CIVIL RIGHTS IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR THE INTERIM FINAL RULE: AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT PROGRAM

Agency: **US Department of Agriculture (USDA)**
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

Subject: **Civil Rights Impact Analysis**
Agricultural Conservation Easement Program Interim Final Rule
2014 Farm Bill

A review of the interim final rule, Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) has been directed towards the identification of actual or potential civil rights issues. In this regard, the review analyzed the rule to ensure compliance with Departmental Regulation (DR) 4300-4, "Civil Rights Impact Analysis"; 7 CFR 15d, "Nondiscrimination in Programs and Activities Conducted by the USDA"; and DR 1512, "Regulatory Decision Making Requirement." The review reveals no factors indicating the ACEP interim final rule would have a disproportionate adverse civil rights impact for NRCS producers who are minorities, women, or persons with disabilities.

BACKGROUND

ACEP is a voluntary nationwide program implemented under the general supervision and direction of the Chief of NRCS, under the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). ACEP is available in any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Through ACEP, NRCS provides financial and technical assistance to eligible entities or to eligible landowners to restore and protect eligible land. Specifically, The [2014 Act] Act consolidated the purposes of the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP), the Grassland Reserve Program (GRP), and the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) into one easement program called the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP). ACEP restores, protects, and enhances wetlands on eligible land; protects the agricultural use, viability, and related conservation values of eligible land by limiting non-agricultural uses of that land; and protects grazing uses and related conservation values by restoring and conserving eligible land.

ACEP is composed of two components: (1) Wetland Reserve Easements (WRE) component will provide technical and financial assistance to landowners to restore and protect agricultural wetlands and associated habitats through conservation easements. ACEP-WRE will address wetlands, wildlife habitat, soil, water, and related natural resource concerns on private lands; and (2) Agricultural Land Easements (ALE), which will protect the natural resources and agricultural value of the land, promote agricultural viability for future generations, preserve open space, provide scenic amenities, and protect grazing uses and related conservation values by restoring and conserving eligible land and limiting non-agricultural uses.

ACEP–WRE will provide eligible landowners with Permanent (or maximum duration allowed by State law) and 30-Year Easement options as well as a 30-Year Contract option for acreage owned by Indian tribes. ACEP-WRE easements are solely purchased and held by the United

States. NRCS considers the conservation benefits of restoring wetlands and associated habitats on marginal crop land removed from agricultural production, the cost effectiveness of the easement relative to the environmental benefits, and financial contribution by the landowner or other third party.

ACEP-ALE easements will be acquired through the use of a cooperative agreement with an eligible entity where NRCS will assist the eligible entity with the entity's purchase of a conservation easement. The only enrollment option is a permanent (or the maximum length allowed by State law) easement. The Act defines an Agricultural Land Easement as an easement or other interest in eligible land that is conveyed for the purposes of protecting natural resources and the agricultural nature of the land, and of promoting agricultural viability for future generations; and permits the landowner the right to continue agricultural production and related uses subject to an agricultural land easement plan.

LEGISLATIVE CHANGES – The 2014 Act kept much of the substance of the statutory provisions that had originally existed in the FRPP and the WRP, with land eligibility elements from the GRP incorporated. In particular, ACEP as authorized by the 2014 Act:

- Consolidates the FRPP, GRP easement options, and WRP into one (1) program, and repeals FRPP, GRP, and WRP

- Elements of FRPP and GRP become the agricultural land easement component of ACEP, and elements of WRP become the wetland reserve easement component of ACEP

- Agricultural Land Easement Component
    - Limits Federal share to not exceed 50 percent of the fair market value of the agricultural land easement, while requiring the non-Federal share to be equivalent to the Federal share, with the entity contributing at least 50 percent of the Federal share with its own cash resources.
    - The new program includes improvements to help protect environmentally sensitive lands, such as an option for the Federal share to contribute up to 75 percent for grasslands of special environmental significance through agricultural land protection easements, with adjustments to the non-federal share made accordingly
    - Maintains the certification process for eligible entities, with same ability to have longer-term agreements, etc.
    - Prohibits bidding down
    - Requires easements to be subject to an agricultural land easement plan

- Wetland Reserve Easement Component
    - Maintains most elements of WRP eligibility and administrative framework
    - Authorizes a waiver process to allows enrollment of CRP lands established to trees
    - Allows ranking criteria to consider extent to which landowner or other non-Federal entity leverages Federal investment
    - Reduces ownership requirement prior to enrollment from 7 years to 2 years
    - Keeps WRP compensation framework for wetland reserve easements

- Joint Provisions
    - Specifies the following lands as ineligible:
        - Federal lands except lands held in trust for Indian tribes
        - State-owned lands, including lands owned by agencies or subdivisions of the State, or unit of local government
        - Land that already receives similar protection that would be achieved by enrollment
        - Lands that have on-site or off-site conditions that would undermine meeting purposes of the program
    - Authorizes easement subordination, modification, exchange, termination of easements under certain limited criteria
    - Lands enrolled in FRPP, GRP, and WRP are considered enrolled in ACEP
    - Provides transition of contracts, agreements, and easements, creating pool of funds from each of original programs to address current obligations, to remain available until expended.

In the development of this rule for implementation of ACEP, NRCS transferred the substance of many of the regulatory provisions of FRPP as found at 7 CFR Part 1491 and WRP as found at 7 CFR Part 1467. ACEP is a consolidated program and therefore NRCS has organized these provisions into (3) three subparts:

- Subpart A contains provisions that apply to both agricultural land easements and wetland reserve easements and 30-year contracts.
- Subpart B contains provisions specific to the implementation of agricultural land easements.
- Subpart C contains provisions specific to the implementation of wetland reserve easements and 30-year contracts.

CIVIL RIGHTS IMPACT ANALYSIS

The Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) is directed towards the identification of actual or potential civil rights issues. The purpose is to identify if any, adverse implications the ACEP rule will have on any affected group and rationally and reasonably dispose of each. The theory of discrimination applied to the rule is disparate impact. Disparate impact occurs when a recipient uses a policy or practices that while neutral on its face and applicable to everyone, disproportionately and adversely affects members of a protected group and the recipient can articulate no substantial legitimate justification. The theory of disparate impact does not require proof of discriminatory intent, but centers around the adverse effect(s) that a policy or practices has on protected groups.

The analysis evaluated the extent to which the various populations are affected by the rule, and how the impact is manifested. The review examined: (A) general provision; (B) administration and development; (C) historical participation data; (D) eligibility criteria; (E) outreach strategy; (F) barrier removal provisions; (G) conclusion; and (H) NRCS Civil Rights Director's certification. The examination sought to determine if all the affected groups:

- are provided the same opportunities to participate in the decision-making or rulemaking process for ACEP,
- have historically been provided the same opportunities to participate in NRCS programs, and
- are provided the same information to decide if they wish to participate in the ACEP.

A. General Provisions

Urban sprawl continues to threaten the Nation's farm and ranch lands and wetland resources. Social and economic changes over the past three decades have influenced the rate at which land is converted to non-agricultural uses. Population growths, demographic changes, large lot development, expansion of transportation systems, and economic prosperity have contributed to increased agricultural land conversion rates. Increased population, growing affluence, and an expanded transportation infrastructure have accelerated the depopulation of the urban centers and have resulted in the loss of wetlands and the conversion of farm and ranch land.

Over half the Nation's wetlands in the lower 48 States have been lost since colonial times and over 80 percent of lands on which restoration is economically feasible are in private ownership. Congress continues to recognize the importance of wetlands and that the greatest potential for wetland restoration and protection is on private lands. Wetlands benefit the nation by providing habitat for fish and wildlife, including threatened and endangered species; improving water quality by filtering sediments and chemicals; reducing flooding; recharging groundwater; protecting biological diversity; as well as providing opportunities for educational, scientific, and recreational activities.

Between 1960 and 1990, metropolitan area populations grew by 50 percent, while the acreage of developed land increased 100 percent. About 45 percent of new construction between the years of 1994 and 1997 occurred in rural areas, with nearly 80 percent being land bordering urban areas. Overall, this translates to over 2.2 million acres being converted per year.

As a result of these land use changes, there is growing national interest in protecting wetlands, farm and ranch lands. Once developed, productive topsoil is effectively lost forever, placing the Nation's future food security at risk. Furthermore, land use devoted to agriculture provides other significant public benefits, including environmental quality, historic preservation, and scenic beauty.

ACEP is a voluntary program to help farmers and ranchers preserve their agricultural land, including wetland functions and values. The program has two conservation easement enrollment options: 1) agricultural land easements; and 2) wetland reserve easements for 30-year contracts. The 30-year contract enrollment option is limited to acreage owned by Indian Tribes. Under the agricultural land easement enrollment option, NRCS provides matching funds to State, Tribal, and local governments, and nongovernmental organizations with farmland protection programs to assist them with purchasing agricultural land easements. Under the wetland reserve easement enrollment option, NRCS purchases a reserved interest easement directly from owners of eligible land which provides for the restoration, enhancement, and protection of agricultural wetlands and associated lands.

ACEP's financial and technical assistance help producers comply with environmental regulations and enhance agricultural and forested lands in a cost-effective and environmentally beneficial manner. The purposes of the program are achieved by implementing conservation practices.

Congress continues to recognize the importance of protecting these lands by authorizing funding to preserve and protect farms, ranches and prevent soil erosion.

B. Administration and Development

The Secretary of Agriculture has delegated authority to the Chief of NRCS to implement ACEP. The NRCS Chief may implement ACEP in any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.

Program Delivery: ACEP, through its agricultural land enrollment component works with eligible entities to purchase conservation easements on agricultural land and, through its wetland reserve enrollment component works directly with landowners to obtain conservation easements on eligible wetlands.

Signup Period and Contract Determinations: ACEP applications are made available on USDA and NRCS websites, by partners, and through direct outreach. To participate in the agricultural land easement component of ACEP, an eligible entity must submit an application to the State Conservationist in the State where parcels are located. To participate in the wetland reserve easement component of ACEP, an eligible landowner may submit an application for participation in ACEP at a local USDA service center. Information is provided that explains the process to request assistance. Applications are accepted throughout the year.

C. Historical Participation Data

NRCS is a science-based agency. As such, the agency collects, develops, analyzes and maintains large amounts of data. The Agency relies on a number of key databases. Though each one has its own purpose and function, some of the databases have overlapping functions.

In processing a majority of data requests, the Resource Economics, Analysis and Policy Division (REAPD), Data and Information Team, works primarily with three key operational databases; ProTracts, the National Easements Staging Tool (NEST) and the Financial Management Modernization Initiative (FMMI). In addition to these datasets, the team also works with Agency data stewards for the National Conservation Planning (NCP) database. Other research databases are developed and maintained by Soil Survey and Resource Assessment (SSRA). REAP cooperates with database managers in SSRA to develop data used in research.

ProTracts is the Agency's primary software application for managing several financial assistance programs. The application is used to help manage the ranking and funding of applications and to carry out the contract development process. ProTracts contains data for CSP.

Agency data is captured at the end of each quarter and includes basic performance, i.e. number of applications, contracts and acres. Other data specific to the participant are available through the link to the Service Center Information Management System (SCIMS) that contains demographic information for each customer.

The National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) 2012 Census data reports that there are a total of 2,109,303 Principal operators. They also report the following National Selected Principal Operator numbers for the various demographic groups:

Male operators - 1,821,039
Female Operators - 288,264
White – 2,012,652;
Black – 33,371
American Indian – 37,851
Asian – 13,669
Native Hawaiian (Pac Isl) – 1,468
More than 1 race – 10,292
Hispanic is considered an ethnicity. The number of Hispanic Principal operators is reported at 67,000.

The attached data (SEE ATTACHMENT 1) for the three year period from FY 2010 to 2013 has been supplied and appears to indicate program parity in relation to NASS data. In the attached charts the calculation of the percentage of Principal operators is based on the reported 2012 Census data for each of the groups.

D. Eligibility Criteria

The ACEP is a voluntary program. To participate in ACEP, the land, the landowner, and if applicable, the eligible entity, must meet program eligibility requirements. Applications must be submitted by the eligible entities to the appropriate NRCS State Office.

Land eligibility requirements under the agricultural land easement component include, but are not limited items, such as the land must: be private or Tribal land subject to a written pending offer from an eligible entity that administers a farm or ranch land protection program; contain at least 50 percent prime or unique farmland, or other appropriate designation; be subject to an agricultural land easement plan; be owned by eligible landowners; and possess suitable onsite and offsite conditions to meet the purposes of the program.

Land eligibility requirements under the wetland reserve component include, but are not limited to, items such as the land: must be private or Tribal land upon which eligible farmed and converted wetlands can be successfully and cost-effectively restored and protected; must maximize wildlife benefits and wetland functions and values; is farmed or converted wetland together with adjacent lands that are functionally dependence or meets other technical land eligibility criteria.

E. Outreach Strategy

The NRCS Director of Communications and the Director of Office of Outreach and Advocacy (OOA) will provide and coordinate training regarding program outreach strategies necessary to inform all segments of the affected public about the ACEP interim final rule. Public notification and outreach will be aggressively expanded to include news releases, radio and TV spots, publications, and brochures to ensure those traditionally under-served will have an equal opportunity to benefit from the proposed rule.

The NRCS Deputy Chief for Programs will work in partnership with the NRCS - OOA to locate and provide information to protected groups. A press release announcing the issuance of the newly proposed ACEP rule will be electronically sent to universities and colleges specifically identified with a protected group. The press release will contain a contact person for obtaining further information. Mailing lists have been obtained to reach 52 Land-Grant Universities, 17

1890 Land-Grant Universities, 192 HACU colleges and universities located in 6 U.S. Territories, and 32 Tribal Colleges and Universities.

NRCS will submit information for publication in the national newsletters of several national agricultural organizations. These include American Agri-Women, WAgN (Women's Agricultural Network), MANRRS (Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Related Sciences), WIFE (Women Involved in Farm Economics), and the National AgrAbility Project (approximately 22,000-30,000 farmers with disabilities receive the Breaking New Ground Newsletter). Significant media outreach will be undertaken to acquaint under-served producers with the newly proposed ACEP rule. Spanish-translated press releases and informational materials will be made available.

Encouraging Community Involvement and Locally Led Conservation

Local offices will continue to encourage community involvement and locally led conservation activities they have underway. Locally led conservation is helping community stakeholders to:

- Assess their natural resource conservation needs;
- Set community conservation goals;
- Develop an action plan;
- Obtain resources to carry out the plan;
- Implement solutions; and
- Measure their success.

The locally led process provides for input from a broad range of agencies, organizations, businesses, and individuals in the local area who have an interest in natural resource management and are familiar with the local resource needs and conditions. Through this input process there is the opportunity for minority and socially disadvantaged groups to indicate how to address their natural resource concerns. Outreach efforts are made to ensure that the diversity of residents, landowners, and land operators in the local area are well represented in this process.

Tribal Impact Statement

The ACEP consolidates the former FRPP, GRP, and WRP programs and resulted in changes to the enrollment options historically available under the predecessor programs. The 2014 Farm Bill included provisions for rental agreements formerly offered under GRP to be offered under the Conservation Reserve Program. Additionally, stand-alone restoration cost-share agreements offered under WRP are no longer available. Pursuant to EO 13175, there is no negative impact for American Indians, America Indian tribes, or tribal entities. Since the introduction of the option for 30-Year Contracts on acreage owned by Indian tribes under WRP in the 2008 Farm Bill, there are 14 30-Year Contracts with Tribes on just over 2,700 acres. Tribal participation indicates that NRCS currently has 14 – 30 year contracts with Tribes; participation is not expected to change dramatically under ACEP, however, consolidation with other programs may increase awareness of easement programs. Therefore, it is anticipated this will increase American Indian tribal participation.

F. Barrier Removal Provisions – Not Applicable.

G. Conclusion

The civil rights review of the interim final rule discloses no disproportionately adverse impacts for minorities, women, or persons with disabilities. The data presented indicates producers who are members of the protected groups have participated in NRCS conservation programs at parity with other producers. Specific program outreach efforts target groups such as American Indian tribes. NRCS' partnerships with the local working groups and Conservation Districts, as well as the USDA Office of Tribal Relations, have increased participation in NRCS easement programs.

Extrapolating from historical participation data, it is reasonable to conclude that NRCS programs, including the ACEP, will continue to be administered in a non-discriminatory manner. Outreach and communication strategies are in place to ensure all producers will be provided the same information to allow them to make informed compliance decisions regarding the use of their lands that will affect their participation in USDA programs. ACEP applies to all persons equally regardless of their race, color, national origin, gender, sex, or disability status. Therefore, the ACEP rule portends no adverse civil rights implications for women, minorities, and persons with disability.

H. Certification

I certify that the review and analysis of the 2014 ACEP Interim Final Rule has been conducted in accordance with DR 4300-4, "Civil Rights Impact Analysis"; 7 CFR 15d, "Nondiscrimination in Programs and Activities Conducted by USDA"; and DR 1512-1, "Regulatory Decision-Making Requirements." The ACEP interim final rule portends no adverse civil rights implications for women, minorities, and persons with disability.

Selina Lee

Selina Lee
Director, Civil Rights Division
Natural Resources Conservation Service

8-13-2014
Date

ATTACHMENT 1

GRP Program Enrollment Funds by Select Participant Categories

2010	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	121	71	-	-	5	-	212
Funds Awarded	49,790,007	29,215,624	-	-	2,057,438	-	87,235,385
Percent of Funds Awarded	53.3%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	93.4%

2011	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	71	33	-	-	-	-	110
Funds Awarded	44,169,540	20,529,504	-	-	-	-	68,431,681
Percent of Funds Awarded	62.8%	29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	97.3%

2012	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	44	34	-	-	-	2	93
Funds Awarded	26,310,889	20,331,141	-	-	-	1,195,949	55,611,652
Percent of Funds Awarded	44.4%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	93.9%

2013	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	21	4	-	-	1	-	39
Funds Awarded	15,462,067	2,945,156	-	-	736,289	-	28,715,266
Percent of Funds Awarded	27.3%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	50.6%

Source: National Easement Staging Tool (NEST) for enrollment, then linked to SCIMS identification numbers for easement agreements in each fiscal year
Source: Foundation Financial Information System (FFIS) 2010 and 2011 and Financial Management Modernization Initiative (FMMI) 2012 and 2013 for financial estimates
Percentage of funds awarded is a ratio of the numbers of participants within a category divided by the total participants with identifiable SCIMS and program data.
Funds awarded is the product of the percentage of funds awarded and the total FA obligation for the fiscal year
Figures will not add to 100 across categories due to missing SCIMS information, and participants whose categories are "unknown" or "other".
Agreement obligations within a fiscal year may include activity for prior year agreements
Data reflect number of participants and it is possible to have more than one participant per agreement

HFRP Program Enrollment Funds by Select Participant Categories

2010	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	12	3	2	-	-	-	17
Funds Awarded	292,168	73,042	48,695	-	-	-	413,905
Percent of Funds Awarded	63.2%	15.8%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.5%

2011	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	30	3	8	-	-	-	23
Funds Awarded	60,935	6,094	16,249	-	-	-	46,717
Percent of Funds Awarded	16.7%	1.7%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%

2012	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	16	2	2	-	-	-	23
Funds Awarded	217,008	27,126	27,126	-	-	-	311,949
Percent of Funds Awarded	61.5%	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	88.5%

2013	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	10	2	-	-	-	-	17
Funds Awarded	107,377	21,475	-	-	-	-	182,541
Percent of Funds Awarded	47.6%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.0%

Source: National Easement Staging Tool (NEST) for enrollment, then linked to SCIMS identification numbers for easement agreements in each fiscal year
Source: Foundation Financial Information System (FFIS) 2010 and 2011 and Financial Management Modernization Initiative (FMMI) 2012 and 2013 for financial estimates
Percentage of funds awarded is a ratio of the numbers of participants within a category divided by the total participants with identifiable SCIMS and program data.
Funds awarded is the product of the percentage of funds awarded and the total FA obligation for the fiscal year
Figures will not add to 100 across categories due to missing SCIMS information, and participants whose categories are "unknown" or "other".
Agreement obligations within a fiscal year may include activity for prior year agreements
Data reflect number of participants and it is possible to have more than one participant per agreement

Cumulative Easement Data by State and Fiscal Year

State	Prior Years		2009		2010		2011	
	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled
FRPP	2,725	540,482	349	74,551	379	124,676	387	236,026
WRP	9,855	1,860,805	1,035	166,838	1,320	252,113	1,075	191,617
GRP	252	117,658	53	28,234	137	71,656	112	76,112
HFRP	7	193,638	6	646	14	6,075	44	22,950

Easement FA by Fiscal Year ($1,000 dollars)

	2009	2010	2011
FRPP	112,915	144,042	161,046
WRP	404,943	594,219	523,328
GRP	41,043	93,408	70,298
HFRP	1,257	6,476	16,087

Average Easement FA ($1,000 dollars)

	$1000/Easement	$1000/Acre	$1000/Easement	$1000/Acre	$1000/Easement	$1000/Acre
FRPP	324	1.5	380	1.2	416	0.7
WRP	391	2.4	450	2.4	487	2.7
GRP	774	1.5	682	1.3	628	0.9
HFRP	209	1.9	463	1.1	366	0.7

Total Program Participants w/SCIMS

FRPP	644	185
WRP	2271	2705
GRP	227	113
HFRP	19	180

FRPP Program Enrollment Funds by Select Participant Categories

2010	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	309	140	1	-	9	-	496
Funds Awarded	69,113,224	31,313,435	223,667	-	2,013,007	-	110,939,026
Percentage Funds Awarded	48.0%	21.7%	0.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	77.0%

2011	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	125	29	-	-	-	-	185
Funds Awarded	108,814,932	25,245,064	-	-	-	-	161,046,100
Percentage Funds Awarded	67.6%	15.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

2012	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	301	182	1	1	-	4	536
Funds Awarded	74,197,949	44,863,876	246,505	246,505	-	986,019	132,126,580
Percentage Funds Awarded	53.7%	32.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.7%	95.5%

2013	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	155	110	4	1	1	5	287
Funds Awarded	32,395,683	22,990,485	836,018	209,004	209,004	1,045,022	59,984,264
Percentage Funds Awarded	29.5%	21.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%	1.0%	54.7%

Source: National Easement Staging Tool (NEST) for enrollment, then linked to SCIMS identification numbers for easement agreements in each fiscal year
Source: Foundation Financial Information System (FFIS) 2010 and 2011 and Financial Management Modernization Initiative (FMMI) 2012 and 2013 for financial estimates
Percentage of funds awarded is a ratio of the numbers of participants within a category divided by the total participants with identifiable SCIMS and program data.
Funds awarded is the product of the percentage of funds awarded and the total FA obligation for the fiscal year
Figures will not add to 100 across categories due to missing SCIMS information, and participants whose categories are "unknown" or "other".
Agreement obligations within a fiscal year may include activity for prior year agreements
Data reflect number of participants and it is possible to have more than one participant per agreement

WRP Program Enrollment Funds by Select Participant Categories

2010	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	1,390	599	13	2	6	-	2,179
Funds Awarded	363,700,998	156,731,581	3,401,520	523,311	1,569,932	-	570,147,104
Percent of Funds Awarded	61.2%	26.4%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	95.9%

2011	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	608	231	9	1	6	2	940
Funds Awarded	117,627,861	44,690,848	1,741,202	193,467	1,160,801	386,934	181,858,864
Percent of Funds Awarded	22.5%	8.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	34.8%

2012	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	785	470	15	1	20	7	1,373
Funds Awarded	274,643,606	164,436,299	5,247,967	349,864	6,997,289	2,449,051	480,363,911
Percent of Funds Awarded	53.4%	32.0%	1.0%	0.1%	1.4%	0.5%	93.5%

2013	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	367	65	3	-	3	4	524
Funds Awarded	133,419,221	23,630,107	1,090,620	-	1,090,620	1,454,160	190,495,018
Percent of Funds Awarded	40.3%	7.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	57.6%

Source: National Easement Staging Tool (NEST) for enrollment, then linked to SCIMS identification numbers for easement agreements in each fiscal year
Source: Foundation Financial Information System (FFIS) 2010 and 2011 and Financial Management Modernization Initiative (FMMI) 2012 and 2013 for financial estimates
Percentage of funds awarded is a ratio of the numbers of participants within a category divided by the total participants with identifiable SCIMS and program data.
Funds awarded is the product of the percentage of funds awarded and the total FA obligation for the fiscal year
Figures will not add to 100 across categories due to missing SCIMS information, and participants whose categories are "unknown" or "other".
Agreement obligations within a fiscal year may include activity for prior year agreements
Data reflect number of participants and it is possible to have more than one participant per agreement

2012 Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	2013 Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled
409	149,745	344	116,011
996	180,749	575	96,087
70	49,802	42	59,184
24	500,519	21	8,486

2012	2013
138,289	109,727
513,951	330,822
59,200	56,694
8,463	4,735

$1000/Easement	$1000/Acre	$1000/Easement	$1000/Acre
338	0.9	319	0.9
516	2.8	575	3.4
846	1.2	1,350	1.0
353	0.0	225	0.6

561	525
1469	910
99	77
26	21

FRPP Financial Assistance Obligations,
by Fiscal Year
In thousands of dollars

Division	2009	2010	2011	2012
Alabama	$540.00	$542.70	$96.80	
Alaska	$700.00			$431.50
Arizona	$120.00			$229.80
California	$3,646.10	$5,025.70	$3,181.30	$3,778.90
Colorado	$5,541.10	$6,451.90	$8,394.70	$7,134.40
Connecticut	$5,733.40	$6,313.00	$6,336.40	$6,423.60
Delaware	$5,589.00	$4,918.60	$4,918.60	$4,762.30
Florida	$1,459.20	$8,506.30	$5,096.30	$4,892.60
Georgia			$791.40	$150.00
Hawaii/Pacific	$325.00		$607.40	$2,501.40
Idaho	$1,060.90	$1,334.70	$1,200.50	$1,103.10
Illinois	$1,581.50	$8.30	$3.00	
Kansas	$1,004.90	$816.00	$410.70	$1,691.50
Kentucky	$3,024.20	$2,440.00	$2,132.40	$339.40
Maine	$318.10	$620.00	$2,078.90	$1,360.40
Maryland	$4,022.00	$4,309.60	$2,354.70	$1,072.70
Massachusetts	$5,865.00	$8,653.80	$5,499.70	$9,151.00
Michigan	$2,886.20	$6,134.40	$2,012.20	$3,201.10
Minnesota	$2,986.40	$1,385.80	$1,160.80	$1,118.40
Missouri		$0.80	$142.00	$4.60
Montana	$2,710.90	$2,588.50	$6,368.00	$4,162.20
Nebraska	$1,451.70	$1,120.10	$1,495.50	$1,035.80
Nevada	$3,559.20	$5,292.50	$3.20	$5,402.50
New Hampshire	$3,806.30	$2,506.10	$2,365.60	$1,847.70
New Jersey	$6,455.80	$8,878.90	$8,110.10	$9,651.10
New Mexico	$601.20	$600.00	$791.80	$851.20
New York	$2,409.40	$4,159.20	$5,591.90	$5,191.80
North Carolina	$2,921.30	$2,529.50	$2,410.70	$2,298.40
Ohio	$3,218.60	$3,658.80	$11,802.20	$8,214.70
Oklahoma	$268.00	$276.50	$0.30	$0.30

WRP Financial Assistance Obligations,
by Fiscal Year
In thousands of dollars

Division	2009	2010
Alabama	$20,252.30	$14,422.90
Alaska	$10.00	
Arizona	$86.30	$13.40
Arkansas	$8,933.30	$17,602.00
California	$16,063.10	$27,480.60
Caribbean		$1,664.30
Colorado	$553.40	$1,249.00
Connecticut	$575.40	$0.50
Delaware	$654.70	$1,112.00
Florida	$75,982.20	$145,279.90
Georgia	$3,414.00	$5,423.80
Hawaii/Pacific	$520.20	$16.00
Idaho	$314.40	$4,898.50
Illinois	$3,602.20	$9,356.70
Indiana	$6,687.50	$12,525.10
Iowa	$16,498.40	$12,472.90
Kansas	$4,149.30	$5,163.10
Kentucky	$4,954.30	$6,327.80
Louisiana	$4,950.70	$36,791.30
Maine		$247.40
Maryland	$5,381.60	$6,949.70
Massachusetts	$4,891.20	$2,788.20
Michigan	$5,837.80	$4,014.80
Minnesota	$30,399.80	$14,046.80
Mississippi	$4,192.70	$24,828.40
Missouri	$7,089.00	$21,320.00
Montana	$466.20	$3,100.60
Nebraska	$22,285.10	$22,958.00
Nevada		
New Hampshire	$20,267.20	$9,454.50

Pennsylvania	$5,528.50	$6,443.00	$4,008.20	$4,392.60
Rhode Island	$5,301.20	$2,918.50	$4,127.50	$6,317.10
South Carolina	$2,742.00	$3,504.80	$2,667.50	$1,500.00
Tennessee	$1,000.00	$1,250.00		
Texas	$2,163.20	$2,075.00	$2,900.20	$5,583.90
Utah	$893.30	$255.70	$980.30	$1,863.50
Vermont	$3,104.90	$3,005.70	$2,989.60	$3,338.90
Virginia	$1,735.40	$1,177.50	$912.90	$4,141.70
Washington	$5,785.90	$6,196.00	$1,679.10	$3,824.80
West Virginia	$5,466.10	$5,641.90	$2,463.50	$3,105.10
Wisconsin	$1,407.00	$1,846.50	$753.80	$850.50
Wyoming	$3,782.20	$20,655.50	$52,134.00	$15,369.20
Other	$200.00		$72.50	
Total	$112,915.20	$144,041.80	$161,046.10	$138,289.20

New Jersey	$2,451.40	$1,159.40
New Mexico	$82.50	$920.10
New York	$4,498.40	$5,511.80
North Carolina	$7,712.00	$9,487.30
North Dakota	$22,986.20	$34,302.20
Ohio	$3,690.20	$8,856.70
Oklahoma	$4,403.90	$8,153.40
Oregon	$13,375.30	$11,854.00
Pennsylvania	$2,014.40	$4,098.00
Rhode Island	$52.20	$464.00
South Carolina	$6,735.00	$5,021.80
South Dakota	$11,027.00	$19,314.50
Tennessee	$21,560.60	$16,716.20
Texas	$3,053.00	$37,475.30
Utah	$13.00	$1,527.40
Vermont	$1,408.60	$1,254.60
Virginia	$375.20	$397.10
Washington	$1,323.60	$1,191.60
West Virginia	$230.60	$402.60
Wisconsin	$24,614.70	$10,637.50
Wyoming	$1,890.90	$2,308.60
Other	$2,431.70	$1,657.30
Total	$404,942.70	$594,219.40

HFRP Financial Assistance Obligations,
by Fiscal Year
In thousands of dollars

2011	2012
$9,988.00	$7,507.60
	$10.30
$4.50	$7.50
$11,048.40	$26,559.10
$34,783.70	$35,655.80
$1,473.30	$970.70
$36.50	$29.30
$302.70	$621.70
$97,698.00	$74,801.70
$9,320.30	$13,011.40
$42.40	$55.20
$2,494.80	$2,496.40
$6,828.30	$5,666.90
$14,033.80	$7,883.70
$35,612.20	$29,072.50
$4,558.70	$2,406.50
$8,161.30	$15,235.80
$40,463.10	$37,587.00
$428.20	$384.20
$6,903.40	$5,654.00
$3,675.50	$2,540.70
$3,160.50	$3,813.90
$26,056.80	$27,434.10
$19,339.00	$21,616.10
$15,393.30	$17,124.00
$1,821.10	$2,993.30
$12,797.30	$13,525.00
$3,321.20	$3,982.60
$2,927.20	$12,000.80

GRP Financial Assistance Obligations,
by Fiscal Year
In thousands of dollars

Division	2009	2010	2011	2012
Alabama				($0.30)
Arizona				
Arkansas	$119.20			
California		$600.00	$599.00	$351.70
Colorado	$4.00		$2,230.40	$200.90
Connecticut	$28.80	$1,154.30	$1,494.80	($33.80)
Delaware		$58.50	$1,247.50	$2,041.40
Florida				$235.00
Georgia		$11.60	$160.50	$175.40
Hawaii/Pacific	$5.60			
Idaho	$903.70	$882.30	$76.70	$366.60
Illinois		$10.60	$25.30	$187.20
Indiana	$6.60	$976.30	$3,512.70	$493.60
Iowa	$158.60	$2,781.90	$5,699.00	$3,676.70
Kansas		$1.00	$88.00	$1,233.90
Kentucky			$950.00	($465.00)
Louisiana	$30.00		$3.10	
Maryland	$1,256.50	$6,476.40	$16,086.90	$8,463.30
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi				
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York				
North Carolina				

$1,072.20	$1,087.10	Ohio
$1,461.20	$926.20	Oklahoma
$3,749.50	$6,163.30	Pennsylvania
$7,347.70	$8,734.10	Rhode Island
$32,671.00	$15,185.10	South Carolina
$6,658.90	$5,517.90	South Dakota
$8,062.10	$6,735.60	Tennessee
$3,874.30	$13,831.50	Texas
$8,601.60	$10,018.50	Utah
$121.00	$542.20	Vermont
$7,327.20	$1,916.10	Virginia
$19,414.70	$22,693.80	Washington
$18,102.50	$15,785.90	West Virginia
$16,114.50	$20,213.10	Wisconsin
$1,456.50	$57.90	Wyoming
$482.20	$1,107.90	Other
$1,069.00	$1,084.30	Total
$903.90	$2,643.10	
$532.00	$140.30	
$8,289.00	$7,456.20	
$1,313.20	$1,455.10	
$2,030.20	$7.80	
$523,327.90	$513,950.90	

2009	2010	2011	2012
$5.20	$3.50	$13.70	$67.40
$2.50	$23.70	$3.00	$30.30
	$9.80		$75.30
		$1.50	$172.60
$22.40	$64.00	$89.30	$38.40
$7.50	$755.00	$71.90	$2.80
		$4.10	
$30.30	$189.70	$287.30	$37.30
		$40.00	
	$12.00	$18.00	$2.50
$2.20	$23.70	$3,876.60	$1,020.60
	$27.70	$39.90	$11.90
$4.80	$11.90	$23.20	$11.90
$3.90	$93.10	$293.20	$108.20
	$381.50	$132.10	$247.30
$1.00	$11.30	$107.10	$66.60
	$42.30	$46.60	$44.00
$4.80	$9.10		
$16.90	$35.90	$23.60	$5.70
			$20.40
$41.90	$9.60	$28.50	
$16.60	$70.20	$76.60	$31.50
$6.70	$33.40		$32.20
		$2.50	$10.60
			$64.60
$7.50	$4.00	$43.70	
			$3.50
$65.00	$35.70	$30.00	$36.40
	$34.60	$94.10	$43.40
		$1.50	

$5.10	$61.20	$110.20	$22.00
$1.40	$29.10	$23.00	$2.70
	$67.10	$31.40	$6.10
		$21.00	
	$28.00	$34.00	$34.70
$9.20	$153.80	$327.10	$139.40
$4.60	$22.30	$48.20	$4.00
	$399.80	$1,089.00	$565.60
		$21.70	$43.10
$3.30	$79.80	$9.20	$58.00
	$112.20	$132.80	$28.50
$22.70	$12.00	$13.70	$19.70
	$247.40	$42.20	$2.90
	$2.30	$31.50	$67.50
	$136.00	$260.00	$108.50
$40,757.00	$90,175.10	$62,755.10	$55,911.00
$41,042.50	$93,407.70	$70,298.00	$59,199.50

FRPP Cumulative Easement Data by State and Fiscal Year

State	Prior Years		2009		2010		2011		2012
	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easements
Alabama	26	5,207.60	5	786.1					
Alaska	2	80	1	40					
Arizona	3	2,347.00							2
California	57	18,633.20	8	3,218.90	9	9,925.00	5	2,994.80	8
Colorado	75	47,730.00	17	5,570.60	17	23,254.40	18	9,476.80	15
Connecticut	85	8,635.70	16	1,532.30	22	1,235.80	22	911.5	25
Delaware	150	23,302.60	38	2,380.80	25	2,794.70	20	2,293.00	
Florida	16	15,126.40	5	265	3	4,908.00	3	1,450.00	7
Georgia	16	2,446.60					1	223.2	
Hawaii/Pacific	3	302.6	1	6.3					
Idaho	12	4,397.70	2	4,780.00	2	1,109.00	2	3,200.00	1
Illinois	27	4,014.00	3	328					
Iowa	12	2,731.50							
Kansas	17	17,985.00	2	5,837.40	3	3,572.30	3	1,616.00	16
Kentucky	171	28,538.00	11	1,682.00	9	1,104.50	4	986.7	1
Maine	23	5,038.00	2	107	3	667	7	3,644.50	9
Maryland	220	29,657.30	6	1,030.20	9	2,017.20	9	1,625.30	4
Massachusetts	172	11,688.90	16	1,301.10	22	1,455.50	20	1,507.60	35
Michigan	71	8,767.40	5	771.5	31	4,595.70	13	1,736.50	20
Minnesota	30	3,232.90	8	1,141.00	14	1,098.00	13	1,522.00	11
Missouri	2	172					2	210	
Montana	26	34,435.20	12	6,422.00	6	5,241.40	11	49,299.20	8
Nebraska	2	782	5	2,270.90	3	5,316.00	2	25,712.00	2
Nevada	4	405	1	45					2
New Hampshire	107	6,450.60	6	773.9	8	306.3	11	789.6	6
New Jersey	159	16,644.40	12	823.8	12	720.5	20	1,538.80	23
New Mexico	11	309.8	1	2,880.00	1	2,040.00	2	2,277.00	3
New York	90	20,200.90	6	2,515.30	17	2,799.40	12	1,247.90	16
North Carolina	60	9,640.80	11	2,001.20	11	996.2	11	785.3	10
North Dakota	3	210							

Ohio	128	24,827.70	20	3,613.00	15	2,994.40	69	9,704.20	39
Oklahoma	17	1,972.10			3	379.2			
Oregon	5	15,908.00							
Pennsylvania	325	45,101.30	31	3,958.40	38	4,336.10	19	2,671.20	30
Rhode Island	39	2,208.00	5	260.4	3	118.6	5	272.8	8
South Carolina	42	4,999.60	3	1,759.10	3	380.9	5	1,161.00	
Tennessee	5	742	2	819.4					
Texas	7	4,262.90	2	637	2	694	1	828	6
Utah	15	3,029.00	2	53.1	1	10.3	5	610	1
Vermont	241	48,831.30	20	3,210.80	20	3,688.60	18	2,311.20	22
Virginia	28	6,350.30	5	614.6	3	955	4	557	9
Washington	67	5,622.90	23	1,947.40	14	3,190.60	5	543	27
West Virginia	58	6,885.50	28	3,086.40	25	3,474.70	16	1,349.00	20
Wisconsin	79	10,986.40	4	1,089.30	9	1,647.40	3	619.2	7
Wyoming	17	29,642.00	4	4,992.00	16	27,649.80	26	100,352.00	16
Total	2,725	540,481.90	349	74,551.00	379	124,676.40	387	236,026.30	409

WRP Cumulative Agreement Data by State and Fiscal Year

State	Prior Years		2009		2010		2011		2012
	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer
Alabama	44	3,910.80	68	11,621.60	30	5,238.00	36	3,605.00	15
Alaska	1	15.7							
Arizona	4	1,843.00							
Arkansas	440	193,103.00	17	4,783.60	46	11,060.70	27	6,453.60	48
California	230	93,013.30	9	6,215.50	11	7,780.90	41	12,061.60	33
Caribbean	1	1,230.00			1	284.5			
Colorado	94	16,264.30	2	1,732.60	2	623.7	2	760	1
Connecticut	11	742	2	75.9	1	80.3			
Delaware	30	1,496.90	2	223.3	4	321	1	16.6	2
Florida	78	141,191.80	22	15,330.20	15	39,024.70	9	22,879.00	10
Georgia	50	16,089.40	11	2,135.20	3	3,274.50	20	5,741.20	20
Hawaii/Pacific	10	693.8							1
Idaho	46	8,400.50	2	120.9	7	2,067.20	4	1,175.00	7

Illinois	259	61,134.40	7	1,072.20	17	2,609.10	19	1,783.10	12
Indiana	501	52,208.50	42	1,971.60	71	3,387.10	54	7,690.20	23
Iowa	651	73,087.70	44	4,064.00	31	3,375.50	41	3,730.00	53
Kansas	147	14,672.70	18	2,800.00	22	3,224.70	19	1,916.20	8
Kentucky	117	16,610.20	11	1,597.50	27	2,030.00	9	2,223.00	28
Louisiana	599	217,780.10	11	1,247.00	120	21,432.90	40	18,295.50	55
Maine	8	7,814.00			4	248.6	1	75	1
Maryland	51	3,540.10	17	3,981.90	21	3,005.80	16	1,823.50	14
Massachusetts	17	510.6	2	231.4	5	164.1	5	240.8	2
Michigan	395	36,545.90	25	1,967.60	20	1,120.00	14	855.7	13
Minnesota	601	72,265.60	124	19,248.30	54	5,869.80	122	11,841.70	106
Mississippi	440	147,962.00	13	2,835.20	55	11,434.60	38	7,016.10	33
Missouri	681	102,787.50	29	2,060.20	74	7,718.30	69	5,897.40	53
Montana	55	22,622.10			6	1,186.30	5	947.5	10
Nebraska	426	53,107.30	77	14,620.80	73	10,084.60	40	5,213.60	28
Nevada	1	190					3	3,683.40	2
New Hampshire	39	2,577.90	56	4,507.50	19	2,507.90	7	1,303.60	19
New Jersey	21	3,488.60	1	394.9	3	369	4	188.4	4
New Mexico	3	292.2			3	458.2	1	274.9	2
New York	1,114	46,970.20	52	1,865.60	50	2,261.90	26	1,219.70	29
North Carolina	105	38,786.90	8	3,581.50	4	5,807.20	1	2,168.50	7
North Dakota	141	24,074.60	105	22,569.40	195	31,055.60	169	28,354.60	93
Ohio	319	19,985.20	15	611.4	31	2,319.70	15	1,514.90	17
Oklahoma	218	51,089.30	14	2,792.60	32	5,590.60	12	1,465.70	19
Oregon	138	45,212.30	11	7,090.30	11	7,392.00	3	379	5
Pennsylvania	80	2,100.90	8	1,274.50	27	1,425.80	38	1,899.50	30
Rhode Island	5	1,621.00					1	20	1
South Carolina	200	56,353.40			13	3,889.60	8	4,832.00	9
South Dakota	352	35,746.60	76	5,697.90	88	11,071.10	84	8,808.00	91
Tennessee	137	22,307.90	55	7,289.40	34	5,230.40	16	2,471.50	25
Texas	117	61,267.10			24	18,379.30	11	7,981.10	17
Utah	17	6,737.00			3	636.2			
Vermont	17	1,403.80	23	1,089.20	9	883.8	4	121.2	4
Virginia	41	1,395.70	6	213.9	2	140.9	6	241.6	9

Washington	180	26,177.00	3	46	3	105.4	8	595.1	2
West Virginia	19	481.2	3	32.4	5	86	6	102.2	3
Wisconsin	515	47,241.40	31	6,992.10	26	2,348.10	18	1,731.60	24
Wyoming	89	4,661.60	13	852.4	18	3,507.90	2	18.8	8
Total	9,855	1,860,804.80	1,035	166,837.50	1,320	252,113.20	1,075	191,616.60	996

GRP Cumulative Easement Data by State and Fiscal Year

State	Prior Years		2009		2010		2011		2012
	Number of Easem	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easem	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easem	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easem	Acres Enrolled	Number of Easem
Alabama	3	186.2			3	1,364.00	3	465	1
Alaska	2	163.4							
Arizona			1	1,422.00	1	1,430.00			
Arkansas	2	182.6					3	502.3	3
California	2	2,731.00			1	5,975.00			1
Colorado	6	14,098.30	1	5,476.30	4	12,861.70	1	3,697.30	1
Connecticut	4	79.9			1	16	4	45.3	2
Delaware	3	55.7							
Florida	2	438.9	2	1,170.00	4	1,544.80	1	197	1
Georgia			2	48	1	268.9	4	74.6	
Hawaii/Pacific									1
Idaho	8	2,253.30			6	11,925.20	13	22,909.00	13
Illinois	3	177.3			3	343.1	2	311.6	2
Indiana	12	557.5	1	46.5	1	17.1	3	231	1
Iowa	4	277.9	5	923.3	10	1,127.90	9	956	3
Kansas	47	22,620.00	2	5,414.60	17	8,984.00	7	4,977.20	11
Kentucky	15	1,934.10	1	437.5	3	312.9	2	452	1
Louisiana					2	43.7	2	153.9	
Michigan	1	226.1	3	454.9	3	800.6	3	709.7	2
Minnesota							3	126.5	1
Mississippi	12	1,540.80	1	39	2	314.7	2	263.1	
Missouri	13	821.9	5	1,092.40	9	968.8	8	1,137.00	2
Montana	4	21,687.60			1	2,522.10	1	2,828.30	1
Nebraska	8	1,717.70	3	269.6			2	202.7	

Nevada							1	1,276.50	1
New Hampshire	6	399.1			1	29.5	1	49.7	
New Jersey	1	18.9							
New Mexico	2	15,225.10	1	5,326.80	1	1,277.30			1
New York	5	381			1	41.3	1	28.4	2
North Carolina	6	258.8	1	278.4					
North Dakota	3	2,612.40					1	3,094.10	
Ohio	6	553	1	350.3	6	361.5	2	230.5	
Oklahoma	5	5,532.60	1	147.5	1	2,448.00	2	2,340.70	
Pennsylvania	5	590.6	1	14	4	397.5	1	42.3	2
Rhode Island	4	96.4							2
South Carolina	7	991.6			3	682	1	140.3	
South Dakota	1	310	9	2,803.70	8	1,089.20	14	7,001.30	1
Tennessee	1	119.4	2	91.6	1	219.5	1	105	
Texas	11	4,915.70	5	1,469.30	19	7,543.90	2	1,422.90	8
Utah	1	4,800.00							
Vermont			1	205.5	1	82.2	1	267.3	
Virginia	8	655.6	1	95.3	8	605.4	2	231.4	1
Washington	3	3,688.60	2	315.8	1	300	2	96	
West Virginia	6	551.5			3	291.2			3
Wisconsin	15	1,444.40	1	341.8	2	557.4	3	530	1
Wyoming	5	2,763.50			5	4,909.60	4	19,016.40	1
Total	252	117,658.40	53	28,234.00	137	71,655.90	112	76,112.30	70

HFRP Cumulative Agreement Data by State and Fiscal Year

State	Prior Years		2009		2010		2011		2012
	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled	Number of Agreer
Arkansas	1	200	1	113					
California					1	2,747.10	3	11,915.00	5
Georgia							5	1,850.00	
Indiana					4	417.5	4	739.1	
Kentucky							2	1,465.00	8
Maine	2	190,877.00							3

Michigan							4	85.3	1
Mississippi	4	2,561.00	5	532.9	1	785			1
Ohio									2
Oklahoma					4	1,499.30	20	5,324.40	
Oregon					4	625.5	5	896.5	2
Pennsylvania									2
South Carolina							1	675	
Total	7	193,638.00	6	645.9	14	6,074.50	44	22,950.20	24

Acres Enrolled	Total Number of Easements	Acres Enrolled
	31	5,993.70
	3	120
399	5	2,746.00
2,038.00	87	36,809.80
18,575.50	142	104,607.20
1,809.50	170	14,124.80
	233	30,771.00
2,273.70	34	24,023.10
	17	2,669.80
	4	308.9
11,000.00	19	24,486.70
	30	4,342.00
	12	2,731.50
6,882.00	41	35,892.70
256	196	32,567.20
641.6	44	10,098.10
164.5	248	34,494.50
2,017.00	265	17,970.10
2,645.10	140	18,516.20
932	76	7,925.90
	4	382
15,588.00	63	110,985.80
252.2	14	34,333.10
4,200.00	7	4,650.00
200.3	138	8,520.60
1,580.20	226	21,307.70
15,637.00	18	23,143.80
2,175.40	141	28,938.90
1,031.90	103	14,455.40
	3	210

4,516.20	271	45,655.50
	20	2,351.30
	5	15,908.00
3,141.50	443	59,208.40
200.3	60	3,060.10
	53	8,300.60
	7	1,561.40
1,404.00	18	7,825.90
52.2	24	3,754.60
3,120.30	321	61,162.20
1,497.20	49	9,974.10
1,999.10	136	13,302.90
2,962.70	147	17,758.30
1,494.20	102	15,836.40
39,058.00	79	201,693.80
149,744.60	4,249	1,125,480.10

Acres Enrolled	Total Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled
1,441.90	193	25,817.30
	1	15.7
	4	1,843.00
9,509.10	578	224,910.00
9,495.70	324	128,566.90
	2	1,514.50
219.4	101	19,600.00
	14	898.2
140	39	2,197.80
23,099.20	134	241,524.90
8,037.00	104	35,277.30
2.1	11	695.9
605.6	66	12,369.20

1,419.40	314	68,018.20
929.3	691	66,186.60
4,813.70	820	89,070.90
505.3	214	23,118.90
4,330.50	192	26,791.20
19,426.70	825	278,182.20
2	14	8,139.60
1,714.60	119	14,065.80
210.2	31	1,357.00
596	467	41,085.30
11,896.60	1,007	121,122.00
7,700.10	579	176,948.00
5,258.70	906	123,722.10
1,401.10	76	26,157.10
4,126.80	644	87,153.10
6,136.00	6	10,009.40
1,608.30	140	12,505.30
193.1	33	4,634.00
182	9	1,207.30
1,338.60	1,271	53,656.00
1,202.20	125	51,546.40
14,382.70	703	120,436.90
1,121.90	397	25,553.10
2,423.50	295	63,361.70
3,251.10	168	63,324.70
1,766.20	183	8,466.90
65	7	1,706.00
892	230	65,967.00
11,025.80	691	72,349.30
4,920.90	267	42,220.10
10,253.70	169	97,881.10
	20	7,373.20
214.7	57	3,712.60
203	64	2,195.10

55	196	26,978.50
26	36	727.8
1,950.20	614	60,263.40
656.2	130	9,696.80
180,749.10	14,281	2,652,121.20

Acres Enrolled	Total Number of Easem	Acres Enrolled
160	10	2,175.20
	2	163.4
	2	2,852.00
462	8	1,146.90
2,625.00	4	11,331.00
1,200.00	13	37,333.60
47.8	11	189
	3	55.7
200	10	3,550.70
	7	391.4
40.7	1	40.7
14,038.00	40	51,125.40
129.8	10	961.8
49.5	18	901.7
785.8	31	4,070.80
4,445.10	84	46,440.90
268.4	22	3,404.80
	4	197.6
222.6	12	2,413.90
94	4	220.5
	17	2,157.70
340	37	4,360.10
3,808.80	7	30,846.80
	13	2,190.00

741	2	2,017.50
	8	478.4
	1	18.9
1,420.00	5	23,249.30
235.7	9	686.4
	7	537.2
	4	5,706.50
	15	1,495.30
	9	10,468.80
219.9	13	1,264.40
24	6	120.4
	11	1,813.90
1,891.00	33	13,095.20
	5	535.5
6,686.90	45	22,038.70
	1	4,800.00
	3	554.9
71	20	1,658.70
	8	4,400.40
152.5	12	995.2
1,040.00	22	3,913.60
8,402.00	15	35,091.50
49,801.50	624	343,462.10

Acres Enrolled	Total Number of Agreer	Acres Enrolled
	2	313
1,695.20	9	16,357.30
	5	1,850.00
	8	1,156.60
2,586.50	10	4,051.50
493,776.00	5	684,653.00

82.9	5	168.2
305	11	4,183.90
102.4	2	102.4
	24	6,823.80
827	11	2,349.00
1,143.50	2	1,143.50
	1	675
500,518.50	95	723,827.10

CRIA Tables for Farm Bill Regulatory Process

FY 2010 Cost-Share Dollars Awarded Nationally for EWPP-FPE in (NEST)

	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	138	77	0	0	0	0	252
Funds Awarded	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

FY 2011 Cost-Share Dollars Awarded Nationally for EWPP-FPE in (NEST)

	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	19	4	0	0	0	1	24
Funds Awarded	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

FY 2012 Cost-Share Dollars Awarded Nationally for EWPP-FPE in (NEST)

	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	13	19	0	0	0	0	32
Funds Awarded	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

FY 2013 Cost-Share Dollars Awarded Nationally for EWPP-FPE in (NEST)

	Male	Female	American Indian	Asian American	African American	Hispanic	White
Number of Contracts	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Funds Awarded	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A