

**Conservation Effects Assessment Project** 

#### August 2012

#### CONTENTS

#### 2 Study Methodology

#### **3** Study Findings

Voluntary, incentivesbased conservation approaches are achieving results

Opportunities exist to further reduce soil erosion and nutrient losses from cultivated cropland

Comprehensive conservation planning and implementation are essential

Targeting improves effectiveness and efficiency

#### 5 Conservation Practice Effects on Water Quality

Sediment loss

Nitrogen loss

Phosphorus loss

9 Regional Comparisons: Missouri, Upper Mississippi, and Ohio-Tennessee River Basins

To view or download a PDF version of the full report, visit the NRCS Web site,

http://www.nrcs.usda.gov, and follow links to Technical Resources / Natural Resources Assessment / CEAP

#### **Summary of Findings**

# Assessment of the Effects of Conservation Practices on Cultivated Cropland in the Upper Mississippi River Basin

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP) has undertaken a series of studies designed to quantify the effects of conservation practices on cultivated cropland in the conterminous 48 States. The first study in this series was on the Upper Mississippi River Basin (UMRB), the northernmost of the water resource regions that make up the Mississippi River drainage (fig. 1). USDA released a draft report on the UMRB in June 2010, then revised the draft and released the final report in August 2012 to reflect changes in modeling protocols and the inclusion of an additional subregion in the analysis.

The UMRB covers some 190,000 square miles—121.5 million acres—between Lake Itaska in northern Minnesota and the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. The basin includes large parts of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, and small areas in Indiana, Michigan, and South Dakota. Urban areas make up about 8 percent of the basin. The major metropolitan areas are Chicago, IL; Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN; St. Louis, MO; Des Moines, IA; and the Quad Cities area of Illinois and Iowa.

About half the area of the UMRB is in crops; in 2007, UMRB cropland accounted for 19 percent of all harvested cropland and 17 percent of crop sales in the United States. Most of the cropland is in corn (32 million acres) or soybeans (19 million acres); the region accounts for more than 40 percent of the national corn grain harvest and more than a third of the soybean harvest. Some 2.8 million acres of cropland in the UMRB have been enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and have been planted to introduced grasses or trees, or are in wildlife habitat. Livestock operations are a significant part of the local farm economy, accounting for 35 percent of U.S. hog and pig sales and 17 percent of dairy sales in 2007.

Figure 1. Location of and land cover in the Upper Mississippi River Basin



Summary of Findings Assessment of the Effects of Conservation Practices on Cultivated Cropland in the Upper Mississippi River Basin

## **Study Methodology**

The assessment uses a statistical sampling and modeling approach to estimate the effects of conservation practices. The National Resources Inventory (NRI), a statistical survey of conditions and trends in soil, water, and related resources on U.S. non-Federal land conducted by USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service, provides the statistical framework for the study. Physical process simulation models were used to estimate the effects of conservation practices that were in use during the period 2003 to 2006. Information on farming activities and conservation practices was obtained primarily from a farmer survey conducted as part of the study. The assessment includes not only practices associated with Federal conservation programs but also the conservation efforts of States, independent organizations, and individual landowners and farm operators. The analysis assumes that structural practices (such as buffers, terraces, and grassed waterways) reported in the farmer survey or obtained from other data sources were appropriately designed, installed, and maintained.



The national sample for the farmer survey consists of 18,700 sample points with 3,703 of these sample points located in the UMRB. This sample size is sufficient for reliable and defensible reporting at the regional scale and for large watersheds within the region, but is generally insufficient for assessments of smaller areas.

The modeling strategy for estimating the effects of conservation practices consists of two model scenarios that are produced for each sample point.

- A baseline scenario, the "baseline conservation condition" scenario, provides model simulations that account for cropping patterns, farming activities, and conservation practices as reported in the NRI-CEAP Cropland Survey (2003–06) and other sources.
- 2. An alternative scenario, the "no-practice" scenario, simulates model results as if no conservation practices were in use but holds all other model inputs and parameters the same as in the baseline conservation condition scenario.

The effects of conservation practices are obtained by taking the difference in model results between the two scenarios. The need for additional conservation treatment was evaluated using a common set of criteria and protocols applied to all regions in the country to provide a systematic, consistent, and comparable assessment at the national level.

## **Study Findings**

These findings represent the baseline conservation condition, using conservation practices reported in the 2003–06 NRI-CEAP Survey. *The most critical conservation concern in the region is the loss of nitrogen through leaching.* 

### Voluntary, Incentives-Based Conservation Approaches Are Achieving Results

Farmers have reduced sediment, nutrient, and pesticide losses from farm fields through conservation practice adoption throughout the UMRB, compared to losses that would be expected if no conservation practices were in use. Structural practices for controlling water erosion are in place on 45 percent of all cropped acres in the region. Ninety-one percent of the cropland acres meet criteria for no-till (28 percent) or mulch till (63 percent), and all but 5 percent have evidence of some kind of reduced tillage on at least one crop in the rotation. Ninety-six percent have structural or management practices, or both. Application of these practices has reduced sediment and nutrient losses from cultivated cropland (table 1).

 Table 1. Reductions in edge-of-field losses of sediment and nutrients from cultivated cropland through conservation treatment in

 2003–06, in percent, Upper Mississippi River Basin

Wind erosion	Sediment losses with runoff	Nitrogen losses						
		With runoff	Through leaching	Total phosphorus losses				
Percent reduction								
64	61	45	9	44				

#### Opportunities Exist to Further Reduce Soil Erosion and Nutrient Losses from Cultivated Cropland

The need for additional conservation treatment in the region was determined by imbalances between the level of conservation practice use and the level of inherent vulnerability. Areas of sloping soils are more vulnerable to surface runoff and consequently to loss of sediment and soluble nutrients with overland flow of water; areas of level, permeable soils are generally not vulnerable to sediment loss or nutrient loss through overland flow but are more prone to nitrogen losses through subsurface pathways. Three levels of treatment need were estimated:

- A high level of need for conservation treatment exists where the loss of sediment and/or nutrients is greatest and where additional conservation treatment can provide the greatest reduction in agricultural pollutant loadings. Some 9 million acres—15 percent of the cultivated cropland in the region—have a high level of need for additional conservation treatment.
- A moderate level of need for conservation treatment exists where the loss of sediment and/or nutrients is not as great and where additional conservation treatment has less potential for reducing agricultural pollutant loadings. Approximately 26 million acres—45 percent of the cultivated cropland in the region—have a moderate level of need for additional conservation treatment.
- A low level of need for conservation treatment exists where the existing level of conservation treatment is adequate compared to the level of inherent vulnerability. Additional conservation treatment on these acres would provide little additional reduction in sediment and/or nutrient loss. *Approximately 23 million acres*—40 percent of the cultivated cropland in the region—have a low level of need for additional conservation treatment.

The most critical conservation concern in the region is the loss of nitrogen through leaching. About 47 percent of cropped acres require additional nutrient management to address excessive levels of nitrogen loss in subsurface flow pathways, including tile drainage systems. Table 2 shows potential reductions in edge-of-field sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus losses. Potential reductions from existing levels could be achieved through implementation of suites of conservation practices on cropped acres having high or moderate levels of treatment need.

Table 2. Potential for further reductions in edge-of-field losses of sediment and nutrients from cultivated cropland through conservation treatment on high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland, in percent, Upper Mississippi River Basin

	Nitrogen	Total sharehows losses						
Sediment losses with runoli	With runoff	Through leaching	rotar phosphorus losses					
Percent reduction								
76	58	48	45					

#### Comprehensive Conservation Planning and Implementation Are Essential

Nutrient loss from fields is within acceptable limits when erosion-control practices are paired with management of rate, form, timing, and method of nutrient application that maximizes the availability of nutrients for crop growth while minimizing environmental losses. Treatment of erosion alone can exacerbate the nitrogen leaching problem by rerouting surface runoff to subsurface flow pathways. Soil erosion control practices are effective in reducing the loss of nitrogen in surface runoff, but for some acres the re-routing of surface water runoff to subsurface flow along with incomplete nutrient management results in a small net increase in total nitrogen loss from the field.

Complete and consistent nutrient management (proper rate, form, timing, *and* method of application) is generally lacking throughout the region; only about 13 percent of the cropped acres meet criteria for nitrogen *and* phosphorus application for all crops in all years of the rotation. Suites of practices that include both soil erosion control and nutrient management—appropriate rate, form, timing, *and* method of application—are required to simultaneously address soil erosion and nutrient losses by wind, in runoff, and through leaching.

#### Targeting Enhances Effectiveness and Efficiency

Conservation practices have the greatest effect on the more vulnerable acres, such as highly erodible land and soils prone to leaching. Targeted treatment of these vulnerable acres is the most efficient strategy for reducing sediment, nutrient, and pesticide loads to water bodies in the region. Use of additional conservation practices on acres that have a high need for additional treatment—acres most prone to runoff or leaching and with low levels of conservation practice use—can reduce most edge-of-field losses by about twice as much or more compared to treatment of acres with a moderate level of need. Even greater efficiencies can be achieved when comparing treatment of high- or moderate-treatment-need acres to low-treatment-need acres.

## **Conservation Practice Effects on Water Quality**

Reductions in field-level losses due to conservation practices, including land in long-term conserving cover, are expected to improve water quality in streams and rivers in the region. Figures 2, 3, and 4 summarize the extent to which conservation practices on cultivated cropland acres have reduced—and can potentially further reduce—sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus loads in the UMRB, on the basis of the model simulations. In each figure, the top map shows reductions in loadings to rivers and streams resulting from the use of conservation practices on cultivated cropland during the period 2003 to 2006, and potential for further reductions through use of additional conservation practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland. The bottom map shows reductions in loadings below the 2003–06 baseline through the application of additional practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation further reductions in loadings below the 2003–06 baseline through the application of additional practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation further reductions in loadings below the 2003–06 baseline through the application of additional practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation further reductions in loadings below the 2003–06 baseline through the application of additional practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation further reductions in loadings below the 2003–06 baseline through the application of additional practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation further reductions in loadings below the 2003–06 baseline through the application of additional practices on high- and moderate-treatment-need conservation.

On all three figures—

- "no-practice scenario" refers to conditions that would be expected if no conservation practices were in use;
- "baseline conservation condition" refers to estimates of conditions based on farming and conservation practices in use during the period 2003–06;
- "critical under-treated acres" refers to land with a high level of conservation treatment need, as defined on page 3;
- "all under-treated acres" refers to land with high and moderate levels of conservation treatment need, as defined on page 3; and
- "background" refers to expected levels of sediment and nutrient loadings if no acres were cultivated in the region. Estimates of background loadings simulate a grass and tree mix cover without any tillage or addition of nutrients or pesticides for all cultivated cropland acres in the watershed. Background loads also include loads from all other land uses—hayland, pastureland, rangeland, horticultural land, forest land, and urban land—as well as point sources.

The effects of practices in use during the period 2003 to 2006 are determined by contrasting loads for the baseline conservation condition to loads for the no-practice scenario. The effects of additional conservation treatment on loads are determined by contrasting the loads for the baseline condition to either loads for treatment of cropped acres with a *high* level of treatment need (9 million acres), or loads for treatment of cropped acres with a *high* or *moderate* level of treatment need (35 million acres).

#### **Tile Drainage**

In the UMRB, about 57 percent of the cropped acres have some portion of the field that is tile drained, according to the farmer survey. For these acres, about 82 percent of the subsurface flow in the baseline—as well as the soluble nutrients carried in the subsurface flow—was allocated by the physical process model (APEX) to tile drainage flow in this region. Tile drainage flow is included in the water loss category "subsurface water flows" in the UMRB study.

Although the CEAP-NRI Cropland Survey provided information on whether or not the field with the CEAP sample point had tile drainage, tile drainage flow and loss of soluble nutrients in tile drainage water were not reported separately because other important information on the tile drainage characteristics were not covered in the survey. The missing information includes—

- the depth and spacing of the tile drainage field,
- the extent of the tile drainage network,
- the proportion of the field, or other fields, that benefited from the tile drainage system, and
- the extent to which overland flow and subsurface flow from surrounding areas enters through tile surface inlets.

Without this additional information, it is not possible to accurately separate out the various components of subsurface flow when tile drainage systems are present.

### Sediment Loss

In figure 2, the top map shows that the use of conservation practices has reduced *sediment loads delivered from cropland to rivers and streams* in the region by 65 percent from conditions that would be expected without conservation practices. Application of additional conservation practices on the high- and moderate-treatment-need acres would further reduce nitrogen loads to rivers and streams by 74 percent below baseline levels.

The bottom map shows that the use of conservation practices on cropland has reduced *sediment loads delivered from all sources to the Lower Mississippi River* at Cairo, IL, by 14 percent from conditions that would be expected without conservation practices. Application of additional conservation practices on the high- and moderate-treatment-need acres would further reduce sediment loads to the Lower Mississippi River by 8 percent below baseline levels.

**Figure 2.** Summary of the effects of conservation practices on sediment loads delivered to rivers and streams in the UMRB (top) and to the outlet of the basin at Cairo, IL (bottom), and potential for further reductions with application of additional conservation treatment on high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland



### Nitrogen Loss

In figure 3, the top map shows that the use of conservation practices has reduced **total nitrogen loads delivered from cropland to rivers and streams** in the region by 26 percent from conditions that would be expected without conservation practices. Application of additional conservation practices on the high- and moderate-treatment-need acres would further reduce nitrogen loads to rivers and streams by 49 percent below baseline levels.

The bottom map shows that the use of conservation practices on cropland has reduced **total nitrogen loads delivered from all sources to the Lower Mississippi River** at Cairo, IL, by 19 percent from conditions that would be expected without conservation practices. Application of additional conservation practices on the high- and moderate-treatmentneed acres would further reduce nitrogen loads to the Mississippi River by 33 percent below baseline levels.

**Figure 3.** Summary of the effects of conservation practices on nitrogen loads delivered to rivers and streams in the UMRB (top) and to the outlet of the basin at Cairo, IL (bottom), and potential for further reductions with application of additional conservation treatment on high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland



### **Phosphorus Loss**

In figure 4, the top map shows that the use of conservation practices has reduced **total phosphorus loads delivered from cropland to rivers and streams** in the region by 41 percent from conditions that would be expected without conservation practices. Application of additional conservation practices on the high- and moderate-treatment-need acres would further reduce phosphorus loads to rivers and streams by 41 percent below baseline levels.

The bottom map shows that the use of conservation practices on cropland has reduced **total phosphorus loads delivered from all sources to the Mississippi River** by 26 percent from conditions that would be expected without conservation practices. Application of additional conservation practices on the high- and moderate-treatment-need acres would further reduce phosphorus loads to the Mississippi River by another 26 percent below baseline levels.

**Figure 3.** Summary of the effects of conservation practices on phosphorus loads delivered to rivers and streams in the UMRB (top) and to the outlet of the basin at Cairo, IL (bottom), and potential for further reductions with application of additional conservation treatment on high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland



## **Regional Comparisons:**

## Upper Mississippi, Ohio-Tennessee, and Missouri River Basins

The Upper Mississippi, Ohio-Tennessee, and Missouri River Basins make up the northern part of the vast Mississippi river drainage area. Vulnerability factors are generally similar among the three basins, except that average annual precipitation in the Upper Mississippi basin is 11 inches per year more than in the Missouri basin but 8 inches per year less than in the Ohio-Tennessee basin.

Table 3 compares several factors across the three regions. The major difference in findings among the three regions is that the most widespread agricultural conservation concern is the loss of nitrogen through leaching in the Upper Mississippi, the loss of soluble phosphorus in surface runoff in the Ohio-Tennessee, and control of wind erosion in the Missouri.

Conservation practice use is extensive in all three basins. Structural or management practices for erosion control are in use on 96 percent of cropped acres in the Upper Mississippi basin, a slightly lower percentage than in the other two basins. Nutrient management practices are more prevalent in the Missouri basin than in either the Upper Mississippi or Ohio-Tennessee basins; barely 40 percent of the cropped acres in the UMRB meet criteria for high or moderately high nitrogen or phosphorus management.

Farmers' use of structural and tillage practices has reduced sediment and nutrient losses in all three regions. Few farmers, however, are using complete and consistent nutrient application *rate, form, timing,* and *method* on all crops in all years, although many farmers are successfully meeting one or more of these criteria on some crops in the rotation.

The UMRB has a smaller percentage of high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland than does the Ohio-Tennessee River Basin and a larger percentage than does the Missouri River Basin (60 percent in the Upper Mississippi, 70 percent in the Ohio-Tennessee, 18 percent in the Missouri). The UMRB, however, has twice as many acres or more needing treatment than do the other two regions (35 million acres in the Upper Mississippi, 17<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> million acres in the Ohio-Tennessee, 15 million acres in the Missouri). See figure 5.



*Figure 5.* Percentage (left) and acreage (right) of high- and moderate-treatment-need cropland in the Upper Mississippi River Basin (UMRB), Ohio-Tennessee River Basin (OH-TN), and Missouri River Basin (MO)

Total acres (million acres excluding water)River BainRiver Bai	Table 3. Comparison of conservation factors in the opper Mississi	ppi, Onio-Tennessee	, and wissourt kive	r basins	
Factor         River Basin*         River Basin         River Basin         River Basin           Total arces (million acres) Percent (ubixeted cropalm (inclus) Percent (ubixeted cropalm (inclus) Percent (ubixeted cropalm (inclus) S3         128.5         322.1         30           Vulnerability Factors         34         42         23         48         9         3           Vulnerability Factors         34         42         23         48         9         3           Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres) Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)         1         0         28         9         3           Prone to leaching (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12         10         8         11           Prone to unid erosion (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12         10         8         11           Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)         11         0         28         11         28         12           Prone to wind erosion (tons/acre)         11         0         8         11         22         59         43         63         63           Structural practice (se cropped acres)         5         4         12         22         5         4         12           Sediment		Upper Mississippi	Ohio Tennessee	Missouri	
Basin OverviewUAcres of cultivated cropland (million acres)118.2128.5322.2Acres of cultivated cropland (million acres)62.926.895.1Percent urban land (excluding water)893Vulnerability Factors893Average annual precipitation (inches)444223Stopes >2% (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)13912Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water erosion control:919393Prone to leacing (% of cropped acres)13912Prone to leacing (% of cropped acres)144265Prone to leacing (% of cropped acres)919393Prone to leacing (% of cropped acres)144265Percent of all cropped acres25412Percent of all cropped acres160.312High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)160.3Wateborne eadiment (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Wind borne phorus (bounds/acre)2.74.50.7Wateborne eadiment (tons/acre)2.74.50.7Wateborne entrogen (subsurface) (bounds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne phorus (bounds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (	Factor	River Basin*	River Basin	River Basin	
Total acres (million acres excluding water)118.2128.5322.2Acres of cultivated cropiand (excluding water)532130Percent urban land (excluding water)532130Vulnerability Factors344223Average annual precipitation (inches)344223Stopes >2% (% of cropped acres)182740Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)10811Onservation Practice USe (2003 06)919393Structural practices (% cropped acres)919393Frenet of all cropped acres)919393Frenet of all cropped acres)919393High or moderately high phrogen management (% cropped acres)144265High or moderately high phrogen management (% cropped acres)5412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind borne nitrogen (gounds/acre)0.30.01.0Wind borne nitrogen (gounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind borne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind borne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind borne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind borne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)556338	Basin Overview				
Access of cultivated cropiand (million acces)         62:9         26:8         95:1           Percent urban land (excluding water)         8         9         3           Vulnerability Factors         34         42         33         48           Highly ordbile cropland (% of cropped acres)         1         0         28           Prone to uniface water runoff (% of cropped acres)         1         0         28           Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12           Prone to leaching (% of cropped acres)         10         8         11           Conservation (% of cropped acres)         91         93         93           Structural practices for water crosion control:         45         40         41           Percent of all cropped acres         91         93         93           Structural practices for water crosion control:         45         40         41           Pactoret uniface water runoff (% of cropped acres)         96         98         38           High or moderately high honghorus management (% cropped acres)         93         5         4         12           Wind crosion (tons/acre)         0.23         0.02         1.13         0         2           Wind crosio	Total acres (million acres excluding water)	118.2	128.5	322.2	
Percent cultivated cropland (excluding water)532130Vunerability Factors344223Average annual precipitation (inches)344223Slopes 226 (k of cropped acres)142348Highly erotilities contain (k of cropped acres)182740Prone to wind erosion (k of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (k of cropped acres)10811Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)919393Milch till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices (for water crosion control:259494Percent of all cropped acres)919393High or moderately high hiposphorus management (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)144265High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)102.30.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.33Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.40.01.02.5Wind erosion (% reduction)2.74.50.72.5Wind erosion (% cropped acres)10.40.01.02.7High or moderately high inforce (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Wind erosion (ms/acre)0.40.01.02.53Wind erosion (% reduction)2.74.50.72.5Wind erosion (% reduction)55	Acres of cultivated cropland (million acres)	62.9	26.8	95.1	
Percent urban land (excluding water)893Vulnerability Factors Average annual precipitation (inches)344223Sloges 2-K (6 of copped acres)423348Highly erodible cropland (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)13912Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)10811Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)919393Mult till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water crossion control: Percent of all cropped acres)969838High or moderately high horgen management (% cropped acres)369836High or moderately high horgen management (% cropped acres)344225Waterborne sediment (tons/acre)0.230.0221.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.10.230.0221.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.40.01.02.7Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind brone nitrogen (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)556358Wind brone nitrogen (pounds/acre)1145Wind brone nitrogen (pounds/acre)15241Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)15241Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)556358	Percent cultivated cropland (excluding water)	53	21	30	
Vulnerability FactorsCCCVulnerability Factors344223Stopes 22% (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to surface water (% (% of cropped acres))1028Prone to surface water (% (% of cropped acres))10811Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)919393Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Precent of all cropped acres)969898Precent of all cropped acres)969898High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)544363Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.31.60.33Windborne Introgen (surface) (pounds/acre)18.71.9.26.9Wind borne Introgen (surface) (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Wind erosion (% reduction)91935563Sediment (% reduction)931.44265Wind borne Introgen (surface) (% cropped acres)0.40.01.0Vindoborne Introgen (surface) (% cropped acres)1.42.76.9Wind borne Introgen (surface) (% cropped acres)1.40.31.3Wi	Percent urban land (excluding water)	8	9	3	
Vulnerability Factors Average annual precipition (inches) Stopes 23:K % of cropped acres)344223Stopes 23:K % of cropped acres)182740Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)182740Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)13912Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)10811Conservation Practice Use (2003 06) Much till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water erosion control:919393Precent of HEL cropland Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)454041Precent of HEL cropland resonation (tons/acre)725949High or moderately high high phonors management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high phonors management (% cropped acres)5412Sediment fuctors (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)0.31.122.6Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)2.10.21.0Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reduction (% feduction)453555Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% crouped acres)374746Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)45355Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% crouped acres)556338Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% creduction)5		Ũ	5	0	
Average annual precipitation (inches)344223Slopes 2% (% of cropped acres)423348Highly erolible cropland (% of cropped acres)1028Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)11028Prone to surface water (moff (% of cropped acres))11028Prone to surface water (moff (% of cropped acres))10811Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)919393Structural practices for water erosion control:919393Percent of all cropped acres454041Percent of HEL cropland725949Reduced tillage or structural practices (% tropped acres)969898High or moderately high nosphorus management (% cropped acres)414263Unid erosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Waterborne nitrogen (suburface) (pounds/acre)0.230.021.13Waterborne nitrogen (suburface) (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Waterborne nitrogen (suburface) (% reduction)423359Onservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Windborne nitrogen (suburface) (% reduction)423359Ocservation resolution (% of cropped acres)1.134546Windborne nitrogen (suburface) (% reduction)423359Ocservation	Vulnerability Factors				
Arcenge animal procession         3-5         4-2         3-3         4-8           Highly erodible crophator (% of cropped acres)         18         27         40           Prone to virtace water runoff (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12           Prone to virtace water runoff (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12           Prone to leaching (% of cropped acres)         10         8         11           Onservation Practice Use (2003 06)         91         93         93           Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)         91         93         93           Structural practices for water erosion control:         91         93         93           Precent of HEL crophand         72         59         49           Reducet Hilgs or structural practices (% cropped acres)         41         42         65           High or moderately high hosphorus management (% cropped acres)         5         4         12           Sediment fueroge (structural practices (or copped acres)         5         4         12           Sediment (for considerate) high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)         5         4         12           Sediment (for considerate) high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)         5         4         12 <t< th=""><th>Average annual precipitation (inches)</th><th>21</th><th>12</th><th>22</th></t<>	Average annual precipitation (inches)	21	12	22	
adupt 3/26 (xs) 01 (Upped alces)         42         33         43           Highly crodible crophad (% of cropped acres)         1         0         28           Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12           Prone to surface water runnel (% of cropped acres)         10         8         11           Conservation Practice Ue (2003 06)         91         93         93           Structural practices for water crosion control:         96         98         98           Precent of all cropped acres)         96         98         98           High or moderately high introgen management (% cropped acres)         96         98         98           High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)         54         43         63           Wind erosion (tons/acre)         0.23         0.02         1.13           Wind erosion (tons/acre)         0.4         0.0         10           Wind brome nitrogen (nounds/acre)         0.4         0.0         10           Wind brome nitrogen (nounds/acre)         0.4         0.0         10           Wind brome nitrogen (nounds/acre)         0.4         0.0         10           Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)         0.4         0.7	Slopes $>2\%$ /% of cropped acres	12	42	23	
Initial vertouble Cropped actes)         1a         2         4 ad           Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)         1         0         28           Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)         13         9         12           Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)         10         8         11           Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)         91         93         93           Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)         91         93         93           Structural practices for water erosion control:         91         93         93           Percent of HEL cropland         72         59         49           Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)         41         42         65           High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)         5         4         43         63           Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)         0.9         1.6         0.3         11           Waterborne nitrogen (punds/acre)         2.1         0.2         5.8         4         12           Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)         0.3         10         2.7         4.5         0.7           Wind brone nitrogen (punds/acre)	Slopes >2% (% of cropped acres)	42	22	40	
Prone to Wind Proson (% of cropped acres)102.8Prone to surface water unof (% of cropped acres)10811Onservation Practice Use (2003 06)919393Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Precent of all cropped acres)454041Percent of all cropped acres)969898High or moderately high introgen management (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high introgen management (% cropped acres)544363Unid erosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.40.010Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.40.010Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.40.010Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Wind brome nitrogen (subsurface) (for eduction)91.145Wind brome nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91.145Wind bre	Rightly erouble cropianu (% of cropped acres)	10	27	40	
Prone to Surface Water fundor (% of cropped acres)13912Prone to leaching (% of cropped acres)10811Ocnservation Practice Use (2003 06)919393Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water erosion control:725949Percent of HEL cropland725949Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)130.0021.13Wind crosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Vind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Vind borne phosphorus (pounds/acre)2.74.513Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)374746Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)453558Waterborne nitrogen (suburds) (% reduction)91445Sediment (% reduction)9134545Sediment (% reduction)913 <td< th=""><th>Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)</th><th>1</th><th>0</th><th>28</th></td<>	Prone to wind erosion (% of cropped acres)	1	0	28	
Prone to leaching (% of cropped acres)10811Conservation Practice Use (2003 06) Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water erosion control: Percent of all cropped acres454041Percent of all cropped acres454041Percent of HL cropped acres969898High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)544363Sediment and nutrient tosses, baseline** (average annual) Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Windborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)646058Sediment (% reduction)453558Sediment (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (upounds/acre)423359Onservation treaden (with moderate need (% of cropped acres))15241Conservation treaden end or more resource concerns: Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)15263High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)15241Conservation treadment need (% of cro	Prone to surface water runoff (% of cropped acres)	13	9	12	
Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water erosion control:919393Percent of all cropped acres454041Percent of HEL cropland725949Reduced Higge or structural practices (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)544363Wind erosion (cons/acre)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (cons/acre)0.91.60.3Wind erosion (cons/acre)0.40.01.0Windbrome phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Sediment (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)374746Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)355858Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)15241Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)	Prone to leaching (% of cropped acres)	10	8	11	
Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)Mulch ill or no till (% cropped acres)919393Structural practices for water erosion control:919393Percent of all cropped acres)969898High or moderately high infragen management (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high infragen management (% cropped acres)914265High or moderately high infragen management (% cropped acres)544363Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)5412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind crosin (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Wind borne introgen (upconds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)0.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.73.558Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)2.74.50.7Windborne nitrogen (upconds/acre)3.74.74.6<					
Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)91939393Structural practices for water erosion control:Percent of All cropped acres454041Percent of HEL cropland725949Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)5412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Wind borne nitrogen (pounds/acre)646058Sediment (% reduction)556358Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)374746Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Wat	Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)				
Structural practices for water erosion control:Percent of All cropped acres454041Percent of HEL cropland725949Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high hosphorus management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)544363Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)544363Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)646058Sediment (% reduction)64535558Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)453558Sediment (% reduction)9114559Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Onservation treatment needsTreatment need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)15241 <td c<="" th=""><th>Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)</th><th>91</th><th>93</th><th>93</th></td>	<th>Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)</th> <th>91</th> <th>93</th> <th>93</th>	Mulch till or no till (% cropped acres)	91	93	93
Percent of all cropped acres445400411Percent of HEL cropped acres725949Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high hosphorus management (% cropped acres)54433633Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)55412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.30.160.3Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (subarface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Wind borne nitrogen (subarface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)556358Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)374746Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Sediment less to surface) (% reduction)91145Wind erosion (% reduction)91145Wind erosion (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359	Structural practices for water erosion control:				
Percent of HEL cropland725949Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)914265Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)544363Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosin (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Wind erosin (tons/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Wind borne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Wind borne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)556358Wind brone nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Wind brone nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Wind brone nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment need (% of cropped acres)15241Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)453558Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)15241Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need (% of cropped acres)15241 <td< th=""><th>Percent of all cropped acres</th><th>45</th><th>40</th><th>41</th></td<>	Percent of all cropped acres	45	40	41	
Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)969898High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high hosphorus management (% cropped acres)544363Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)55412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus losufface) (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)646058Sediment (% reduction)556358Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)453558Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs54617Treatment need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss vi	Percent of HEL cropland	72	59	49	
High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)414265High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)544363Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)544363Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind crosin (ton/s/acre)0.91.60.3Wind point (ton/s/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Wind point (sold core)18.719.26.9Wind borne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Wind dorne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)646058Wind dorne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)64535563Sediment (% reduction)9114545Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Conservation treatement needs152411Treatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)102533Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface resoion (% of cropped acres)24 <td< th=""><th>Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)</th><th>96</th><th>98</th><th>98</th></td<>	Reduced tillage or structural practices (% cropped acres)	96	98	98	
High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres)544363Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)5412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)8.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reduction)8646058Sediment (k' reduction)646058Wind borne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment need(% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with high need(% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with subrace Nows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with subrace Nows (% of cropped acres)22631Phosphorus lost (% of cropped acres)2263	High or moderately high nitrogen management (% cropped acres)	41	42	65	
Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)5412Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual) Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Wind borne nitrogen (pounds/acre)0.91.60.3Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Wind borne nitrogen (sufface) (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Wind borne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs70181412Mindborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)453558Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface	High or moderately high phosphorus management (% cropped acres	54	43	63	
Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)0.230.021.13Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)646058Wind erosion (% reduction)615273Wind borne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Wind borne nitrogen (pounds/acre)91145Wind borne nitrogen (pounds/acre)556358Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)91145Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)91145Windborne nitrogen (sufface) (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface mater (% of cropped acres)2263<	Land in long term conserving cover (% of cropped acres)	5	4	12	
Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)Wind crosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Waterborne sediment (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (suface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Windborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)91145Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)556358Orservation treatment needs114517Conservation treatment need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Mid erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Mitrogen loss (% of cr		-	·		
Wind erosion (tons/acre)0.230.021.13Waterborne sediment (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)4533558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)10253High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Phosphorus lo	Sediment and nutrient losses, baseline** (average annual)				
Waterborne sediment (tons/acre)0.91.60.3Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Windborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need for one or more resource concerns:15241Cropland with migh need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface lows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface lows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631 <th>Wind erosion (tons/acre)</th> <th>0.23</th> <th>0.02</th> <th>1.13</th>	Wind erosion (tons/acre)	0.23	0.02	1.13	
Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)0.31.00.3Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)2.10.25.8Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)8.813.22.6Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Wind borne nitrogen (pounds/acre)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)374746Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)22631Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)22 </th <th>Waterborne sediment (tons/acre)</th> <th>0.9</th> <th>1.6</th> <th>0.3</th>	Waterborne sediment (tons/acre)	0.9	1.6	0.3	
Windborne mitrogen (surface) (pounds/acre)2.10.22.6Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)Wind erosion (% reduction)615273Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre)374746Waterborne nitrogen (sufface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusVind erosion	Windhorne nitrogen (nounds/acre)	2.1	0.2	5.8	
Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)0.013.22.0Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)18.719.26.9Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Wind erosion (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need for one or more resource concerns:15241Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss uto surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Wind erosion loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Most extensive need:Subsurface </th <th>Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (nounds/acre)</th> <th>2.1</th> <th>13.2</th> <th>2.6</th>	Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (nounds/acre)	2.1	13.2	2.6	
Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)13.20.3Windborne phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)646058Wind erosion (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need (% of cropped acres)15241Ligh or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)22631Mind erosion (% of cropped acres)242941Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosionMost extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusVind erosion	Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)	10.7	10.2	2.0	
Windborne phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)0.40.01.0Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06) Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Treatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Waterborne introgen (subsurface) (pounds/acre)	10.7	19.2	0.9	
Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)2.74.50.7Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06) Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needs15241Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Windborne phosphorus (pounds/acre)	0.4	0.0	1.0	
Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Practice Use (2003 06)Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres) High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Phosphorus lost to surface water (pounds/acre)	2.7	4.5	0.7	
Lage of Field Reductions of Conservation Practice Ose (2005 Od)Wind erosion (% reduction)646058Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)15241High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Edge of Field Reductions Due to Conservation Drastice Lice (2002.06)				
Wind Posion (% reduction)646053Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)10253Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Edge of Field Reductions Due to conservation Practice Use (2003-06)	C 4	<u> </u>	50	
Sediment (% reduction)615273Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (sufface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Conservation treatment need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosionMost extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion		64	60	58	
Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre374746Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Corpland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosionMost extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Sediment (% reduction)	61	52	/3	
Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)453558Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)556358Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosionMost extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Windborne nitrogen (pounds/acre	37	47	46	
Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)91145Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:Subsurface Phosphorus lossWind erosion (% of cropped acres)22631	Waterborne nitrogen (surface) (% reduction)	45	35	58	
Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)556358Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:Subsurface PhosphorusWind erosion with erosioncontrol	Waterborne nitrogen (subsurface) (% reduction)	9	11	45	
Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)423359 <b>Conservation treatment needs</b> Treatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)154617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:Subsurface phosphorus lossWind erosion controlcontrol	Windborne phosphorus (% reduction)	55	63	58	
Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns: Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:Subsurface Phosphorus lossWind erosion controlSubsurface phosphorusWind erosion	Phosphorus lost to surface water (% reduction)	42	33	59	
Conservation treatment needsTreatment need for one or more resource concerns:Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern:0012Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion					
Treatment need for one or more resource concerns:Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern:0012Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Conservation treatment needs				
Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)15241Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern:0012Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Treatment need for one or more resource concerns:				
Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)454617High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern:0012Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Cropland with high need (% of cropped acres)	15	24	1	
High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)607018High or moderate need by resource concern: Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Cropland with moderate need (% of cropped acres)	45	46	17	
High or moderate need by resource concern:Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	High or moderate need (% of cropped acres)	60	70	18	
Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)0012Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	High or moderate need by resource concern:				
Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)10253Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:SubsurfacePhosphorusWind erosion	Wind erosion (% of cropped acres)	0	0	12	
Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)24294Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:Subsurface pitrogen lossPhosphorus lossWind erosion control	Sediment loss due to water erosion (% of cropped acres)	10	25	3	
Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)47172Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)22631Most extensive need:Subsurface pitrogen lossPhosphorus controlWind erosion control	Nitrogen loss with surface water (% of cropped acres)	24	29	4	
Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)     22     63     1       Most extensive need:     Subsurface     Phosphorus     Wind erosion	Nitrogen loss in subsurface flows (% of cropped acres)	47	17	2	
Most extensive need: Subsurface Phosphorus Wind erosion pitrogen loss control	Phosphorus loss (% of cropped acres)	22	63	- 1	
Most extensive need: Subsurface Phosphorus Wind erosion			00	-	
pitrogen loss loss control	Most extensive need:	Subsurface	Phosphorus	Wind erosion	
		nitrogen loss	loss	control	

Table 3. Comparison of conservation factors in the Upper Mississippi, Ohio-Tennessee, and Missouri River Basins

\*Findings from the UMRB study were revised in December 2010 (revision completed July 2012).

\*\* "Baseline" refers to estimates of conditions based on farming and conservation practices in use during the period 2003–06.

**River Basin Cropland Modeling Study Reports** The U.S. Department of Agriculture initiated the Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP) in 2003 to determine the effects and effectiveness of soil and water conservation practices on agricultural lands. The CEAP report Assessment of the Effects of Conservation Practices on Cultivated Cropland in the Upper Mississippi River Basin is one in a series of studies covering the major river basins and water resource regions of the conterminous 48 United States. It was designed to quantify the effects of conservation practices commonly used on cultivated cropland in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, evaluate the need for additional conservation treatment in the region, and estimate the potential gains that could be attained with additional conservation treatment. This series is a cooperative effort among USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service and Agricultural Research Service, Texas AgriLife Research of Texas A&M University, and the University of Massachusetts.

Upper Mississippi River Basin (draft released June 2010, revision released August 2012)) Chesapeake Bay Region (released March 2011) Great Lakes Region (released September 2011) Ohio-Tennessee River Basin (released February 2012) Missouri River Basin (released August 2012) Arkansas-White-Red River Basin Lower Mississippi River Basin Northeast Region, including the Delaware River Watershed South Atlantic-Gulf Region Texas Gulf Water Resource Region Souris-Red-Rainy Water Resource Regions Pacific Northwest and Western Water Resource Regions



The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity employer.