

Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Texas A&M University

April 2010

A HISTORICAL LOOK AT TEXAS CRP PARTICIPATION: TEXAS AGRILIFE EXTENSION DISTRICT 1



AFPC

Department of Agricultural Economics
Texas AgriLife Research
Texas AgriLife Extension Service
Texas A&M University

AgriLIFE **RESEARCH
& EXTENSION**
Texas A&M System

College Station, Texas 77843-2124
Telephone: (979) 845-5913
Fax: (979) 845-3140
<http://www.afpc.tamu.edu>

© 2010 by the Agricultural and Food Policy Center

Research Report 10-1.1

Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Department of Agricultural Economics
2124 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-2124
Web site: www.afpc.tamu.edu

A HISTORICAL LOOK AT TEXAS CRP PARTICIPATION: TEXAS AGRILIFE EXTENSION DISTRICT 1

Laura M. Bankhead
Joe L. Outlaw
David P. Ernstes



**Agricultural and Food Policy Center
The Texas A&M University System**

Agricultural & Food Policy Center
Department of Agricultural Economics
Texas AgriLife Research
Texas AgriLife Extension Service
Texas A&M University

Excerpts from APFC Research Report 10-1

April 2010

College Station, Texas 77843-2124

Telephone: 979.845.5913

Fax: 979.845.3140

Web site: <http://www.afpc.tamu.edu/>

Texas AgriLife Extension Districts




Table of Contents

Texas AgriLife Extension Districts	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Texas Counties by Texas AgriLife Districts	4
Introduction	6
Conservation Reserve Program Legislative History	6

Figures

Texas Conservation Reserve Program Signups 1-12	8
Texas Conservation Reserve Program Signups 13-38.....	9
Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2010.....	10
Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2011	11
Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2012.....	12
Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2013.....	13
Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2014.....	14
Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2015.....	15
Top Ten Texas Counties in Acres Enrolled in CRP	16
Top Ten Texas Counties in Number of CRP Contracts.....	17
Top Ten Texas Counties in Average Acres per CRP Contract.....	18
Top Ten Texas Counties in Average Rental per Acre Enrolled in CRP	19

Data Tables

CRP Data for Texas and Extension Districts (Signups 1-12).....	20
CRP Data for Texas and Extension Districts (Signups 13-38)	21
Acres of CRP for Texas and Extension Districts by Signup Period	22
Acres of CRP for Texas and Extension Districts by Signup Period	23
CRP Enrollment by Year of Contract Expiration by Extension District (All Signup Types)	24
CRP Data for Texas, District 1, and District Counties (Signups 1-12)	25
CRP Data for Texas, District 1, and District Counties (Signups 13-38).....	26
Acres of CRP for Texas, District 1, and District Counties by Signup Period.....	27
Acres of CRP for Texas, District 1, and District Counties by Signup Period.....	28
CRP Enrollment by Year of Contract Expiration for District 1 Counties (All Signup Types)	29

Texas Counties by Texas AgriLife Extension Districts

Anderson	District 5	Dickens.....	District 3
Andrews.....	District 6	Dimmitt.....	District 12
Angelina	District 5	Donley	District 1
Aransas	District 11	Duval	District 12
Archer	District 3	Eastland	District 8
Armstrong.....	District 1	Ector	District 6
Atascosa	District 12	Edwards.....	District 10
Austin	District 11	El Paso	District 6
Bailey.....	District 2	Ellis	District 8
Bandera	District 10	Erath.....	District 8
Bastrop.....	District 10	Falls.....	District 8
Baylor	District 3	Fannin.....	District 4
Bee	District 11	Fayette	District 11
Bell	District 8	Fisher.....	District 7
Bexar.....	District 10	Floyd.....	District 2
Blanco.....	District 10	Foard.....	District 3
Borden.....	District 2	Fort Bend	District 9
Bosque.....	District 8	Franklin	District 4
Bowie.....	District 4	Freestone	District 8
Brazoria.....	District 9	Frio	District 12
Brazos.....	District 9	Gaines	District 2
Briscoe	District 1	Galveston	District 9
Brooks	District 12	Garza	District 2
Brown.....	District 7	Gillespie.....	District 10
Brewster	District 6	Glasscock.....	District 6
Burleson.....	District 9	Goliad	District 11
Burnet	District 7	Gonzales.....	District 10
Caldwell.....	District 10	Gray	District 1
Calhoun.....	District 11	Grayson	District 4
Callahan.....	District 7	Gregg	District 5
Cameron	District 12	Grimes.....	District 9
Camp.....	District 4	Guadalupe.....	District 10
Carson.....	District 1	Hale	District 2
Cass.....	District 4	Hall.....	District 3
Castro.....	District 2	Hamilton.....	District 8
Chambers	District 9	Hansford	District 1
Cherokee	District 5	Hardeman.....	District 3
Childress.....	District 3	Hardin	District 9
Clay.....	District 3	Harris.....	District 9
Cochran	District 2	Harrison.....	District 5
Coke	District 7	Hartley.....	District 1
Coleman.....	District 7	Haskell.....	District 3
Collin.....	District 4	Hays	District 10
Collingsworth.....	District 1	Hemphill.....	District 1
Colorado.....	District 11	Henderson	District 5
Comal.....	District 10	Hidalgo.....	District 12
Comanche.....	District 8	Hill.....	District 8
Concho	District 7	Hockley.....	District 2
Cooke.....	District 4	Hood.....	District 8
Coryell.....	District 8	Hopkins.....	District 4
Cottle	District 3	Houston.....	District 5
Crane.....	District 6	Howard.....	District 6
Crockett.....	District 6	Hudspeth.....	District 6
Crosby	District 2	Hunt.....	District 4
Culberson	District 6	Hutchinson	District 1
Dallam	District 1	Irion	District 7
Dallas.....	District 4	Jack	District 3
Dawson	District 2	Jackson.....	District 11
Deaf Smith	District 1	Jasper.....	District 5
Delta	District 4	Jeff Davis.....	District 6
Denton.....	District 4	Jefferson	District 9
Dewitt.....	District 11	Jim Hogg.....	District 12

Jim Wells..... District 12
 Johnson..... District 8
 Jones..... District 7
 Karnes..... District 11
 Kaufman..... District 4
 Kendall..... District 10
 Kenedy..... District 12
 Kent..... District 3
 Kerr..... District 10
 Kimble..... District 10
 King..... District 3
 Kinney..... District 10
 Kleberg..... District 12
 Knox..... District 3
 Lamar..... District 4
 Lamb..... District 2
 Lampasas..... District 7
 Lasalle..... District 12
 Lavaca..... District 11
 Lee..... District 9
 Leon..... District 8
 Liberty..... District 9
 Limestone..... District 8
 Lipscomb..... District 1
 Live Oak..... District 12
 Llano..... District 7
 Loving..... District 6
 Lubbock..... District 2
 Lynn..... District 2
 Madison..... District 9
 Marion..... District 5
 Martin..... District 6
 Mason..... District 7
 Matagorda..... District 11
 Maverick..... District 12
 McCulloch..... District 7
 McLennan..... District 8
 McMullen..... District 12
 Medina..... District 10
 Menard..... District 7
 Midland..... District 6
 Milam..... District 8
 Mills..... District 7
 Mitchell..... District 2
 Montague..... District 3
 Montgomery..... District 9
 Moore..... District 1
 Morris..... District 4
 Motley..... District 3
 Nacogdoches..... District 5
 Navarro..... District 8
 Newton..... District 5
 Nolan..... District 7
 Nueces..... District 11
 Ochiltree..... District 1
 Oldham..... District 1
 Orange..... District 9
 Palo Pinto..... District 3
 Panola..... District 5
 Parker..... District 3
 Parmer..... District 2
 Pecos..... District 6
 Polk..... District 5
 Potter..... District 1
 Presidio..... District 6

Rains..... District 4
 Randall..... District 1
 Reagan..... District 6
 Real..... District 10
 Red River..... District 4
 Reeves..... District 6
 Refugio..... District 11
 Roberts..... District 1
 Robertson..... District 8
 Rockwall..... District 4
 Runnels..... District 7
 Rusk..... District 5
 Sabine..... District 5
 San Augustine..... District 5
 San Jacinto..... District 9
 San Patricio..... District 11
 San Saba..... District 7
 Schleicher..... District 7
 Scurry..... District 2
 Shackelford..... District 7
 Shelby..... District 5
 Sherman..... District 1
 Smith..... District 5
 Somervell..... District 8
 Starr..... District 12
 Stephens..... District 3
 Sterling..... District 7
 Stonewall..... District 3
 Sutton..... District 10
 Swisher..... District 2
 Tarrant..... District 4
 Taylor..... District 7
 Terrell..... District 6
 Terry..... District 2
 Throckmorton..... District 3
 Titus..... District 4
 Tom Green..... District 7
 Travis..... District 10
 Trinity..... District 5
 Tyler..... District 5
 Upshur..... District 5
 Upton..... District 6
 Uvalde..... District 10
 Val Verde..... District 6
 Van Zandt..... District 4
 Victoria..... District 11
 Walker..... District 9
 Waller..... District 9
 Ward..... District 6
 Washington..... District 11
 Webb..... District 12
 Wharton..... District 11
 Wheeler..... District 1
 Wichita..... District 3
 Wilbarger..... District 3
 Willacy..... District 12
 Williamson..... District 8
 Wilson..... District 10
 Winkler..... District 6
 Wise..... District 3
 Wood..... District 5
 Yoakum..... District 2
 Young..... District 3
 Zapata..... District 12
 Zavala..... District 12

Introduction

The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is one of the most successful Federal agricultural programs. While the program has been adjusted over time, for more than 30 years the primary emphasis has been to protect environmentally sensitive land while providing farmers with annual rental payments.

Texas has historically had the highest number of acres enrolled in the CRP. In any given year, 3 to 4 million of the slightly more than 30 million acres nationally have been enrolled in Texas.

Over time, as contracts have expired, most of the land that had been enrolled in the program was re-enrolled. However, due to funding limitations, the acreage cap has been reduced which will likely mean that many Texas farmers and landowners will not be able to re-enroll this land in the CRP. This publication, focusing on Texas AgriLife Extension District 1, is excerpted from a larger work and is part of a planned series of publications designed to provide farmers and landowners statewide with additional information regarding their options as their contracts begin to expire. This publication addresses where the CRP acreage is in Texas AgriLife Extension District 1 and when contracts will be expiring, as well as providing a historical view of how important the CRP program has been over the past 30 years. If you wish to see the larger report, it is available on the AFPC website at <http://www.afpc.tamu.edu/pubs/2/541/RR-10-01%20-%20for%20web.pdf>

Conservation Reserve Program Legislative History

The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) was first established by the Food Security Act of 1985 with the purpose of removing up to 45 million acres from production and reducing damage to highly erodible soils and environmentally sensitive land. Patterned after the conservation reserve part of the Soil Bank Program that was initiated during the 1950s, the program offered annual rental payments and cost-share assistance up to 50% of expenses to producers for taking their land out of production and establishing long-term conserving covers. Landowners could enter into contracts for a minimum of 10 years or a maximum of 15 years. A county could not enroll more than 25% of its cropland unless the Secretary of Agriculture determined that doing so would not have an adverse economic impact. In its early years, CRP eligibility was limited to land with highly erodible soils, and, during the first nine signups, 34 million acres were enrolled.

The Food, Conservation, Agriculture, and Trade Act of 1990 (1990 Farm Bill) extended CRP land eligibility beyond highly erodible soils to include state water quality priority areas, plots of land that adopted high priority conservation practices, and "Conservation Priority Areas" (Chesapeake Bay, Long Island Sound, and the Great Lakes watershed). Producers were given the option to participate in limited fall and winter grazing or cropping between trees on CRP land in exchange for reduced rental rates. The 1990 Farm Bill also made changes to the way CRP contracts were ranked and annual rental rates were applied. The Environmental Benefits Index (EBI) was created as a way to rank offers based on water quality, air quality, and soil erodibility concerns. Maximum soil specific rental rates were also set allowing producers with highly productive and highly erodible soils to enter into contracts.

The Federal Agricultural Improvement Reform Act of 1996 capped CRP enrollment at 36.4 million acres. Wildlife habitat was also added to the EBI. CRP continuous sign-up was created to allow environmentally desirable land devoted to specific conservation practices to be enrolled in CRP at any time. Eligible conservation practices included riparian buffers, wildlife habitat buffers, wetland buffers, filter strips, wetland restoration, grass waterways, shelterbelts, living snow fences, contour grass strips, salt tolerant vegetation, and shallow water areas for wildlife. Continuous sign-up contracts were not subject to competitive bidding. The USDA allowed some producers an early out option to modify or end their CRP contracts after 5 years of the program. During 1997 – 2002, many of the early CRP contracts began to expire and approximately 22 million acres were enrolled. The

expiring contracts were not automatically renewed. There was increased competition because bids were ranked by the EBI.

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 made a few minor changes to CRP. It increased the acreage cap to 39.2 million acres. Cropping history requirements were changed to four of the last six years. CRP enrollment began to shift geographically. The Northern Great Plains region gained slightly at the expense of the Heartland and the Southern Seaboard. The Plains were able to offer land at a lower rental rate to increase the attractiveness of their offers.

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 capped CRP at 32 million acres beginning on October 1, 2009. Eligibility requirements were modified to land cropped in four of six years prior to 2008 rather than 2002. Alfalfa, legumes, and multi-year grasses in a rotation practice with an annual commodity could be used to meet the cropping history requirement. A local preference criterion was also added in determining the acceptability of CRP offers. In previous bills the Secretary used different criteria for different States and regions to determine acceptability. No more than 25% of a county's cropland could be enrolled in CRP; however, exceptions were created to waive this limit in the case of continuous or Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) enrollment. A provision was also added for beginning or socially disadvantaged producers to help them make the transition from CRP land to production or other conservation programs; \$25 million in funding was authorized for these transitions.

About 75% of CRP contracts (28 million acres) are scheduled to expire between 2007 and 2010. During 2006, in an attempt to distribute the upcoming administrative burden, holders of expiring contracts were allowed to re-enroll or extend their contracts, and 82% of contract holders chose to do this. Over the next five years, 3.9 – 5.6 million acres are scheduled to expire annually.

Background Sources:

O'Brien, Doug. "Conservation Reserve Program." Summary and Evolution of U.S. Farm Bill Conservation Titles – Expanded Discussions. Fayetteville, AR: The National Agricultural Law Center. [Accessed April 2010]. Available online at <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/farmbills/conservation-expanded.html#reserve-90>

USDA Economic Research Service. "Conservation Policy: Land Retirement Programs." Briefing Rooms. Washington, DC: USDA Economic Research Service. [Accessed April 2010]. Available online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/conservationPolicy/retirement.htm>

USDA Economic Research Service. "Title II: Conservation." 2008 Farm Bill Side-By-Side. Washington, DC: USDA Economic Research Service. [Accessed April 2010]. Available online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/FarmBill/2008/Titles/TitleIIConservation.htm>

Report Data Sources

Smith, Jackie G., Joe L. Outlaw, Edward G. Smith, Travis D. Miller, Steve H. Amosson and Stan J. Bevers. Texas CRP Database Book. College Station, TX: Texas Agricultural Extension Service, January 24, 1996.

USDA Farm Service Agency. "Contract Extension, Expirations and Enrollment Update, CRP Contract Summary and Statistics." Conservation Programs. Washington, DC: USDA Farm Service Agency. [Accessed February 2010.] Available online at <http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=copr&topic=rns-css>

USDA Farm Service Agency. "Monthly Active CRP Contract Reports." Conservation Programs. Washington, DC: USDA Farm Service Agency. [Accessed February 2010.] Available online at <http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=copr&topic=rns-crt>

Figure 1: Texas Conservation Reserve Program Signups 1-12




Figure 2: Texas Conservation Reserve Program Signups 13-38




Figure 3: Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2010




Figure 4: Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2011




Figure 5: Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2012




Figure 6: Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2013




Figure 7: Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2014




Figure 8: Conservation Reserve Program Acres Expiring in 2015




Figure 9: Top Ten Texas Counties in Acres Enrolled in CRP (Signups 13-38)




Figure 10: Top Ten Texas Counties in Number of CRP Contracts (Signups 13-38)




Figure 11: Top Ten Texas Counties in Average Acres per CRP Contract (Signups 13-38)




Figure 12: Top Ten Texas Counties in Average Rental per Acre Enrolled in CRP (Signups 13-38)




Table 1. CRP Data for Texas and Extension Districts (Signups 1-12).									
	Total Acres*	Contracts	Average Acres/Contract	Average Rental Rate	1 and 2	3	4	5 through 7	
Texas	4,138,160	19,707	210	\$39.54	695,438	2,533,753	702,565	192,764	
District 1	1,119,507	4,119	272	\$39.15	101,871	914,546	92,770	7,118	
District 2	1,614,575	7,262	222	\$39.30	178,463	927,887	423,647	80,596	
District 3	473,579	2,556	185	\$39.24	136,764	271,008	49,563	16,109	
District 4	96,191	815	118	\$39.39	39,407	34,082	14,158	7,457	
District 5	7,070	74	96	\$39.14	1,501	2,802	1,331	1,436	
District 6	250,786	937	268	\$39.56	30,545	100,149	66,534	53,346	
District 7	308,261	2,281	135	\$39.04	140,710	150,717	6,528	7,019	
District 8	77,402	763	101	\$39.09	16,531	41,386	12,840	5,997	
District 9	371	4	93	\$39.82		69	302		
District 10	12,271	58	212	\$39.43	3,587	4,217	711	3,757	
District 11	22,317	145	154	\$48.55	12,558	9,152	94	513	
District 12	155,829	693	225	\$45.62	33,502	77,738	34,087	9,415	
* General signup acres only. Continuous signup did not begin until Signup 14.									
† In later signups the land class was replaced with an environmental benefits index.									

Table 2. CRP Data for Texas and Extension Districts (Signups 13-38).							
	Total Acres	Contracts	Average Acres/Contract	Average Rental Rate	General Acres	Continuous Acres	Average Erosion Index
Texas	3,305,540	21,152	156	\$35.43	3,254,107	51,296	11
District 1	824,623	3,702	223	\$34.57	824,623	3,453	9
District 2	1,524,104	9,918	154	\$36.06	1,523,821	283	11
District 3	288,870	2,174	133	\$34.71	285,199	3,672	9
District 4	25,795	452	57	\$37.30	23,577	2,219	9
District 5	2,009	29	69	\$29.82	2,009	0	7
District 6	226,570	1,272	178	\$33.38	221,072	5,498	18
District 7	191,020	2,144	89	\$34.79	182,300	8,720	9
District 8	11,087	362	31	\$35.47	9,859	1,228	10
District 9							
District 10	5,618	89	63	\$37.99	4,068	1,550	6
District 11	849	61	14	\$46.60	0	849	2
District 12	118,041	735	161	\$36.76	116,182	1,859	10
(As of February 2010)							

Table 3. Acres of CRP for Texas and Extension Districts by Signup Period.													
	1 - 12	13	14*	15	16	17*	18	19*	20	21*	22*	23*	24*
Texas	4,138,160	955	47	1,315,036	784,654	33	403,026		188,344	333	935	1,746	9,567
District 1	111,507			274,043	273,207		97,390		37,640		229	53	
District 2	1,614,577			715,744	296,975		179,678		61,845				
District 3	473,582			134,631	80,160		40,557		16,831	36		85	50
District 4	96,192		47	8,880	3,678		7,516		2,689		172	264	426
District 5	7,071			681									
District 6	250,786			76,221	45,260		26,450		14,461				4,083
District 7	308,262			49,480	54,199		31,560		32,451			329	2,336
District 8	77,403			1,803	4,924		1,066		663		17		146
District 9	371												
District 10	12,272			814	1,434		1,821						398
District 11	22,318												53
District 12	155,830	955		40,583	18,476		8,240		9,894				663
* denotes continuous signup numbers													

Table 4. Acres of CRP for Texas and Extension Districts by Signup Period.														
	25*	26	27*	28*	29	30*	31*	32-REX	33	34*	35*	36*	37*	38*
Texas	5,400	85,775	2,932	4,785	103,304	9,429	5,008	323,356	49,657		6,014	3,930	944	193
District 1		5,519		50	11,111			112,930	9,330		2,350	772		
District 2		42,120			57,639	120		155,485	14,336				163	
District 3	618	1,761	568	230	4,053	1,241	259	5,162	2,044		585			
District 4	637			138	145	471		670					65	
District 5								1,329						
District 6		17,910	145	38	9,238		1,174	29,788	1,744		58			
District 7	1,242	4,903	268	298	2,964	1,701	1,057	4,340	2,404		964	527		
District 8		940	122	81		217	160		464		195	252	39	
District 9														
District 10	123			718		226						84		
District 11			88	315		203	191							
District 12	284	7,785		912	10,608			7,018	12,624					
* denotes continuous signup numbers														

Table 5. CRP Enrollment by Year of Contract Expiration by Extension District (All Signup Types).												
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	>2019
Texas	561,330	670,661	685,133	822,585	363,052	169,686	139,748	61,391	138,557	103,951	88,943	53,561
District 1	181,665	150,588	119,958	253,369	97,665	60,110	22,346	11,317	55,294	21,968	38,504	5,419
District 2	254,062	277,812	379,397	356,682	170,640	76,534	73,313	17,966	41,987	64,050	35,822	34,391
District 3	61,904	95,096	80,825	80,930	15,344	4,395	5,322	2,502	4,296	2,438	2,342	1,424
District 4	5,741	6,937	6,272	8,159	4,247	832	1,209	827	1,343	189	598	278
District 5		11	442	258	307	42	36		1,454	89		317
District 6	18,462	48,833	21,940	50,571	40,767	15,157	15,022	5,640	20,515	6,008	6,939	5,866
District 7	21,300	53,252	48,743	46,552	19,647	6,172	6,467	5,956	5,515	4,555	1,321	2,645
District 8	1,946	5,993	2,074	2,304	1,497	507	515	709	314	308	198	234
District 9												
District 10	3,899	1,762	1,335	1,882	1,097	90	215	349	832	884	359	360
District 11	554	78	198	399	27	81	42	177	278	348	379	347
District 12	11,333	29,239	22,070	20,686	11,663	5,368	15,109	15,680	6,515	2,764	2,000	1,408
(As of February 2010)												

	Total Acres*	Contracts	Average Acres/Contract	Average Rental Rate	Land Class†				
					1 and 2	3	4	5 through 7	
Texas	4,138,160	19,707	210	\$39.54	695,438	2,533,753	702,565	192,764	
District 1	1,119,507	4,119	272	\$39.15	101,871	914,546	92,770	7,118	
Armstrong	43,764	190	230	\$39.36		43,022	742		
Briscoe	46,413	174	267	\$38.96	1,352	43,262	1,635	164	
Carson	46,360	182	255	\$39.75	4,232	39,248	479	2,401	
Collingsworth	55,768	312	179	\$38.94	26,272	27,314	2,003	179	
Dallam	107,301	275	390	\$39.16	6,859	80,012	20,431		
Deaf Smith	156,898	430	365	\$39.06	1,383	152,362	380	17	
Donley	27,216	188	145	\$37.93	2,526	22,937	1,184	569	
Gray	38,437	198	194	\$39.45	382	37,547	391	117	
Hansford	46,126	179	258	\$39.46	2,567	39,367	3,842	349	
Hartley	60,007	152	395	\$39.62	16,804	38,289	4,913		
Hemphill	19,357	102	190	\$38.66	6,136	11,319	1,711	191	
Hutchinson	8,215	36	228	\$39.12	693	7,456			
Lipscomb	50,202	198	254	\$37.63	13,681	18,551	17,844	71	
Moore	50,141	150	334	\$39.41	12,454	37,687			
Ochiltree	74,565	277	269	\$39.52		69,008	4,597	959	
Oldham	40,443	110	368	\$38.96	206	39,306	390	542	
Potter	11,436	56	204	\$39.43	427	10,158	851		
Randall	78,599	299	263	\$39.70		77,727	872		
Roberts	12,312	39	316	\$39.03	257	10,114	691	1,250	
Sherman	91,573	249	368	\$39.39		68,878	22,371		
Wheeler	54,376	323	168	\$38.39	5,639	40,985	7,443	309	
* General signup acres only. Continuous signup did not begin until Signup 14.									
† In later signups the land class was replaced with an environmental benefits index.									

Table 7. CRP Data for Texas, District 1, and District Counties (Signups 13-38).							
	Total Acres	Contracts	Average Acres/Contract	Average Rental Rate	General Acres	Continuous Acres	Average Erosion Index
Texas	3,305,540	21,152	156	\$35.43	3,254,107	51,296	11
District 1	824,623	3,702	223	\$34.57	824,623	3,453	9
Armstrong	25,242	125	202	\$32.67	25,242		6
Briscoe	18,019	108	167	\$34.26	18,019		7
Carson	55,471	222	250	\$36.80	55,471	2,579	6
Collingsworth	37,482	301	125	\$34.02	37,482		12
Dallam	109,486	347	316	\$34.47	109,486		7
Deaf Smith	152,810	501	305	\$38.01	152,810	53	8
Donley	16,200	137	118	\$33.26	16,200		13
Gray	34,237	162	211	\$33.62	34,237	772	6
Hansford	26,199	132	198	\$34.30	26,199		11
Hartley	32,918	206	160	\$37.03	32,918		10
Hemphill	9,882	69	143	\$33.14	9,882		10
Hutchinson	841	10	84	\$34.67	841		7
Lipscomb	33,109	172	192	\$32.48	33,109		10
Moore	20,738	100	207	\$35.49	20,738		9
Ochiltree	33,829	160	211	\$36.42	33,829	50	7
Oldham	24,155	78	310	\$32.82	24,155		9
Potter	6,849	28	245	\$36.16	6,849		7
Randall	65,218	232	281	\$35.87	65,218		7
Roberts	5,190	27	192	\$34.70	5,190		6
Sherman	85,837	357	240	\$35.68	85,837		11
Wheeler	30,911	228	136	\$30.10	30,911		18
(As of February 2010)							

Table 8. Acres of CRP for Texas, District 1, and District Counties by Signup Period.													
	1 - 12	13	14*	15	16	17*	18	19*	20	21*	22*	23*	24*
Texas	4,138,160	955	47	1,315,036	784,654	33	403,026		188,344	333	935	1,746	9,567
District 1	111,507			274,043	273,207		97,390		37,640		229	53	
Armstrong	43,764			15,812	9,430								
Briscoe	46,413			9,579	7,243								
Carson	46,360			1,441	20,486		22,975		6,177		229		
Collingsworth	55,768			13,366	15,496		5,640		503				
Dallam	107,301			36,964	4,947		2,083						
Deaf Smith	156,898			37,543	85,555		6,331					53	
Donley	27,216			13,825	1,176								
Gray	38,437			3,299	11,700		7,834		7,323				
Hansford	46,126			9,518	7,278		4,241		3,489				
Hartley	60,007			12,060	4,156		5,316		4,046				
Hemphill	19,357			3,161	874		2,388		1,164				
Hutchinson	8,215						841						
Lipscomb	50,202			8,210	15,996		6,730						
Moore	50,141			9,242	5,220		1,058		4,788				
Ochiltree	74,565			2,673	9,786		10,471		3,880				
Oldham	40,443			15,331	8,824								
Potter	11,436			767	1,875		2,824		1,383				
Randall	78,599			15,136	40,982		2,074						
Roberts	12,312				3,606		1,584						
Sherman	91,573			45,881	13,631		11,763		3,515				
Wheeler	54,376			20,235	4,947		3,238		1,372				
* denotes continuous signup numbers													

Table 9. Acres of CRP for Texas, District 1, and District Counties by Signup Period.														
	25*	26	27*	28*	29	30*	31*	32-REX	33	34*	35*	36*	37*	38*
Texas	5,400	85,775	2,932	4,785	103,304	9,429	5,008	323,356	49,657		6,014	3,930	944	193
District 1		5,519		50	11,111			112,930	9,330		2,350	772		
Armstrong														
Briscoe								1,197						
Carson								1,815			2,350			
Collingsworth					561			1,240	675					
Dallam								65,492						
Deaf Smith								23,328						
Donley								1,200						
Gray					1,073			2,236				772		
Hansford		461						687	525					
Hartley		687			2,621			2,084	1,950					
Hemphill		772						1,523						
Hutchinson														
Lipscomb					1,083			1,091						
Moore									430					
Ochiltree		502		50	1,914			1,076	3,478					
Oldham														
Potter														
Randall								7,025						
Roberts														
Sherman		2,656			3,447			2,937	2,008					
Wheeler		442			412				265					
* denotes continuous signup numbers														

Table 10. CRP Enrollment by Year of Contract Expiration for District 1 Counties (All Signup Types).

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	>2019
Texas	561,330	670,661	685,133	822,585	363,052	169,686	139,748	61,391	138,557	103,951	88,943	53,561
District 1	181,665	150,588	119,958	253,369	97,665	60,110	22,346	11,317	55,294	21,968	38,504	5,419
Armstrong	17,726	7,811	3,824	13,387	136				208			
Briscoe	27,322	6,586	1,473	7,685	1,189				193	1,000		40
Carson	4,804	2,493	6,282	17,895	10,472	11,540	2,832	72	2,350	883	754	1,216
Collingsworth	5,322	11,245	10,034	9,982	2,074	1,659	592	732		145	1,191	
Dallam	2,767	6,125	15,150	18,881	2,094	1,745	115	1	48,801	7,915	7,814	962
Deaf Smith	22,568	26,717	16,379	59,656	20,403	6,331	742	118	1,019	4,629	17,680	102
Donley	7,827	4,656	1,521	7,681	873		121		145	1,055		
Gray	6,750	4,631	2,284	12,688	2,021	7,323	2,531	404	532	1,492	1,207	
Hansford	3,568	8,545	6,389	4,571	2,189	1,372	1,695	525	183	161	343	210
Hartley	7,180	4,199	5,274	7,551	2,416	4,608	4,639	1,950	722	455	1,023	204
Hemphill	2,511	1,249	1,119	2,074	782	2,988	275		401	64	1,122	
Hutchinson	574		389	496	617	526		458				132
Lipscomb	11,360	7,309	7,761	8,136	3,096	4,783	1,083	153		73	1,018	356
Moore	3,720	6,104	5,413	4,099	1,302	3,338	293	430		124	128	53
Ochiltree	3,795	3,868	5,938	9,706	6,377	1,396	1,779	3,640	34	20	50	1,295
Oldham	2,830	9,582	5,305	8,340	928	1,646			80	446	132	
Potter	2,100	475	816	1,413	2,496	1,613		96				36
Randall	25,057	6,479	3,727	21,185	25,396	1,292				2,388	4,638	
Roberts	4,167	2,155	1,403	1,336	144	1,142	584	466	44	101		
Sherman	14,385	22,542	13,201	23,063	10,796	5,828	4,656	2,008	520	1,017	1,405	815
Wheeler	5,331	7,817	6,278	13,546	1,865	981	412	265	63			
(As of February 2010)												

A policy research report presents the final results of a research project undertaken by AFPC faculty. At least a portion of the contents of this report may have been published previously as an AFPC issue paper or working paper. Since issue and working papers are preliminary reports, the final results contained in a research paper may differ - but, hopefully, in only marginal terms. Research reports are viewed by faculty of AFPC and the Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University. AFPC welcomes comments and discussions of these results and their implications. Address such comments to the author(s) at:

Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Department of Agricultural Economics
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843-2124

or call (979) 845-5913.

Copies of this publication have been deposited with the Texas State Library in compliance with the State Depository Law.

Mention of a trademark or a proprietary product does not constitute a guarantee or a warranty of the product by Texas AgriLife Research or Texas AgriLife Extension Service and does not imply its approval to the exclusion of other products that also may be suitable.

All programs and information of Texas AgriLife Research or Texas AgriLife Extension Service are available to everyone without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin.