Conservation: A Path to Community Sustainability

Sustainability: Traditional Approach
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Viable Sustainability
$75.5 million of Federal & State conservation funding, FY 2008

- CRP: 47%
- Admin: 25%
- EQIP: 18%
- WRP: 2%
- Water: 2%
- LLCSP: 1%
- WHIP: 0%
- Other Payments: 1%
- CSP: 4%
Regions of Analysis

Top Funded Practices by Region

Irrigation, Sprinkler
Brush Management
No Till Residue Mgt

Irrigation, Microirrigation
Pasture & Hay Planting
Irrigation, Sprinkler

Brush Management
Waste Storage
Pest Management

Brush Management Pond
Restoration of Declining Habitat
Multipliers

- Estimates the additional economic activity generated in a community due to the expenditure of conservation dollars
- For every $1 spent locally, how many additional dollars of final demand will be generated?
- A multiplier of 1.5 says that $1 spent will create an additional $0.50 of economic activity
- 2 factors affect the size of a multiplier:
  - Size of the region
  - The industry under analysis

Examples of Multiplier Values
Results, Project-based Expenditures

Results, Direct Payment Expenditures
Overall Impact: $117.4 million
Two Applications

1. Advocacy

2. Strategic Prioritization of Practices
Strategic Prioritization of Practices

- Range Planting & Prescribed Grazing vs Pasture & Hay Planting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Range Planting/Prescribed Grazing</th>
<th>Pasture &amp; Hay Planting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2.1785</td>
<td>1.7230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>1.9132</td>
<td>1.6226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2.1604</td>
<td>1.7138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1.9963</td>
<td>1.5922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Choice of Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>FY 2008 Expenditures on Pasture &amp; Hay Planting</th>
<th>Range Planting/Prescribed Grazing</th>
<th>Pasture &amp; Hay Planting</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>$282,425</td>
<td>$615,264</td>
<td>$486,619</td>
<td>$128,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>$315,301</td>
<td>$603,235</td>
<td>$511,608</td>
<td>$91,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>$880,989</td>
<td>$1,903,288</td>
<td>$1,509,838</td>
<td>$393,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>$234,483</td>
<td>$468,099</td>
<td>$373,344</td>
<td>$94,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Conservation alone will not “save” rural communities

2. New funding opportunities