



United States
Department
of Agriculture

Agricultural
Economic
Report No.
832

June 2004



A Report from the Economic Research Service

www.ers.usda.gov

Environmental Compliance in U.S. Agricultural Policy

Past Performance and Future Potential

**Roger Claassen, Vince Breneman,
Shawn Bucholtz, Andrea Cattaneo,
Robert Johansson, and Mitch Morehart**

Abstract

Since 1985, U.S. agricultural producers have been required to practice soil conservation on highly erodible cropland and conserve wetlands as a condition of farm program eligibility. This report discusses the general characteristics of compliance incentives, evaluates their effectiveness in reducing erosion in the program's current form, and explores the potential for expanding the compliance approach to address nutrient runoff from crop production. While soil erosion has, in fact, been reduced on land subject to Conservation Compliance, erosion is also down on land not subject to Conservation Compliance, indicating the influence of other factors. Analysis to isolate the influence of Conservation Compliance incentives from other factors suggests that about 25 percent of the decline in soil erosion between 1982 and 1997 can be attributed to Conservation Compliance. This report also finds that compliance incentives have likely deterred conversion of noncropped highly erodible land and wetland to cropland, and that a compliance approach could be used effectively to address nutrient runoff from crop production.

Keywords: conservation compliance, Sodbuster, Swampbuster, conservation policy, agri-environmental policy, nutrient management, buffer practices.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of Marca Weinberg, Ralph Heimlich, Alex Barbarika, Jeanne Christie, Skip Hyberg, Jeff Loser, Ed Rall, Marc Ribaud, Kitty Smith, John Stierna, Keith Wiebe, and Doug Young. We also thank Lou King for editorial assistance and Cynthia Ray and Victor Phillips, Jr. for layout and cover design.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
List of Figures	iv
Summary	v
Introduction	1
Compliance Mechanisms: A Primer	3
Current Compliance Mechanisms	6
Compliance Objectives and Standards	6
Programs and Payments Subject to Compliance	8
Analysis of Conservation Compliance	11
Analysis of Swampbuster	22
Potential for Extending Compliance: Nutrient Management in Crop Production	26
Nutrient Loss and Crop Producers	26
Nutrient Runoff and Farm Program Participation	27
Reducing Nutrient Runoff: Nutrient Management and Buffer Practices	31
Cost of Nutrient Management	32
Cost of Buffer Practices	33
Conclusions	37
References	39
Appendix 1: Linking Environmental Indicators to Farm-Level Data	44
Appendix 2: Methodology for Constructing Nutrient Loss Indicators	46

Cover photograph: Tim McCabe, Natural Resources Conservation Service/USDA.

List of Tables

1. Conservation management systems and practices applied on HEL cropland subject to compliance, 1997	7
2. Direct payments subject to Wetland and/or HEL conservation provisions	8
3. Government loan programs subject to Wetland and/or HEL conservation provisions	10
4. Erosion reduction on U.S. cropland between 1982 and 1997	15
5. Average and 95th percentile EQIP incentive payments for selected conservation practices	22
6. Average EQIP incentive payments for selected conservation practices, by region	22
7. Average and 95th percentile EQIP incentive payments for nutrient management	33

Appendix tables

1. Acreage estimates using indicator surfaces and ARMS versus acreage estimates directly from NRI	45
2. Runoff curve table based on NRI land use	47

List of Figures

1. Distribution of commodity program payments, 1998	11
2. Distribution of highly erodible cropland subject to compliance by soil erosion rate before and after Conservation Compliance, 1997	12
3. Erosion reduction and Conservation Compliance, 1982-97	16
4. Distribution of commodity program payments and highly erodible cropland, 1998	17
5. Highly erodible cropland acreage subject to Conservation Compliance on farms with and without farm program payments, 1997	18
6. Highly erodible cropland on farms with and without payments, by ERS Farm Resource Region, 1997	18
7. Highly erodible cropland on farms with and without payments, by commodity specialization, 1997	18
8. ERS Farm Resource Regions	20
9. Highly erodible cropland acreage by payment per acre, 1997	20
10. Percent change in excess erosion on highly erodible cropland on farms with and without payments, 1982-1997	20
11. Distribution of commodity program payments and wetlands, 1998	23
12. Distribution of commodity program payments and wetlands adjacent to existing cropland, 1998	24
13. Distribution of commodity program payments and very high nitrogen-runoff potential, 1998	28
14. Distribution of commodity program payments and very high phosphorus-runoff potential, 1998	29
15. Distribution of commodity program payments and very high nitrogen leaching potential, 1998	29
16. Percent of cropland acres on farms with and without payments, by potential nutrient loss to water, 1997	30
17. Average farm program payment per acre of cropland, by potential nutrient loss to water, 1997	30
18. Potential for overlap between existing compliance requirements and nutrient requirement	35