 million in FY2008, \$35 million in FY2009, \$50 million in FY2010, \$60 million in FY2011, and \$75 million. Requires funds be allocated as follows: \$5 million annually for organic and specialty crop producers; \$5 million annually for a new comprehensive conservation pilot planning program; \$10 million annually for competitive grants for innovative approaches to conservation that provide environmental and resource conservation benefits; and the remainder for air quality improvements to help producers meet regulatory requirements. (Sec. 2105)</p>	<p>No change in funding from current law.</p>

CRS-7

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
<p><b>EQIP — Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program:</b> Mandatory funding of \$25 million in FY2002; \$45 million in FY2003; and \$60 million in FY2004 through FY2007. Funding is in addition to funding authorized for EQIP. (Sec. 1240I of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>No provision. It would be replaced by a new Regional Water Enhancement Program in Sec. 2106; see below in new programs.</p>	<p>Provides mandatory funding of \$65 million annually in FY2008 through FY2012, and \$60 million annually thereafter. Funding is in addition to funding authorized for EQIP. (Sec. 2359)</p>
<p><b>EQIP — Klamath Basin:</b> \$50 million in mandatory funding, to be made available as soon as practicable. Funding is in addition to funding authorized for EQIP. (Sec. 1240I of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>Makes the Klamath Basin 1 of the 5 identified water quality and water quantity priority areas in the Regional Water Enhancement Program. The 5 priority areas may receive up to 50% of the amount made available for this program. (Sec. 2106)</p>	<p>Not identified in the EQIP provisions generally, or Ground and Surface Water component of EQIP.</p>
<p><b>Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP):</b> Provides mandatory funding of \$15 million in FY2002; \$30 million in FY2003; \$60 million in FY2004; and \$85 million in FY2005-07. (Sec. 1241 of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>Extends \$85 million annual funding level through FY2012. (Sec. 2401)</p>	<p>Extends \$85 million annual funding level through FY2012. (Sec. 2401)</p>
<p><b>Regional Equity:</b> Ensures that a total of at least \$12 million is provided annually to every state for a combination of CRP, WRP, and CSP. (Sec. 1241 of 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	<p>Ensures that a total of at least \$15 million is provided annually from FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2404)</p>	<p>Ensures that a total of at least \$15 million is provided annually from FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2402)</p>
<p><b>Agricultural Management Assistance:</b> Provides mandatory funding of \$20 million annually in FY2003 through FY2007, and \$10 million annually thereafter. (Sec. 524 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act)</p>	<p>Does not amend overall funding level; allocates 50% of funding to NRCS for conservation, 40% to the Risk Management Agency, and 10% to the Agricultural Marketing Service. (Sec. 2201)</p>	<p>Reauthorizes program through FY2012. (Sec. 2601)</p>
<p><b>Healthy Forest Reserve Program:</b> Authorizes \$25 million in discretionary funding in FY2004 and such sums as necessary in FY2005 through FY2008. (Title V of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003)</p>	<p>No provision in conservation title. (Forestry title provision provides \$10 million annually for FY2008 through FY2012, with funds to be available until expended (Sec. 8101))</p>	<p>Authorizes “such funds as are necessary” annually for FY2008 through FY2012.</p>

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
<p><b>Conservation Corridor Demonstration Program:</b> Authorizes such sums as are necessary in discretionary funding annually from FY2002 through FY2007. (Sec. 2601-2604 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002)</p>	No provision.	No provision.
<p><b>Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program:</b> Provides mandatory funding of \$45 million in FY2003, \$50 million in FY2004, \$55 million in FY2005, \$60 million in FY2006, \$65 million in FY2007, and \$0 in FY2008; and authorizes to be appropriated discretionary funding of \$45 million in FY2003, \$55 million in FY2004, \$65 million in FY2005, \$75 million in FY2006, and \$85 million in FY2007. (Sec. 14 of the Watershed Prevention and Flood Protection Act)</p>	Provides mandatory funding of \$50 million annually from FY2009 through FY2012, and authorizes discretionary funding of \$85 million annually from FY2007 through FY2012. (Sec. 2203)	Authorizes “such sums as are necessary” for FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2604)
<p><b>Conservation of Private Grazing Lands:</b> Authorizes appropriations of \$60 million annually between FY2002 and FY2007. (Sec. 1240M of the 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	Extends authorization through FY2012 at \$60 million per year. (Sec. 2108)	Extends authorization through FY2012 at \$60 million per year. (Sec. 2392)
<p><b>Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control:</b> Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually between FY2002 and FY2007. (Sec. 1240P of the 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	Extends authorization through FY2012 at \$5 million per year. (Sec. 2109)	Extends authorization through FY2012 at \$5 million per year. (Sec. 2395)
<p><b>Grassroots Source Water Protection Program:</b> Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually between FY2002 and FY2007. (Sec. 1240O of the 1985 Food Security Act)</p>	Provides \$20 million annually through FY2012, and a one-time “infusion” of \$10 million. (Sec. 2107)	Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually between FY2008 and FY2012. (Sec. 2394)

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
<p><b>Partnerships and Cooperation:</b> Authorizes up to 5% annually from funding for several programs, including CRP, WRP, CSP, and EQIP, to be set aside to fund this program, with any funds unallocated as of April 1 of a fiscal year to be used to carry out other activities under each of those programs. (Sec. 1243 (f))</p>	<p><b>Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative:</b> Authorizes up to 10% annually through FY2012 of the funding for each of three specified conservation programs (CSP, EQIP, and WHIP) to be set aside to fund this program, with any funds unallocated as of April 1 of a fiscal year to be used to carry out other activities under each of those programs. (Sec. 2403)</p>	<p><b>Partnerships and Cooperation.</b> Up to 10% of the funding each year for EQIP and several smaller programs is to be set aside to fund this program (at least 75% is to go to intrastate projects and less than 25% is to go to multistate projects), with any unallocated funds as of April 1 of a fiscal year to be used to carry out other activities under each of those programs. (Sec. 2405)</p>
<b>Proposed New Programs</b>		
No provision.	<p><b>Market-Based Approaches to Conservation:</b> Authorizes a total of \$50 million to be appropriated, with no years specified, and appropriated amounts to remain available until expended. (Sec. 2407)</p>	Authorizes “such sums as are necessary” for FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec.2406)
See EQIP: Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program, above.	<p><b>EQIP: Regional Water Enhancement Program:</b> Provides \$60 million annually. Provides up to 50% of funds to 5 identified priority areas and limits administrative expenses to 3% of funds made available. (Replaces Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program) (Sec. 2106)</p>	See EQIP: Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program, above.
No provision.	<p><b>Chesapeake Bay Program for Nutrient Reduction and Sediment Control:</b> Authorizes \$10 million in FY2008, \$15 million in FY2009, \$30 million in FY2010, \$40 million in FY2011, and \$55 million in FY2012, with the federal share of any single project to be less than \$5 million. (Sec. 2301)</p>	See Chesapeake Bay provision added to EQIP, above.
No provision.	<p><b>Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program:</b> Authorizes \$20 million to be annually appropriated from FY2008 through FY2012 to provide public access for wildlife-dependent recreation. (Sec. 2302)</p>	<p><b>Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentive Program.</b> Authorizes \$20 million annually through FY2012 to provide grants land owners to provide public access for wildlife-dependent recreation. (Sec. 2399)</p>

CRS-10

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
No provision.	<b>Farmland Resource Information:</b> Funded using at least \$400,000 annually, but not more than 0.5% of the funds provided to the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program annually. (Sec. 2503)	No funding provision.
No provision.	<b>Muck Soil Conservation:</b> Authorize \$50 million in appropriations annually from FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2303)	No provision.
No provision.	<b>Pilot Peanut Program for Four-Year Crop Rotation.</b> Authorizes up to \$10 million per year for FY2008 through FY2012. (Sec. 2504)	No provision.
No provision.	No provision.	<b>Comprehensive Stewardship Incentives Program.</b> Authorizes new program combining aspects of the Conservation Security Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program and authorizes an enrollment of 13.3 million acres each fiscal year, at an average annual cost of \$19 per acre, and with direction on how acreage is to be allocated to each state. (Sec. 2341).
No provision.	No provision.	<b>Discovery Watershed Demonstration Program.</b> Authorizes “such sums as are necessary” for a new demonstration program in the Upper Mississippi watershed to promote effective approaches for reducing the loss of nutrients into surface waters. (Sec. 2397)

CRS-11

Program and Provisions in Current Law (FY2002 - FY2007, unless otherwise noted)	H.R. 2419, the House-Passed Farm Bill	H.R. 2419 (amended), the Senate-Passed Farm Bill
No provision.	No provision.	<b>Emergency Landscape Restoration Program.</b> Authorizes “such sums as are necessary” annually between FY2008 and FY2012 , to remain available until spent, to restore certain lands and resources “adversely affected by natural catastrophic events.” Sec. 2398)
No provision.	No provision.	<b>Agriculture Conservation Experienced Services Program.</b> Authorizes use of funds from EQIP and two other to provide grants to employee experts over 55 to provide technical assistance. (Sec. 2602)

**Table 2. Comparison of FY2007 Funding Level Under Current Law with FY2008 and FY2012 Funding Levels Under the House- and Senate-Passed Farm Bills**

<b>Program<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>FY2007 authorized spending under current law /FY2007 actual spending</b>	<b>H.R. 2419: FY2008 spending/FY2012 spending</b>	<b>H.R. 2419 (amended): FY2008 spending/FY2012 spending</b>
Conservation Reserve Program	Up to 39.2 million acres at any time (No dollar amount specified)/\$2,187 million	Up to 39.2 million acres at any time/Up to 39.2 million acres (No dollar amount specified annually or overall)	Up to 39.2 million acres at any time/Up to 39.2 million acres (No dollar amount specified annually or overall)
Wetlands Reserve Program	250,000 acres per year (No dollar amount specified)/\$250 million to enroll 150,000 acres	250,000 acres per year/250,000 acres per year (No dollar amount specified annually or overall)	250,000 acres per year/250,000 acres per year (No dollar amount specified annually or overall)
Farmland (Farm and Ranchland) Protection Program	\$97 million/\$74 million	\$150 million/\$280 million	\$97 million/\$97 million
Agricultural Management Assistance	\$14 million/\$0	\$5 million/\$5 million	\$10 million/\$10 million
Grasslands Reserve Program	\$0/\$0 (entire 2002 farm bill allocation of \$254 million had been spent to enroll just over 1 million acres before FY2007)	Enroll an additional 1.34 million acres in total (No dollar amount specified annually or overall)	A total of \$254 million between FY2008 and FY2012
Environmental Quality Incentives Program	\$1,270 million/\$1,017 million	\$1,250 million/\$2,000 million	\$1,270 million/\$1,300 million
Ground and Surface Water/Regional Water Quality Enhancement Program	\$60 million/\$51 million	\$60 million/\$60 million	\$65 million/\$65 million
Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program	\$85 million/\$43 million	\$85 million/\$85 million	\$85 million/\$85 million
Watershed Rehabilitation Program	\$65 million in mandatory funding and \$85 million in discretionary funding /\$0 in mandatory funding and \$32 million in discretionary funding.	\$85 million discretionary and \$0 mandatory/\$85 million discretionary and \$50 million mandatory funding	Discretionary funding of such sums as may be necessary.

a. The Conservation Security Program (CSP) is not included in the table because the authorized funding levels in current law and in H.R. 2419 are for multi-year periods. The Natural Resource Conservation Service estimates that CSP spending in FY2007 will total \$374 million.