

For: State Offices

**CRP Questions and Answers**

Approved by: Acting Deputy Administrator, Farm Programs

**1 Overview**

**A**

**Purpose**

This notice provides a list of questions and answers (Exhibit 1) resulting from conference calls about CRP.

**B**

**Administering  
CRP**

Exhibit 1 provides answers to specific questions. The answers do **not** establish policy or procedures for CRP.

FSA and NRCS Offices shall continue to follow 2-CRP to administer CRP.

**2 Action**

**A**

**State Office  
Action**

State Offices shall provide a copy of this notice to State NRCS Offices.

<p><b>Disposal Date</b></p> <p>June 1, 1999</p>	<p><b>Distribution</b></p> <p>State Offices; State Offices relay to NRCS State Offices; FS, 80; CSREES, 5</p>
---	---

**CRP Questions and Answers**

---

**East Region**

1. Is there a dollar limit on annual rental payments on CREP land, or can rental payments be increased to encourage greater participation?

*Answer:* Annual rental payments under CREP are based on general CRP soil rental rates. Any additional incentives must be justified with verifiable documented justification and will be negotiated as part of the CREP agreement signed for the specific CREP. The per person payment limitation for CRP, CREP, and continuous signup is \$50,000.

2. Do local sponsors have to obligate their share of cost-share dollars or will reasonable assurance of financial support suffice for CREP project approval?

*Answer:* It is presumed that once an agreement has been signed the State Government has committed the necessary funds.

3. Does technical assistance money go to local sponsors as well as USDA?

*Answer:* FSA provides dollars for technical assistance to NRCS and the Forest Service for certain CRP practices. All technical assistance funds received by NRCS nationally are obligated to the State NRCS Offices. There is no national hold-back. State NRCS Offices may enter into reimbursable agreements with local sponsors.

4. We lack standards and specifications that would give us the technical information needed for designing the width, etc., of buffers. For example, if phosphorus is the concern in a given situation in a field, is a 100-foot width or a 400-foot width needed?

*Answer:* NRCS maintains national standards and specifications for nearly all CRP practices. If State standards are needed to address a particular natural resource concern, then NRCS State Offices must revise existing standards and specifications or develop new standards and specifications to address the concern. If any changes pertain to highly erodible land and wetland provisions of Title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, NRCS shall publish or otherwise distribute for public review and comment those revisions to practice standards.

The width of a buffer intended to address a specific natural resource concern, such as phosphorus loss, depends on individual site conditions. The NRCS technician must document the site conditions and make his or her recommendations based on the site conditions and on professional judgment and experience. NRCS offices shall also ensure that CRP practice standards are followed.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

5. Please explain what Notice CRP-318 is requiring States to do for water quality areas under subfactor N2a.

*Answer:* States must prioritize all watersheds that are impacted by agricultural activities. No more than 33 percent of the State's total cropland acres can be approved to receive the 30 points under the N2a subfactor.

6. If a producer does not install a practice, must FSA make rental payments to that individual?

*Answer:* FSA will make the annual rental payment to a CRP participant provided there is no violation of the terms and conditions of the CRP contract. Participants are provided an equitable amount of time to install the approved practice. The designated conservationist completes a status review with the participant and a COC representative, if available, for each CRP-1 before the end of each fiscal year until all practices in the plan are applied and the approved cover is established. The third annual status review shall be considered NRCS' final review regardless of whether the practice is complete. See 2-CRP, paragraph 338. If at any time a producer tells NRCS that he or she does not plan to install the planned practice, NRCS shall document this fact and immediately inform the COC for the appropriate action. Whether the CRP contract is terminated as a result is an FSA county committee's decision and not an NRCS decision.

7. Are there standards and specifications for the buffer initiative?

*Answer:* There are no standards and specifications for the National Conservation Buffer Initiative; however, NRCS maintains standards and specifications for most conservation buffer practices. For purposes of the National Conservation Buffer Initiative, NRCS provided guidance to all NRCS regional and State Offices on those CP practices that are a part of the continuous CRP signup. This guidance included maximum widths for particular conservation buffer practices that had been agreed to by FSA. This guidance, including the width limitations, has since been incorporated into 2-CRP which shall be used by both FSA and NRCS. Both the guidance issued originally for the National Conservation Buffer Initiative and 2-CRP indicate that filter strips, CP21, may have a width not to exceed 100 feet, unless **water quality concerns** require a wider filter strip. In the case of riparian buffers, CP22, the width may not exceed 150 feet, except when **water quality concerns** require a wider buffer. Shallow water areas for wildlife, CP9, are limited to 5 acres.

8. Why isn't a living snow fence, CP17A, allowed to have a 10- to 15-year contract? And why isn't the practice eligible for an incentive payment?

*Answer:* Living snow fence, CP17A, is currently eligible for a 10-year contract only. Longer contract options for this practice are being discussed. An interagency team reviewed all the

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

information available about the practices eligible for continuous signup and the applicability of incentives. The incentives established by the Secretary were based on several factors, including the purpose of the practice, the environmental impact of the practice, and the impact of the practice on the farming operation. Based on the information available, the interagency team concluded that an incentive rate was not justified for CP17A.

9. Is windbreak renovation a practice eligible for the continuous CRP signup?

*Answer:* No. The purpose of the CRP is not to "renovate" established windbreaks. In addition, established windbreaks would generally not meet the cropping history requirements for enrollment in the CRP. Renovation of a windbreak may be eligible under EQIP or WHIP.

10. Is woody vegetation required for riparian forest buffers, CP22?

*Answer:* Riparian buffers must be devoted to trees. Woody vegetation may be included in combination with trees. Native grasses may be included in the groundcover with trees. A zone 3 of native grasses and forbs may be added, if otherwise eligible, only for concentrated flow conditions dependent on the site. Where trees **cannot** be established as determined by the technical agency, otherwise eligible land may be enrolled provided woody vegetation is planted. Woody vegetation should only be approved in arid areas with less than 25 inches annual precipitation. If trees or woody vegetation cannot be planted, the land is not eligible to be enrolled in the CRP to be devoted to CP22. Grasses or forbs only is **not** an eligible cover for riparian buffers under any circumstance.

11. Can the new practice CP25 be used for riparian restoration?

*Answer:* The purpose of CP25 is to restore the functions and values of critically endangered, endangered, and threatened habitats. These habitats are provided in 2-CRP, Exhibit 9. Other specifically identified habitats within a State with documented losses of greater than 70 percent since European settlement may also be eligible. If a specific riparian area meets these requirements, then the State may request approval for a CP25 for the specific area. All CP25's must be approved by DAFP. See 2-CRP, Exhibit 9.

12. What is the deadline for the continuous CRP signup? Must a contract be completed by September 30, or can enrollment continue into the next fiscal year?

*Answer:* The continuous CRP signup was developed with a continuous signup period. The sign-up number will change at the beginning of each fiscal year for accounting purposes. See 2-CRP, subparagraphs 98 C and 101 B.

---

Continued on the next page

## CRP Questions and Answers

---

13. What promotion of riparian buffers and other continuous signup practices is being done by FSA?

*Answer:* The National Conservation Buffer Initiative is a USDA-wide initiative. In fact, it is a public/private initiative. Nearly 100 public agencies and private organizations have endorsed the effort. All of these parties, along with NRCS, FSA, Extension, and other agencies within the Department should be "selling" this practice and other buffer practices to landowners when those practices can help achieve a particular conservation objective. FSA does have a brochure on the continuous CRP signup and has called attention to this program and conservation buffers in many county-level newsletters.

### Southeast Region

1. In a marginal pastureland situation where there is presently a few trees with tall canopy but the area is not functioning as a riparian buffer (no understory or ground vegetation) because of livestock activity, are there restrictions on the kind of livestock that is present (dairy versus beef cattle or swine) for the area to be eligible for a riparian buffer under the continuous CRP signup?

*Answer:* The presence of livestock is not a requirement for marginal pastureland to be enrolled in the CRP. Further, the presence of trees on the site may not make marginal pastureland ineligible for enrollment in the CRP. However, if trees are already established and functioning as a riparian buffer, then the land is not eligible for enrollment in the CRP. If the only reason the trees are not functioning as a riparian buffer is because of the presence of livestock, the land is not eligible for enrollment in the CRP. Other programs such as EQIP or WHIP may be used to exclude the cattle and restore the function of the riparian buffer.

2. Can native vegetation be established without planting—naturally vegetated by removal of livestock access and management practices carried out to encourage native vegetation establishment?

*Answer:* The use of natural regeneration for certain practices is being discussed and will be issued in a future amendment to 2-CRP.

3. In a marginal pastureland with trees present, can CP22, riparian buffer, qualify adjacent to a wetland (need clarification of wetland definition--2-CRP states "other waterbodies of a permanent nature, including wetlands...." What constitutes the "edge" of the wetland--Corps of Engineers or FSA definition, or other?

*Answer:* If trees are present and are functioning as a riparian buffer, the land is not eligible for enrollment in the CRP. It is unclear what the question refers to as "edge". However, riparian

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

buffers must be adjacent to the applicable waterbody. A future amendment to 2-CRP will provide clarification about what land is eligible for enrollment adjacent to streams, wetlands, and other waterbodies.

4. Can multiple wells for watering facilities be cost-shared under CP22 or are we limited to one well per request? The multiple wells are intended to accommodate rotational grazing, in addition to providing another source of water.

*Answer:* Wells were not originally considered as eligible for cost-share assistance in developing livestock watering facilities. Spring developments, rock-lined trenches, or pipes to tap the stream water originally used by the livestock are more cost-effective than digging wells. However, shallow dug or bored wells are eligible for cost-share assistance if needed to develop livestock watering facilities on filter strips and riparian buffers. Other types of wells are not authorized. In addition, installation of wells may require Federal, State, or local permits, easements, right-of-ways, or other permission. Participants are responsible for obtaining such authority. The person receiving cost-share is responsible to CCC for any losses sustained by the Federal Government if the person infringes on the rights of others or does not comply with applicable laws and regulations. See 2-CRP, paragraphs 209 and 375 and Exhibit 9. It is unclear why multiple wells would be needed. Please provide an example of when multiple wells would be required.

5. How far from the stream or waterbody (wetland) may the inner edge of the buffer be located (immediately adjacent to the stream bank or permanent waterbody boundary, or some other close proximity)?

*Answer:* See response for Southeast Region, question 3.

6. The North Carolina CREP advocates enrollment of wetland restoration (CP23). We need clarification on whether this practice would become eligible under the provisions of the continuous CRP signup or only during the periodic general CRP signups.

*Answer:* Individual CREP agreements do not affect the general or continuous CRP signups. The North Carolina CREP agreement includes CP23 as an approved practice. Therefore producers with eligible land located within the approved CREP area may offer to enroll such land to be devoted to CP23 under the CREP agreement if all other eligibility requirements are met. The eligibility of CP23 under the North Carolina CREP agreement does not make CP23 an eligible practice under continuous signup. Further, it does not make it an ineligible practice under general signups. Producers will continue to have the opportunity to offer eligible land to be devoted to CP23 under future general signups.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

7. We seek guidance on acceptable use of natural volunteer vegetation for establishment of CRP conservation practices. Our recommendation is that NRCS be given authority to develop guidelines on acceptable uses of volunteer vegetation at the State level. For example: (1) On soil where a seed bank is determined to exist, or where natural colonization of selected native perennial species will dominate within 3 years, then natural regeneration can be allowed. (2) Where a volunteer native cover becomes established (other than what was planted) and where it meets the landowner's objectives, the cover shall be considered adequate.

*Answer:* See response for Southeast Region, question 2.

8. Several questions are being raised at the field level about the land use conditions that should be present when land eligibility is based on marginal pastureland instead of crop history. In Kentucky, marginal pastureland is primarily considered as land being directly impacted by domestic grazing animals. The land being impacted must support the installation of a riparian buffer practice according to the FOTG standard. In some cases, producers desire to enroll land under the marginal pastureland provision in situations where no livestock are currently present on the offered acreage and/or when no adverse impacts can be attributed to inadequate livestock rotation systems. In a few very limited cases there may be situations on marginal pastureland (without livestock) that warrant treatment with a riparian buffer when excessive soil erosion and/or water quality problems are present. When land is enrolled under the marginal pastureland provision, we are including a fence as part of the conservation plan unless the participant can implement an alternative method to exclude livestock from the CRP acreage for the contract period.

*Answer:* For land to be enrolled in the continuous CRP signup as a riparian buffer, it must be either cropland or marginal pastureland. If cropland, it must meet the cropping history requirements (2 out of the 5 most recent crop years) and it must be physically and legally capable of being cropped. The fact that land is not classified as cropland does not mean it is marginal pastureland. If it is marginal pastureland, it must first be suitable for the installation of a riparian buffer. If it is suitable for a riparian buffer, it must be devoted to trees. If it is not suitable for trees, then it is ineligible for enrollment. Also see responses to East Region, question 10, and Southeast Region, question 1.

9. The Federal Register information refers to CRP land eligibility for riparian buffers to be land in permanent stream corridors. This is causing some conflicts between participants and NRCS when the participant desires to enroll land in areas that cannot be associated with permanent streams channels. I am aware that riparian buffers for CRP should not exceed 150 feet in width. The riparian buffer standard in Kentucky (with 3 zones) is being used to determine the minimum/maximum design widths for CRP purposes. According to the standard, the minimum

---

Continued on the next page

### CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)

---

width for zone 1 is 15 feet; zone 2 (according to land slope) and zone 3 are each 20 feet. For example, with an average watershed land slope of 25 percent (which is rare), the width of zone 2 would be 85 feet. In this case, the entire width of the riparian buffer would be  $15+80+20=120$  feet.

*Answer:* First, riparian buffers can be installed under the continuous CRP signup along streams having perennial flow, seasonal streams (excluding gullies and sod waterways), sinkholes, karst areas, other groundwater recharge areas, and other permanent waterbodies. A 150-foot-wide buffer is the maximum width allowed unless water quality considerations require a greater width. See 2-CRP, Exhibit 9, pages 151 and 152.

10. A 40-cattle beef herd has unlimited access to a half mile of perennial stream as their only watering source. The riparian area has an overstory of trees, but the natural understory and ground cover is seriously degraded. Various segments of streambank are seriously eroding because of cattle impact, and streambed trampling is significant in three or four separate areas. Roughly half of the animal waste is delivered directly to the stream because of either loafing in the stream or as storm runoff from adjacent loafing areas. Both terrestrial and aquatic wildlife and ecology are seriously and negatively impacted. Is the stream and riparian zone eligible for the continuous CRP signup?

*Answer:* See response to Southeast Region, question 1.

11. Both producer and a mile of degraded streambank are eligible under the marginal pastureland rule and the producer is willing to enroll the land to be devoted to a riparian buffer, CP22. Producer has no pond or other water supply readily available as an alternate water supply and will not participate in the program unless wells are eligible for cost-share. The producer also runs an agricultural supply firm and has experience with wells in his part of the country. He is convinced that a bored well costing less than half of a drilled well, saving himself and the program money, would be sufficient for his operation and wants to go ahead with it. Why can we not leave this decision up to the producer so long as he or she takes on the risk, rather than simply making all bored wells ineligible?

*Answer:* Wells were not originally considered as eligible for cost-share assistance in developing livestock watering facilities. Spring developments, rock-lined trenches, or pipes to tap the stream water originally used by the livestock are more cost-effective than digging wells. However, shallow dug or bored wells are eligible for cost-share assistance if needed to develop livestock watering facilities on filter strips and riparian buffers. This decision is a technical determination to be made by the designated conservationist not the producer. Other types of wells are not authorized. In addition, installation of wells may require Federal, State, or local

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

permits, easements, right-of-ways, or other permission. Participants are responsible for obtaining such authority. The person receiving cost-share is responsible to CCC for any losses sustained by the Federal Government if the person infringes on the rights of others or does not comply with applicable laws and regulations. See 2-CRP, paragraphs 209 and 375, and Exhibit 9. Also see response for Southeast Region, question 4.

12. A producer is clearing woodland for additional pasture adjacent to existing pasture. He is planning to clear down to the stream and use it as a watering source, but is willing to fence off and protect the riparian area if there is available cost-share for fencing and an alternate water supply. (He applied for EQIP and wasn't accepted because he had not yet caused the problems and so wasn't competitive.) Do we need to let him bulldoze the riparian forest and put his cows in the creek before we can tell him he is eligible for an "environmentally sensitive areas" program?

*Answer:* The land is not eligible for enrollment in the CRP. The land as described in the question is woodland, not marginal pastureland.

13. A producer just bought an additional piece of land and is planning to pasture his cattle there. He plans to water the animals out of the stream, but is open to the idea of fencing it off, providing there is help available for alternative water systems and fencing. Is he eligible for the continuous CRP signup, CP22, under the marginal pastureland provision even if the cows are not currently degrading the stream?

*Answer:* See responses to Southeast Region, questions 1 and 8.

14. A producer has a beef cattle herd watering out of a creek. There are a few trees around, but the riparian area/streambanks are seriously degraded and eroding badly, and the cattle spend much time loafing in the creek itself. The floodplain is very wide for a medium-sized creek, but the producer doesn't want to lose 200 feet of pasture (100 feet on either side), which over a half mile amounts to 12 acres or roughly one-fifth of this particular pasture. There is minimal overland flow and no cropland or animal waste applications other than the pastured livestock to contribute to elevated groundwater nitrate levels. Considering that a 50-foot riparian buffer on either side would perform the functions of water quality protection (through livestock exclusion, streambank stabilization) and wildlife habitat, can the producer enroll just these 50 feet of zone 1 as CP22?

*Answer:* The 150-foot maximum width requirement does not prevent the producer from enrolling a more narrow buffer so long as the narrower buffer solves the natural resource concern. If it does not, the producer must enroll the minimum width required to solve the

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

problem. In this example, a 50-foot-wide buffer would be permissible provided it solves the natural resource conservation problem. However, see answers to Southeast Region, questions 1 and 8, for eligibility of the land for enrollment.

15. A producer is eligible for CP22 under the continuous CRP signup on marginal pasture adjacent to two creeks. She wants to enroll the land along one creek and cost-share on fencing and water supply, but wants to keep the other creek open as a water supply out of that pasture (pastures are adjacent and within the same tract). A field office tells her that she is ineligible because she is not meeting RMS, that is, not willing to fully implement riparian buffers on both streams with a need. Is this the correct decision?

*Answer:* Yes. The two streams are in one field. Protection of both is required.

16. Can the 150-foot width on riparian buffers be exceeded, and if so, what are the criteria we should follow? There are valid technical arguments that we should be able to exceed the 150-foot maximum in effect.

*Answer:* The 150-foot maximum width for riparian buffers may be exceeded only when the minimum design specifications to address the water quality concern exceeds 150 feet. The maximum width shall not exceed 150 feet for any other purpose. See 2-CRP, Exhibit 9, and response for East Region, question 7.

**Midwest Region**

1. CP22 requires us to plant marginal pasture to trees. There are areas in Wisconsin where this is fine, but we also have many more areas that the native vegetation in the riparian corridor was grasses or forbs. We would like to be able to take these areas of marginal pasture, which are presently non-native species, and plant native species of grasses and forbs. This would accomplish two goals: (1) We would not be introducing trees into an area where they did not historically exist. (2) The trout managers with our State Department of Natural Resources do not want trees near the stream. In Wisconsin, we get better trout production if there are no trees near the stream. We would like to request either one of the following: (1) Allow us under CP22 to plant native grasses/forbs in place of trees. (2) Allow us under CP21 to plant filter strips in marginal pasture.

*Answer:* The statute requires that marginal pastureland must be devoted to trees in or near riparian areas. What tree species, tree spacing, and size of trees is a technical call to be made by the technical agency. If trees cannot be established on the marginal pastureland offered, the land is ineligible for enrollment in the CRP. See response to East Region, question 10.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

2. Planting trees in marginal pasture along streams in Iowa flies in the face of a FWS environmental impact statement for the northern tall grass prairie. Why can't consultation occur with the relevant conservation agencies to discuss these guidelines with the idea of establishing operational guidelines for riparian buffers in the State?

*Answer:* NRCS should be consulting with other natural resource agencies, where appropriate. NRCS shall not install a practice that impacts a threatened or endangered species until consulting with the appropriate agency to ensure all applicable requirements are met. See response to Midwest Region, question 1.

3. Can't we have greater flexibility in using the CP22 standard from State to State?

*Answer:* See response to East Region, question 7.

4. Halfway through this signup, the rules in Minnesota changed and virtually reduced riparian buffers to not more than 100 feet. Folks who had an interest but had to finish planting before sitting down to work up a contract are now out half their potential payment. Many of these folks will walk away, not only from this program, but from other programs being offered as well.

*Answer:* The rules did not change about the size requirements for filter strips. See response to East Region, question 7.

5. In spite of what appear to be generous rental payments and cost-sharing, many landowners are not participating, particularly where marginal pasture is involved. Why? Notably, because field bottoms associated with many Missouri streams, particularly where continuous CRP signup could be most helpful in addressing resource needs, tend to be only a few acres in size. Landowners can only receive payment on up to 150 feet per side of stream or 4.5 acres per quarter mile of stream (per side). Annual rental rates average \$80 per acre (\$360 per year). Landowners get cost-share to establish vegetative buffers but have to pay 50 percent themselves (could be a few hundred dollars); they get cost-sharing for fencing but have to pay 50 percent themselves (about \$300 to \$400 per quarter mile of fence out of pocket); they get 50 percent cost-sharing for alternative water supply development (several hundred dollars to several thousand dollars out of pocket). The choice for the landowner is to leave the riparian zone open to grazing and degradation and do nothing, or to enroll the land in the continuous CRP signup and maybe break even after 10 to 15 years in the program (annual payments plus cost-share versus landowner portion of cost-share plus riparian grazing forgone). Most landowners do not want to carve off 3 or 4 acres of a 6- or 8-acre bottomland field, pay their part of fencing and an alternative water source, maybe incur more expenses than the USDA dollars they will take in and

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

be left with a tiny spot to graze and restrictions on riparian use. Dedicated and financially secure landowners may participate, but many others will not when they put a pencil to paper. A possible solution: Adopt one of the CRP scour erosion eligibility criteria for the CRP continuous signup riparian buffer practice (whole field enrollment allowable if whole field is less than or equal to 9 acres). This would address many Missouri situations and may even result in less cost to USDA on some sites because of fewer situations where fencing and alternative water sources would be needed. This idea may be flawed when applied to other locations in the U.S., but it may help in certain locations outside of Missouri, particularly in the Southeast.

*Answer:* The purpose of the CRP continuous signup is to enroll small acreages that are environmentally sensitive and when enrolled will provide benefits to large areas when compared to the acreage on which the practice is implemented. USDA has an interagency team reviewing the current soil rental rates and other incentives. The State may want to review the option of developing a CREP proposal based on documented verifiable data to address these situations.

6. An item that we have had some difficulty with is filter strips and grassed waterways in areas delineated on FSA maps as having no crop history. An example would be a 20-foot strip through a farm field that is delineated out of the field, which may be an existing waterway. The waterway over the years has filled with sediment and trees and now causes surface water to be forced out into the field causing erosion. The proper practice may be a 40-foot waterway that encompasses the 20-foot sod strip. Is this situation ineligible for the continuous CRP signup? Can we cost-share on the 10 feet on each side of the existing grass strip? This same situation often occurs with filter strips and riparian buffers where crop history does not occur next to a stream (or other waterbody).

*Answer:* Cropland must meet the cropping history requirements to be eligible for enrollment. A wider waterway could be constructed to solve the natural resource concern, however, only that portion of the new waterway that is cropland that meets the cropping history requirements can be enrolled. If waterways are plowed out to meet the cropping history requirement, the land is ineligible for enrollment. See 2-CRP, paragraph 82. States need to submit examples to the National Offices of NRCS and FSA if there are questions about situations of this sort.

7. Can field offices work with private and nonprofit restoration specialists in assessment, design, and implementation of practices on land enrolled in the continuous CRP?

*Answer:* Yes, but all practices must meet NRCS standards and specifications and the requirements of 2-CRP. The producer is not reimbursed for the services of the private or nonprofit specialists, although NRCS State Offices could enter into agreements with State or local

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

agencies or organizations that would result in reimbursement of specialists using technical assistance reimbursement funds NRCS receives from FSA through the National NRCS Office. See response for East Region, question 3.

8. Do NRCS field staff conduct on-site assessments of existing vegetation and site conditions for areas offered into continuous CRP? Are field offices allowed the flexibility to consider input from ecologists, botanists, biologists, and other experts to apply appropriate restoration and management practices when native plant community remnants are found?

*Answer:* Yes, a field visit is required for all continuous CRP signup practices. Field visits are also required for all general CRP signup practices before the conservation plan is approved. Ecologists, biologists, botanists, and other experts can be consulted, but practice(s) installed must meet all requirements of 2-CRP and NRCS standards and specifications. See response to Midwest Region, question 7.

9. 2-CRP includes detailed size requirements, practice requirements, and technical responsibility information for all practices, including CP21, filter strips, and CP22, riparian buffer. The current procedure appears to have conflicting information related to minimum size requirements. Size requirements for CP21 include a minimum acceptable width of 20 feet. This conflicts with Missouri's Field Office Technical Guide of 25 feet (similar situation for CP22). If NRCS has technical responsibility, no minimum size requirements are needed for any practice in program guidelines/handbooks. We do support maximum width requirements to maintain program integrity. We believe only program maximums need to be included as part of size requirements. Our FOTG provides the technical guidance needed for minimums.

*Answer:* The minimum width for a filter strip in Missouri is 25 feet, which exceeds the minimum national standard of 20 feet, so there is no conflict between 2-CRP and the Missouri FOTG. A minimum width requirement is needed to ensure that resource problems are solved and program integrity is maintained.

10. We would like clarification on the cost-share policy for filter strips (CP21) and riparian buffers (CP22). Specifically, where the component is pipelines and watering facilities constructed outside of the filter strip/riparian buffer strip for the purpose of providing a water source for livestock. On a very limited basis, Missouri has interpreted this to include wells and ponds. Is this interpretation correct?

*Answer:* See response to Southeast Region, question 4, about cost-share for wells. Missouri and other States are asked to submit case files for review to the National Offices of NRCS and FSA about establishment of ponds for livestock watering facilities.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

11. Missouri would like a short discussion on the extent of application on CP21 and CP22? Do other States refer only to USGS drainage lines for application relative to seasonal streams? In Missouri, seasonal/intermittent streams are not always indicated on USGS topographical maps.

*Answer:* USGS maps, soil maps, conservation plan maps, and similar information resources, maps or otherwise, can be used to determine the existence of permanent and seasonal streams. What information is used must be included as documentation in case files.

12. Why isn't CRP practice CP17A, living snowfence, allowed to have a 10- to 15-year contract and given a 20 percent bonus similar to other windbreak practices?

*Answer:* See response to East Region, question 8.

13. Why were the land eligibility criteria changed for CRP practice CP18C?

*Answer:* The previous policy did not clearly delineate the land eligibility criteria for saline seeps and associated recharge areas. Land was being enrolled that did not address saline seep development. The revised eligibility criteria provides consistent guidance about identifying saline seeps and associated recharge areas and ensures that enrollment in the CRP will address the resource concern. The revised criteria was developed by experts in the area of saline seeps in consultation with State and National Office FSA and NRCS representatives.

14. For CP22, when marginal pasture is enrolled, why is it a requirement to establish woody vegetation in areas not suited to trees?

*Answer:* See responses to East Region, question 10, and Midwest Region, question 1.

15. Why is the rental rate for marginal pasture calculated the same way as cropland?

*Answer:* Notice CRP-320 provided per acre maximum rental rates for marginal pastureland. Previous to Notice CRP-320, per acre rental rates for marginal pastureland were the same rates that were paid for cropland. Because of concerns that CRP rental rates for marginal pastureland was far above the prevailing market rental rates for such land, FSA in consultation with NRCS established a per acre payment limit for marginal pastureland enrolled in the CRP. To encourage enrollment of marginal pastureland the rental rate limit was established at a minimum of 30 percent above the prevailing market rental rate for pastureland in the county.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

16. The change in allowable widths for CP21 and CP22 are too restrictive. In many cases, wider average widths are required to sell a landowner on a practical buffer. Can these widths be more flexible?

*Answer:* See response to East Region, question 7.

17. The change in CP5, field windbreak, width allows the establishment of only one row of trees. This meets the Minnesota FOTG requirement for erosion control by a windbreak. This is also too restrictive and will result in many less-than-desirable plantings.

*Answer:* The size requirement for CP5A, Field Windbreak, was agreed to during the establishment of the USDA Buffer Initiative. FSA and NRCS will review any request to modify the size requirement. Any such request must include verifiable documentation supporting the change to the approved requirement.

18. We have a large workload for windbreak renovations. Could the continuous CRP signup be used for renovation of existing windbreaks? Most existing farmstead and field windbreaks are not considered cropland by FSA and are not eligible for the continuous CRP signup.

*Answer:* See the response to East Region, question 9.

19. CP8A, Grass Waterway, allows for cost-sharing on outlet structures. In some cases, the size and cost of the outlet structure and the waterway could be greatly reduced if sediment and water control basins were constructed upslope. Can upslope basins be included and cost-shared using the CP8A practice?

*Answer:* No.

20. Can we use the filter strip practice along streams as a buffer without trees when water only crosses the filter strip in a few small areas and not along its entire length?

*Answer:* We are unable to respond to the question as worded. Please provide an example to the National Office for review.

21. Is an existing waterway that is silted in and has no depth or has a gully down in the waterway eligible for the continuous CRP signup?

*Answer:* The statute only allows newly created waterways to be eligible for the CRP. Newly created waterways are those that are completed within the 12-month period previous to being offered for enrollment. In addition, the land must meet the cropping history requirements to be

---

Continued on the next page

CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)

---

eligible for enrollment. Grass waterways that are purposely destroyed to be made eligible for enrollment in the CRP shall remain ineligible. See 2-CRP, paragraph 82. Also see response to Midwest Region, question 6.

22. Are there national standards and specifications on designing conservation buffers?

*Answer:* NRCS has established national standards and specifications for most of the conservation buffers eligible under the continuous CRP signup. When the National Conservation Buffer Initiative was started, guidance was also provided on the maximum acceptable widths and similar requirements for the buffer practices eligible under the continuous CRP signup. This guidance has since been incorporated into 2-CRP. See response to East Region, questions 4 and 7.

23. NRCS policy places emphasis on the use of native plant species and consideration of wildlife. But cost differentials between native grasses and non-native grasses not beneficial to wildlife (such as fescue) are magnified by high seeding rates for buffer plantings. Economics discourages landowners to plant non-native grasses that do not benefit wildlife. What will be done to address this?

*Answer:* The specific site and resource problem will determine what type of cover to establish. For example, because of a severe erosion problem a cover of close sown grasses may be required. This may require the planting of non-native grasses such as fescue. However, NRCS has an established policy that requires the use of native species whenever possible. We are aware of the price increases in certain seed varieties. However, the increased benefits that will be achieved from the native grass plantings will outweigh the temporary increase in cost. FSA will provide up to 50 percent of the eligible cost of establishing the approved cover. In addition, States were encouraged to establish several native grass seed varieties before signup 16 and 18 to help control an increase in price of any one seed type.

24. Buffer strips often have water quality as a primary purpose, and the usual configuration is dense plantings and narrow width. However, dense and narrow buffer/filter strip plantings offer less value to wildlife than less dense and wider plantings. Has thought been given to using slightly wider and less dense plantings to achieve water quality objectives as well as to incorporate wildlife benefits?

*Answer:* See response to Midwest Region, questions 22 and 23.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

25. Can maintenance be applied to buffer/filter strips to maintain wildlife habitat? If so, can participants be awarded the \$5 per acre maintenance fee to maintain wildlife habitat (and other values) like the general CRP signup offers?

*Answer:* The FSA State Committee, with NRCS concurrence, has authority to establish maintenance rates between \$0 and \$5 per acre for all CRP practices. The maintenance rate is to reimburse the participant for the average annual cost of the practice maintenance.

26. Wildlife is a coequal purpose of CRP, along with soil and water. The EBI for the general CRP signup helps to achieve a balance of considerations. The continuous CRP signup uses no EBI, and none of the practices automatically addresses upland wildlife needs. Will USDA offer continuous CRP signup practices for upland wildlife needs (field borders, pivot corners, etc.) to better balance the soil/water/wildlife equation? If not, can consideration be given to using an EBI with a minimum threshold entry score (with wildlife wrapped in) as a requisite for continuous CRP signup entry?

*Answer:* The continuous signup is a component of the CRP designed to enroll small acreages that serve much larger acreages. While wildlife habitat is not the purpose of some of the practices eligible under the continuous signup, most of the practices do provide benefits to wildlife and wildlife habitat just as erosion control may not be the purpose of the practice but reduced erosion will result from the establishment of many of the practices. Therefore, the practices eligible under continuous signup do provide a balance between water quality, erosion control, and wildlife habitat.

27. Can a 100- or 150-foot buffer be added outside a narrow strip of existing vegetation on land with no crop history along a stream or around a waterbody?

*Answer:* A future amendment to 2-CRP will provide procedure about this issue.

**Northern Plains Region**

1. Several of us in the Midwest and Plains have for the past year campaigned to add field borders and center-pivot irrigation corners to the continuous CRP eligible-practice list. Although some of these areas qualify for the general CRP signup, they are often not accepted because of low EBI scores based on their small size and erodibility index. In intensively farmed areas, where little permanent habitat exists, these additions would provide a patchwork of permanent vegetation with a lot of edge, which would benefit upland birds and other wildlife as well as provide buffers for wind erosion control and water quality protection. The main reasons for not adding these two practices seemingly is based on concern that too many acres might qualify. If these areas were made eligible, however, the general CRP acreage could be reduced accordingly.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

Moreover, response to the continuous CRP has not been overwhelming, so adding these two practices could help achieve the buffer goal more quickly than might be possible otherwise. In the process, more wildlife benefits could be achieved per dollar invested than under the large tracts enrolled in the general CRP.

*Answer:* The practices eligible for enrollment under the continuous signup provide benefits to large areas when compared to the acreage on which the practice is implemented. In addition, the practices provide multiple benefits, including water quality, erosion control, and wildlife habitat. The inclusion of areas such as field borders and center pivot corners has been thoroughly reviewed by an interagency team. It has been determined that such areas do not provide the level of benefits that warrant automatic noncompetitive enrollment in the CRP. Further, the size of the acreage offered is not a criteria under the EBI.

2. Although the language has been changed, according to 2-CRP, Exhibit 9, page 81, the change has not been stressed to indicate that riparian buffers do apply to seasonal streams, groundwater recharge areas, and wetlands. I still hear references to blueline streams.

*Answer:* The question refers to practice CP13C in 2-CRP, Exhibit 9, page 81. Beginning with signup 14, practices CP13, CP13A, CP13B, CP13C, and CP13D are no longer available. These practices were replaced with CP21 for filter strips and CP22 for riparian buffers. Riparian buffers can be installed under the continuous CRP signup along streams having perennial flow, seasonal streams (excluding gullies and sod waterways), sinkholes, karst areas, other groundwater recharge areas, and other permanent waterbodies. See 2-CRP, Exhibit 9, pages 151. See the response to Southeast Region, question 6.

3. There have been many discussions about the definition of "marginal pastureland." The last I heard from Parks Shackleford, this was interpreted very liberally and that pastureland did not need to be previously seeded to qualify. I think there is some confusion over this definition.

*Answer:* Marginal pastureland does indeed include grazing land that has not been previously seeded. See 2-CRP, paragraph 98.

4. Zone requirements for riparian buffers are hindering riparian buffers in Colorado and I assume throughout the West. The requirements in zones 1 and 2 call for a mixture of shrubs and grass in regions with less than 20 inches of rainfall. In most instances, simply fencing these areas will start the process of bank stabilization, including the establishment of shrubs and grasses. In other instances, there may be a need to plant them. Flexibility should be given to the States about

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

the need to plant vegetation or to simply allow natural succession to occur after fencing. This would result in considerable cost savings if shrub plantings were not required in all instances.

*Answer:* See the responses to Southeast Region, question 2.

5. Why is physical planting required on areas where woody species have been suppressed by grazing, but would recover with a management change mandated by CRP? The statement in 2-CRP, Exhibit 9, page 151, that states that "if trees are already established on the land, it is ineligible for CRP" is too broad. A more useable statement would be: "If changes in land use/management effect the creation of the required canopy/ground cover, acreage enrolled as CP-22 does not have to be planted. NRCS will determine canopy requirements by the performance of annual status reviews. If after two full growing seasons, it is apparent that the canopy requirement will not be met, tree/shrub plantings will be required." After all, what we're after is a functional riparian area. Why be so concerned with the path taken to achieve that functionality?

*Answer:* See the responses to Southeast Region, question 2.

6. Since the benefits of buffers result from continuity of the practice along the stream, wetland, waterbody, small areas (less than 10 percent of bid acres) that would not otherwise be eligible should be considered eligible if the inclusion is necessary to insure buffer functionality.

*Answer:* The size of the acreage is not an eligibility criteria under the CRP. All land enrolled must meet all eligibility requirements.

7. The low rental rates (about \$25 average) offered on riparian areas make enrollment of these areas into CRP next to impossible. The logistics of a producer moving areas that account for 30 to 35 percent of his entire production (not to mention winter and/or calving protection) for a rental rate of \$42.50 is simply not feasible. Areas in the corn belt where rental rates are in the \$75 to \$100 range and where livestock production is not the dominant land use are, of course, seeing huge numbers of signups. We have submitted a CREP proposal, but we feel strongly that rental rates for these "riparian soils" need to be sharply increased; any mechanism to do so?

*Answer:* All States were asked to review the 1997 soil rental rates and recommend adjustments for use in FY 1999. States should have requested changes where needed during this process. Further, separate not to exceed rates were established for marginal pastureland to ensure that the fair market rate is used for the CRP. CREP does allow for incentives to be raised in certain circumstances; however, those increases must be justified.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

8. What is the acreage goal for the buffer initiative and continuous CRP signup? The only thing I've seen is the reference to 2 million miles by 2002. If you figure an average of 30 foot, that would equal about 7 million acres.

*Answer:* The goal of 2 million miles for the National Conservation Buffer Initiative applies to all USDA programs and amounts to about 7 million acres if one assumes an average buffer width of 30 feet. There is no specific goal about the number of acres to be enrolled under the continuous CRP signup.

9. There seems to be a need for some clarification between waterways, filter strips, and riparian buffers. When is there use appropriate, minimum and maximum widths, vegetation used?

*Answer:* 2-CRP provides guidance, including maximum widths, on each of these practices.

10. There is a concern that riparian buffers must be devoted to trees in certain grassland areas that did not have tree-lined streams historically. Could there be an east/west line that would define when trees are required and how many?

*Answer:* The establishment of an east/west line would be arbitrary. Grasses only are not permitted on riparian buffers. If trees cannot be established on the acreage offered, the land is not eligible to be devoted to a riparian buffer. See response to East Region, question 10.

11. Would it be possible to allow marginal pastureland to be enrolled west of the line (see Question 10) and just fence off existing herbaceous vegetation?

*Answer:* See response to Southeast Region, question 2.

12. Is it allowable to modify contour buffer strip widths to eliminate point rows and accommodate ease of farming?

*Answer:* Yes, provided the maximum width requirement for the practice according to 2-CRP is not exceeded and the resource concern of erosion and runoff control is resolved.

13. All continuous CRP plantings should be done with cover best suited to wildlife when this cover will provide adequate erosion control. Currently, there is no requirement to do so since the EBI is not used.

*Answer:* The specific site and resource problem will determine what type of cover to establish. For example, because of a severe erosion problem a cover of close sown grasses may be

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

required. This may require the planting of non-native grasses such as fescue. However, NRCS has an established policy that requires the use of native species whenever possible. While wildlife habitat is not the purpose of some of the practices eligible under the continuous signup, most of the practices do provide benefits to wildlife and wildlife habitat just as erosion control may not be the purpose of the practice but reduced erosion will result from the establishment of many of the practices.

14. 2-CRP allows incidental grazing on contour buffer strips if done after harvest of a crop. Would it be possible to graze winter wheat as well if done outside the primary nesting season?

*Answer:* No. The statute only allows incidental grazing as part of the gleaning of crop residue after a field has been harvested.

15. Weed/moisture barrier should be available for use in all of the State (Kansas), especially since trees are required in riparian buffers in the eastern part. Also, it should be available for CP4 tree plantings.

*Answer:* Use of such barriers in areas with more than 25 inches of average annual precipitation is not a cost-effective use of the CRP. Trees are required on all riparian buffers regardless of location within the State.

16. There is supposedly a ban on disturbance of CRP acres during the primary nesting season. Although burning is a beneficial practice and should be continued, it should not be allowed after the 15<sup>th</sup> of April in Kansas. This year, much was done all the way through May because of adverse weather conditions.

*Answer:* The beginning date of the primary nesting season is established by the FSA State Committee, in consultation with the State Technical Committee. The ending date of the primary nesting date is provided in 2-CRP, Exhibit 30. There is no exception for adverse weather conditions.

17. The main concern we have in the field has to do with the education of staff on program objectives, installation, and interpretation of State-level guidelines. For a few months last year, many producers were being turned down for practices because staff was not aware of practices that could be installed.

*Answer:* Use of DM-9500 should help when it is released. Training of NRCS staff on conservation buffers and supporting practices is also planned.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

18. Determination of official acreages for windbreaks, vegetative buffers, filters, etc., is very difficult and extremely time-consuming. Sometimes the acreage amount cannot be determined until the practice has been installed (and established). Problem: FSA cannot approve the contract until the acreage is official. This really hurts the producer who thinks he or she may have signed up in October, plants in fall, then finds out his or her acreage has not been measured and will not be until August of the next year (real-life events).

*Answer:* NRCS needs to timely provide FSA with a map indicating practice location. FSA, in turn, has an obligation to timely measure the area.

19. Practice codes between NRCS and FSA do not always match. Installed herbaceous wind barriers last fall—no code in FSA system, so went with cross wind trap strips. FSA still does not have a code, so we are still waiting.

*Answer:* Only those practice codes provided in DM-9500 are eligible for enrollment in the CRP. Use of other codes or "similar" codes are **not** authorized.

20. Riparian buffers on marginal pasture guidelines have been interpreted by someone in Montana as "having to plant trees." In most cases in this region, native regeneration will occur and will occur sooner if areas are fenced and left undisturbed. If we must till an area and plant trees, we are causing erosion, increasing the probability of water quality problems, and causing additional deposition of sediment, nutrients, and organics in our streams.

*Answer:* See response to Southeast Region, question 2.

21. FSA determines the width and acreage they will allow for practices. Shouldn't these be based on technically sound decisions rather than politics? I would rather see conservation on the ground based on resource needs and technically sound criteria.

*Answer:* The width requirements used by FSA are based on sound technical criteria. Both FSA and NRCS developed the width requirements provided in 2-CRP.

22. We have several areas in the State where we are trying State initiatives to establish filter strips and riparian buffers. The fact that permissive grazing is not allowed for these two practices is discouraging many potential participants. I know the arguments against allowing grazing, and I don't argue with them. I just want you to know that this seems to be a key issue for enrollment of these practices in Kansas.

*Answer:* We understand, however, the statute prohibits grazing. USDA efforts to amend the statute to provide for managed grazing have not been successful.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

23. We still get a lot of questions about filter strips and riparian buffers. In Kansas, most potential participants are willing to enroll filter strips, but are unwilling to enroll riparian buffers. We have been asked to develop guidelines and a method of documenting decisions for requiring a riparian buffer over a filter strip. Generally speaking, if adjacent cropland is experiencing scour erosion, sediment deposition, and/or streambank erosion, a riparian buffer should be required rather than a filter strip. Because of appeals, our field office personnel are reluctant to refuse a filter strip offer in situations where a riparian buffer is necessary and more appropriate.

*Answer:* We understand your situation, but NRCS must recommend appropriate practices for the conservation problem to be addressed. If a producer is unwilling to install the recommended practice, we shall not recommend an alternative practice that will not adequately treat the conservation problem just to facilitate participation in the continuous CRP signup. If a producer wins an appeal, you should immediately inform the National Offices of NRCS and FSA so that a NAD director's review can be requested.

24. The eligibility of marginal pastureland and what is required for the establishment of CP22 on these acres is confusing and difficult to address with any real definitive answers. We could use some more guidance and definition.

*Answer:* See the responses to East Region, question 10, and Northern Plains Region, question 3.

25. Determining the width that is needed for filter strips and riparian buffers is another difficult question. There is general guidance, but no definitive way to determine and document the needed width.

*Answer:* Where State standards and specifications are lacking, States must develop this guidance. NRCS needs to document the conditions observed--drainage area, slope of the drainage, soil types, whether runoff is concentrated flow or sheet flow, scour areas, gullies, soil deposition, etc.--based on **both** an office and field review. NRCS then needs to document the alternative solutions to the conservation problem and the recommended practice. See response to East Region, question 4.

26. Can areas subject to scour erosion be added to the list of eligible practices for the continuous CRP signup?

*Answer:* It has been determined that such areas do not provide the level of benefits that warrant automatic noncompetitive enrollment in the CRP.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

**South Central Region**

1. During April 1998, we were asked to submit recommendations for conversion factors for converting buffer practices report in acres to feet/miles. We would like to know if and when conversion factors are going to be established and sent out to the field.

*Answer:* Conversions of acres to miles for purposes of the National Conservation Buffer Initiative will be done nationally. State and field offices need only report the various buffer practices installed by acres. Conversions made to this point have assumed an average buffer width of 30 feet, which translates to 3.64 acres to the mile.

2. Are man-made channels eligible for riparian buffers (or filter strips)?

*Answer:* Being man-made does not preclude the adjacent acreage from being enrolled. However, all eligibility requirements must be met for the acreage to be enrolled. State Offices should submit questionable cases to the National Office for review before enrollment.

3. Wellhead protection areas in Louisiana cover both confined and unconfined aquifers. Confined aquifers have a 1-mile radius; unconfined aquifers have a 2-mile radius. Notice CRP-300 states that land must be within a 2,000-foot radius of an approved public wellhead. It seems to us that landowners within an approved wellhead, particularly those, which cover an unconfined aquifer, are being excluded from participating in CRP. The State Technical Committee and the FSA State Committee would like to know if special consideration can be given to land outside the 2,000-foot radius that is still within an approved wellhead protection area.

*Answer:* The 2,000-foot radius was established in consultation with several Federal agencies, including the EPA. EPA is the agency responsible for approving the wellhead protection plans developed by the State. Based on all the available information, it was determined that enrollment of a 2,000 foot radius would provide cost-effective protection of the public wellhead. Therefore, enrollment in excess of the 2,000 foot radius is not authorized.

**West Region**

1. I understand the continuous CRP signup deadline expires in September 1998. Can people sign up after that date?

*Answer:* There is no ending date for the continuous signup except for the statutory limitation for the CRP of December 31, 2002. The signup number changes at the beginning of each fiscal year for accounting purposes. See 2-CRP, paragraph 98.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

2. The Nevada Department of Wildlife is interested in CREP and may want to start an application in 1999. How do they proceed?

*Answer:* The Nevada Department of Wildlife should contact the FSA State Executive Director to learn more about the CREP. There is also a Federal Register notice on CREP. Agencies and organizations interested in CREP should start a dialogue to determine what conservation concerns need to be addressed and what contribution each partner will make.

3. There has not been a continuous CRP contract executed in Nevada. What can we do to change this?

*Answer:* The first step is determining what practices might benefit what conservation problems in Nevada. Then USDA staff and partners in the public and private sectors need to develop a strategy for promoting the use of the appropriate practice to address those problems. Contacting landowners one-by-one has worked best in other States. Obviously, there will be other needs as well, such as training.

4. Where in the CRP manual does it define whose responsibility (FSA or NRCS) it is to determine whether a field's crop history makes it eligible for CRP? 2-CRP, page 2-31, refers to the District Conservationist being responsible for determining whether land offered is eligible. 2-CRP, page 4-31, mentions the COC. It's not clear as to whom actually is responsible to gather the history and make the call.

*Answer:* FSA determines whether the land is cropland, whether the cropping history requirements are met, and whether the land is physically and legally capable of being planted in a normal manner. NRCS determines the remainder of land eligibility. 2-CRP, paragraphs 100 and 155, provide instructions for completing the CRP-2 for continuous and general signups respectively.

---

Continued on the next page

**CRP Questions and Answers (Continued)**

---

5. Please clarify 2-CRP, subparagraph 49 H, with regard to the continuous CRP signup. Is a CRP participant ineligible for all other Federal cost-share programs once he or she is approved for CRP, or is the ineligibility for other Federal cost-share limited only to the specific acreage designated under CRP (such as a windbreak or riparian buffer)? For example, a participant owns 100 acres of cropland. If the participant is approved for a 1-acre windbreak under continuous CRP signup, is the participant eligible to receive EQIP cost-sharing on the remaining 99 acres?

*Answer:* Participants that receive CRP cost-share assistance are not eligible for other Federal cost-share programs on the same acreage. See 2-CRP, paragraph 375. In your example, the participant is ineligible for EQIP cost-share on the 1 acre enrolled in the CRP. The participant may be eligible for EQIP cost share on the remaining 99 acres if otherwise eligible. The same acreage cannot be enrolled in EQIP and CRP.