



State by State Cuts

By Craig Cox, September 2008

When Congress passed the 2008 farm bill on June 18, 2008, it promised to increase funding for the most important and popular program in farm country to prevent water pollution and tackle other priority conservation problems. The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) was to be funded at \$1.337 billion dollars in fiscal year 2009—an increase of \$320 million over the fiscal year 2007 funding for EQIP.

Just 29 days after the 2008 farm bill became law, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported out a bill, S. 3289, that proposes to fund EQIP at only \$1.052 billion—an increase of \$35 million over fiscal year 2007. Congress's proposed "increase" in EQIP funding is really a cut of \$285 million from what was promised in the 2008 farm bill.

EWG has analyzed the cuts in EQIP funding that states will suffer if Congress does not keep the promises it made in the 2008 farm bill. Table 1 compares the increase in EQIP funding states *should get* if Congress keeps its 2008 farm bill promises to what states *will get* if Congress fails to reverse the cuts proposed in the Senate bill.

Fourteen states stand to see their mandated increases in EQIP reduced by more than \$6 million each (Table 1). The five states that stand to lose the most EQIP funding are Texas (-\$22.5 million), California (-\$15.5 million), Colorado (-\$10.0 million), Minnesota (-\$8.1 million) and Nebraska (-\$8.0 million).

TABLE 1: FOURTEEN STATES POISED TO LOSE MORE THAN \$6 MILLION EACH

State	Increase State Should Get	Increase State Will Get	Difference
Texas	\$25,604,995	\$3,144,473	-\$22,460,522
California	\$17,716,182	\$2,175,671	-\$15,540,510
Colorado	\$11,417,634	\$1,402,166	-\$10,015,469
Minnesota	\$9,264,396	\$1,137,733	-\$8,126,663
Nebraska	\$9,124,519	\$1,120,555	-\$8,003,964
Montana	\$8,981,516	\$1,102,993	-\$7,878,523
Kansas	\$8,676,492	\$1,065,534	-\$7,610,958
Oklahoma	\$8,307,025	\$1,020,161	-\$7,286,864
New Mexico	\$7,523,437	\$923,931	-\$6,599,506
Iowa	\$7,366,755	\$904,689	-\$6,462,065
Arizona	\$7,324,762	\$899,532	-\$6,425,230
Florida	\$7,161,626	\$879,498	-\$6,282,128
Utah	\$6,945,715	\$852,983	-\$6,092,732
Arkansas	\$6,877,154	\$844,563	-\$6,032,591
TOTAL	\$142,292,209	\$17,474,482	-\$124,817,727

The six states in the Chesapeake Bay region will suffer a cut of over \$16 million in EQIP funds, erasing much of the \$23 million gain the Bay states are set to receive under the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program created in the 2008 farm bill (Table 2). Either figure is a fraction of the \$262 million per-year experts estimate is needed from the federal government to pay for agricultural practices that will "clean up the Bay" by 2010-the deadline established in the 2000 Chesapeake Bay Agreement.¹

TABLE 2: CHESAPEAKE BAY STATES POISED TO LOSE OVER \$16 MILLION

Delaware	\$2,027,977	\$249,050	-\$1,778,927
Maryland	\$2,298,227	\$282,238	-\$2,015,989
New York	\$4,031,570	\$495,105	-\$3,536,465
Pennsylvania	\$3,845,235	\$472,222	-\$3,373,013
Virginia	\$4,023,216	\$494,079	-\$3,529,137
West Virginia	\$2,157,308	\$264,933	-\$1,892,376
Total	\$18,383,532	\$2,257,627	-\$16,125,906

In February 2008, scientists at the U.S. Geological Survey completed a study that found that agriculture is the predominant source of the nitrogen and phosphorus that cause the Dead Zone in the Gulf of Mexico. Moreover, the scientists reported that 9 states-Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi-account for 75 percent of the nitrogen and phosphorus delivery to the Dead Zone.² These 9 states are poised to get over \$47 million less in EQIP funding than they should under the 2008 farm bill (Table 3). Five of those states are among the 14 states set to lose more than \$6 million of the EQIP increase promised in the 2008 bill.

TABLE 3: KEY MISSISSIPPI RIVER STATES POISED TO LOSE NEARLY \$48 MILLION

Illinois	\$5,004,171	\$614,547	-\$4,389,624
Iowa	\$7,366,755	\$904,689	-\$6,462,065
Indiana	\$3,748,560	\$460,349	-\$3,288,210
Missouri	\$6,767,252	\$831,066	-\$5,936,186
Arkansas	\$6,877,154	\$844,563	-\$6,032,591
Kentucky	\$6,877,154	\$844,563	-\$6,032,591
Tennessee	\$6,877,154	\$844,563	-\$6,032,591
Ohio	\$4,609,211	\$566,043	-\$4,043,168
Mississippi	\$5,850,915	\$718,533	-\$5,132,382
Total	\$53,978,327	\$6,628,917	-\$47,349,409

Every state faces pressing natural resource and environmental problems associated with agriculture and each of those states is in danger of losing millions of dollars of EQIP funds (Table 4). If the cuts to EQIP proposed by Congress stand, tens of thousands of farmers and ranchers who are volunteering to make things better, and share the cost of doing so with the government, will be turned away and taxpayers will face more delays in getting the improvements air, water, soil, and wildlife habitat they are willing to pay for.

TABLE 4: SHORTFALL IN EQIP FUNDS BY STATE

State	Increase State Should Get	Increase State Will Get	Difference	Total State Should Get	Total State Will Get	Difference
Alabama	\$4,593,381	\$564,099	-\$4,029,282	\$20,050,726	\$16,021,444	-\$4,029,282
Alaska	\$1,953,300	\$239,879	-\$1,713,421	\$8,389,946	\$6,676,525	-\$1,713,421
Arizona	\$7,324,762	\$899,532	-\$6,425,230	\$33,830,927	\$27,405,697	-\$6,425,230
Arkansas	\$6,877,154	\$844,563	-\$6,032,591	\$31,259,358	\$25,226,767	-\$6,032,591
California	\$17,716,182	\$2,175,671	\$15,540,510	\$79,805,711	\$64,265,200	\$15,540,510
Colorado	\$11,417,634	\$1,402,166	\$10,015,469	\$51,633,992	\$41,618,524	\$10,015,469
Connecticut	\$1,736,850	\$213,297	-\$1,523,553	\$7,921,694	\$6,398,141	-\$1,523,553
Delaware	\$2,027,977	\$249,050	-\$1,778,927	\$9,306,140	\$7,527,213	-\$1,778,927
Florida	\$7,161,626	\$879,498	-\$6,282,128	\$33,521,262	\$27,239,134	-\$6,282,128
Georgia	\$5,367,782	\$659,201	-\$4,708,581	\$24,335,611	\$19,627,030	-\$4,708,581
Hawaii	\$2,151,366	\$264,203	-\$1,887,163	\$9,160,572	\$7,273,409	-\$1,887,163
Idaho	\$5,572,974	\$684,400	-\$4,888,574	\$24,902,988	\$20,014,414	-\$4,888,574
Illinois	\$5,004,171	\$614,547	-\$4,389,624	\$22,876,425	\$18,486,801	-\$4,389,624
Indiana	\$3,748,560	\$460,349	-\$3,288,210	\$17,812,300	\$14,524,089	-\$3,288,210
Iowa	\$7,366,755	\$904,689	-\$6,462,065	\$33,698,467	\$27,236,401	-\$6,462,065
Kansas	\$8,676,492	\$1,065,534	-\$7,610,958	\$39,101,309	\$31,490,351	-\$7,610,958
Kentucky	\$3,829,676	\$470,311	-\$3,359,365	\$17,503,179	\$14,143,814	-\$3,359,365
Louisiana	\$5,204,849	\$639,192	-\$4,565,657	\$23,240,238	\$18,674,581	-\$4,565,657
Maine	\$2,583,893	\$317,320	-\$2,266,573	\$11,093,374	\$8,826,801	-\$2,266,573
Maryland	\$2,298,227	\$282,238	-\$2,015,989	\$10,864,110	\$8,848,121	-\$2,015,989
Massachusetts	\$1,496,463	\$183,776	-\$1,312,687	\$6,971,693	\$5,659,006	-\$1,312,687
Michigan	\$5,567,241	\$683,696	-\$4,883,545	\$25,989,052	\$21,105,507	-\$4,883,545
Minnesota	\$9,264,396	\$1,137,733	-\$8,126,663	\$42,170,983	\$34,044,320	-\$8,126,663
Mississippi	\$5,850,915	\$718,533	-\$5,132,382	\$25,624,290	\$20,491,908	-\$5,132,382
Missouri	\$6,767,252	\$831,066	-\$5,936,186	\$31,469,180	\$25,532,994	-\$5,936,186
Montana	\$8,981,516	\$1,102,993	-\$7,878,523	\$40,351,775	\$32,473,252	-\$7,878,523
Nebraska	\$9,124,519	\$1,120,555	-\$8,003,964	\$41,576,800	\$33,572,836	-\$8,003,964
Nevada	\$2,415,388	\$296,627	-\$2,118,761	\$10,745,888	\$8,627,127	-\$2,118,761
New Hampshire	\$1,563,881	\$192,056	-\$1,371,826	\$6,889,665	\$5,517,840	-\$1,371,826

New Jersey	\$1,423,732	\$174,844	-\$1,248,887	\$6,570,973	\$5,322,085	-\$1,248,887
New Mexico	\$7,523,437	\$923,931	-\$6,599,506	\$31,876,439	\$25,276,933	-\$6,599,506
New York	\$4,031,570	\$495,105	-\$3,536,465	\$19,078,964	\$15,542,499	-\$3,536,465
North Carolina	\$5,221,686	\$641,260	-\$4,580,426	\$24,186,300	\$19,605,874	-\$4,580,426
North Dakota	\$6,394,434	\$785,281	-\$5,609,153	\$28,779,627	\$23,170,474	-\$5,609,153
Ohio	\$4,609,211	\$566,043	-\$4,043,168	\$20,618,157	\$16,574,989	-\$4,043,168
Oklahoma	\$8,307,025	\$1,020,161	-\$7,286,864	\$37,815,928	\$30,529,064	-\$7,286,864
Oregon	\$6,398,157	\$785,739	-\$5,612,419	\$28,248,298	\$22,635,880	-\$5,612,419
Pennsylvania	\$3,845,235	\$472,222	-\$3,373,013	\$17,801,483	\$14,428,470	-\$3,373,013
Rhode Island	\$1,419,404	\$174,313	-\$1,245,091	\$6,062,361	\$4,817,270	-\$1,245,091
South Carolina	\$2,678,503	\$328,939	-\$2,349,564	\$11,507,767	\$9,158,203	-\$2,349,564
South Dakota	\$6,005,592	\$737,529	-\$5,268,063	\$26,893,220	\$21,625,157	-\$5,268,063
Tennessee	\$3,680,413	\$451,981	-\$3,228,433	\$16,949,222	\$13,720,790	-\$3,228,433
Texas	\$25,604,995	\$3,144,473	-	\$114,729,478	\$92,268,956	-
Utah	\$6,945,715	\$852,983	-\$6,092,732	\$31,459,722	\$25,366,990	-\$6,092,732
Vermont	\$1,698,357	\$208,570	-\$1,489,787	\$8,044,479	\$6,554,692	-\$1,489,787
Virginia	\$4,023,216	\$494,079	-\$3,529,137	\$18,211,392	\$14,682,255	-\$3,529,137
Washington	\$5,791,749	\$711,267	-\$5,080,481	\$26,018,088	\$20,937,606	-\$5,080,481
West Virginia	\$2,157,308	\$264,933	-\$1,892,376	\$10,089,099	\$8,196,724	-\$1,892,376
Wisconsin	\$5,990,755	\$735,707	-\$5,255,049	\$27,638,154	\$22,383,106	-\$5,255,049
Wyoming	\$5,079,573	\$623,807	-\$4,455,765	\$22,570,874	\$18,115,108	-\$4,455,765
Pacific Basin	\$600,297	\$73,721	-\$526,576	\$3,558,726	\$3,032,150	-\$526,576
Puerto Rico	\$1,924,452	\$236,336	-\$1,688,116	\$9,119,838	\$7,431,722	-\$1,688,116
Total	\$285,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$250,000,000	\$1,289,926,249	>\$1,039,926,249	\$250,000,000

HOW WE ESTIMATED EACH STATE'S SHARE OF EQIP CUTS

The amount of EQIP funding a state receives each year is determined using a formula that stays fairly constant from year to year. We calculated the percent share of total EQIP funds each state received on average each year in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007 (the most recent information available from USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service).³ Table 5 presents those data.

TABLE 5: AVERAGE STATE SHARES OF EQIP FUNDING, 2005 TO 2007

State	Average Share
Alabama	1.61%
Alaska	0.69%
Arizona	2.57%
Arkansas	2.41%
California	6.22%
Colorado	4.01%
Connecticut	0.61%
Delaware	0.71%
Florida	2.51%
Georgia	1.88%
Hawaii	0.75%
Idaho	1.96%
Illinois	1.76%
Indiana	1.32%
Iowa	2.58%
Kansas	3.04%
Kentucky	1.34%
Louisiana	1.83%
Maine	0.91%
Maryland	0.81%
Massachusetts	0.53%
Michigan	1.95%
Minnesota	3.25%
Mississippi	2.05%
Missouri	2.37%
Montana	3.15%
Nebraska	3.20%
Nevada	0.85%
New Hampshire	0.55%
New Jersey	0.50%
New Mexico	2.64%
New York	1.41%
North Carolina	1.83%
North Dakota	2.24%
Ohio	1.62%
Oklahoma	2.91%

Oregon	2.24%
Pennsylvania	1.35%
Rhode Island	0.50%
South Carolina	0.94%
South Dakota	2.11%
Tennessee	1.29%
Texas	8.98%
Utah	2.44%
Vermont	0.60%
Virginia	1.41%
Washington	2.03%
West Virginia	0.76%
Wisconsin	2.10%
Wyoming	1.78%
Pacific Basin	0.21%
Puerto Rico	0.68%
Total	100.00%

We then used the three-year average annual share of total EQIP funds shown in Table 5 to compare each state's share of the \$320 million increase in EQIP funds mandated by the 2008 farm bill to the \$35 million "increase" proposed by Congress in S. 3289.

References

¹ The Chesapeake Bay Commission's 2007 Federal Farm Bill Report: Concepts for Conservation Reform. <http://www.chesbay.state.va.us/farbill.html>

² Alexander, R.B., R.A. Smith, G.E. Shwarz, E.W. Boyer, J.V. Nolan, and J.W. Brakebill. Differences in Phosphorus and Nitrogen Delivery to the Gulf of Mexico from the Mississippi River Basin. *Environmental Science and Technology* 2008: 42(822-830). http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/sparrow/gulf_findings/

³ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Environmental Quality Incentives Program 2007 Allocation Information: http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/2007_allocations/FY2007program_allocat

...