



1436 U Street NW, Suite 100  
Washington, DC 20009  
T: 202.667.6982  
F: 202.232.2592

***STATEMENT OF KEN COOK  
President  
Environmental Working Group***

***Hearing to Review USDA Farm Bill Conservation Programs  
Before the Committee on Agriculture  
Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Energy, and Research  
Thursday, April 19, 2007, at 1 pm***

***Submitted for the Record***

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Subcommittee: my name is Ken Cook, and I am president of the Environmental Working Group (EWG), a nonprofit research and advocacy organization based in Washington, DC and Oakland, California. In the years since the first farm bill I worked on, as an agriculture policy analyst the Congressional Research Service in 1977, I have had the honor of testifying before this subcommittee on a number of occasions. I very much appreciate the opportunity to do so again, today.

My testimony addresses two parts.

(1) District-level summary conservation program data for each member of the subcommittee. This previously unpublished data is derived from EWG's forthcoming release of subsidy benefits information obtained through the Freedom of Information Act last December, when USDA released the database it compiled in response to the congressional mandate in Section 1614 of the 2002 farm bill.

(2) At the request of the subcommittee, I will also address the innovative Conservation Security Program that was established in the 2002 farm bill, with emphasis on findings of a recent, excellent evaluation of the CSP prepared by the Soil and Water Conservation Society and Environmental Defense.

**Importance of conservation programs.** Farm bill conservation programs and program spending are critically important to the subcommittee's members, collectively and individually.

Using the new USDA 1614 database of direct payments and attributed benefits for program years 2003 through 2005, EWG found that over \$1.6 billion in conservation

payments (CRP, EQIP, CSP, WRP, GRP, and WHIP<sup>1</sup>) have been provided to over 162,000 beneficiaries in the districts of the 26 members of the House Subcommittee on Conservation. (See Table below)

**Conservation program benefits provided to farmers in the districts of members of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Energy and Research, PY 2003-2005.**

<b>District</b>	<b>Conservation Program Benefits (2003-2005)</b>	<b>Conservation Program Recipients (2003-2005)</b>	<b>Conservation Benefits per Beneficiary</b>	<b>Conservation Benefits As Percent of Commodity plus Conservation Benefits (2003-2005)</b>
Rep. Jerry Moran (KS-1)	\$296,568,102	31,749	\$9,341	18%
Rep. Stephanie Herseth Sandlin (SD-AL)	\$223,291,192	20,559	\$10,861	17%
Rep. Steve King (IA-5)	\$179,465,556	18,042	\$9,947	13%
Rep. Sam Graves (MO-6)	\$170,897,910	12,545	\$13,623	39%
Rep. Marilyn N. Musgrave (CO-4)	\$170,871,193	7,874	\$21,701	34%
Rep. Jeff Fortenberry (NE-1)	\$109,471,201	10,385	\$10,541	14%
Rep. Frank D. Lucas (OK-3)	\$105,529,685	10,014	\$10,538	20%
Rep. Leonard L. Boswell (IA-3)	\$93,400,170	7,996	\$11,681	19%
Rep. Timothy J. Walz (MN-1)	\$78,733,878	12,035	\$6,542	8%
Rep. Nancy E. Boyda (KS-2)	\$44,966,601	7,072	\$6,358	16%
Rep. Terry Everett (AL-2)	\$31,012,641	4,482	\$6,919	16%
Rep. John T. Salazar (CO-3)	\$29,329,853	2,167	\$13,535	54%
Rep. Tim Walberg (MI-7)	\$27,844,685	3,171	\$8,781	18%
Rep. Brad Ellsworth (IN-8)	\$25,633,867	4,268	\$6,006	8%
Rep. Steve Kagen (WI-8)	\$11,473,671	3,025	\$3,793	8%
Rep. Zachary T. Space (OH-18)	\$7,749,129	1,341	\$5,779	11%
Rep. Tim Holden (PA-17)	\$7,157,500	848	\$8,440	20%
Rep. Mike Rogers (AL-3)	\$5,262,026	807	\$6,520	16%
Rep. Henry Cuellar (TX-28)	\$4,088,265	342	\$11,954	11%
Rep. Jo Bonner (AL-1)	\$3,908,361	872	\$4,482	7%
Rep. Robin Hayes (NC-8)	\$3,665,685	905	\$4,050	9%
Rep. Jean Schmidt (OH-2)	\$3,591,685	546	\$6,578	13%
Rep. Kirsten E. Gillibrand (NY-20)	\$3,296,325	410	\$8,040	11%
Rep. Jim Costa (CA-20)	\$2,789,949	369	\$7,561	1%
Rep. Dennis A. Cardoza (CA-18)	\$2,734,336	313	\$8,736	2%
Rep. David Scott (GA-13)	\$70,243	19	\$3,697	40%
<b>Subcommittee Total</b>	<b>\$1,642,803,708</b>	<b>162,156</b>	<b>\$10,131</b>	<b>17%</b>

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

<sup>1</sup> CRP stands for Conservation Reserve Program, EQIP – Environmental Quality Incentives Program, CSP – Conservation Security Program, WRP – Wetlands Reserve Program, GRP- Grasslands Reserves Program, and WHIP- Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program.

On average, over the three program years, \$10,000 in benefits was provided per beneficiary. Conservation payments in the subcommittee's districts averaged 17 percent of the total spending on conservation plus commodity programs. Every district on the subcommittee received conservation funds. Any member by member comparison must consider the size of the state and the number of farmers in each state to put the data in perspective.

**Distribution of conservation benefits.** For seven members of the subcommittee, conservation program payments to their districts exceeded \$100 million over the last three years. In the districts of eight members, conservation payments ranged between \$11.4 million and \$93.5 million over the period.

**Distribution of conservation program beneficiaries.** In seven of the subcommittee's districts, more than 10,000 farmers and ranchers received benefits through conservation programs between 2003 and 2005. For another nine members, between 1,000 and 10,000 farmers received benefits in their districts.

**Distribution of conservation benefits per beneficiary.** In eight subcommittee districts, farmers received, on average, over \$10,000 in conservation benefits over the three program years. In thirteen subcommittee districts, farmers received over \$5,000 and under \$10,000 in conservation benefits.

**Distribution of conservation spending as a percent of commodity plus conservation spending.** To illustrate the importance of conservation relative to commodity programs, we summed both categories and then presented conservation funding as a percentage of that total. We found that for four members of the subcommittee, conservation spending between 2003 and 2005 exceeded 30 percent of the combined commodity and conservation funds. For fifteen districts, farmers and ranchers received between 10 percent and 30 percent of their federal support through conservation programs while 7 members had farmers receiving less than 10 percent of their federal support from conservation programs.

Below we provide a sample narrative for conservation spending in the districts of the Chairman and the Ranking Member. In addition to referencing the data contained from the table above, we cite data from a table showing Unfunded Conservation Requests by State in 2004 (below). We also provide 52 tables – two tables for each district represented on the Subcommittee showing 1) farmer participation in each conservation program in one table and 2) conservation program ranking against commodity programs in a second table.

**Unfunded Conservation Requests by State, 2004**

<b>State Rank</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>2004 Total NRCS Conservation Backlog</b>
1	Arkansas	\$253,832,454
2	Texas	\$162,919,270
3	Florida	\$160,944,955
4	California	\$143,096,228
5	Nebraska	\$139,210,997
6	Indiana	\$131,566,485
7	Illinois	\$115,180,386
8	Iowa	\$112,305,471
9	Oklahoma	\$98,025,377
10	Louisiana	\$95,523,177
11	New York	\$92,535,120
12	Colorado	\$75,808,617
13	Minnesota	\$71,739,333
14	Kansas	\$70,969,832
15	Vermont	\$66,759,932
16	Missouri	\$63,172,954
17	South Carolina	\$61,988,880
18	Montana	\$58,024,599
19	Alabama	\$55,954,634
20	Mississippi	\$52,035,498
21	Oregon	\$51,365,140
22	Tennessee	\$49,214,986
23	Kentucky	\$48,833,147
24	South Dakota	\$46,287,600
25	North Carolina	\$45,858,375
26	Washington	\$44,205,467
27	Maine	\$43,622,734
28	Michigan	\$43,063,298
29	Idaho	\$41,364,464
30	Ohio	\$39,192,545
31	New Mexico	\$38,971,942
32	Pennsylvania	\$37,457,519
33	Utah	\$33,827,759
34	Wisconsin	\$31,575,143
35	Georgia	\$28,091,435
36	North Dakota	\$26,596,053
37	Wyoming	\$24,966,315
38	New Jersey	\$24,915,318
39	Massachusetts	\$24,491,974
40	Arizona	\$24,103,523
41	West Virginia	\$22,701,307

42	Virginia	\$17,349,645
43	Connecticut	\$16,205,047
44	Nevada	\$12,744,590
45	Delaware	\$8,079,452
46	Alaska	\$7,693,875
47	Rhode Island	\$7,116,541
48	New Hampshire	\$5,526,717
49	Hawaii	\$5,324,931
50	Maryland	\$4,539,395
51	Puerto Rico & VI	\$863,216
52	Pacific Basin	\$201,103
	<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$2,937,944,755</b>

Source: Environmental Working Group, compiled from 2004 Unfunded Conservation Applications data, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

**Chairman Tim Holden.** Within the subcommittee, Chairman Holden's district ranks 17<sup>th</sup> in conservation benefits received, with \$7 million going to 848 beneficiaries over the last three program years. From the Chairman's table showing conservation program participation, we see that farmers in his district were enrolled in four programs over the last three years: 751 farmers in CRP receiving \$6.4 million, 42 in EQIP receiving \$489,000, 80 in CSP receiving \$173,000 and one in the GRP receiving \$1,287.

From the Chairman's table showing conservation programs ranked against commodity programs, between 2003 and 2005, the CRP was the third most important farm program in Rep. Holden's district in terms of expenditure, behind the corn and dairy program, while EQIP ranked sixth behind soybean subsidies and wheat subsidies. The CSP ranked eighth in spending importance, behind barley subsidies.

In terms of the conservation backlog problem, Chairman Holden's state, Pennsylvania ranked 32<sup>nd</sup> in the nation for the value of unfunded conservation program applications in FY 2004. That is, Pennsylvania farmers in 2004 applied for \$37 million in various NRCS-run conservation programs and had eligible applications but were turned away due to lack of conservation funds. That's \$37 million that could have gone to assist in dairy manure management to prevent further nutrient leaching and runoff to the Chesapeake Bay and to help in various soil erosion prevention practices like contour tillage, terracing, and grassed waterways to help farmers prevent loss of valuable topsoil and sedimentation of the states rivers and tributaries to the Bay.

**Ranking Member Frank Lucas.** Rep. Lucas' district ranked seventh in conservation dollars amongst districts on the subcommittee. Some 10,014 beneficiaries in Rep. Lucas' district received \$105.5 million in benefits over the last three program years for conservation practices: 8,619 beneficiaries received \$97 million from CRP; 1,418 received \$5.4 million from EQIP; 266 received \$2 million from CSP; 21 farmers received \$795,000 from WRP; 34 received \$145,000 from GRP; and 12 received \$36,000 from WHIP.

Four of the six conservation programs operating in Rep. Lucas' district are amongst the top 10 commodity and conservation programs in the district. CRP ranks second only to wheat subsidies in program benefits, while EQIP ranks seventh behind cotton, peanuts, corn, and sorghum. CSP and WRP rank 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>, respectively, for program funding, behind dairy subsidies.

At the state level, over \$98 million in 2004 NRCS conservation requests from Oklahoma farmers went unfulfilled, ranking Oklahoma 9<sup>th</sup> in the nation's conservation backlog. That's nearly \$100 million that was requested by farmers to help with wind erosion problems that remain a major cause of unsustainable rates of erosion, lowering soil productivity, increasing the chances for crop failure and increasing air pollution and sedimentation of the state's streams.

### **Unfunded conservation program requests: The Conservation Backlog**

The NRCS tracks conservation program applications that have been received from tens of thousands of farmers and ranchers each year, but which are turned away for lack of funds. We tallied the value of that "conservation backlog" for just one year (FY 2004) across all conservation programs for the states represented by members of this subcommittee. The total backlog in FY 2004 in just these 18 states was \$1.3 billion or nearly half the conservation backlog in all 50 states.

### **Conservation Security Program**

The Conservation Security Program was authorized by the 2002 farm bill and was the first attempt to take on what I consider one of the toughest problems in federal agricultural resource policy.

We have long experience in this country of providing technical and financial assistance to farmers and ranchers to solve specific agricultural resource problems, from water pollution to wildlife conservation.

But how can conservation policy fairly, effectively and efficiently reward the good resource and environmental stewardship so many farmers and ranchers have already demonstrated? How do we recognize producers who adopted above- average--or even state-of-the-art--conservation and environmental practices on their own while encouraging them to do even more?

Put another way, why should we provide taxpayer support, sometimes significant support, to a farmer or rancher to adopt basic conservation practices, when their neighbors all around have long since adopted them on their own, with no help from the federal government?

I am reminded of a conversation I had just about 20 years ago with a Missouri cow-calf operator who had about 1,000 acres of hay and pasture. A few months before, Congress had enacted the Conservation Reserve Program that originated in this subcommittee. I had lobbied for it over several years. I explained how the government was going to kill two birds with one stone: we would cost-effectively tackle excessive soil erosion on tens of millions of acres by paying farmers to plant

cropped land to a protective cover of grass or trees, and by doing so help control surplus crop production with a *real* conservation program—not just annual set-asides.

“Let me see if I have this right,” he asked. “We’ve had all these fellows in northern Missouri plowing up pasture land to get federal crop subsidies for planting corn. And now we’re going to give them fifty buck an acre to plant it *back* to grass, so that their fields will look again the way mine have looked all along?”

The two of us looked out over those gorgeous, emerald fields to the forested knobs beyond.

“You figure that’s how this will work, Kenny?”

At that, I suddenly found it easier to look into the beer he’d just handed me. “I guess so, Uncle Paul.”

That would be the late Paul Cook, of Roselle, Missouri, as good a steward of the land he had inherited from my grandfather—and the 800 acres he added—as you’d ever care to meet.

The truth is, both problems are worth tackling: how to solve conservation problems that badly need solving, and how to support conservationists who’ve already solved those very same problems.

That’s how I think of the Conservation Security Program and what it set out to do. Tough stuff, Mr. Chairman; tough stuff.

Recently, two highly respected organizations with deep experience in agricultural conservation policy, the Soil and Water Conservation Society and Environmental Defense, completed a review of the CSP as it has operated in the past few years. I commend it to the subcommittee as a fine example of fair, unflinching program evaluation, which is something of a lost art in this town. My colleagues and I excerpted the following passages from the SWCS/ED assessment for your consideration.

I look forward to answering any questions you or your subcommittee may have, Mr. Chairman.

### **CSP Faces Serious Challenges**

“CSP was designed to serve 2 purposes: 1) to provide a source of income to producers and 2) to improve environmental quality and natural resource condition in agricultural landscapes. These two purposes are complementary but different. Our assessment suggests that CSP is falling short of realizing either of its two purposes...Urgent action is needed to recover the promise of CSP. Major changes must be made to the program, and a secure funding level must be established if CSP is to have any hope of realizing its potential.” (p. 1)

**Align Vision and Funding**

"It is possible for one program to achieve the two purposes of income support (rewarding good stewards) and environmental improvement (providing incentives for producers to take new actions to help the environment), but not without significant public investment. At least so far, Congress and the Administration have not been willing to make that investment; since enactment of the 2002 farm bill, Congress has capped funding for CSP six times." (p. 1)

**Reward More Than the Status Quo**

"CSP, as currently implemented, presents conservationists with a dilemma. Taxpayers are largely paying for environmental benefits they are already receiving. Existing practice payments (4% of payments, stewardship payments (14% of payments), and all of the enhancement payments paid through the end of fiscal year 2005 (82% of payments) are for benchmark, that is, pre-existing practices and activities. Essentially all of the CSP payments made through the end of fiscal year 2005 and a large majority of total payments anticipated over the life of 2005 CSP contracts, then, are rewarding participants' status quo level of conservation performance." (p. 2)

**Emphasize Quality Over Quantity**

"CSP, in statute and in implementation, rewards addressing a broad range of resource concerns. That makes the program more flexible and recognized the multiple benefits flowing from working land. It also introduces the danger that quantity – the number of resource concerns addressed – outweighs quality – the comprehensiveness with which an individual resource concern is addressed. In other words, doing a little for a lot of resource concerns may result in the same reward as doing a lot for a few resource concerns even if those few are of the greatest importance to conserve resources and improve environmental quality in a particular area. The environmental performance of CSP should be enhanced by taking the following steps: (1) emphasize management intensity, (2) focus on resources that matter most, (3) improve quality criteria,...and (4) lift the cap on technical assistance." (p.2)



# CONSERVATION SECURITY PROGRAM (CSP)

FEBRUARY 2007

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

A Report from the Soil and Water Conservation Society and Environmental Defense









# CONSERVATION SECURITY PROGRAM ASSESSMENT— EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This assessment of the Conservation Security Program (CSP) is one of four assessments of the major U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) conservation programs. These assessments are intended to improve understanding of how these programs are working and how they may be improved. Assessing CSP is particularly important because it has great potential to contribute to a well-focused and strategic conservation effort on the nation's working land.

We relied on fiscal year 2005 program information for most of the analyses presented in this report. USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) graciously provided us with 2005 CSP program data from its ProTracts database. NRCS staff, particularly the CSP program staff, answered many questions about CSP program policies, guidance, and data. We provided NRCS an advance copy of this report, and the agency graciously agreed to check the accuracy of the data and statements about program policy made in this report. The conclusions and recommendations, however, are solely the responsibility of Environmental Defense and the Soil and Water Conservation Society. NRCS's much-appreciated cooperation in completing this assessment must not be interpreted in any way as an endorsement of our conclusions and recommendations.

## CSP FACES SERIOUS CHALLENGES

CSP was designed to serve two purposes: (1) to provide a source of income to producers and (2) to improve environmental quality and natural resource condition in agricultural landscapes. These two purposes are complementary but different. Our assessment suggests that CSP is falling short of realizing either of its two purposes.

Urgent action is needed to recover the promise of CSP. Major changes must be made to the program, and a secure funding level must be established if CSP is to have any hope of realizing its potential. The status quo is not sustainable. Budget constraints, reluctance to replace crop production-based subsidies with stewardship-based subsidies, and a lack of emphasis on rewarding new rather than pre-existing conservation effort has put CSP in a no-mans land, impairing its ability to achieve either of its two purposes and increasing the risk that the program will lose the support of producers, conservation organizations, and Congress.

## ALIGN VISION AND FUNDING

It is possible for one program to achieve the two purposes of income support (rewarding good stewards) and environmental improvement (providing incentives for producers to take new actions to help the environment), but not without significant public investment. At least so far, Congress and the Administration have not been willing to make that investment; since enactment of the 2002 farm bill, Congress has capped funding for CSP six times.

These funding caps have had a profound effect on how CSP has been implemented. Even with the restrictions imposed to keep CSP within its budget caps, CSP funding will still have to grow at nearly a geometric rate each year. Traditionally, all the annual payments owed a producer under a multi-year contract are obligated in the fiscal year in which the contract is signed. NRCS, however, took a different approach with CSP and uses all of the funding provided in one fiscal year to pay participants only for the payments due in that fiscal year. This approach to meeting contract obligations substantially increased the number of producers who could participate in CSP, but also means that Congress must increase CSP funding every year in order to allow new producers to participate in the program. Even more funding will be needed each year to reward current participants for doing more to improve the environment. Modifications made to 2004 CSP contracts, for example, increased the cost of those contracts by 69%. This is good news: it indicates the willingness of producers to increase their level of conservation effort on their farms and ranches. But the increase in cost also demonstrates the challenge ahead to provide adequate funding both to reward current participants who are willing to do more and to enroll new producers based on what they are already doing. The variable rate enhancement payment policy implemented in the 2005 sign-up will take some of the pressure off the CSP budget but will also increase the demand by current participants wanting to add new activities to shore up their declining payments.

Achieving such a substantial annual growth in funding for CSP in the next farm bill will be challenging given budget realities and competing demands from numerous stakeholders. Moreover, the difficult and troubling budget history of CSP may make some members of Congress reluctant to dramatically increase funding for the program in the farm bill for fear that later Congressional



actions will result in new caps and diversion of the funding to other purposes.

CSP cannot continue to function with such a large gap between the vision of an open-ended entitlement program and the reality of strict caps on annual funding. The current gap between vision and reality has already sparked intense criticism of the implementation decisions NRCS has made to keep the program within funding caps.

Congress must either provide the funding needed to fully realize the vision or limit the vision of CSP to fit within available funding.

## **REWARD MORE THAN THE STATUS QUO**

CSP, as currently implemented, presents conservationists with a dilemma. Taxpayers are largely paying for environmental benefits they are already receiving. Existing practice payments (4% of payments), stewardship payments (14% of payments), and all of the enhancement payments paid through the end of fiscal year 2005 (82% of payments) are for benchmark, that is, pre-existing practices and activities. Essentially all of the CSP payments made through the end of fiscal year 2005 and a large majority of total payments anticipated over the life of 2005 CSP contracts, then, are rewarding participant's status quo level of conservation effort.

As implemented, CSP puts the priority on rewarding the status quo. Improving the status quo depends entirely on whether Congress increases CSP funding enough to modify current contracts and reward producers for going above and beyond their benchmark (pre-existing) level of conservation effort. Unless CSP reverses its priorities, it will do little to help agriculture meet its serious and growing environmental challenges. Meeting those environmental challenges requires changing the status quo, not rewarding the status quo.

Rewarding the status quo—providing farmers and ranchers a return on their past and ongoing investment in conservation—is a much better way to support income than the current amalgam of crop and income subsidies in place today. It is also a laudable way to reward the good actors in conservation rather than directing taxpayer funding to producers who have not made much of an investment in conservation. But this approach will be costly and will likely require transforming current crop production-based subsidies to subsidies based on stewardship. Until such a fundamental shift in farm policy is made, rewarding the status

quo with limited conservation program dollars is an inefficient and likely ineffective way to meet the significant environmental challenges confronting agriculture.

There are many ways CSP could be reformed to do a much better job of helping agriculture meet these challenges. Enhancement payments, for example, could be reserved only for new effort above and beyond the benchmark (pre-existing) level of effort rewarded through stewardship payments. Alternatively, contracting periods in CSP could be shortened to five years and producers be required to do more in order to renew their contracts (and receive higher payments) for another five years. Alternatively, producers could be required to plan for and commit to new conservation practices and activities as part of their CSP contract with their CSP payment growing as those new practices and activities come online.

The CSP framework provides multiple opportunities to increase its effectiveness to improve the status quo level of conservation on U.S. agricultural land. The best specific option to choose depends on many factors, not least of which is the funding level Congress provides for CSP in the future. It is imperative that a future CSP devote much more of its resources to spurring new effort to meet agriculture's mounting environmental challenges.

## **EMPHASIZE QUALITY OVER QUANTITY**

CSP, in statute and in implementation, rewards addressing a broad range of resource concerns. That makes the program more flexible and recognizes the multiple benefits flowing from working land. It also introduces the danger that quantity—the number of resource concerns addressed—outweighs quality—the comprehensiveness with which an individual resource concern is addressed. In other words, doing a little for a lot of resource concerns may result in the same reward as doing a lot for a few resource concerns even if those few are of the greatest importance to conserve resources and improve environmental quality in a particular area. The environmental performance of CSP should be enhanced by taking the following steps:

- **Emphasize management intensity**
- **Focus on resources that matter most**
- **Improve quality criteria**



## EMPHASIZE MANAGEMENT INTENSITY

Management intensity is a measure of how completely a producer is addressing a specific resource concern. The intensity with which a resource concern is addressed is often a more direct indication of the environmental benefits produced than simply the number of resources concerns addressed or the total acres treated.

Tying enhancement payments to management intensity could and should help simplify CSP by reducing the number of activities qualifying for enhancement payments. In 2005, for example, there were 52 individual enhancements all of which had some effect on nutrient management and each of which has its unique requirements and payment levels. Instead of such a complex set of individual enhancements, there could, for example, be a single nutrient management enhancement payment, scaled to the intensity and comprehensiveness of treatment, and tailored to the farming system and geographic features of the local watershed. Such an approach would simplify and streamline the program, reduce administrative burdens, and improve the environmental performance of the program.

The concept of management intensity could and should also be incorporated into stewardship payments. Currently, a producer can increase his/her stewardship payment by: (1) addressing more resource concerns, (2) treating more acres, or (3) treating land with higher rental payments. Stewardship payments could and should also be scaled to the level of intensity with which a priority resource concern is addressed. A producer, then, could increase his/her stewardship payment by intensifying his/her management in addition to, or rather than simply by, treating more resource concerns or more acres. Movement to higher tiers could also be based on increasing the intensity and comprehensiveness with which those resource concerns are addressed.

The quantitative indices currently used in CSP could easily be incorporated into a system of graduated payments that increase with increasing level of effort and anticipated environmental benefits. Where such quantitative indices do not exist, the use of practice-based indices could help fill the gap. Strict guidance will be needed to ensure the concept of management intensity is implemented using consistent methods and approaches across the nation and to ensure those methods and approaches are rigorous and technically sound.

## FOCUS ON RESOURCES THAT MATTER MOST

The environmental benefits provided by CSP could be greatly increased if the program was targeted at achieving greater level of treatment of only those resource concerns most critical to the environment in a local area or watershed. Allowing the state offices to specify the three most important resources of concern, instead of using soil and water quality as the national bar for eligibility, would allow states to emphasize which resources producers need to address. In watersheds where wildlife habitat or air quality might be particularly problematic, producers would be required to address these issues first. This would ensure that CSP participants are addressing the most important environmental issues in a given area.

We also recommend tying enhancement payments closely to conservation and environmental management needs that address the most important local environmental priorities and contribute substantially to achieving regional and national environmental priorities. This could be accomplished by adjusting the payment rate on selected enhancements to reflect the greater value created by addressing the most important local, regional, and national environmental priorities.

Strict guidance will need to be developed to ensure that the methods and approaches used to target enhancements at critical, local environmental problems produce consistent results across the nation and that the targeting process is driven by rigorous and technically sound criteria.

## IMPROVE QUALITY CRITERIA

The rigor and technical soundness of quality criteria are fundamental determinants of the environmental performance of CSP. Quality criteria are used to determine whether treatment of a resource concern is sufficient to meet the nondegradation standard and determine the size of tier-based stewardship and existing practice payments the producer will receive. Quality criteria are also used to determine which conservation activities on the farm or ranch qualify for enhancement payments. Taken together, these two determinations—both based on quality criteria—largely determine how much CSP will spend and what environmental benefits will be produced.



We applaud the efforts NRCS has already taken to strengthen quality criteria. A comprehensive review of quality criteria was beyond the scope of this report, but a cursory review suggests that substantial additional work is needed. Some quality criteria are largely practice-based while others are based on indices. Some indices are more rigorous and quantitative while others are largely qualitative. We recommend three areas to focus effort on improving quality criteria.

First, we applaud and encourage the use of indices, such as the Soil Conditioning Index (SCI) as the basis for quality criteria. We encourage NRCS to continuously test, evaluate, and improve the SCI and other existing indices and to place a high priority on the development of additional indices that can serve as the basis for quality criteria for CSP and all other conservation programs. The role of the SCI has been questioned. The questions raised include technical concerns about the index's applicability to particular farming systems and landscapes and policy questions about the fairness or effectiveness of placing so much emphasis on soil quality in CSP. It is imperative that the technical issues surrounding SCI and all other such indices be thoroughly evaluated and improved on an ongoing basis. One of the most important contributions CSP could make to the portfolio of USDA conservation programs is the development, testing, and application of such indices.

Second, we recommend that greater priority and weight be given to those enhancements for which quality criteria are most rigorous and robust while other quality criteria are strengthened and developed.

Third, wildlife habitat quality criteria appear to be the weakest link currently. We recommend high priority be given to strengthening these criteria. Wildlife habitat management enhancements were the fourth largest category of expenditures for enhancements in 2005. In addition, it appears that a determination of whether benchmark practices and activities were sufficient to meet wildlife habitat quality criteria was the determining factor for placing many operations in Tier III. Making sure habitat criteria are meaningful is critical to ensuring the public is getting real wildlife benefits from CSP.

## **INCREASE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

In addition, Congress must remove the present 15% cap for technical assistance and give the Secretary of Agriculture the flexibility to allocate the amount of funding for technical assistance needed to ensure CSP is implemented effectively and efficiently. The statutory limit on technical assistance has led to decisions that have reduced the environmental performance of the program.

Most important, limited field technical staff and short contracting periods have seriously constrained planning for new practices and activities in the out-years of a producer's CSP contract. This is one of the primary reasons that nearly all of the long-term financial commitment created by 2005 CSP contracts is for "benchmark" practices—practices that were already in place when the producer signed up for CSP.

CSP demands a high degree of technical assistance to conduct benchmark assessments, evaluate the extent to which current efforts meet appropriate treatment standards, and assist producers to plan, and eventually implement, new conservation practices and activities. A stronger technical assistance network is essential to implementing all of the recommendations in this report. Arbitrary limits on technical assistance are unhelpful and impede progress toward creating the effective and efficient program CSP should become.

## **STRENGTHEN THE PORTFOLIO**

CSP has the potential to become a successful conservation incentives program. CSP, or any other reward-based conservation program alone, however, will not be sufficient to meet the environmental agenda confronting U.S. agriculture. The other conservation programs in the portfolio must also grow in funding and effectiveness to create the balanced conservation portfolio needed to meet the environmental challenge U.S. producers' face. Serious reforms must be made to other programs in the conservation title to ensure the most cost-effective practices and systems are encouraged, that a critical mass of participation is achieved to produce real improvements in environmental quality, that critical habitat and landscape features are restored, and to support cooperative, locally led conservation projects on a large scale across the United States. Such reforms are beyond the scope of this assessment but are being developed and will be shared in other reports.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Alabama (Rep. Jo Bonner), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	654	\$3,117,024
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	235	\$782,032
3	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	5	\$9,305

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Alabama (Rep. Jo Bonner), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Cotton Subsidies	762	\$38,329,104
2	Peanut Subsidies	421	\$14,562,004
3	Conservation Reserve Program	654	\$3,117,024
4	Corn Subsidies	886	\$2,105,289
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	235	\$782,032
6	Wheat Subsidies	623	\$537,549
7	Soybean Subsidies	237	\$214,395
8	Dairy Program Subsidies	8	\$140,885
9	Sorghum Subsidies	197	\$57,141
10	Oat Subsidies	242	\$30,318
11	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	5	\$9,305
12	Rice Subsidies	2	\$89
13	Sunflower Subsidies	5	\$73

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Iowa (Rep. Leonard L. Boswell), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	7,770	\$90,856,200
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	446	\$2,176,212
3	Wetlands Reserve Program	12	\$205,251
4	Total Conservation Security Program	27	\$139,061
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	9	\$21,035
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	1	\$2,410

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Iowa (Rep. Leonard L. Boswell), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	13,027	\$364,622,289
2	Conservation Reserve Program	7,770	\$90,856,200
3	Soybean Subsidies	11,497	\$39,252,279
4	Env. Quality Incentive Program	446	\$2,176,212
5	Dairy Program Subsidies	164	\$1,992,681
6	Wheat Subsidies	1,105	\$283,925
7	Wetlands Reserve Program	12	\$205,251
8	Total Conservation Security Program	27	\$139,061
9	Oat Subsidies	3,140	\$120,694
10	Wool Subsidies	320	\$110,553
11	Sorghum Subsidies	175	\$65,993
12	Sheep Meat Subsidies	91	\$25,413
13	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	9	\$21,035
14	Dry Pea Subsidies	10	\$5,678
15	Grasslands Reserve Program	1	\$2,410
16	Mohair Subsidies	1	\$1,498
17	Barley Subsidies	32	\$1,451
18	Flax Subsidies	6	\$72

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.



**Top Conservation Programs in the 2nd district of Kansas (Rep. Nancy E. Boyda), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	6,414	\$39,992,770
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	817	\$3,544,245
3	Total Conservation Security Program	147	\$975,003
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	20	\$200,648
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	61	\$160,723
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	7	\$77,541

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 2nd district of Kansas (Rep. Nancy E. Boyda), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	15,364	\$110,071,880
2	Sorghum Subsidies	18,796	\$49,651,931
3	Wheat Subsidies	19,777	\$41,462,143
4	Conservation Reserve Program	6,414	\$39,992,770
5	Soybean Subsidies	18,691	\$23,058,293
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	817	\$3,544,245
7	Dairy Program Subsidies	306	\$3,505,207
8	Total Conservation Security Program	147	\$975,003
9	Wetlands Reserve Program	20	\$200,648
10	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	61	\$160,723
11	Sunflower Subsidies	368	\$106,158
12	Cotton Subsidies	25	\$99,332
13	Grasslands Reserve Program	7	\$77,541
14	Barley Subsidies	673	\$61,061
15	Oat Subsidies	2,812	\$54,355
16	Wool Subsidies	83	\$15,591
17	Dry Pea Subsidies	11	\$6,208
18	Sheep Meat Subsidies	23	\$5,364
19	Canola Subsidies	1	\$49

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 18th district of California (Rep. Dennis A. Cardoza), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Env. Quality Incentive Program	282	\$2,419,418
2	Conservation Reserve Program	28	\$185,179
3	Grasslands Reserve Program	2	\$92,732
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	2	\$37,008

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 18th district of California (Rep. Dennis A. Cardoza), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Cotton Subsidies	795	\$74,723,391
2	Dairy Program Subsidies	709	\$18,664,192
3	Corn Subsidies	1,315	\$15,867,968
4	Rice Subsidies	139	\$5,452,704
5	Wheat Subsidies	899	\$3,750,842
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	282	\$2,419,418
7	Oat Subsidies	971	\$523,545
8	Barley Subsidies	548	\$453,254
9	Conservation Reserve Program	28	\$185,179
10	Grasslands Reserve Program	2	\$92,732
11	Wool Subsidies	18	\$77,294
12	Sorghum Subsidies	172	\$58,319
13	Safflower Subsidies	105	\$48,407
14	Wetlands Reserve Program	2	\$37,008
15	Sheep Meat Subsidies	2	\$10,850
16	Sunflower Subsidies	1	\$74

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 20th district of California (Rep. Jim Costa), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Env. Quality Incentive Program	360	\$2,532,236
2	Wetlands Reserve Program	7	\$225,509
3	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	5	\$23,423
4	Conservation Reserve Program	1	\$8,781

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 20th district of California (Rep. Jim Costa), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Cotton Subsidies	2,026	\$241,704,155
2	Dairy Program Subsidies	413	\$9,386,099
3	Wheat Subsidies	1,659	\$7,172,980
4	Corn Subsidies	1,365	\$5,979,435
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	360	\$2,532,236
6	Barley Subsidies	1,300	\$1,555,084
7	Rice Subsidies	206	\$821,938
8	Sorghum Subsidies	493	\$271,981
9	Wool Subsidies	18	\$255,530
10	Wetlands Reserve Program	7	\$225,509
11	Oat Subsidies	271	\$32,842
12	Sheep Meat Subsidies	5	\$24,549
13	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	5	\$23,423
14	Safflower Subsidies	91	\$17,027
15	Conservation Reserve Program	1	\$8,781
16	Sunflower Subsidies	2	\$2,298
17	Peanut Subsidies	1	\$43

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 28th district of Texas (Rep. Henry Cuellar), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	155	\$3,245,985
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	193	\$818,850
3	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	2	\$13,696
4	Total Conservation Security Program	2	\$9,734

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 28th district of Texas (Rep. Henry Cuellar), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Peanut Subsidies	586	\$28,181,559
2	Sorghum Subsidies	1,813	\$5,336,644
3	Corn Subsidies	1,531	\$4,277,503
4	Cotton Subsidies	244	\$4,232,167
5	Conservation Reserve Program	155	\$3,245,985
6	Wheat Subsidies	1,333	\$1,254,215
7	Env. Quality Incentive Program	193	\$818,850
8	Dairy Program Subsidies	26	\$479,886
9	Oat Subsidies	584	\$34,620
10	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	2	\$13,696
11	Total Conservation Security Program	2	\$9,734
12	Sunflower Subsidies	5	\$1,960
13	Soybean Subsidies	21	\$1,456
14	Wool Subsidies	5	\$591
15	Barley Subsidies	10	\$174

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 8th district of Indiana (Rep. Brad Ellsworth), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	3,962	\$19,687,683
2	Wetlands Reserve Program	53	\$2,732,276
3	Env. Quality Incentive Program	292	\$1,497,211
4	Total Conservation Security Program	219	\$1,411,497
5	Grasslands Reserve Program	5	\$239,583
6	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	30	\$62,291

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 8th district of Indiana (Rep. Brad Ellsworth), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	16,624	\$260,487,927
2	Soybean Subsidies	15,660	\$31,310,910
3	Conservation Reserve Program	3,962	\$19,687,683
4	Wheat Subsidies	10,141	\$11,340,956
5	Wetlands Reserve Program	53	\$2,732,276
6	Dairy Program Subsidies	163	\$1,627,220
7	Env. Quality Incentive Program	292	\$1,497,211
8	Sorghum Subsidies	1,542	\$1,466,730
9	Total Conservation Security Program	219	\$1,411,497
10	Grasslands Reserve Program	5	\$239,583
11	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	30	\$62,291
12	Barley Subsidies	42	\$12,934
13	Wool Subsidies	31	\$11,664
14	Oat Subsidies	428	\$4,325
15	Dry Pea Subsidies	2	\$2,432
16	Sunflower Subsidies	10	\$211
17	Canola Subsidies	9	\$32
18	Flax Subsidies	4	\$12

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 2nd district of Alabama (Rep. Terry Everett), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	4,005	\$28,300,924
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	570	\$2,592,834
3	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	28	\$83,535
4	Grasslands Reserve Program	10	\$35,348

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 2nd district of Alabama (Rep. Terry Everett), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Peanut Subsidies	4,242	\$102,164,006
2	Cotton Subsidies	3,242	\$74,613,134
3	Conservation Reserve Program	4,005	\$28,300,924
4	Corn Subsidies	4,843	\$6,418,361
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	570	\$2,592,834
6	Wheat Subsidies	3,130	\$1,671,835
7	Sorghum Subsidies	2,447	\$823,940
8	Dairy Program Subsidies	31	\$736,200
9	Oat Subsidies	1,315	\$84,230
10	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	28	\$83,535
11	Soybean Subsidies	348	\$53,821
12	Grasslands Reserve Program	10	\$35,348
13	Canola Subsidies	24	\$5,848
14	Barley Subsidies	9	\$3,673
15	Sunflower Subsidies	5	\$484

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Nebraska (Rep. Jeff Fortenberry), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	9,969	\$102,054,160
2	Wetlands Reserve Program	91	\$3,272,851
3	Grasslands Reserve Program	17	\$2,171,065
4	Env. Quality Incentive Program	361	\$1,418,990
5	Total Conservation Security Program	235	\$552,523

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Nebraska (Rep. Jeff Fortenberry), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	25,910	\$521,069,309
2	Conservation Reserve Program	9,969	\$102,054,160
3	Soybean Subsidies	24,362	\$64,871,957
4	Sorghum Subsidies	13,011	\$62,157,773
5	Wheat Subsidies	12,544	\$11,987,416
6	Dairy Program Subsidies	350	\$3,922,796
7	Wetlands Reserve Program	91	\$3,272,851
8	Grasslands Reserve Program	17	\$2,171,065
9	Env. Quality Incentive Program	361	\$1,418,990
10	Total Conservation Security Program	235	\$552,523
11	Oat Subsidies	3,209	\$192,957
12	Wool Subsidies	212	\$50,627
13	Sunflower Subsidies	27	\$16,302
14	Barley Subsidies	120	\$14,604
15	Dry Pea Subsidies	12	\$13,188
16	Sheep Meat Subsidies	76	\$12,879
17	Mohair Subsidies	3	\$8,837
18	Cotton Subsidies	1	\$332

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 20th district of New York (Rep. Kirsten E. Gillibrand), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	271	\$2,498,344
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	169	\$717,991
3	Wetlands Reserve Program	4	\$15,267
4	Grasslands Reserve Program	8	\$4,275
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	7	\$3,358

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 20th district of New York (Rep. Kirsten E. Gillibrand), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	1,488	\$14,707,254
2	Dairy Program Subsidies	1,010	\$12,993,398
3	Conservation Reserve Program	271	\$2,498,344
4	Env. Quality Incentive Program	169	\$717,991
5	Wheat Subsidies	203	\$60,627
6	Soybean Subsidies	95	\$45,576
7	Barley Subsidies	155	\$31,771
8	Oat Subsidies	634	\$18,013
9	Wetlands Reserve Program	4	\$15,267
10	Wool Subsidies	62	\$12,468
11	Sorghum Subsidies	34	\$5,514
12	Mohair Subsidies	6	\$4,656
13	Grasslands Reserve Program	8	\$4,275
14	Sheep Meat Subsidies	18	\$3,983
15	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	7	\$3,358
16	Sunflower Subsidies	4	\$76

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.



**Top Conservation Programs in the 6th district of Missouri (Rep. Sam Graves), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	12,186	\$166,924,386
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	435	\$2,206,957
3	Wetlands Reserve Program	55	\$1,086,568
4	Total Conservation Security Program	136	\$444,504
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	51	\$127,833
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	32	\$51,886

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 6th district of Missouri (Rep. Sam Graves), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	19,917	\$200,070,572
2	Conservation Reserve Program	12,186	\$166,924,386
3	Soybean Subsidies	16,526	\$40,826,083
4	Wheat Subsidies	14,041	\$20,069,022
5	Sorghum Subsidies	7,383	\$7,947,302
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	435	\$2,206,957
7	Dairy Program Subsidies	136	\$1,326,505
8	Wetlands Reserve Program	55	\$1,086,568
9	Total Conservation Security Program	136	\$444,504
10	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	51	\$127,833
11	Grasslands Reserve Program	32	\$51,886
12	Oat Subsidies	1,937	\$38,354
13	Wool Subsidies	169	\$35,564
14	Barley Subsidies	114	\$19,669
15	Dry Pea Subsidies	2	\$1,412
16	Sheep Meat Subsidies	16	\$1,397
17	Sunflower Subsidies	15	\$619
18	Sesame Subsidies	1	\$21

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 8th district of North Carolina  
(Rep. Robin Hayes), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	797	\$2,398,242
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	106	\$1,238,079
3	Total Conservation Security Program	1	\$14,193
4	Grasslands Reserve Program	1	\$4,436

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 8th district of  
North Carolina (Rep. Robin Hayes), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Cotton Subsidies	626	\$25,202,314
2	Corn Subsidies	1,722	\$6,223,111
3	Conservation Reserve Program	797	\$2,398,242
4	Wheat Subsidies	1,579	\$2,035,700
5	Soybean Subsidies	1,334	\$1,600,559
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	106	\$1,238,079
7	Dairy Program Subsidies	16	\$337,014
8	Sorghum Subsidies	512	\$161,069
9	Barley Subsidies	434	\$141,723
10	Peanut Subsidies	23	\$77,104
11	Oat Subsidies	434	\$15,875
12	Total Conservation Security Program	1	\$14,193
13	Grasslands Reserve Program	1	\$4,436
14	Sunflower Subsidies	14	\$2,097
15	Wool Subsidies	2	\$223

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the At Large District of South Dakota  
(Rep. Stephanie Herseth), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	19,391	\$204,562,290
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,626	\$16,000,164
3	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	206	\$931,654
4	Total Conservation Security Program	129	\$663,621
5	Wetlands Reserve Program	87	\$528,754
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	22	\$406,662

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the At Large District of South Dakota (Rep. Stephanie Herseth), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	37,520	\$732,992,890
2	Conservation Reserve Program	19,391	\$204,562,290
3	Wheat Subsidies	28,389	\$140,994,704
4	Soybean Subsidies	30,904	\$135,707,775
5	Sorghum Subsidies	9,499	\$19,387,532
6	Sunflower Subsidies	8,429	\$16,256,919
7	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,626	\$16,000,164
8	Dairy Program Subsidies	1,909	\$14,525,612
9	Barley Subsidies	10,257	\$8,121,510
10	Dry Pea Subsidies	504	\$2,222,871
11	Oat Subsidies	15,985	\$1,865,149
12	Wool Subsidies	1,782	\$1,388,120
13	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	206	\$931,654
14	Total Conservation Security Program	129	\$663,621
15	Wetlands Reserve Program	87	\$528,754
16	Grasslands Reserve Program	22	\$406,662
17	Sheep Meat Subsidies	538	\$220,410
18	Flax Subsidies	442	\$131,415
19	Safflower Subsidies	290	\$81,013
20	Chick Pea Subsidies	27	\$42,006

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 17th district of Pennsylvania (Rep. Tim Holden), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	751	\$6,479,315
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	42	\$488,901
3	Total Conservation Security Program	80	\$173,345
4	Grasslands Reserve Program	1	\$1,287

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 17th district of Pennsylvania (Rep. Tim Holden), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	1,296	\$14,796,878
2	Dairy Program Subsidies	584	\$10,890,385
3	Conservation Reserve Program	751	\$6,479,315
4	Soybean Subsidies	861	\$1,112,113
5	Wheat Subsidies	875	\$785,695
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	42	\$488,901
7	Barley Subsidies	554	\$308,091
8	Total Conservation Security Program	80	\$173,345
9	Sorghum Subsidies	93	\$60,884
10	Oat Subsidies	651	\$18,131
11	Wool Subsidies	15	\$4,731
12	Sheep Meat Subsidies	4	\$2,691
13	Mohair Subsidies	2	\$1,803
14	Grasslands Reserve Program	1	\$1,287
15	Rapeseed Subsidies	1	\$36
16	Sunflower Subsidies	2	\$19

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 8th district of Wisconsin (Rep. Steve Kagen), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	2,370	\$8,128,073
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	615	\$2,467,072
3	Total Conservation Security Program	128	\$837,741
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	3	\$31,730
5	Grasslands Reserve Program	8	\$5,722
6	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	3	\$3,333

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 8th district of Wisconsin (Rep. Steve Kagen), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	6,900	\$76,082,413
2	Dairy Program Subsidies	3,336	\$43,726,527
3	Conservation Reserve Program	2,370	\$8,128,073
4	Soybean Subsidies	3,277	\$3,366,700
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	615	\$2,467,072
6	Wheat Subsidies	2,326	\$1,180,021
7	Total Conservation Security Program	128	\$837,741
8	Barley Subsidies	1,855	\$607,285
9	Oat Subsidies	4,860	\$232,032
10	Dry Pea Subsidies	23	\$41,312
11	Wetlands Reserve Program	3	\$31,730
12	Sunflower Subsidies	48	\$10,998
13	Wool Subsidies	31	\$6,740
14	Sorghum Subsidies	143	\$6,269
15	Grasslands Reserve Program	8	\$5,722
16	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	3	\$3,333
17	Mohair Subsidies	1	\$1,344
18	Sheep Meat Subsidies	8	\$267
19	Rapeseed Subsidies	10	\$54
20	Safflower Subsidies	2	\$15

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 5th district of Iowa (Rep. Steve King), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	16,962	\$166,853,082
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,320	\$6,693,672
3	Total Conservation Security Program	741	\$4,809,988
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	17	\$900,640
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	27	\$128,893
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	30	\$77,641

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 5th district of Iowa (Rep. Steve King), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	34,355	\$1,026,961,927
2	Conservation Reserve Program	16,962	\$166,853,082
3	Soybean Subsidies	31,574	\$124,817,370
4	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,320	\$6,693,672
5	Dairy Program Subsidies	421	\$5,837,235
6	Total Conservation Security Program	741	\$4,809,988
7	Wheat Subsidies	3,787	\$1,323,244
8	Wetlands Reserve Program	17	\$900,640
9	Wool Subsidies	715	\$352,780
10	Oat Subsidies	6,346	\$313,000
11	Sorghum Subsidies	599	\$216,895
12	Sheep Meat Subsidies	337	\$181,457
13	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	27	\$128,893
14	Grasslands Reserve Program	30	\$77,641
15	Barley Subsidies	142	\$39,917
16	Cotton Subsidies	4	\$97
17	Flax Subsidies	2	\$21
18	Mohair Subsidies	1	\$20

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Oklahoma (Rep. Frank D. Lucas), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	8,619	\$97,134,709
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,418	\$5,374,038
3	Total Conservation Security Program	266	\$2,046,654
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	21	\$795,085
5	Grasslands Reserve Program	34	\$144,816
6	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	12	\$35,848

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Oklahoma (Rep. Frank D. Lucas), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Wheat Subsidies	33,354	\$258,264,235
2	Conservation Reserve Program	8,619	\$97,134,709
3	Cotton Subsidies	5,921	\$88,905,669
4	Peanut Subsidies	1,152	\$39,566,745
5	Corn Subsidies	2,461	\$29,111,443
6	Sorghum Subsidies	10,913	\$22,227,056
7	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,418	\$5,374,038
8	Dairy Program Subsidies	202	\$2,339,076
9	Total Conservation Security Program	266	\$2,046,654
10	Wetlands Reserve Program	21	\$795,085
11	Barley Subsidies	2,210	\$468,299
12	Soybean Subsidies	2,186	\$459,717
13	Sunflower Subsidies	240	\$347,493
14	Grasslands Reserve Program	34	\$144,816
15	Oat Subsidies	5,761	\$113,214
16	Wool Subsidies	106	\$60,275
17	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	12	\$35,848
18	Mohair Subsidies	3	\$2,222
19	Dry Pea Subsidies	3	\$1,515
20	Canola Subsidies	2	\$916

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Kansas (Rep. Jerry Moran), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	29,993	\$274,208,762
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	2,898	\$14,300,557
3	Total Conservation Security Program	834	\$7,097,058
4	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	135	\$413,461
5	Grasslands Reserve Program	23	\$404,301
6	Wetlands Reserve Program	6	\$108,598

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Kansas (Rep. Jerry Moran), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Wheat Subsidies	74,242	\$484,789,624
2	Corn Subsidies	31,759	\$459,192,902
3	Sorghum Subsidies	66,167	\$342,525,508
4	Conservation Reserve Program	29,993	\$274,208,762
5	Soybean Subsidies	26,300	\$21,686,434
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	2,898	\$14,300,557
7	Total Conservation Security Program	834	\$7,097,058
8	Sunflower Subsidies	8,816	\$5,455,188
9	Cotton Subsidies	987	\$5,379,553
10	Dairy Program Subsidies	380	\$5,199,134
11	Barley Subsidies	14,689	\$4,545,527
12	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	135	\$413,461
13	Grasslands Reserve Program	23	\$404,301
14	Oat Subsidies	12,807	\$362,446
15	Wool Subsidies	294	\$165,916
16	Wetlands Reserve Program	6	\$108,598
17	Sheep Meat Subsidies	75	\$28,908
18	Dry Pea Subsidies	24	\$17,631
19	Peanut Subsidies	3	\$3,555
20	Mohair Subsidies	3	\$2,143

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.



**Top Conservation Programs in the 4th district of Colorado (Rep. Marilyn N. Musgrave), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	7,049	\$160,602,450
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,319	\$7,969,256
3	Total Conservation Security Program	139	\$1,645,543
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	10	\$341,696
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	44	\$234,407
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	3	\$22,200

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 4th district of Colorado (Rep. Marilyn N. Musgrave), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	9,538	\$203,978,459
2	Conservation Reserve Program	7,049	\$160,602,450
3	Wheat Subsidies	13,719	\$107,408,605
4	Sorghum Subsidies	4,733	\$12,569,722
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,319	\$7,969,256
6	Dairy Program Subsidies	226	\$5,134,102
7	Barley Subsidies	6,198	\$4,039,816
8	Sunflower Subsidies	2,734	\$2,975,585
9	Total Conservation Security Program	139	\$1,645,543
10	Sheep Meat Subsidies	27	\$802,313
11	Wetlands Reserve Program	10	\$341,696
12	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	44	\$234,407
13	Wool Subsidies	109	\$149,138
14	Soybean Subsidies	400	\$129,176
15	Dry Pea Subsidies	34	\$82,226
16	Oat Subsidies	3,106	\$81,693
17	Grasslands Reserve Program	3	\$22,200
18	Canola Subsidies	16	\$2,235
19	Safflower Subsidies	9	\$672

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Alabama (Rep. Mike Rogers), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	548	\$3,931,691
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	273	\$1,087,522
3	Grasslands Reserve Program	5	\$205,445
4	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	9	\$37,648

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Alabama (Rep. Mike Rogers), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Cotton Subsidies	736	\$22,506,052
2	Conservation Reserve Program	548	\$3,931,691
3	Peanut Subsidies	45	\$3,113,733
4	Corn Subsidies	885	\$1,686,601
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	273	\$1,087,522
6	Wheat Subsidies	771	\$852,496
7	Dairy Program Subsidies	25	\$304,369
8	Soybean Subsidies	352	\$237,147
9	Grasslands Reserve Program	5	\$205,445
10	Sorghum Subsidies	497	\$182,477
11	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	9	\$37,648
12	Oat Subsidies	161	\$5,350
13	Wool Subsidies	2	\$810
14	Barley Subsidies	5	\$246

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Colorado (Rep. John T. Salazar), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	913	\$16,244,493
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,204	\$11,774,452
3	Grasslands Reserve Program	6	\$429,786
4	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	32	\$397,764
5	Total Conservation Security Program	56	\$337,682
6	Wetlands Reserve Program	2	\$14,274

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 3rd district of Colorado (Rep. John T. Salazar), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	913	\$16,244,493
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	1,204	\$11,774,452
3	Wheat Subsidies	2,889	\$8,681,692
4	Corn Subsidies	1,245	\$7,180,967
5	Barley Subsidies	1,694	\$6,846,815
6	Dairy Program Subsidies	40	\$951,551
7	Wool Subsidies	309	\$820,563
8	Sorghum Subsidies	442	\$442,982
9	Grasslands Reserve Program	6	\$429,786
10	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	32	\$397,764
11	Total Conservation Security Program	56	\$337,682
12	Sheep Meat Subsidies	33	\$226,896
13	Oat Subsidies	1,488	\$101,673
14	Canola Subsidies	43	\$29,303
15	Wetlands Reserve Program	2	\$14,274
16	Cotton Subsidies	10	\$12,411
17	Soybean Subsidies	46	\$10,888
18	Safflower Subsidies	42	\$6,610
19	Mohair Subsidies	14	\$4,724
20	Dry Pea Subsidies	1	\$2,292

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 2nd district of Ohio (Rep. Jean Schmidt), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	443	\$3,144,172
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	100	\$418,943
3	Grasslands Reserve Program	18	\$28,571

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 2nd district of Ohio (Rep. Jean Schmidt), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	3,118	\$17,197,586
2	Soybean Subsidies	1,809	\$4,134,364
3	Conservation Reserve Program	443	\$3,144,172
4	Dairy Program Subsidies	122	\$934,127
5	Wheat Subsidies	1,922	\$834,384
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	100	\$418,943
7	Grasslands Reserve Program	18	\$28,571
8	Oat Subsidies	279	\$2,379
9	Wool Subsidies	11	\$1,340
10	Barley Subsidies	24	\$1,228
11	Sunflower Subsidies	3	\$1,140
12	Sorghum Subsidies	7	\$751
13	Mohair Subsidies	1	\$173
14	Sheep Meat Subsidies	5	\$150

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 13th District of Georgia (Rep. David Scott), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Env. Quality Incentive Program	6	\$41,015
2	Conservation Reserve Program	13	\$29,228

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 13th District of Georgia (Rep. David Scott), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Wheat Subsidies	70	\$71,459
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	6	\$41,015
3	Conservation Reserve Program	13	\$29,228
4	Peanut Subsidies	2	\$12,967
5	Sorghum Subsidies	21	\$9,831
6	Corn Subsidies	20	\$2,866
7	Barley Subsidies	10	\$2,779
8	Soybean Subsidies	4	\$2,573
9	Cotton Subsidies	3	\$2,044
10	Oat Subsidies	15	\$198
11	Canola Subsidies	1	\$33

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 18th district of Ohio (Rep. Zachary T. Space), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	968	\$5,929,159
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	371	\$1,680,365
3	Grasslands Reserve Program	52	\$73,897
4	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	7	\$41,497
5	Total Conservation Security Program	7	\$15,922
6	Wetlands Reserve Program	1	\$8,288

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 18th district of Ohio (Rep. Zachary T. Space), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	4,323	\$46,463,590
2	Dairy Program Subsidies	761	\$8,395,783
3	Conservation Reserve Program	968	\$5,929,159
4	Soybean Subsidies	2,284	\$4,197,771
5	Wheat Subsidies	2,547	\$1,752,560
6	Env. Quality Incentive Program	371	\$1,680,365
7	Grasslands Reserve Program	52	\$73,897
8	Wool Subsidies	248	\$59,587
9	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	7	\$41,497
10	Barley Subsidies	257	\$27,864
11	Oat Subsidies	1,475	\$27,395
12	Mohair Subsidies	8	\$19,476
13	Total Conservation Security Program	7	\$15,922
14	Sheep Meat Subsidies	128	\$12,559
15	Wetlands Reserve Program	1	\$8,288
16	Sorghum Subsidies	41	\$8,018
17	Sunflower Subsidies	10	\$43

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 7th district of Michigan (Rep. Timothy Walberg), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	3,033	\$21,603,243
2	Total Conservation Security Program	226	\$4,488,187
3	Env. Quality Incentive Program	148	\$1,334,776
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	14	\$375,697
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	11	\$25,917
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	6	\$8,886

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 7th district of Michigan (Rep. Timothy Walberg), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	5,252	\$105,701,984
2	Conservation Reserve Program	3,033	\$21,603,243
3	Soybean Subsidies	4,252	\$11,261,476
4	Wheat Subsidies	3,977	\$6,986,250
5	Dairy Program Subsidies	424	\$5,844,997
6	Total Conservation Security Program	226	\$4,488,187
7	Env. Quality Incentive Program	148	\$1,334,776
8	Wetlands Reserve Program	14	\$375,697
9	Wool Subsidies	98	\$49,921
10	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	11	\$25,917
11	Oat Subsidies	957	\$17,233
12	Barley Subsidies	130	\$11,714
13	Grasslands Reserve Program	6	\$8,886
14	Sorghum Subsidies	30	\$6,349
15	Sheep Meat Subsidies	19	\$4,428
16	Mohair Subsidies	2	\$2,848
17	Sunflower Subsidies	2	\$30

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Minnesota (Rep. Timothy J. Walz), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Conservation Reserve Program	11,176	\$66,958,093
2	Env. Quality Incentive Program	955	\$6,709,067
3	Total Conservation Security Program	464	\$4,088,816
4	Wetlands Reserve Program	36	\$726,656
5	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	68	\$172,479
6	Grasslands Reserve Program	21	\$44,715

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.

**Top Commodity and Conservation Programs in the 1st district of Minnesota (Rep. Timothy J. Walz), program years 2003-2005:**

Rank	Program	Number of Beneficiaries program years 2003-2005	Total program years 2003-2005
1	Corn Subsidies	20,029	\$804,289,124
2	Soybean Subsidies	18,132	\$92,955,011
3	Conservation Reserve Program	11,176	\$66,958,093
4	Dairy Program Subsidies	2,191	\$28,866,255
5	Env. Quality Incentive Program	955	\$6,709,067
6	Total Conservation Security Program	464	\$4,088,816
7	Wheat Subsidies	4,378	\$1,669,773
8	Wetlands Reserve Program	36	\$726,656
9	Barley Subsidies	1,060	\$481,383
10	Oat Subsidies	5,159	\$299,102
11	Wool Subsidies	556	\$174,121
12	Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP)	68	\$172,479
13	Sheep Meat Subsidies	241	\$71,572
14	Grasslands Reserve Program	21	\$44,715
15	Mohair Subsidies	7	\$10,245
16	Sunflower Subsidies	8	\$9,519
17	Sorghum Subsidies	22	\$7,120
18	Flax Subsidies	1	\$48

Source: Environmental Working Group. Compiled from USDA Section 1614 Data Release, December 2006.