

An hourglass-shaped graphic with a globe of the Earth inside. The top bulb is dark blue, and the bottom bulb is light blue. The hourglass is centered on the page.

WikiLeaks Document Release

<http://wikileaks.org/wiki/CRS-RL31486>

February 2, 2009

Congressional Research Service

Report RL31486

*Resource Conservation Title of the 2002 Farm Bill: A
Comparison of New Law with Bills Passed by the House and
Senate, and Prior Law*

Jeffrey A. Zinn, Resources, Science and Industry Division

Updated June 25, 2002

Abstract. President Bush signed the new farm bill, titled the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, on May 13, 2002 (P.L. 107-171). Most of the agricultural conservation programs are in Title II. This report compares the Title II provisions of P.L. 107-171 with the conservation titles in the bills that passed both Chambers, and with prior law, in two tables. The first table presents the major provisions. The second table compares funding levels for each program, by year.

WikiLeaks

Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Resource Conservation Title of the 2002 Farm Bill: A Comparison of New Law with Bills Passed by the House and Senate, and Prior Law

Updated June 25, 2002

Jeffrey A. Zinn
Senior Analyst in Natural Resources Policy
Resources, Science, and Industry Division

<http://wikileaks.org/wiki/CRS-RL31486>

Resource Conservation Title of the 2002 Farm Bill: A Comparison of New Law with Bills Passed by the House and Senate, and Prior Law

Summary

President Bush signed the new farm bill, titled the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, on May 13, 2002 (P.L. 107-171). Most of the agricultural conservation programs are in Title II. This report compares the Title II provisions of P.L. 107-171 with the conservation titles in the bills that passed both Chambers, and with prior law (primarily the 1996 Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act), in two tables. The first table presents the major provisions. The second table compares funding levels for each program, by year. The tables only include the programs and provisions that were enacted in Title II; conservation provisions in other farm bill titles, or those that were in the conservation title of one of the bills but either were dropped in conference or moved elsewhere in the bill are listed in the Introduction.

The conservation title reauthorizes many major conservation programs and authorizes new programs, mostly through FY2007. For existing programs, the provisions make many policy adjustments, and increase funding or raise enrollment ceilings. The new programs enacted in the Title provide additional conservation assistance for purposes or in locations that policy makers believe were not being adequately served. The largest of the new programs is the Conservation Security Program.

The new law greatly increases total conservation budget authority above current levels, and funds more of the conservation effort as mandatory spending through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Funding for most programs will increase from year-to-year, and will increase several-fold for some programs, such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program and the Farmland Protection Program. The Congressional Budget Office issued a baseline (for mandatory spending only) in April 2001 that was used by policy makers to calculate future spending patterns in this legislation. It determined that the baseline (that is, reauthorization of all programs with no changes in policy, and no new programs) for conservation programs was \$11.6 billion over the next 6 years. The new law will increase mandatory spending for conservation programs by \$9.2 billion over the next 6 years to a total of \$20.8 billion, according to the CBO.

Farm bill conferees had to resolve many differences between the conservation titles of the two bills. The House bill primarily reauthorized existing programs, usually at smaller funding increases than the Senate bill, and included fewer new programs and less change to current conservation policy. By contrast, the Senate bill made more numerous and significant changes to existing programs and to conservation policies that generally expanded the conservation effort. It also created many more new programs, such as the Conservation Security Program. Among the most hotly debated issues over the farm bill was how much of the new funding should go to conservation programs (rather than commodity programs, for example), and how that funding should be divided among the programs.

Contents

Introduction	1
Table 1. Comparison of Current Resource Conservation Law with Provisions in Title II of Farm Bills Passed by House and Senate	6
A. Environmental Conservation Acreage Reserve Program (ECARP)	6
B. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)	7
C. Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)	10
D. Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)	11
E. Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	15
F. Farmland Protection Program (FPP)	16
G. Other Programs (Including Technical Assistance)	17
H. New Programs	20
Table 2. Comparison of Resource Conservation Title Funding in 2002 Farm Bill with Proposed Funding in Farm Bills Passed by House and Senate, and Prior Law	29

Resource Conservation Title of the 2002 Farm Bill: Comparison of New Law with Bills Passed by the House and Senate, and Prior Law

Introduction

Resource conservation programs were first enacted in the 1930s to reduce the effects of soil erosion on crop production. They then were expanded in the 1940s and 1950s to help landowners manage water resources and control floods. The approach to conservation that developed with these earliest programs, based on voluntary participation, changed little until 1985. Participants were attracted by the availability of a combination of financial, technical and educational assistance, and results from related research.

Starting with the 1985 farm bill, Congress rapidly expanded conservation programs beyond erosion control and water management, and beyond the goal of improving crop production. Programs enacted in the 1985, 1990, and 1996 farm bills protect and restore wetlands and wildlife habitat, and recognize the need to improve air and water quality, for example. The 1985 provisions also increased producer interest by requiring that crop producers who wish to receive federal farm program subsidies meet certain erosion control and wetland protection requirements.

Since the 1996 law was enacted, new issues have emerged, including: the role that agriculture might play in producing energy from biomass and in sequestering carbon; protection and restoration of grasslands; reduction of non point water pollution caused by large confined animal feeding operations; and additional attention to other “off-farm” impacts. The new farm bill addresses some of these issues as it expands the breadth and the magnitude of the resource conservation effort, and as new conservation tools are added, such as multi-year agreements to maintain conservation on lands in production through the Conservation Security Program.

The expanded conservation effort is reflected in increasing funding. In 1985, all conservation activities at USDA received a total of just over \$1 billion (and all funding was discretionary, and dependent on the annual appropriations process). The 1996 farm bill moved five conservation programs to mandatory funding through USDA’s Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). (Mandatory funding is provided through the borrowing authority of the CCC, while discretionary funding requires an annual appropriation.) Conservation programs now receive more than \$3 billion annually (about \$1.25 billion in discretionary spending and slightly over \$2 billion in mandatory spending). Most of the spending growth since 1985 has been for land retirement and easements (e.g., the Conservation Reserve and Wetlands Reserve Programs), while the other activities have grown very slowly, if at all, in real terms.

The new farm bill will increase mandatory spending by a total of \$9.2 billion over 6 years, to a total of \$20.8 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). This averages out to an additional \$1.5 billion each year, but the increases will gradually grow, and the amounts spent will be largest for most programs in the last year.

Under the 1996 farm bill, numerous programs were scheduled to expire at the end of FY2002. During several days of hearings in 2001, both agriculture committees gathered ideas for a new farm bill as they considered how to extend existing programs beyond FY2002. Farm groups generally suggested increasing funding for existing programs and increasing compatibility between conservation activities and farm operations. Other interest groups, while supporting some of the farmer proposals, recommended more substantial changes, including new programs and major shifts in policy that would increase environmental benefits. Demand to participate in most programs has greatly exceeded available financial and technical resources in recent years, creating a major challenge that conservation supporters said justified higher authorization levels.

The remainder of this report is two tables. **Table 1** lists resource conservation provisions enacted in Title II of the 2002 farm bill in the first column, and includes the section number of the legislation. The second and third columns summarize the comparable provisions in the farm bills that passed each Chamber. The final column presents prior law or policy, and includes the section in law where it was placed. Table entries note where 2002 farm bill provisions move a program to a different section of law. Funding information in this table is scattered throughout; **Table 2** pulls all the funding information together in one place.

Table 1 does not include any of the provisions that were dropped in conference, or moved to another title in the finally-enacted farm bill. (For more information on the provisions that were dropped, see CRS Report, RL31255, titled *Resource Conservation Title: Comparison of Current Law with Farm Bills Passed by the House and Senate*, and issued February 28, 2002.) Some of the provisions passed by the Senate may have disappeared as free-standing programs, only to reappear as activities within other programs. Dropped provisions from the House-passed bill include:

- a new Farmland Stewardship Program “to more precisely tailor and target” conservation programs, on a watershed basis where possible; and
- repeal of numerous programs (none of which are currently being implemented), including the Environmental Easement Program, the Conservation Farm Option, and the National Natural Resources Conservation Foundation.

Dropped provisions from the Senate-passed bill include:

- a new Wetland Reserve Enhancement Program as a component of the Wetland Reserve Program, modeled on the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program;
- new programs, each spending small portions of funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program for a Groundwater Conservation Program in the Southern High Plains, a pilot program for drinking water suppliers, and a nutrient management program for the Chesapeake Bay watershed;

- a new Watershed Risk Reduction Program to purchase floodplain easements;
- a new Water Conservation Program to permit eligible states to purchase or lease water rights as part of a Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, and to provide cost-sharing assistance in the same eligible states to increase irrigation efficiency, convert production to less water-intensive crops, and acquire water rights;
- new organic agriculture provisions that would establish a new research trust fund and a National Organic Research Endowment Institute to develop and implement a plan for research on organic products using the trust fund; and
- new provisions on mediation services when an adverse decision on a conservation program is made.

Both tables identify only provisions that are in Title II of the 2002 farm bill. Some provisions in other titles, including commodities, forestry, energy, rural development, and miscellaneous that may be considered to be conservation topics, are not included in this comparison. They include:

- requiring producers who receive direct or counter-cyclical payments to be meet conservation and wetland compliance requirements (§1105(a) in the Commodity Title);
- requiring producers who receive nonrecourse marketing loans to meet conservation and wetland compliance provisions (§1201, in the commodity Title);
- prohibiting making conservation and commodity payments to individuals or entities with annual adjusted gross incomes greater than \$2.5 million in FY2003 through FY2007 (§1604, in the Commodity Title);
- providing relief in commodity and conservation programs for producers who act in good faith (§1613, in the Commodity Title; the conservation portion had been in the conservation title of the Senate-passed version)
- replacing the Forestry Incentive Program, administered by NRCS, which provided cost-sharing assistance on small private nonindustrial forest lands, with a new Forest Land Enhancement Program, to be administered by the U.S. Forest Service (§8001 and §8002, in the Forestry Title);
- establishing a Cranberry Acreage Conservation Reserve to protect wetlands associated with cranberry production (§10608 of the Miscellaneous Title; it had been in the conservation title of the Senate-passed farm bill);
- granting authority to the Secretary to provide financial and technical assistance to the Chino Dairy Preserve Project (§10803 of the Miscellaneous Title); and
- requiring a review of natural resource (and other) programs operating on tribal and trust lands, with a report to Congress within 1 year of enactment (§10910 of the Miscellaneous Title).

This report does not analyze or comment on the probable effects of the enacted conservation program changes on resource conditions or program management and delivery. Many of these changes are likely have significant effects because of: their scope or scale, and the places and natural resources that they could affect. Additionally, the effects will be determined, in part, by the approaches that implementing agencies choose to follow in undertaking changed or new responsibilities. Some of these provisions went through a lengthy gestation period, such as the Conservation Security and Grasslands Reserve Programs, developed by Senator Harkin's staff and the Nature Conservancy, respectively. (Development of

the Conservation Security Program included test implementation by the Department of Agriculture staff and by others.)

Less analysis and information is available about many of the other provisions. These provisions include: small or limited programs, such as the Grassroots Source Water Protection Program; programs of limited geographic scope, such as the Conservation Corridor Demonstration Program (available only on the Delmarva Peninsula); and proposals that appeared as the farm bill process was drawing to a close to address an issue that emerged recently, such as the Klamath Basin provisions which were introduced as a free-standing proposal with many elements and incorporated into the Senate bill, and then were greatly altered, becoming limited to an earmarking of funds from the new Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program component of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program by the conference committee.

Table 2 lists annual funding/enrollment levels authorized under the new current law through FY2007 in the first column, and compares these with proposed funding/enrollment levels in both bills, and under earlier law. The House bill would have authorized programs through FY2011, while the Senate bill would have authorized them through FY2006, unless noted. Most programs are first funded in the current fiscal year, FY2002, although a few will not be eligible for funding until FY2003, and one program is funded through FY2008. The conservation title also contains numerous proposed changes in policy that do not involve funding/enrollment levels; these changes, which in some instances include how the funds are to be allocated, are not identified in table 2.

The entry for each program notes whether the proposal would require mandatory or discretionary funding. A large majority of conservation funding (although not necessarily a majority of all active conservation programs) already is mandatory, and the portion of all funding using CCC resources will increase. Entries also indicate new smaller programs that would be funded using a portion of funds authorized for a larger program, and identify the relationship between the recipient and the source program.

Funding levels for many of the programs would increase gradually from year to year, rather than jump to the highest authorized level in a single year and then remain at that level through FY2007. Higher funding levels in out-years will allow the administering agencies to “ramp up” their efforts. Given the large magnitude of increases from current levels and the large number of programs where increases will simultaneously occur, “ramping up” is widely viewed as having the potential to result in more efficient and effective implementation.

Table 2 also provides the official estimates in budget authority prepared by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). These CBO estimates are only for the mandatory programs. They show projected increases above the baseline which was prepared in April, 2001, by year. This baseline is used because although a revised baseline was issued in March 2002 and projected higher costs as the farm bill legislative debate was concluding, the congressional debate was based largely on the 2001 baseline.

To summarize these CBO 2001 baseline estimates, total conservation funding for mandatory programs will amount to \$20.8 billion over the next 6 years, an increase of \$9.2 billion. This increase over baseline is somewhat closer to the estimate of the additional cost of the House-passed bill of \$6.788 billion through FY2006 and \$15.787 billion through FY2011, then for the Senate-passed bill, which would have raised spending by \$11.776 billion through FY2006. The conservation program increases are a significant portion of the \$73.5 billion increase in budget authority allowed by the FY2001 budget agreement for all spending in programs under the jurisdiction of the agriculture committees. While using the more recent March, 2002 baseline would have had a major effect on estimates of overall agriculture spending, increasing the total from \$73.5 billion to \$82.8 billion, total conservation spending was forecast to be only \$500 million higher, or \$21.3 billion.

For several programs, participation is limited by acres permitted to be enrolled, rather than a cap on funding levels. For these programs, CBO must estimate both the average cost per acre and the rate at which land would be enrolled. CBO has developed the following factors for making cost estimates for these acreage-based programs:

- For the CRP, \$50 per acre annually for regular enrollment, and \$100 per acre for the continuous enrollment option and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP);
- For the proposed Grasslands Reserve Program, \$15 to \$20 per acre annually; and
- For the WRP, \$1000 per acre.

Table 1. Comparison of Current Resource Conservation Law with Provisions in Title II of Farm Bills Passed by House and Senate

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
A. Environmental Conservation Acreage Reserve Program (ECARP)			
<p>1. Purpose and Programs. Renames ECARP the Comprehensive Conservation Enhancement Program (CCEP). [<i>§2006(a)</i>] Places new name throughout §1230; repeals §1230A. [<i>§2006(b)</i>] [Note: New good faith provisions for both commodity and conservation programs are placed in §1613 of the commodity title.]</p> <p><small>http://wikileaks.org/wiki/CRS-103148</small></p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Renames ECARP the Comprehensive Conservation Enhancement Program (CCEP), and places new name throughout §1230. [<i>§207(a)</i>] Amends §1230(a) to reflect changed placement of conservation programs in 1985 FSA. CCEP includes: Conservation Reserve Program; Wetlands Reserve Program; Environmental Quality Incentives Program; Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program; a new Grasslands Reserve Program; and an amended Conservation of Private Grazing Lands Program. [<i>§211(a)</i>] Repeals §1230A. [<i>§207(c)</i>] [Note: §1230A is replaced with new good faith provisions in §1244(a) of the 1985 FSA, discussed below in subsection H and found in §204 of this bill.]</p>	<p>Authorizes ECARP through long term contracts and acquisition of easements, to be implemented through the Conservation Reserve Program, Wetlands Reserve Program, and Environmental Quality Incentive Program. [<i>§1230(a) of the 1985 FSA as amended by §331 of the 1996 FAIR</i>] Good Faith protection provisions added as §1230A of the 1985 FSA in §755 of the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations. [<i>§1230A</i>]</p>
<p>2. Priority Areas. Repeals §1230(c), which allows the Sec. to designate national priority areas for enhanced conservation assistance. [<i>§2006(b)</i>] [Note: National priority areas are affirmed, but only for the CRP, in §1231(f).]</p>	<p>Repeals §1230(c). [<i>§201(2)</i>]</p>	<p>Adds a new subsection giving priority to areas where projects could be completed most rapidly. [<i>§211(b)</i>]</p>	<p>Permits the Sec. to designate watershed, multistate areas, or areas of special environmental sensitivity for enhanced conservation assistance through the CRP, WRP, and EQIP. [<i>§ 1230(c) of the 1985 FSA as amended by §331 of the</i></p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
			<i>1996 FAIR</i>
B. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)			
<p>1. Period of Authorization and Purposes. Reauthorizes CRP through FY2007, and adds wildlife resources to the purposes of the program. [<i>§2101(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes CRP through FY2011. [<i>§211(a)</i>] Adds wildlife resources to the purposes of the program. [<i>§211(b)</i>]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes CRP through FY2006. [<i>§212(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Authorizes program through FY2002, and states the purposes are to conserve and improve soil and water resources. [<i>§1231 (a) of the 1985 FSA as amended by §322(a)(1) of the 1996 FAIR</i>]</p>
<p>2. Eligibility. Repeals the limit on enrolling marginal pastureland to less than 10% of the total enrolled acres, expands the definition of other eligible cropland to include threats to soil and air quality, and makes eligible land that has a cropping history or was considered to be planted at least 4 of the 6 years preceding enactment, and that would conserve ground or surface water. Adds a new §231(j) that requires an equitable balance between soil erosion, water quality, and wildlife habitat when reviewing bids. [<i>§2101(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Repeals the limit on enrolling marginal pastureland to less than 10% of the total enrolled acres, expands the definition of other eligible cropland to include threats to soil and air quality, and makes eligible land in production for at least 4 years that would contribute to conservation of ground and surface water. [<i>§212(a)</i>] Adds a new §231(i) that requires balance between soil erosion, water quality, and wildlife habitat when reviewing bids, with implementing regulations to be issued within 180 days of enactment. [<i>§212(d)</i>]</p>	<p>Makes eligible land that has a cropping history for 3 of the 6 years preceding enactment (and land enrolled in the CRP on that date), and adds a new subsection that makes land enrolled under the continuous signup and the buffer initiative eligible for the regular program. [<i>§212(b)</i>]</p>	<p>Makes certain highly erodible land, marginal pastureland, and other cropland eligible. [<i>Section 1231(b) of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
<p>3. Enrollment Ceiling. Raises ceiling to 39.2 million acres. [<i>§2101(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Raises ceiling to 39.2 million acres. [<i>§212(b)</i>]</p>	<p>Raises ceiling to 41.1 million acres. [<i>§212(c)</i>] [Note: §215(a), water conservation, lowers the CRP enrollment ceiling from 41.1 million acres to 40.0 million acres, then adds 500,000 acres for a new pilot program, bringing the total to 40.5 million acres.]</p>	<p>Authorizes enrollment ceiling at 36.4 million acres. [<i>§1231(d) of the 1985 FSA as amended by §332(b) of the 1996 FAIR.</i>]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>4. Duration of Contract. Allows producers to extend contracts for hardwood trees, shelter belts, wind breaks, or wildlife corridors for up to a total of 15 years, allows the Sec. to extend contracts for hardwood trees of any length for up to 5 additional years, and allows producers to extend contracts expiring in 2002 for 1 additional year. [§2101]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Allows the Sec. to extend contracts on hardwood forests for up to 15 years, and limits annual payments to 50% of the original contract amount. New contracts can be from 10 to 30 years in length. [§212(d)]</p>	<p>Allows CRP contracts for some land devoted to hardwood trees, shelter belts, wind breaks, or wildlife corridors to be longer than the 10 to 15 years allowed for other contracts. [§1231(e)(2) of the 1985 FSA]</p>
<p>5. Conservation Priority Areas. Retains prior law in §1231(f).</p>	<p>Allows land enrolled under this subchapter to be eligible to reenroll in the CRP. [§212(c)]</p>	<p>Gives priority to areas where designation would lead to the most rapid completion of projects. [§212(b)]</p>	<p>Requires the Sec. to establish, at the request of a state, priority watersheds in specified and other areas where enrollment would “maximize water quality and habitat benefits.” Areas must be redesignated at least once every 5 years. [§1231(f) of the 1985 FSA]</p>
<p>6. Enrollment Subcategories. Expands the pilot wetland program to all states, with some exceptions (wetlands adjacent to larger perennial streams are ineligible), and limits enrollment to 1 million acres of wetlands and associated buffers in total and to 100,000 acres in any state. Eligible areas must have been cropped 3 of the preceding 10 years. Enrolled wetland areas must be smaller than 10 acres, with up to 5 acres eligible for payments. These acres are not to count against the 39.2 million acres ceiling. [§2101]</p>	<p>Expands the pilot program to all states and limits enrollment in any state to 150,000 acres. [§215]</p>	<p>Deletes “pilot”, reauthorizes the program through FY2006, and increases the maximum size of eligible sites from 5 acres to 10 acres (but only up to 5 acres are eligible for payments). [§212(e)]</p>	<p>Authorizes a 500,000 acre pilot program, with enrollment limited to 150,000 acres in any state for small wetlands (less than 5 acres) and associated buffers in 6 specified upper Midwestern states. [A new §1231(h), enacted in Title XI of the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations (P.L. 106-387)]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>7. Duties of Owners and Operators. Adds provision forgiving producers who violate their contracts by not installing approved conservation practices because of acts of nature. Expands circumstances to permit managed harvesting and grazing when there is no emergency. Replaces provisions that permit up to 6 biomass projects with language permitting the installation of wind turbines on CRP lands, subject to certain considerations. Deletes subsections (c) and (d), and adds a new subsection (c) that permits the Sec. to limit repayments from producers subject to foreclosure, and to reinstate the terms of the contract when the producer resumes control of the land. [§2101]</p>	<p>Allows certain economic uses of enrolled lands if consistent with soil, water, and wildlife conservation. These uses include managed grazing and haying (with reduced payments), siting of wind turbines, and harvesting biomass to produce energy (with reduced payments). Deletes subsections (c) and (d). [§213]</p>	<p>Adds a subsection allowing irrigated land to be enrolled through the buffer initiative or a CREP at the irrigated land rate. [Section 212(f)] Allows participants to plant native prairie grasses on enrolled marginal pastureland, to permit harvesting or grazing for maintenance purposes on lands enrolled through the buffer initiative or a CREP, and adds a new subsection that makes crop production on other highly erodible land a violation of a CRP contract unless it has a cropping history or was a building site when it was purchased. [§212(g)] Adds a new subsection that permits wind turbines on CRP land (except land enrolled in the continuous enrollment), with payments reduced based on the diminished value for CRP. [§212(h)]</p>	<p>Lists requirements for participation and penalties for violators. Sets limits on commercial agricultural uses of lands in the CRP, but allows the Sec. to permit harvesting or grazing under very limited circumstances, and to undertake up to 6 biomass production projects. [§1232(a) of the 1985 FSA as amended by the 1990 FACTA] Sets a goal of planting 1/8 of the land enrolled each year to trees or habitat. [§1232(c) of the 1985 FSA] Allows alley-cropping. [§1232(d) of the 1985 FSA]</p>
<p>8. Funding and Administration. Reauthorizes mandatory funding from the CCC, including funding for technical assistance, through FY2007. [§2701]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes mandatory funding through FY2011. [§241]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes funding from the CCC through FY2006, and includes funding for technical assistance in support of this program. [§211(c)]</p>	<p>Provides mandatory funding through the CCC. [§1241(a) of the 1985 FSA as amended by §341 of the 1996 FACT]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>9. Study of Economic Effects. Requires the Sec. to report to both Agriculture Committees on the economic and social effects of the CRP on rural communities within 18 months of enactment. Specifies 4 components of the analysis. [§2101(b)]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Requires the Sec. to report to both Agriculture Committees on the economic and social effects of the CRP on rural communities within 270 days of enactment. Specifies 3 components of the analysis. [§212(l)]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
C. Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)			
<p>1. Enrollment. Authorizes WRP enrollment through calendar year 2007. [§2201] Sets a maximum enrollment ceiling of 2,275,000 acres, and an annual enrollment goal of 250,000 acres. [§2202]</p>	<p>Allows enrollment of up to 150,000 acres per calendar year starting in 2002, with any acres up to the annual limit that are not enrolled can be enrolled in succeeding years, through FY2011. [§221(a)] Authorizes enrollment through FY2011. [§221(c)]</p>	<p>Authorizes WRP enrollment through calendar year 2006. [§214(c)] Sets a maximum enrollment ceiling of 2,225,000 acres, and an annual enrollment goal of 250,000 acres, of which up to 25,000 acres can be enrolled in the new Wetland Reserve Enhancement Program. [§214(b)]</p>	<p>The 1990 FACTA adds a new §1237 to the 1985 FSA establishing the WRP and capping enrollment at 975,000 acres. [Section 1237 of the 1985 FSA, as amended] Enrollment allowed through calendar year 2002. [§333(b)(1) of the 1996 FAIR] Enrollment ceiling increased from 975,000 acres to 1,075,000 acres. [§808 of the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations (P.L. 106-387)]</p>
<p>2. Enrollment Options. Allows land to be enrolled using permanent and 30 year easements, and restoration cost sharing agreements in any combination. [§2202]</p>	<p>Deletes the 1/3 requirement, and the distinction between permanent and temporary easements. [§221(b)]</p>	<p>Creates a new Wetland Reserve Enhancement Program that allows agreements with state and local government, and non-governmental organizations to restore wetlands on land in or eligible to be enrolled in the WRP. [§214(d)]</p>	<p>Requires 1/3 enrollment each using permanent easements, 30 year easements, and long-term agreements. [§1237(b) of the 1985 FSA as amended by §333(a) of the 1996 FAIR]</p>
<p>3. Easements and Agreements. Deletes subsection (h). [§2203]</p>	<p>Replaces the 4 specific prohibitions with a general statement to allow only changes permitted in the plan. Deletes subsection (e), which distinguishes 3 lengths of easements, and subsection (h).</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Describes the general terms of easements and agreements. Prohibits altering habitat, spraying chemicals and mowing, any activity that degrades the land, and any other activity that counters the purpose of</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
	[§222]		the easement, unless permitted in the plan. Subsection (h) allows the Sec. to require landowners using cost sharing agreements to restore wetlands if the agreement does not provide an easement. [<i>§1237A of the 1985 FSA as amended by §333(d)(1) of the 1996 FAIR</i>]
<p>4. Changes in Ownership. Replaces 1990 acquisition date in §1237E(a)(2) with provision to make eligible at any time land acquired through foreclosure where the previous owner exercised a right of redemption. [<i>§2204</i>]</p>	<p>Replaces 1990 acquisition date in §1237E(a)(2) with provision to make eligible at any time land acquired through foreclosure where the previous owner exercised a right of redemption. [<i>§224</i>]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Limits program entry if ownership changes occurred during the previous year, and specifies terms under which easements can be modified or terminated. [<i>§1237E of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
<p>5. Funding. Reauthorizes mandatory funding from the CCC, including funding for technical assistance through FY2007. [<i>§2701</i>]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes mandatory funding from the CCC through FY2011. [<i>§241</i>]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes mandatory funding from the CCC through FY2006, and includes funding for technical assistance in support of this program. [<i>§211(c)</i>]</p>	<p>Mandatory funding from the CCC is authorized to implement the WRP. [<i>§1241(a) of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
D. Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)			
<p>1. Program Purposes. Specifies that EQIP is to promote production and environmental quality, and to optimize environmental benefits by helping producers meet regulatory requirements for soil water, and air quality, wildlife habitat, and surface and groundwater conservation and 4 other specified purposes. [<i>§2301</i>].</p>	<p>Deletes reference to the programs that were replaced; replaces the purpose of responding to environmental threats with the purpose of providing environmental benefits; and expands the benefits to include air quality. [<i>§231</i>]</p>	<p>Specifies that EQIP is to promote production and environmental quality while maximizing environmental benefits per dollar spent by assisting producers to meet 6 specified purposes. [<i>§213(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Identifies 4 programs that EQIP replaces. Specifies that EQIP maximize environmental benefits per dollar spent while meeting 4 purposes. [<i>§334 of the 1996 FAIR adds §1240 to the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
<p>2. Definitions. Adds definitions of “beginning farmer” and “practice”; deletes definition of “producer”;</p>	<p>Adds non-industrial private forest land to “eligible land”, and replaces the notion of posing an</p>	<p>Adds definitions of “beginning farmer or rancher”, “comprehensive nutrient management”, “innovative</p>	<p>Defines “eligible land”, “land management practice”, “livestock”, “producer”, and “structural</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>modifies definition of “eligible land” to include private nonindustrial forest land. [§2301]</p>	<p>environmental threat with the notion of providing environmental benefits in that definition; and “producer” is expanded to include non-industrial private forestry. [§232]</p>	<p>technology”, “managed grazing”, “maximum environmental benefits per dollar expended”, “practice”, and “program”. [§213(a)]</p>	<p>practice”. [§1240A of the 1985 FSA]</p>
<p>3. Program Establishment and Administration. Reauthorizes EQIP through FY2007; adds incentive payments for comprehensive nutrient management plans; authorizes contracts of 1 to 10 years; prohibits bidding down; limits cost sharing payments to 75% (up to 90% for limited resource and beginning farmers, or to address a natural disaster); prohibits duplicate cost sharing payments for the same practice; eliminates (by not including) the limitation on cost-sharing with large confined livestock operations for waste management facilities; specifies circumstances for modifying and terminating contracts. [§2301]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes EQIP through FY2011; authorizes contracts of 1 to 10 years; repeals requirement that structural practices be selected to maximize environmental benefits per dollar spent; deletes limitation on payments to large livestock operations to construct animal waste management facilities; and adds a new provision to make incentive payments at an amount and rate to encourage multiple land management practices, with emphasis on payments for practices that address “residue, nutrient, pest, invasive species, and air quality management.” [§233]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes EQIP through FY2006; adds comprehensive nutrient management planning to the list of eligible practices; allows the Sec. to provide conservation education to producers; authorizes contracts of 3 to 10 years; limits producers to 1 contract for structural practices to manage livestock nutrients through FY2006; limits large confined livestock operators to 1 contract over authorization period for a waste storage or treatment facility; authorizes application and evaluation procedures for selecting applicants; prohibits bidding down; limits cost sharing payments to 75% (up to 90% for limited resource and beginning farmers, or to address a natural disaster); prohibits duplicate cost sharing payments for the same practice; eliminates (by not including) the limitation on cost-sharing with large confined livestock operations for waste management facilities; permits incentive payments for technical assistance to certified individuals to develop comprehensive nutrient</p>	<p>Authorizes EQIP through 2002; eligible practices include structural and land management practices; authorizes contracts of 5 to 10 years; provides cost-share of not more than 75% for structural practices; prohibits cost sharing to large livestock operations to construct animal waste management facilities; provides incentive payments for land management practices; provides funding (not to exceed projected costs) for technical assistance; and lists types of private sources to provide technical assistance. [§1240B of the 1985 FSA]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
		management plans; and specifies circumstances for terminating contracts. [<i>§213(a)</i>]	
<p>4. Evaluation of Offers. Requires the Sec. to give higher priority to cost-effective conservation practices, and practices that address national conservation priorities. [<i>§2301</i>]</p>	<p>Replaces these provisions with general language about aiding farmers to comply with environmental laws and encourage conservation, maximizing the benefits of using manure and other soil amendments, and encouraging sustainable grazing systems. [<i>§234</i>]</p>	<p>Adds higher priority also to be given for special projects initiated by a new partnership program to address environmental issues placed in <i>§1243(f)</i>, and to innovative technologies for structural or land management practices. [<i>§213(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Requires Sec. to give higher priority to assistance in priority areas, maximize environmental benefits per dollar spent, or are in watersheds, regions, or conservation priority areas where states or localities are active partners. [<i>§1240C of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
<p>5. Duties of Producers. Adds comprehensive nutrient management plan to the list of plans to be implemented to be eligible for EQIP assistance. [<i>§2301</i>]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Almost identical to current law, except gives the Sec. greater latitude in determining the appropriate penalty for violations. [<i>§213(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Lists 5 duties; one is a prohibition against practices that counter the purposes of EQIP. [<i>§1240D of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
<p>6. Program Plan. Requires producers seeking support for a confined livestock feeding operation to submit a comprehensive nutrient management plan, if applicable. [<i>§2301</i>]</p>	<p>Replaces mention of management and structural practices with providing greater environmental benefits. [<i>§235</i>]</p>	<p>Almost identical to current law. [<i>§213(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Lists the general contents of plans producers are required to submit to the Sec. to participate. [<i>§1240E of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>
<p>7. Secretarial Duties. Deletes current requirements to provide an eligibility assessment; to provide technical assistance; and to encourage obtaining technical assistance and money from other sources. [<i>§2301</i>]</p>	<p>Deletes incentive payments from implementing structural and land management practices. [<i>§236</i>]</p>	<p>Almost identical to current law, except that it deletes (by not including) the duty of providing an eligibility assessment. [<i>§213(a)</i>]</p>	<p>Assigns 5 duties to the Sec, including: preparing an eligibility assessment; providing technical assistance in developing and implementing a plan; providing technical and financial assistance for developing and implementing practices; providing information and training to implement the program; and encouraging participants to obtain assistance from other sources. [<i>§1240F of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>8. Payment Limits and Timing. Limits payments to a total of \$450,000 for all contracts with an individual or entity between FY2002 and FY2007; repeals language allowing annual limits to be exceeded to provide maximum environmental benefit per dollar spent, and provisions to delay federal expenditures until the year after the contract has been signed. [§2307]</p>	<p>Limits payments to \$50,000 annually and \$200,000 per contract; repeals language allowing annual limits to be exceeded to provide maximum environmental benefit per dollar spent, and provisions to delay federal expenditures until the year after the contract has been signed. [§237]</p>	<p>Limits total payments under all contracts to \$30,000 annually, \$90,000 for 3 year contracts, \$120,000 for 4 year contracts, and \$150,000 for a contract of 4 years or more. The Sec. can waive the annual limit to increase environmental benefits. Deletes provisions to delay federal expenditures until the year after the contract has been signed. [§213(a)]</p>	<p>Limits payments to \$10,000 annually and \$50,000 per contract; specifies the annual limit can be exceeded to maximize the environmental benefits per dollar spent; and delays federal expenditures until the year after the contract has been signed. [§1240G of the 1985 FSA]</p>
<p>9. Other Provisions. Replaces current language in §1240H with provision that uses an unspecified portion of EQIP funds for competitive innovative matching grants of up to 50% and specifies examples to include market systems for pollution reduction, promoting carbon sequestration in soil, and leveraging these funds with matching funds from other sources to promote “environmental enhancement and protection in conjunction with agricultural production.” Adds new program as §1240I for ground and surface water conservation to improve irrigation and water use efficiency and reduce water use by agriculture; assistance is available only if the Sec. determines it will result in a net savings of water. [§2301]</p>	<p>Replaces current language in §1240H with provisions that provide \$30 million, in FY2002, \$45 million in FY2003, and \$60 million annually in FY2004-11 from the CCC for cost share payments and low interest loans to encourage ground and surface water conservation. [§238]</p>	<p>Replaces current language in §1240H with provisions that provide \$100 million annually from EQIP funds, starting in FY2003, for competitive innovative matching grants and specifies examples to include market systems for pollution reduction, promoting carbon sequestration in soil and other Best Management Practices, and protecting drinking water quality; permits funds from other sources; limits funding to 50% of cost; funds unobligated by April 1 each year can be spent on other EQIP purposes. Adds new program as §1240I for groundwater conservation in the southern high plains to improve irrigation efficiency and reduce water use using EQIP funds. (\$15 million in FY2003, \$25 million in FY2004-5, \$35 million in FY2006, and \$0 in</p>	<p>Lays out temporary transition provisions as EQIP replaces 4 repealed programs. [§1240H of the 1985 FSA]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
		FY2007) Adds new pilot programs for drinking water suppliers, and provides incentives to reduce nutrient loads in the Chesapeake Bay watershed using EQIP funds as §1240J. (\$10 million in FY2003, \$15 million in FY2004, \$20 million in FY2005, \$25 million in FY2006, and \$0 in FY2007) [§213(a)]	
<p>10. Funding. Allocates 60% of funding each year to practices related to livestock production. [§230I] Reauthorizes mandatory funding from the CCC, including funding for technical assistance, at: \$400 million in FY2002; \$700 million in FY2003; \$1,000 million in FY2004; \$1,200 million in FY2005 and FY2006; and \$1,300 million in FY2007. [§270I] Authorizes funding for the Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program at \$25 million in FY2002, \$45 million in FY2003, and \$60 million annually in FY2004-FY2007, with \$50 million to be allocated in the Klamath River basin as soon as possible to carry out water conservation measures. [§230I]</p>	<p>Reauthorizes funding from the CCC through FY2011. [§241] Provides: \$0.2 billion in FY2001; \$1.025 billion in FY2002-3; \$1.2 billion in FY2004-6; \$1.4 billion in FY2007-9; and \$1.5 billion in FY2010-11. [§242] Reauthorizes the livestock provision through FY2011. [§243]</p>	<p>Provides: \$0.5 billion in FY2002; \$1.3 billion in FY2003; \$1.45 billion in FY2004-5; \$1.5 billion in FY2006; and \$0.85 billion in FY2007. Provides funding for technical assistance from the CCC. [§241(b)] Reauthorizes funding from the CCC through FY2006, and includes funding for technical assistance in support of this program. [§211(c)]</p>	<p>Provides \$200 million annually through FY2002 from the CCC for EQIP, with 50% of the total going to practices related to livestock production. [§1241 of the 1985 FSA as amended by several annual agricultural appropriations laws]</p>
E. Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)			
<p>1. Program Administration. Moves WHIP to §1240N of the 1985 FSA [§2502]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Moves WHIP to §1240M of the 1985 FSA. [§217(g)],</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
<p>2. Period of Authorization. Reauthorizes mandatory funding from</p>	<p>Reauthorizes funding from the CCC at: \$25 million in FY2002; \$30</p>	<p>Reauthorizes funding from the CCC at: \$50 million in FY2002; \$225</p>	<p>Provides a total of \$50 million from the CCC (from CRP funding) by the</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
the CCC, including funding for technical assistance, at: \$15 million in FY2002; \$30 million in FY2003; \$60 million in FY2004; and \$85 million annually in FY2005 through FY2007. [§2701]	million in FY2003-4; \$35 million in FY2005-6; \$40 million in FY2007; \$45 million in FY2008-9; and \$50 million in FY2010-11. [§ 252]	million in FY2003; \$275 million in FY2004; \$325 million in FY2005; \$355 million in FY2006; and \$50 million in FY2007. All funding is to remain available until spent. Provides funding for technical assistance from the CCC. [§217(g)]	end of FY2002. [§387(c) of the 1996 FAIR]
3. Distribution of Effort. Requires Sec. to address regional wildlife issues of concern [§2502]	No provisions.	No provisions.	No provisions.
4. Pilot Program. Allows the Sec. to use up to 15% of the funds to provide additional payments to landowners who enroll land for at least 15 years to protect and restore plant and animal habitat. [§2502]	No provisions.	Allows the Sec. to use up to 15% of the funds to enroll land for at least 15 years to protect “essential plant and animal habitat.” [§217(d)]	No provisions.
F. Farmland Protection Program (FPP)			
1. Program Administration. Moves the FPP to §1238H-J of the 1985 FSA and requires that the program be administered by NRCS [§2503] Repeals §388 of the 1996 FAIR and amends §211 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 [§2503]	No provisions.	Moves the FPP to §1238H-J of the 1985 FSA and requires that the program be administered by NRCS [§218(a)] Repeals §388 of the 1996 FAIR. [§218(c)]	No provisions.
2. Funding Level. Reauthorizes mandatory funding from the CCC, including funding for technical assistance, at: \$50 million in FY2002; \$100 million in FY2003; \$125 million in FY2004 and in FY2005; \$100 million in FY2006; and \$97 million in FY2007. [§2701]	Provides up to \$50 million annually through FY2011 from the CCC. [§ 253(b)]	Reauthorizes funding from the CCC at: \$150 million in FY2002; \$250 million in FY2003; \$400 million in FY2004; \$450 million in FY2005; \$500 million in FY2006; and \$100 million in FY2007. Provides funding for technical assistance from the CCC; limits the federal	Provides up to a total of \$35 million from the CCC by FY2002. [§388(c) of the 1996 FAIR]

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
Limits the federal share to 50%, and limits the portion of the non federal share provided by the landowner to 25%; prohibits bidding down. [§2503]		share to 50%, and limits the portion of the non federal share provided by the landowner or in kind goods and services to 25%; prohibits bidding down. [§218(b)]	
3. Eligible Land. Deletes the maximum and minimum acreage limits, and expands the list of eligible land to include cropland, rangeland, grassland, pasture land, incidental forest land, and historic and archaeological sites. [§2503]	Deletes the maximum and minimum acreage limits, and makes historic and archaeological sites eligible. [§253(a)]	Same as §253(a); and also defines eligible land to include cropland, rangeland, grassland, pasture land and forest land that is part of an agricultural operation. [§218(a)]	Makes between 170,000 acres and 340,000 acres eligible if the soil is prime, unique or productive, and an offer is pending from a state or local government to limit non agricultural uses. [§388(a) of the 1996 FAIR]
4. Eligible Participants. Expands eligibility to also include federally recognized Indian tribes, and non profit organizations that meet specified qualifications. [§2503]	Expands eligibility to also include federally recognized Indian tribes, and non profit organizations that meet specified qualifications. [§253(c)]	Identical to §253(c). [§218(a)]	Makes eligible any state or local agency that has made an offer to purchase a “conservation easement or other interests”. [§388(a) of the 1996 FAIR]
5. New Program Options. Allows appropriations of “such funds as are necessary” for FY2002 through FY2007 to carry out farm viability programs. [§2503]	No provisions.	Allows up to \$10 million to be spent annually to provide matching grants for market development, and technical assistance to participants. [§218(a)]	No provisions.
G. Other Programs (Including Technical Assistance)			
1. Resource Conservation and Development Program (RC&D). Permanently reauthorizes program, and makes numerous other, mostly minor or technical amendments. [§2504]	Permanently reauthorizes program, and makes numerous other, mostly minor or technical amendments. [§254] [Note: Many of the changes in the two bills are different from each other, but they do not appear to change the basic intent or operation of the program.]	Permanently reauthorizes program, and makes numerous other, mostly minor or technical amendments. [§216] [Note: Many of the changes in the two bills are different from each other, but they do not appear to change the basic intent or operation of the program.]	Provides assistance to encourage and improve the capacity of state and local governments and non profits in rural areas to develop and implement conservation programs. Authorized through FY2002. [Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act as amended by §1528-§1538 of the 1981 AFA]

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>2. Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program. Authorizes mandatory funding from the CCC 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. Also authorizes appropriations, to remain available until spent, of: \$45 million in FY2003; \$55 million in FY2004; \$65 million in FY2005; \$75 million in FY2006, and \$85 million in FY2007. [<i>§2505</i>] [Note: This is the only “no year” funding in the conservation title.]</p>	<p>Authorizes \$15 million annually in “FY2002 and each succeeding year” to fund the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program. [<i>§257</i>]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Provides financial and technical assistance to rehabilitate water structures that are nearing or past the end of their design life. Authorizes appropriations of: \$5 million in FY2001; \$10 million in FY2002; \$15 million in FY2003; \$25 million in FY2004; and \$35 million in FY2005. [<i>§313 of the Grain Standards and Warehouse Improvement Act of 2000</i>]</p>
<p>3. Conservation of Private Grazing Lands. Moves program from §386 of the 1996 FAIR Act to §1240M of the 1985 FSA. Provides coordinated technical, educational, related assistance to preserve and enhance privately-owned grazing lands; to be funded as a specific line item in the NRCS budget; authorizes 2 demonstration districts; authorizes appropriations of \$60 million annually for FY2002 through FY2007. [<i>§2502</i>]</p>	<p>Adds encouraging the use of sustainable grazing systems to the list of activities for which assistance can be provided. [<i>§251</i>]</p>	<p>Moves the program to a new §1240P of the 1985 FSA, makes numerous other, mostly minor, changes, and authorizes \$60 million annually through FY2006. [<i>§217(a)</i>] Repeals provisions establishing program in §386 of the 1996 FAIR. [<i>§217(b)</i>]</p>	<p>Provides coordinated technical, educational, related assistance to preserve and enhance privately-owned grazing lands; authorizes 2 demonstration districts; authorizes appropriations of \$20 million in FY1996, \$40 million in FY1997, and \$60 million in FY1998 and each subsequent year. [<i>§386 of the 1996 FAIR</i>]</p>
<p>4. Technical Assistance. Adds a new §1242 to the 1985 FSA requiring the Sec. to create a certification program to approve third parties to provide technical assistance within 180 days of enactment, specifies standards for certification, permits the Sec. to repay</p>	<p>Allows producers to seek assistance from third parties, who have the specified expertise, and requires the Sec. to develop a system for approving qualified third parties who provide technical assistance to EQIP participants within 6 months</p>	<p>Adds a new §1244(f) to the 1985 FSA requiring the Sec. to create a certification program for third parties to provide technical assistance, specifies standards for certification, permits the Sec. to repay landowners who use third</p>	<p>Allows persons who need and apply a conservation compliance plan to obtain technical assistance from approved sources other than NRCS; the Sec. must document a rejection of assistance from those sources [<i>§1243(d) of the 1985 FSA</i>]</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
landowners who use third parties, and establishes an advisory committee for the certification program. [§2701]	of enactment. [§244(b)]	parties, and establishes an advisory committee for the certification program. [§204]	
5. Conservation Compliance. Adds new provisions prohibiting the Sec. from delegating the authority to determine whether a person is not complying with conservation compliance or wetland conservation requirements to “any private person or entity”. [§2002]	No provisions.	No provisions.	Producers may lose access to specified federal farm program benefits if they cultivate highly erodible land without following a conservation plan or if they alter agricultural wetlands to produce crops. [§1211-1214 and §1221-1224 of the 1985 FSA]
6. Agricultural Management Assistance. Permanently authorizes financial assistance, of up to \$50,000 per year, to producers in 15 designated states, primarily in the northeast that have been underserved by crop insurance, to install conservation practices and take other specified actions that will reduce their financial risk. Permanently authorizes funding from the CCC, capped at \$20 million annually from FY2003 through FY2007, and at \$10 million in other years. [§2501]	No provisions.	No provisions.	Authorizes financial assistance, of up to \$50,000 per year, to producers in 10 to 15 states, to be determined by the Sec., that have been underserved by crop insurance, to install conservation practices and take other specified actions that will reduce their “production, price, or revenue” risk. Permanently authorizes mandatory funding at \$10 million annually from the CCC. [§133 of the Agricultural Risk Management Act of 2000]
7. Repeals of Authorized Programs and Activities. Repeals numerous conservation programs in current law and reauthorizes them in Subtitle D of the 1985 Farm Security Act (and thereby making them subject to highly erodible land and wetland conservation compliance provisions.) Location of	Repeals provisions: creating the Wetlands Mitigation Banking Program [§1222(k) of the 1985 FSA], the Environmental Easement Program [§1239 of the 1985 FSA], the Conservation Farm Option [§1240M of the 1985 FSA], and the Tree Planting Initiative [§1256 of	Repeals numerous conservation programs in current law and reauthorizes them in Subtitle D of the 1985 Farm Security Act (and thereby making them subject to highly erodible land and wetland conservation compliance provisions. Exact location of each change were	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
each change were noted in the entries for each program, above.	the 1985 FSA]; exempting CRP and WRP payments from any limits under the 1985 FSA, the 1990 FACTA, and the 1949 AA [§1234(f)(3) and §1237D(c)(3), respectively]; protecting the base history of land enrolled in the CRP [§1236 of the 1985 FSA]. [§261] Repeals the National Natural Resources Conservation Foundation [§351-§360 of the 1996 FAIR]. [§262]	noted in the entries for each program, above.	
H. New Programs			
1. Conservation Security Program (CSP). A. Program Purpose. Authorizes a CSP in §1238– §1238C of the 1985 FSA to enroll land and assist producers to promote resource conservation on lands producing agricultural commodities, sometimes called “working lands” from FY2003 through FY2007. Specifies 19 acceptable conservation practices, ranging from nutrient and endangered species management to contour farming and strip cropping, and allows the Sec. to approve other practices. [§2001]	No provisions.	A. Program Purpose. Authorizes a CSP in §1238– §1238C of the 1985 FSA to enroll land and assist producers to promote resource conservation on lands producing agricultural commodities, sometimes called “working lands” from FY2003 through FY2007. Specifies 11 acceptable conservation practices and allows the Sec. to approve other practices. [§201]	No provisions.
B. Definitions. Defines 15 terms. Eight terms are dropped from the Senate -passed bill, and 2 are added; “enhanced payment” and “non-degradation standard” [§2001]	No provisions.	Defines 21 terms. [§201]	No provisions.
C. Eligibility. Producers must enter	No provisions.	C. Eligibility. Producers must enter	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
into a conservation security contract to implement an approved conservation security plan at 1 of 3 levels, or tiers, of conservation on private agricultural land that has been in crop production at least 4 of the preceding 6 years, except for land enrolled in the CRP, WRP. or new Grasslands Reserve. [§2001]		into a conservation security contract to implement an approved conservation security plan at 1 of 3 levels, or tiers, of conservation on private agricultural land that has been in crop production at least 3 of the preceding 10 years, except for land enrolled in the CRP, WRP. or new Grasslands Reserve. [§201]	
D. Participation. Producers must have an approved plan for eligible lands. Producers can receive an advance payment when they enroll, base payments, and bonus payments for certain practices (that address state and local priorities). [§2001]	No provisions	Producers must have an approved plan for eligible lands. Producers can receive an advance payment when they enroll, base payments, and bonus payments for certain practices (that address state and local priorities). [§201]	No provisions.
E. Participation Options. Three tiers of participation are specified with acceptable levels of practices, and minimum requirements for each will be determine at the state level and approved by the Sec. Tier 1 contracts will be 5 years; Tier II and III contracts will be 5 to 10 years, and contracts can be renewed. Total annual payments are limited to \$20,000 for Tier I, \$35,000 for Tier II, and \$45,000 for Tier III. [§2001]	No provisions.	Three tiers of participation are specified with acceptable levels of practices, and minimum requirements for each will be determine at the state level and approved by the Sec. Tier 1 contracts will be 5 years; Tier II and III contracts will be 5 to 10 years, and contracts can be renewed. Total annual payments are limited to \$20,000 for Tier I, \$35,000 for Tier II, and \$50,000 for Tier III. [§201]	No provisions.
F. Termination and Renewal. Participants can terminate contracts and retain payments if they were in full compliance when they terminated, and the termination would not defeat the	No provisions.	Participants can terminate contracts and retain payments if they were in full compliance when they terminated, and the termination would not defeat the contract	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>contract purposes. Violations caused by natural disasters are not considered violations. Producers can renew contracts for 5 to 10 years; holders of tier I contracts must agree to apply additional conservation practices in the land already under contract or adopt new ones on another portion of their operation. [§2001]</p>		<p>purposes. Violations caused by natural disasters are not considered violations. Producers can renew contracts for 5 to 10 years; holders of tier I contracts must agree to apply additional conservation practices in the land already under contract or adopt new ones on another portion of their operation. [§201]</p>	
<p>G. Duties. Producers agree to implement the plan, to provide records to the Sec. on implementation, and to avoid inconsistent actions. The Sec. agrees payments that rise with each tier, and are limited based on complex standards spelled out in the legislation. Funds are not available for animal waste storage and treatment facilities, or waste transfer devices, or for buying and maintaining equipment that is not “integral to a land-based practice. [§2001]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Producers agree to implement the plan, to provide records to the Sec. on implementation, and to avoid inconsistent actions. The Sec. agrees payments that rise with each tier, and are limited based on complex standards spelled out in the legislation. The Sec. can approved 1 state pilot program. [§201]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
<p>H. Regulations. Regulations are to be issued within 270 days of enactment.[§2001]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Regulations and other implementing actions can start on the date of enactment. [§206]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
<p>I. Funding. Authorizes mandatory funding from the CCC, including funding for technical assistance, at an unspecified level, from FY2002 through FY2007. [§2701] The amount available for technical assistance is limited to 15% of the total</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Amends §1241 to authorize mandatory funding from the CCC, including funding for technical assistance, at an unspecified level, from FY2002 through FY2006. [§202]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
expended each year. [§2001]			
<p>2. Grasslands Reserve Program (GRP).</p> <p>A. Reserve Size. Creates a 2 million acre GRP including restored or improved grassland, rangeland, and pasture land in §1238 of the 1985 FSA. Minimum size for enrolled parcels at 40 contiguous acres, but the Sec. can waive that requirement. [§2401]</p>	<p>Creates a 2 million acre grasslands reserve, split evenly between restored grasslands and virgin (never cultivated) grasslands in §1238 of the 1985 FSA. §1238(b)(1) sets minimum size for enrolled parcels at 50 contiguous acres east of the 90th meridian and 100 contiguous acres west of the 90th meridian. [§255(a)]</p>	<p>Creates a 2 million acre grasslands reserve, of which up to 500,000 acres will be native grasslands in tracts of 40 acres or less in §1238N-P of the 1985 FSA. §1238N sets minimum size for enrolled parcels at 40 contiguous acres east of the 98th meridian and 100 contiguous acres west of the 98th meridian [§219(a)]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
<p>B. Eligible Lands. Defines eligible land to include natural grass and shrub land that has a potential to serve as important plant or animal habitat, or has been historically dominated by natural grass or shrubland. Also allows incidental additional land that is necessary for the administrative efficiency of an easement to be enrolled. [§2401]</p>	<p>Defines eligible land to include natural grass and shrub land that has a potential to serve as important plant or animal habitat, or has been historically dominated by natural grass or shrubland. [§255(a)]</p>	<p>Same definition of eligible land as in H.R. 2646, except that it also allows incidental additional land that is necessary for the administrative efficiency of an easement to be enrolled. [§219(a)]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
<p>C. Enrollment Options. Allows permanent and 30-year easements, and rental agreements of 10, 15, 20, and 30 years. Up to 60% of the funds can be spent on easements and 30 year agreements; the remainder will be spent on shorter agreements. The Sec. may to delegate easements to state agencies and private organizations if certain conditions are met. [§2401]</p>	<p>Spends at least 2/3 of funds on contracts of 10 to 20 years, and the remainder on 30 year or permanent easements. [§255(a)]</p>	<p>Allows permanent easements, 30 year easements, the longest easements allowed by state law, and 30 year rental agreements. §1238Q allows Sec. to delegate easements to state agencies, private conservation organizations and land trusts. [§219(a)]</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>
<p>D. Permitted and Prohibited Uses of Enrolled Lands. Permits contract holders</p>	<p>Permits contract holders to use common grazing practices, and</p>	<p>Similar to H.R. 2646 for permitted and prohibited uses of enrolled</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
to use common grazing practices, rehabilitate land after fires, and build fences; restricts uses during the bird nesting season; and prohibits all agricultural production (except hay) and all other activities that disturb the land surface. [§2401]	permits haying and mowing outside the bird nesting season, but prohibits all agricultural production (except hay) and almost all practices that disturb the land surface. [§255(a)]	lands. [§219(a)]	
E. Ranking Criteria for Bids. Requires the Sec. to develop ranking criteria for reviewing applications, with emphasis on support for grazing operations, plant and animal diversity, and grasslands most threatened by conversion. [§2401]	Requires the Sec. to develop ranking criteria for reviewing applications, with emphasis on support for native vegetation, grazing operations, and plant and animal diversity, and to set the terms for restoration. [§255(a)]	Requires Sec. to work with State Technical Committees in developing ranking criteria, and to give priority to grazing operations, maintaining or restoring biodiversity, and land under the greatest threat of conversion. [§219(a)]	No provisions.
F. Payment Levels. Describes how maximum payment levels are to be set for each form of participation, sets cost sharing payments for restoration at 90% for virgin grasslands and 75% for restored grasslands. [§2401]	Describes how payment levels are to be set for each form of participation, sets cost sharing payments for restoration at 90% for virgin grasslands and 75% for restored grasslands, and provides technical assistance. [§255(a)]	Describes how payment levels are to be set for each form of participation, provides that rental agreements be reviewed and adjusted at least once every 5 years, limits cost-sharing payments to 75% for restoration, and provides technical assistance. [§219(a)]	No provisions.
G. Penalties for Violation. After a violation, the agreement or easement will remain in force, and the owner may be required to refund part or all the payments, with interest. [§2401]	No provisions.	Describes the roles of the Sec. and the landowner in implementing restoration agreements, and lists the penalties for violations, and allows periodic site inspections. [§219(a)]	No provisions.
H. Funding. Authorizes a total of up to \$254 million between FY2003 and FY2007 from the CCC (including the provision of technical assistance). [§2701]	Amends §1241 of the 1985 FSA to provide a total of \$254 million through the CCC through FY2011 to implement the GRP. [§255(b)]	Amends §1241 of the 1985 FSA to provide such sums as necessary from the CCC to implement the GRP. [§219(b)]	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>3. Partnerships and Cooperation. Adds a new §1243 to the 1985 FSA to allow special projects as recommended by a state conservationist, which can respond to meeting the requirements of three specified federal environmental laws or addressing watersheds or other areas with significant environmental problems. Allows the Sec. to provide incentives. Participants agree to a plan to adjust implementation of conservation programs to increase environmental benefits. Funding uses 5% of mandatory funding for conservation programs, with any funds not obligated by April 1 to go to other conservation activities that year. [§2003]</p>	No provisions.	Adds a new §1242(f) to the 1985 FSA to allow special projects as recommended by a state conservationist, which can respond to meeting the requirements of three specified federal environmental laws or addressing watersheds or other areas with significant environmental problems. Participants agree to a plan to adjust implementation of conservation programs to increase environmental benefits. Funding uses 5% of EQIP funds annually, with any unused funds to go to other EQIP activities that year. [§203]	No provisions.
<p>4. Great Lakes Basin Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Program. Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually from FY2002 through FY2007 to implement a new soil erosion and sediment control program for the Great Lakes basin in §1240P of the 1985 FSA. [§2502]</p>	No provisions.	Authorizes \$5 million annually through FY2006 to implement a new soil erosion and sediment control program for the Great Lakes basin in §1240O of the 1985 FSA. [§217(a)]	No provisions.
<p>5. Grassroots Source Water Protection Program. Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually from FY2002 through FY2007 to use technical assistance capabilities of rural water associations that operate wellhead or groundwater protection programs in</p>	No provisions.	Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually through FY2006 to use technical assistance capabilities of rural water associations that operate wellhead or groundwater protection program in §1240Q of the 1985 FSA. [§217(a)]	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
§1240O of the 1985 FSA. [§2502]			
<p>6. Desert Terminal Lakes. Authorizes the transfer of \$200 million from the CCC to the Bureau of Reclamation (in the Department of the Interior) to provide water to “at-risk natural desert terminal lakes”. The funds can not be used to purchase or lease water rights. [§2507]</p>	No provisions.	No provisions.	No provisions.
<p>7. Conservation Corridor Demonstration Program. Permits one or more states, with local governments on the Delmarva Peninsula, to develop and implement over 3 to 5 years a conservation corridor plan to improve the economic viability of agriculture and the environmental integrity of watersheds. [§2601-§2603] The federal share will be up to 50% of the total, and appropriations are authorized at such sums as may be necessary each year between FY2002 and FY2007. [§2604]</p>	No provisions.	No provisions.	No provisions.
<p>8. Administrative Requirements for Conservation Programs. A. Assistance for Limited Resource Producers. Adds a new §1244(a) to the 1985 FSA which provides unspecified incentives through conservation programs to assist beginning and limited resource producers and Indian tribes to foster new opportunities and to “enhance environmental</p>	No provisions.	Adds a new §1244(b) which provides necessary funds from the CCC to assist certain limited resource, socially disadvantaged, and beginning producers, and Indian tribes to participate in conservation programs by providing “education, outreach, monitoring, evaluation, and related services.” The Sec. may contract with other	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
stewardship”[§2004(a)]		entities to provide these services. Adds a new §1244(c) allowing the Sec. to provide incentives to these producers(except socially-disadvantaged ones) to participate in conservation programs. [§204]	
B. Privacy of Personal Information (Confidentiality). Adds a new §1244(b) to prohibit the Sec. (or any contractor to the Sec.) from releasing personal information about individuals related to conservation programs, except in aggregate. Exceptions are specified. [§2004(a)] Treatment of data collected using the Natural Resources Inventory to protect the identity of individuals is specified. [§2004(b)]	No provisions.	Adds a new §1244(g) to prohibit the Sec. from releasing personal information about individuals related to conservation programs, except in aggregate. [§204]	No provisions.
C. Regional Equity of Conservation Spending. Requires the Sec. to give priority to funding of specified mandatory conservation programs in states that have received less than \$12 million by April 1 each fiscal year (Spending for the CRP, WRP, and the Conservation Security Program is excluded from this calculation). [§2701]	No provisions.	Requires that each state receive at least \$12 million annually from FY2002 through FY2006, for conservation programs. Of the total, \$5 million is to be used for EQIP, and \$7 million is to be used for other conservation programs, with any portion not obligated by April 1 of the fiscal year to be reobligated to other specified programs. [§241]	No provisions.
9. Assessment of Conservation Programs. Requires the Sec. to develop a plan to better coordinate and consolidate the implementation of	No provisions.	Requires the Sec. to develop a plan to better coordinate and consolidate the implementation of conservation programs to insure funding of	No provisions.

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>conservation programs to eliminate redundancy, streamline program delivery, and improve services to producers. [<i>§ 2005(a)</i>] Requires the Sec. to provide the plan (and recommendations for implementation) to both agriculture committees by December 31, 2005. [<i>§2005(b)</i>]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">http://wikileaks.org/wiki/CRS-RL31486</p>		<p>highest priorities while accounting for regional variation. [<i>§ 205(a)</i>] Requires the Sec. to provide the plan (and recommendations) to both agriculture committees within 180 days of enactment. [<i>§205(b)</i>] Requires the Sec. to provide a plan (with a cost estimate) for updating the national conservation program required by the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 to both agriculture committees within 180 days of enactment, and to report to them on plan implementation by April 30, 2005. [<i>§205(c)</i>] Requires the Sec. to revise conservation technical standards within 180 days of enactment, and to update them every 5 years. [<i>§205(d)</i>]</p>	

Table 2. Comparison of Resource Conservation Title Funding in 2002 Farm Bill with Proposed Funding in Farm Bills Passed by House and Senate, and Prior Law

(CBO estimates are from the April, 2001 baseline.)

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Capped at 39.2 million acres; mandatory funding, including funding for technical assistance, authorized through FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$706 million through FY2007.) (\$2101)</p>	<p>CRP capped at 39.2 million acres; mandatory funding authorized through 2011. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$574 million through FY2006, and \$1.517 billion through FY2011.)</p>	<p>CRP capped at 41.1 million acres (the Water Conservation Program would reduce it to 40.0 million acres, and then adds a .5 million acre pilot program, making the final total 40.5 million acres.) Mandatory funding authorized through FY2006. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$931 million through FY2006.)</p>	<p>CRP capped at 36.4 million acres; mandatory spending authorized through FY2002. (16 U.S.C. 3831-3836, and 3841) (CBO estimates baseline spending of \$10.2 billion through FY2007.)</p>
<p>Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP). Capped at total enrollment of 2.275 million acres, with annual enrollment ceiling of 250,000 acres; mandatory funding including funding for technical assistance, authorized through calendar year 2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$1.498 billion through FY2007.) (\$2201)</p>	<p>WRP capped at 150,000 acres per calendar year, and any acres within that cap not used in a given year can be enrolled in subsequent years; mandatory funding authorized through 2011. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$859 million through FY2006, and \$1.726 billion through FY2011.)</p>	<p>WRP capped at total enrollment of 2.225 million acres, with annual (calendar year) enrollment limited to 250,000 acres, of which up to 25,000 acres can be enrolled in a new Wetland Reserve Enhancement Program; mandatory funding is authorized. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$1.383 billion through FY2006.)</p>	<p>WRP capped at 1,075,000 acres in total with no annual enrollment goal or limit; mandatory spending authorized through FY2002. (16 U.S.C. 3837-3837f, and 3841) (CBO estimates no additional spending in baseline as enrollment cap has been reached.)</p>
<p>Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) Mandatory funding, including funding for technical assistance, authorized at: \$15 million in FY2002; \$30 million in FY2003; \$60 million in FY2004; and \$85 million annually in FY2005 through FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$360 million through FY2007.) (\$2502)</p>	<p>WHIP mandatory funding authorized at: \$25 million in FY2002; \$30 million in FY2003 and 4; \$35 million in FY2005 and 6; \$40 million in FY2007; \$45 million in FY2008 and 9; and \$50 million in FY2010 and 11. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$155 million through FY2006, and \$385 million through FY2011.)</p>	<p>WHIP mandatory funding authorized at: \$50 million in FY2002; \$225 million in FY2003; \$275 million in FY2004; \$325 million in FY2005; \$355 million in FY2006, and \$100 million in FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$1.23 billion through FY2006.)</p>	<p>WHIP authorized through FY2002 at a total of \$50 million in mandatory spending from the funds made available to implement the CRP. (16 U.S.C. 3836a) (CBO estimates no additional spending through FY2007 in baseline.)</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) Mandatory funding, including funding for technical assistance, authorized at: \$0.40 billion in FY2002; \$0.70 billion in FY2003; \$1.00 billion in FY2004; \$1.20 billion in FY2005 and 6; and \$1.30 billion in FY2007. 60% of funding each year goes to livestock producers and 40% to crop producers. Unspecified portion of EQIP funding will go to new program for conservation innovation grants, and specified portions of \$25 million in FY2002, \$45 million in FY2003, and \$60 million annually in FY2004 through FY2007 will go to a new ground and surface water conservation program (with \$50 million of that total to be used in the Klamath Basin). (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$4.6 billion for EQIP and \$360 million for water conservation through FY2007.) (§2301)</p>	<p>EQIP mandatory funding authorized at: \$0.200 billion in FY2001; \$1.025 billion in FY2002 and 3; \$1.200 billion in FY2004 through 6; \$1.400 billion in FY2007 through 9; and \$1.500 billion in FY2010 and 11. Authorizes mandatory funding for a Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program at: \$30 million in FY2002; \$45 million in FY2003; and \$60 million in FY2004 through 11. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$4.650 billion through FY2006, and \$10.850 billion through FY2011 for EQIP, and increase in budget authority of \$255 million through FY2006, and \$555 million through FY2011 for the water conservation program.)</p>	<p>EQIP mandatory funding authorized at: \$0.50 billion in FY2002; \$1.30 billion in FY2003; \$1.45 billion in FY2004 and 5; \$1.50 billion in FY2006; and \$0.85 billion in FY2007. Includes new programs for Partnerships and Cooperation at 5% of annual EQIP authorization, Conservation Innovation Grants at \$100 million per year, Southern Plains Groundwater Conservation at \$15 million in FY2003 and increasing to \$35 million in FY2006, and a pilot program for drinking water suppliers in the Chesapeake Bay watershed at \$10 million in FY2003 and increasing to \$25 million in FY2006. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$5.227 billion through FY2006.)</p>	<p>EQIP authorized at \$130 million in mandatory spending in FY 1996, and \$200 million annually in FY1997 through FY2002. (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-3839aa-8, and 3841) (CBO estimates \$1.2 billion in additional spending through FY2007 in baseline.)</p>
<p>Grassland Reserve Program (GRP) Capped at 2 million acres, and mandatory funding is capped at a total of \$254 million through FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$83 million through FY2007.) (§2401)</p>	<p>GRP capped at 1 million acres of “restored grassland” and 1 million acres of “virgin grassland”, and mandatory funding is capped at a total of \$254 million through FY2011. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$45 million through FY2006, and \$254 million through FY2011.)</p>	<p>GRP capped at 2 million acres, with up to 500,000 acres of native grasslands. GRP mandatory funding authorized at “such sums ...as are necessary.” (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$44 million through FY2006.)</p>	<p>New program – no provisions.</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>Farmland Protection Program (FPP). Mandatory funding, including funding for technical assistance, authorized at: \$50 million in FY2002; \$100 million in FY2003; \$125 million in FY2004 and FY2005; \$100 million in FY2006; and \$97 million in FY2007. Acreage limits are deleted. Also authorizes a new Farm Viability Program, and appropriates necessary funds from FY2002 through FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$597 million through FY2007.) (§2503)</p>	<p>FPP mandatory funding authorized at no more than \$50 million annually, and the upper and lower acreage enrollment limits are eliminated. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$250 million through FY2006, and \$500 million through FY2011.)</p>	<p>FPP mandatory funding authorized at: \$150 million in FY2002; \$250 million in FY2003; \$400 million in FY2004; \$450 million in FY2005; \$500 million in FY2006; and \$100 million in FY2007. Not more than \$10 million annually goes to a new Market Viability Program, and the upper and lower acreage enrollment limits are eliminated. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$1.750 billion through FY2006.)</p>	<p>FPP authorized upper and lower acreage enrollment limits of 340,000 acres and 170,000 acres, respectively, through FY2002, with total mandatory funding of \$35 million. (16 U.S.C. 3830) (CBO estimates no additional spending through FY2007 in baseline.)</p>
<p>Resource Conservation and Development Program (RC&D) Authorized permanently to appropriate such funds as may be necessary. (§2504)</p>	<p>RC&D is authorized permanently to appropriate such funds as may be necessary.</p>	<p>RC&D is authorized permanently to appropriate such funds as may be necessary.</p>	<p>RC&D authorized such discretionary funds as may be necessary through FY2002. (16 U.S.C. 3453-3461)</p>
<p>Conservation Corridor Demonstration Project. Authorizes appropriations of “such funds as are necessary” for FY2002 through FY2007 for projects on the Delmarva Peninsula. (§2601)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Authorizes, from mandatory funding provided for EQIP, \$10 million in FY2003; \$15 million in FY2004; \$20 million in FY2005; \$25 million in FY2006; and \$0 in FY2007 for a nutrient reduction pilot program in the Chesapeake Bay drainage (and also funds a drinking water suppliers’ pilot program).</p>	<p>New program – no provisions.</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>Small Watershed Rehabilitation Program. Authorizes mandatory funding at: \$45 million in FY2003; \$50 million in FY2004; \$55 million in FY2005; \$60 million in FY2006; \$65 million in FY2007; and \$0 in FY2008.</p> <p>Also authorizes appropriated funding at: \$45 million in FY2003; \$55 million in FY2004; \$65 million in FY2005; \$75 million in FY2006; and \$85 million in FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$275 million through FY2007.) (\$2505)</p>	<p>Authorizes appropriations of \$15 million annually in discretionary spending “for FY2002 and each succeeding year.”</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Authorized appropriated funding at: \$10 million in FY2002; \$15 million in FY2003; \$25 million in FY2004; and \$35 million in FY2005. (16 U.S.C. 1012)</p>
<p>Conservation Security Program (CSP) CSP mandatory funding authorized at “such funds as are necessary” starting in FY2003. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$369 million through FY2007.) (§2001)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>CSP mandatory funding authorized at “such funds as are necessary”. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$387 million through FY2006.)</p>	<p>New program – no provisions.</p>
<p>Partnerships and Cooperation Use up to 5% of the mandatory funding for conservation programs for special projects where enhanced technical and financial assistance is provided; any available funds not obligated by April 1 of the fiscal year may be reallocated to another program receiving mandatory funding. (§2003)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>May use up to 5% of the mandatory funding for EQIP for special projects where enhanced technical and financial assistance is provided; any available funds not obligated by April 1 of the fiscal year may be reallocated to EQIP.</p>	<p>New program – no provisions.</p>

2002 Farm Bill	Farm Bill Passed by House	Farm Bill Passed by Senate	Prior Law
<p>Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually from FY2002 through FY2007. (§2502)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually from FY2002 through FY2006.</p>	<p>New program – No provisions.</p>
<p>Conservation of Private Grazing Lands. Authorizes appropriations of \$60 million annually from FY2002 through FY2007. (§2502)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Authorizes appropriations of \$60 million annually from FY2002 through FY2006.</p>	<p>Authorized appropriations of \$20 million in FY1996; \$40 million in FY1997; and \$60 million in “each subsequent fiscal year.” (16 U.S.C. 2005b)</p>
<p>Grassroots Source Water Protection Program. Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually from FY2002 through FY2007. (§2502)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Authorizes appropriations of \$5 million annually from FY2002 through FY2006.</p>	<p>New program – no provisions.</p>
<p>Agricultural Management Assistance. Permanently authorizes mandatory funding, and authorizes an additional \$10 million annually in FY2003 through FY2007. (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$50 million through FY2007.) (§2501)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>Permanently authorized \$10 million annually to go to 10 to 15 states that are underserved by crop insurance. (7 U.S.C. 524) (CBO estimates no additional spending through FY2007 in baseline.)</p>
<p>Desert Terminal Lakes (CBO estimates increase in budget authority of \$200 million in FY2002.) (§2507)</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>No provisions.</p>	<p>New program – no provisions.</p>