

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359895656>

# The agricultural conservation planning framework financial and nutrient reduction tool (ACPF FiNRT): A planning tool for cost effective conservation

Article in *Journal of Environmental Quality* · April 2022

DOI: 10.1002/jeq2.20345

CITATIONS

0

READS

6

4 authors, including:



John C. Tyndall

Iowa State University

87 PUBLICATIONS 1,694 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



What would farmers do? Adaptation intentions under a Corn Belt climate change scenario [View project](#)



Social and Economic Factors of Conservation in Residential Areas [View project](#)

**Title:** The Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework Financial and Nutrient Reduction Tool (ACPF FiNRT): A planning tool for cost effective conservation.

<sup>1</sup>Emma E. Bravard, <sup>1</sup>Emily K. Zimmerman, <sup>1</sup>John C. Tyndall, <sup>2</sup>David E. James

#### Author Affiliations

<sup>1</sup>Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 50011

<sup>2</sup>USDA/ARS National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment (retired), Ames, Iowa, 50011

#### Abstract

We have developed an add-on tool for use with the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework (ACPF) that features multi-state financial analysis and field-scale nitrogen reduction tool for use when analyzing different ACPF conservation scenarios. Financial and expected field-scale nitrogen loss data are used to calculate total long-term cost and cost effectiveness of various conservation plans. Unique to the ACPF Financial and Nutrient Reduction Tool (FiNRT) is the ability to identify individual treatment areas for each practice evaluated, allowing users to create combinatorial conservation planning scenarios drawing from multiple ACPF-identified conservation practices. Financial data accounts for direct long-term annualized costs for BMP installation and management in Iowa and Minnesota. Opportunity costs of BMPs that retire cropland are spatially determined according to weighted-average crop productivity indices and land rent relationships. The tool quantifies the nitrogen requirements for each field, based on 6-year land-use data, and evaluates

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/jeq2.20345](#).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

the proportion of nitrogen likely to be lost from the field as nitrate load via leaching. Financial analyses that can be accomplished by using the ACPF are illustrated in case study watershed scenarios in Iowa and Minnesota. In Iowa, featured scenarios range from 26% - 31% reduction in total nitrate for a total cost between \$0.580 million - \$2.3 million per year, respectively. In Minnesota, example scenarios range from 28% - 51% total nitrate reduction for total costs of \$1.7 million - \$2.1 million per year, respectively. Tradeoffs in BMP selection related to nitrogen reduction outcome and cost are also demonstrated.

### Abbreviations

ACPF, Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework

ACPF, FiNRT Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework Financial and Nutrient Reduction Tool

BMP, best management practice

CPI, Crop Productivity Index

DEM, digital elevation model

FGDB, file geodatabase

HUC 12, 12-digit scale hydrologic unit

IA NRS, Iowa Nutrient Reduction Strategy

MLRA, Major Land Resource Area

MRTN, maximum return to nitrogen

USD, United States dollar

US EPA, United States Environmental Protection Agency

## Introduction

Water quality efforts in the United States have been hindered by inadequacies in Best Management Practice (BMP) implementation and coordination at watershed scales, resulting in a lack of spatially effective placement of BMPs to efficiently reduce nutrient and sediment loss (Tomer et al., 2011; Moiaisi et al., 2020). Efficiently and effectively guiding the implementation of proven BMPs at watershed scales is one of the primary challenges for state-level nutrient reduction strategies (Christianson et al., 2018). In the US Cornbelt region a precision conservation planning tool called the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework (ACPF) has emerged as a key tool available for conservation partners to guide biophysically efficient conservation opportunities at watershed scales (Lewandowski et al., 2020).

The ACPF is first and foremost a heuristic framework based on conservation principles and practices that aim to improve soil and water quality in ways that in the aggregate improve overall watershed health (Tomer et al., 2013). As per Tomer et al. (2013, 2015), water quality improvement is a multiscale synergistic process. The concept begins at field scales where the primary tenants of soil management involve practices that minimize erosion, build soil organic matter and carbon, and limit loss of excess nutrients. Controlling water at field scales involves managing drainage, protecting areas of concentrated overland flow within fields, and intercepting sheet flow with enhanced zones of infiltration and soil water storage. Beyond field scales, watershed connectivity is enhanced downstream via different modes of capturing subsurface drainage using impoundments, drainage water redirection, and managing variable source areas. Finally, riparian management recognizes the

role of riparian vegetation in mediating the health of the overall hydrologic system. This framework is not prescriptive, but rather allows for the biophysical identification of field-level opportunities to site suitable and effective conservation practices within small watersheds (Zimmerman et al., 2019).

The ACPF Financial and Nutrient Reduction Tool extends the results of ACPF conservation practice results to identify, analyze, and map different watershed scale scenarios of BMP opportunities, and estimates nutrient reduction outcomes and financial costs associated with conservation scenarios. Financial data are pragmatically essential for conservation planning at all scales and are relevant to all planning partners and landowners alike (Tyndall & Roesch, 2014). Landowners and farmers need field-level cost data for planning capital expenditures relative to their individual farm-level conservation plans, and for weighing the potential use of conservation funding (Tyndall et al., 2013). Watershed-level organizations, as well as state and federal agencies, require an understanding of the aggregate, long-term cost of conservation opportunities at watershed scales to efficiently allocate limited technical and financial resources, and create innovative conservation finance tools (Bose et al., 2019). Directly incorporating field-level BMP cost data into watershed scale spatially targeted conservation analysis will create a more robust and actionable perspective on the conservation planning process (Srinivas et al., 2020).

This case study addresses the opportunity to include costs and expected outcomes by demonstrating an innovative GIS-based dataset and two ACPF add-on toolboxes that integrate financial BMP cost data and nitrate reduction data into the ACPF. These toolboxes, collectively called the ACPF Financial and Nutrient Reduction Tool (ACPF FiNRT; “fine art”), allow conservation planners to estimate the total costs of various conservation scenarios involving HUC12 watersheds in Iowa and Minnesota and to analyze field to watershed scale cost effectiveness. This tool, coupled with the

ACPF, can provide conservation planners and landowners with increased information, and empower more certain decision making.

## Materials and Methods

To operationalize the conceptual framework, the ACPF has a geodatabase component, which includes field boundaries derived from the USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) and updated manually, land-use data from the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) Cropland Data Layer (CDL), gSSURGO soils data, and watershed boundary data from the USGS (Tomer et al., 2017). These datasets are made available at the hydrologic unit code (HUC) 12 watershed scale. The ACPF data archive site currently holds data for almost 12,000 HUC 12 watersheds throughout 10 states within the Upper and Lower Mississippi River basins (ISU GIS Facility, 2020). A layer that is not included in the database is a LiDAR-derived digital elevation model (DEM) that must be generated by the user (Porter et al., 2018). LiDAR data are often 1-3-m in resolution; presently, Iowa has 2-m LiDAR available, and Minnesota has 1-m and 3-m LiDAR available. The ACPF Toolbox is used to perform hydro-conditioning, terrain processing, and hydro-enforcement of elevation data to accurately represent hydrologic flow routing (Porter et al., 2018). Secondly, the ACPF Toolbox is used to delineate the perennial stream network and catchments (Porter et al., 2018). The ACPF Toolbox then aids the user in the distillation of this complex geospatial data to characterize field runoff risk subsurface drainage potential, and riparian areas to identify riparian area functions by perennial stream reach (Tomer et al., 2013). Taken cumulatively, this information allows the user to site suitable BMPs in high-risk areas to reduce watershed nutrient and sediment loss (Porter et al., 2018). The ACPF currently sites nine BMPs, including bioreactors, contour buffer strips, drainage water management, farm ponds, grassed waterways, nutrient removal wetlands, riparian buffers, saturated buffers, and water and sediment control basins. Altogether, this framework, data, and the ArcGIS toolbox make it possible for conservation planners to spatially identify opportunities for

discrete conservation practices within watersheds (Tomer et al., 2015). Input data for use in the ACPF ArcGIS Toolbox can be found and downloaded at <https://acpf4watersheds.org/>. To add analytical value to the ACPF, we introduce two ACPF add-on tools that allow users to estimate nutrient reduction outcomes and financial costs associated with conservation scenarios.

#### Nitrate Leaching Potential and Reduction from BMPs Dataset

To account for nitrate leaching potential, the ACPF FiNRT estimates nitrogen fertilizer application and nitrate-N yield for each field using the *Estimate Field Nitrogen Requirements & N Load* Tool. By default, this tool uses input data from Maximum Return to Nitrogen (MRTN) calculations (Sawyer, 2006; <http://cnrc.agron.iastate.edu/>); however, the user can modify the crop-specific nitrogen fertilizer rates to suit their needs and/or incorporate locally relevant data. The default MRTN input data are based on calculating the return to nitrogen application and finding the maximum return to nitrogen (MRTN) at selected prices of nitrogen and corn directly from recent research data from across the US Cornbelt region (Sawyer, 2006). For each field in agricultural production, nitrogen application is estimated annually for the 6-year crop rotation based on the default MRTN data or user-chosen rates. To assess nitrate leaching potential, we used data from the Iowa Nutrient Reduction Strategy (2017), which combined estimates of surface and subsurface water yield with nitrate-N concentration estimates at the MLRA-level.

To estimate nitrate reduction from potential BMP implementation, the ACPF FiNRT uses data aggregated in state-level nutrient reduction strategies to determine average and standard deviations for nitrate reduction efficiencies by BMP (MNNRS, 2014; IANRS, 2017; Lawrence and Benning, 2019). Using the mean percent nitrate reduction efficiencies from nutrient reduction strategies allows for N load, N-load reduction potential from BMPs, and cost per kilogram of N reduced per BMP to be estimated in the ACPF FiNRT; see supplemental data (S1).

## **Integrating Financial Data into Conservation Scenario Analysis Using the ACPF FiNRT**

Prior to using the ACPF FiNRT, the user must run the ACPF toolbox to produce the suite of potential BMPs that are available for the watershed of interest. GIS layers for individual or combinations of the BMPs can be used as inputs to the ACPF FiNRT to conduct financial calculations and nitrate reduction estimations. The ACPF FiNRT itself contains two toolboxes: (1) Estimate Field Nitrogen Requirements, and (2) Analyze Conservation Scenario N Load. The Estimate Field Nitrogen Requirements toolbox uses 6-year, field-level, land-use data and MRTN default data or user supplied nitrogen fertilizer rates to estimate nitrogen application at the field and watershed level. Potential nitrate loading from each field in kilograms is generated by calculating potential leaching using methods and results informed by methods developed by Lawlor et al. (2008) and included in the IA NRS (2017), which summarize nitrate leaching potential at the MLRA scale. The Analyze Conservation Scenario N Load step uses the ACPF-generated conservation scenarios and quantifies the expected nitrate load reduction and financial costs. Nitrate load reductions in kilograms, total costs at the watershed scale and aggregated practice scale, and cost effectiveness which is total annual cost divided by kilograms of nitrate reduced at the watershed scale and aggregated practice scale are generated. Note that the ACPF FiNRT presents data in English units not metric. We have converted all units to metric for the purposes of this paper. Additional information about each toolbox is below.

### **ACPF FiNRT: Estimate Field Nitrogen Requirements**

The goal of estimating field nitrogen requirements is to quantify potential nitrate load at the field- and watershed-level. This is an important first step because the tool calculates the amount of nitrogen, at the field-level, that may be lost as nitrate. This ArcGIS-based tool requires two primary datasets from the ACPF FGDB: the field boundaries shapefile and the land-use table. Default data are provided for nitrogen fertilization rate in kilograms for a variety of cropping systems. Using these

data (field boundaries, land use, and nitrogen application), the tool quantifies the nitrogen requirements for each field and evaluates the proportion of that nitrogen that is likely to be lost from the field via leaching as nitrate.

#### ACPF FiNRT: Analyze Conservation Scenario N Load

The goal of analyzing conservation scenario N load is to estimate nitrate load reduction from implementing BMPs. The ArcGIS-based tool requires six primary datasets from the ACPF FGDB: field boundaries shapefile, land-use table, field N requirements table, gSSURGO soils raster, flow direction raster, and flow accumulation raster. In addition to the six pieces of required input data, the ACPF FiNRT allows the user to select the BMP layers they would like to include in the scenario. Within the ACPF FiNRT tool, each BMP layer generated from the ACPF has its own designated field. All BMP layers are optional; only BMPs being considered for a certain scenario are included in the tool. These input data come from the layers created through the previous steps in the ACPF toolbox. Users may add all BMP features in a layer, or they may select specific BMP features in the layer for consideration in the tool. This allows users to focus on one specific BMP, on achieving a specific nutrient reduction or cost threshold, or creating a combined scenario, which incorporates multiple BMP types.

#### Calculations within the ACPF FiNRT to generate feature classes

To calculate nitrate load and reduction, catchments are derived for each BMP included in the scenario; catchments are defined as the area above each individual BMP, from which the water in the catchment is intercepted by the BMP. Once the tool identifies these catchments, it creates a feature class that provides summary information at the field level for the attributes related to nitrate load reductions. Fields in the individual BMP watersheds are examined to extract nitrate load characteristics as calculated above by the Field Nitrogen Requirements tool. The N-load-per-hectare value is applied to row-crop areas, in the portion of the field in the BMP catchment, to estimate by-

field nitrate load for the affected hectares. The aggregate of these N load parameters across the individual BMP catchments is created to generate a new nutrient summary feature class, which provides summary information at the practice level for the attributes related to nitrate load reductions.

To calculate the costs associated with BMPs, estimated direct costs, as annualized direct establishment and management costs, are used for each BMP feature in the BMP feature class (Table 1). Opportunity costs for area of land removed from production for relevant practices in the BMP feature class are estimated using state-specific, soils-based crop productivity indices. In this case study, the watersheds are in Iowa and Minnesota, and therefore, the Iowa CSR2 and Minnesota CPI values and the MLRA-level average cropland rental rate are used to generate a dollar amount per productivity index point. This is done within the tool. For Iowa, CSR2 values are extracted from 10-m GSSURGO soils raster for land occupied by a BMP. The area-weighted mean CSR2 value for each practice feature is calculated, and then the annual opportunity costs are calculated as weighted mean CSR2 \* MLRA-level rent per CSR2 point. A similar process is undertaken for Minnesota data. Minnesota CPI values gathered from USDA NRCS Soil Survey tables (2020) are area weighted for each BMP and then multiplied by MLRA-level rent per CPI point. For land cover areas designated as permanent pasture, pasture rent data are utilized.

### **Direct and Opportunity Cost and Nitrate Reduction Datasets**

#### **Direct Costs**

To integrate cost datasets into the ACPF, state-specific comprehensive enterprise budgets reflecting 2021\$ costs (USD) for ACPF-supported BMPs were constructed. Updated enterprise budgets for several of the BMPs were originally developed by Christianson et al. (2013) for use with IA NRS scenario assessments (INRS, 2017). The enterprise budgets used for the ACPF FINRT can be

found in the supplemental data (S2). Across all BMPs, four primary categories of cost are accounted for: (1) design, site preparation and establishment; (2) short- and long- term management, maintenance, and/or replacement; and (3) annual overhead cost and, 4) for relevant BMPs, annual opportunity cost of land.

Using standard discounted cash flow techniques, a partial budget financial analysis was conducted for each BMP to quantify the direct cost of establishing and managing the BMP over a 20-year time-period using a real 2% discount rate. Following Tyndall et al. (2013), the direct cost data were then annualized using a capital recovery procedure to allow for comparative analysis with other farm-level production costs. Table 1 displays average (default) annualized direct costs in Iowa and Minnesota (2021\$ USD) for eleven BMPs.

Table 1. Annual average direct establishment and management costs for eleven ACPF Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Iowa and Minnesota. Cost presented here do not include opportunity costs. All financial assessment over a 20-year period using a 2% discount rate. All data in 2021\$ (USD).

Best Management Practice	Basic Cost Parameters Accounted for in Assessment	2021\$ annual cost per hectare or otherwise designated unit <sup>1</sup>		
		IA	MN	
Soil Health Practice	Cover crops <sup>2</sup>	Seed (usually cereal rye or mix); planting (aerial or broadcast); termination (herbicide or mechanical); monitoring.	\$180	\$173
In-Field Practices	Multi-purpose contour prairie strip <sup>3</sup>	Site preparation; seed mix (high diversity w/forbs); planting; mowing for establishment; periodic mowing/ burning for management; monitoring.	\$77	\$69
	Contour buffer strip	Site preparation; seed mix (usually 1 or 2 different species); planting; mowing for establishment; periodic mowing for management; monitoring.	\$72	\$67
	Grass waterways <sup>4</sup>	Site preparation (including land grading and outlet stabilization); erosion control during establishment; seed mix (high diversity with forbs); maintenance; monitoring.	\$230	\$232
Edge-of-Field or Downstream Practices	Riparian buffer: Multi-species	Site preparation; tree and shrub nursery stock; grass seed mix (high diversity); planting trees and grass; mowing for establishment; periodic mowing/ burning for management; monitoring.	\$193	\$210
	Riparian buffer: Vegetative	Site preparation; grass seed mix (usually low diversity mix); planting; mowing for establishment; periodic mowing/ burning for management; monitoring.	\$101	\$99

Vegetative filter strip	Site preparation; seed mix (usually low diversity mix); planting; mowing for establishment; periodic mowing/ burning for management; monitoring.	\$101	\$99
Nutrient-removal wetlands <sup>5</sup>	Engineering design; site planning, engineering and preparation; excavation and soil movement; tile redirection; installation of structures; planting; seed costs for wetland; seed costs for buffer; mowing buffer for establishment; mowing buffer for management; monitoring.	\$4,066	\$4,076
Bioreactors <sup>6</sup>	Engineering design; excavation; tile pipe, wood chips, and control gate purchase; installation and yearly adjustment/ maintenance; site surface planting; seed mix (usually 1-2 species); annual groundskeeping, replacement costs at end of practice life; monitoring.	\$5,451/ bioreactor	\$5,451/ bioreactor
Saturated buffers <sup>7</sup>	Engineering design; site preparation; seed mix (usually similar to vegetative or riparian buffer strips); planting; mowing. Excavation for tile drainage pipes; control structure purchase and installation; connection tile pipe; control gate yearly maintenance; monitoring.	\$887/ buffer	\$887/ buffer
Farm pond (Embankment) <sup>8</sup>	Engineering design; dam building and general excavation; spillway piping; pond sealer; embankment conservation cover planting; seed mix (usually 1-2 species); annual grounds keeping, monitoring.	\$2,912	\$2,912

<sup>1</sup>All costs have been calculated using standard discounted cash flow analysis and annualized over a 20-year period using a real 2% discount rate. Rounded to nearest dollar. Opportunity costs where relevant and indirect costs not considered here. This data will be updated annually. Caveat: The costs presented by the ACPF FiNRT serve as baseline estimates and are meant to be informative rather than prescriptive. Also note that the ACPF presents in English units not metric. We have converted all area units to metric for the purposes of this paper.

<sup>2</sup>Cover crop modeled is winter cereal rye (*Secale cereal L.*), planted with aerial seeding, and chemically terminated. Costs can vary depending on species or mix being planted and choice of planting and termination. It is assumed that cover crops do not have an effect on cash crop yield.

<sup>3</sup>Prairie strip costs being modeled represent a CP 43 prairie strip economy mix. Burning is assumed to be the primary long-term management.

<sup>4</sup>Costs for grassed waterway assumes grading and outlet stabilization; cost could be considerably less than presented if these actions are not required. Tall fescue is the grass choice; costs of seed may vary depending on species.

<sup>5</sup>Costs of nutrient removal wetlands can vary considerably depending on overall scale, engineering design needs, initial site conditions, and amount of earth and rock moving required.

<sup>6</sup>The cost of a bioreactor depends upon the drainage area being treated and the scale of trench. This assessment assumes a 20-hectare drainage area and two control structures.

<sup>7</sup>The cost of saturated buffers is based on 305 meters of connecting tile to route drainage from 12.15 hectares and one control structure. Assumes a carbon source is present.

<sup>8</sup>Assumes pond is an embankment style pond, 2.1-meter depth capacity. Pond sealant not considered; if needed would add ~\$700 per year to cost.

## Opportunity Costs of Land

To calculate opportunity costs for BMPs in the ACPF that require the use of cropland (e.g., riparian buffers, contour buffer strips, nutrient removal wetlands, and farm ponds), the ACPF FiNRT accounts for spatially explicit long-term cost of land by calculating area-weighted land rent loss as a

proxy opportunity cost (e.g., Zimmerman et al. 2019). Forgone land rent is estimated via an area-weighted land rent calculation determined using state-specific crop productivity indices and Major Land Resource Area (MLRA)-level rent data. MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units, meaning they have similar patterns of soils, climate, water resources, and land uses (USDA SCS, 1981). In Iowa, the Corn Suitability Rating data layer (CSR2) indexes the inherent soil productivity of each soil series relative to corn production in Iowa and is scaled from 5 to 100 for the least to most productive soils, respectively (Miller & Burras 2015). In Minnesota, Crop Productivity Index (CPI) ratings are used to provide a relative soil ranking for row crop production of one soil against that of another over a period of time (Regents of the University of Minnesota, 2018). These ratings range from 0 to 100, with higher numbers indicating a higher production potential (Regents of the University of Minnesota, 2018). Other states have other productivity indices that may be relevant as the tool expands.

To account for rent data, area-weighted averages for county-data were aggregated at MLRA-levels to calculate an average MLRA-level per ha rent. In Iowa, cash rental rates for high, medium, and low cropland in all Iowa counties, and for pasture, hay, and oat production land were gathered from the Iowa State University Extension and Outreach AgDecision Maker (e.g., Plastina et al., 2021). In Minnesota, the land rental data was extracted from FINBIN, a regularly updated database of farm record summaries of over 2,000 Minnesota farms (Bau et al., 2020). Rental rates were summarized at the MLRA-level to increase the spatial resolution of opportunity costs and to align with variations in biophysical characteristics of the landscape more closely. See supplemental data (S3).

### **Demonstration Case Studies**

To demonstrate the utility of the ACPF FiNRT, two HUC 12 watersheds, one in Iowa and one in Minnesota, were selected and run using two different conservation scenarios. These scenarios were developed to examine the application of the ACPF FiNRT to estimate nitrate reduction and

associated costs in the watersheds for simple comparative, demonstrative purposes. Scenario 1 represents a watershed-wide, uniform application of rye cover crops on all corn/soybean hectares, and scenario 2 demonstrates three nitrate-reduction BMPs (bioreactors, saturated buffers, and nutrient removal wetlands) that are generated using a spatially targeted approach. While these two conservation scenarios both demonstrate the value of BMP application, the scenarios differ in their implementation strategy: scenario 1 applies cover crops ubiquitously, to examine potential benefits from conservation with no explicit spatial determination or land being removed from production; scenario 2 uses ACPF placement results for BMPs that have been identified as having a nitrate reduction benefit and involves practices that require crop land retirement.

Upper Big Creek Watershed, Boone County, Iowa.

To demonstrate the utility of the ACPF and its new financial and nitrate reduction data in the context of conservation planning, the Upper Big Creek Watershed in Boone County, Iowa was analyzed as a case study. This HUC 12 watershed (Figure 1) is approximately 11,741 hectares and is a low-relief watershed, located on the Des Moines Lobe in central Iowa. Greater than 90% of the land area within the Upper Big Creek watershed is used for agricultural production, mainly (+95%) row-crop corn and soybean. Because of the biophysical characteristics and agricultural system, a large proportion of the watershed has subsurface tile drainage and excess nitrate in surface waters from nonpoint sources has contributed to algal bloom at the terminus of the watershed, in Big Creek Lake (Kiel and Pierce, 2011).

Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed, Watonwan County, Minnesota.

ACPF FiNRT analysis was also conducted on the Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed, Watonwan County, Minnesota. This HUC 12 watershed (Figure 2) is approximately 11,240 hectares and is a low-relief watershed, located on the Des Moines Lobe in south-central Minnesota. Approximately 90% of the land area within the Middle South Fork Watonwan River

Watershed is used for agricultural production, mainly row-crop corn and soybean. Due to its predominately agricultural land use, subsurface tile drainage is common, resulting in water quality impairments in the Watonwan River, South Fork (Plevan et al., 2020).

## Results and Discussion

Within the Upper Big Creek Watershed, Scenario 1 (S1) placed rye cover crops on all 10,758 hectares of corn/soybean land, while Scenario 2 (S2) assessed a spatially targeted conservation approach using the ACPF. In S2, the ACPF was used to site areas where nutrient removal wetlands, bioreactors, and saturated buffers would be suitable. As shown in Figure 1, S2 consists of 104 hectares of nutrient removal wetlands, 118 bioreactors, and 45 kilometers of saturated buffers.

[Figure 1]

The resulting nitrate load reduction, total cost, cost-effectiveness, number of fields with conservation practices, and hectares removed from cultivation were calculated and are shown in Table 2. Covering all corn/soybean hectares in cover crops achieved a 31% reduction in nitrate-load at an annual cost of ~\$2.3 million. Yet under the targeted conservation scenario, nitrate-load was reduced by 26% and at a much lower annual cost (~\$581,000) and cost-effectiveness also improved. In S2, however, more farmland was taken out of production, 136 hectares in S2 compared to 0 hectares in S1, yet overall, fewer identified fields were impacted by conservation management, which could mean fewer farmers/landowners involved.

Table 2. Outcomes for practices used in Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 in the Upper Big Creek Watershed. N-load reductions assume that stacked conservation practices have a multiplicative effect (Lazarus et al., 2014). Total cost includes both direct and opportunity costs where applicable. Last three rows are a breakdown of the best management practices (BMPs) included in Scenario 2.

	Nitrate Reduction (kg and %)	Total Cost per Year (2021\$)	Average \$/kg Nitrate Reduced	Fields with BMPs	Hectares Removed from Cultivation
Scenario 1: Total (cover crops only)	105,577 (31%)	\$2,295,313	\$21.87	456	0 ha
Scenario 2: Total	86,762 (26%)	\$580,733	\$3.56	220	136 ha
<i>Wetlands</i>	29,569 (9%)	\$479,567	\$16.38	18	104 ha
<i>Bioreactors</i>	24,093 (7%)	\$71,409	\$3.14	118	0 ha
<i>Saturated Buffers</i>	33,100 (10%)	\$29,757	\$1.41	84	32 ha

Similar results were found in Minnesota as were observed in Iowa. In the Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed (Figure 4), Scenario 1 (S1) placed rye cover crops on all 10,116 hectares of corn/soybean land, while Scenario 2 (S2) used the ACPF to illustrate a spatially targeted conservation approach. In S2, the ACPF was used to site areas suitable for nutrient removal wetlands, bioreactors, and saturated buffers. As shown in Figure 4, S2 consists of 353 hectares of nutrient removal wetlands, 96 bioreactors, and 13 kilometers of saturated buffers.

[Figure 2]

Table 3 outlines the resulting nitrate load reduction, total cost, cost-effectiveness, number of fields with conservation practices, and hectares removed from cultivation that were calculated for the Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed. Covering all corn/soybean hectares in cover crops achieved a 51% reduction in nitrate load at an annual cost of ~\$2.1 million. While under the

ACPF targeted conservation scenario, nitrate load was reduced by 38% and at a lower annual cost (~\$1.7 million). Cost-effectiveness also improved in S2. However, S2 removes more farmland from production, 391 hectares in S2 compared to 0 hectares in S1, yet overall, much fewer identified fields were impacted by conservation management.

Table 3. Outcomes for practices used in Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 in the Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed. N-load reductions assume that stacked conservation practices have a multiplicative effect. Total cost includes both direct and opportunity costs where applicable. The last three rows show a breakdown of the best management practices (BMPs) included in Scenario 2.

	Nitrate Reduction (kg and %)	Total Cost per Year (2021\$)	Average \$/kg Nitrate Reduced	Fields with BMPs	Hectares Removed from Cultivation
Scenario 1: Total (cover crops only)	167,041 (51%)	\$ 2,136,962	\$12.81	362	0 ha
Scenario 2: Total	91,902 (28%)	\$1,675,454	\$12.17	130	391 ha
<i>Wetlands</i>	79,959 (24%)	\$1,584,152	\$23.82	17	353 ha
<i>Bioreactors</i>	5,420 (2%)	\$53,573	\$10.30	96	0 ha
<i>Saturated Buffers</i>	6,524 (2%)	\$37,729	\$11.06	17	38 ha

From a planning perspective, the case study watersheds provide a number of example findings that are useful for watershed planners and partners to create and evaluate biophysically effective, affordable, and socially viable watershed management plans. As described in Gensch et al. (2020), with the aid of the ACPF, conservation plans can be collaboratively developed between watershed partners including landowner/ farmer input regarding the ACPF modeling process and results so as to determine multi-scale water protection goals and the biophysically and practicably appropriate practices to address them. Specific action-oriented objectives as modeled via ACPF scenarios then gauge the scale and patterns of BMP application needed to meet desired watershed

goals relative to nutrient loss reduction (Gensch et al., 2020). Part of the deliberation standards regarding any conservation plan is initial budget limits and assessing the longer-term capacity of watershed partners to acquire and allocate scarce resources.

Directly facilitating this process, the ACPF FiNRT calculates total annual costs (direct and opportunity) of a conservation scenario, total number of fields impacted, total land area retired from production, and two types of cost-effectiveness: one based on total percent nitrate-load reduction and the other on cost of unit load reduction. Cost-effectiveness assessments are objective measures of allocative efficiency, and in this case, are calculated by dividing the total present value cost of a BMP by total biophysical effect associated with the use of the conservation practice across the relevant time period. Cost effectiveness as a decision criterion has been demonstrated to be necessary to maximizing conservation impact across a range of activities, which is critical when financial and technical service resources are scarce (Pienkowski et al., 2020).

As per Gensch et al. (2020), ACPF scenarios identify potential combinations of practicable conservation practices that can reasonably be expected to meet watershed goals as set by watershed partners including farmers. The ACPF by itself does not provide output to prioritize specific scenarios because prioritization, deliberation, choice determination, and identifying modes of fostering buy-in involve social and economic factors (Lewandowski et al., 2020). In both case study watersheds, the ACPF FiNRT was used so as to demonstrate two different approaches (objectives) to achieving a certain level of nutrient loss reduction (goals) and generate numerous financial and BMP scale data that further guide watershed planners and partners to assess the viability of a given plan.

In each case watershed, S2 demonstrates a spatially targeted conservation plan that features multiple BMPs (nutrient retention wetlands, bioreactors, and saturated buffers), versus S1

that demonstrates a uniform application of one BMP (cover crops). In the Upper Big Creek Watershed, both scenarios achieve relatively similar reductions in nitrate (S1 achieves a 31% reduction or 105,577 kg of nitrate N; S2 achieves a 26% reduction or 86,762 kg of nitrate N), but S2 does so at only 25% the total cost of S1. As such, S2 features a considerably more cost-effective outcome with an average cost of \$3.56 per kg of nitrate N reduced (compared to \$21.87 per kg of nitrate N for S1). The conservation plan in S1 involves a total of 456 farm fields, and conceivably would involve more landowners voluntarily electing to participate in conservation. Nonetheless, because S1 features only cover crops, no farmland is removed from production. The conservation plan in S2 involves slightly less than half the number of fields as S1, 220 farm fields; yet, it also involves effectively permanently removing 104 hectares of farmland from production for nutrient reduction wetlands.

Similarly, the Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed scenarios accomplish comparable reductions in nitrate (S1 achieves a 51% reduction or 167,041 kg of nitrate N; S2 achieves a 28% reduction or 91,902 kg of nitrate N). While S1 achieves a higher nitrate N reduction, S2 is only 78% the total cost of S1. Additionally, S2 is slightly more cost effective with an average cost of \$12.17 per kg nitrate N reduced, while the average cost per kg nitrate N reduced is \$12.81 in S1. The cover crops in S1 cover 362 farm fields, but do not take any farmland out of production. The BMPs in S2 involve slightly over a third of the fields required for S1, 130 fields; yet, also requires a total of 391 hectares of farmland to be removed from production.

All of the data generated by the ACPF FiNRT provides planners the ability to evaluate potential total costs versus available funding and funding potential in the context of overall goals. Evaluating cost effectiveness at both the watershed and practice scale are key factors in landowner deliberation, adoption, and long-term management of BMPs (Tyndall et al., 2013).

Better understanding the total number of fields involved in a conservation scenario, and the total area of land to be retired contributes to a more comprehensive analysis of the scale of landowner and farmer involvement, the distribution and type of short and long-term costs, and available technical support. All of these factors are relevant to determining modes and scale of outreach, and fostering the necessary conservation buy-in at relevant scales.

Ultimately it needs to be recognized that the utility of deliberative and actionable conservation planning information provided by decision support tools such as the ACPF and the ACPF FiNRT depend on the quality of the modeling and the output (Duncan et al., 2021). Because the ACPF is not a temporally dynamic, process model, but rather a heuristic planning tool, the modes of validation and verification are largely based on examining whether the model is accurately identifying areas of resource concern and potential locations for BMPs. Other studies using the ACPF relied on site visits and/or visual assessments of water conveyances such as culverts (ground truthing, e.g., Hood 2020) and using aerial or ground-truthed photographs (Tomer et al., 2015; Rundhaug et al., 2018; Hood 2020) to verify ACPF outputs. Additionally, Ranjan et al. (2019) overview modes of involving farmers and landowners in the field verification process; such involvement fosters stakeholder trust in the decision support tools being used and the process of their use. Validation of resource concerns and BMP practice suitability by site visits and assessments by conservation professionals is a critical step when using decision-support tools such as the ACPF and ACPF FiNRT in watershed management.

Another component of verification is assessment that scenario outputs are reasonable, given other published data and information. What qualifies as reasonable in this case is determined by the default or user defined values for nitrate reduction efficiency, N load, and direct and opportunity costs per unit of the BMPs being assessed. For all scenarios, the estimated nitrate reduction is

within the bounds of the initial default nitrate reduction efficiency parameters which were set by the Iowa Minnesota and Iowa Nutrient Reduction Strategy meta-analysis of BMP effectiveness (Lawrence and Benning, 2019; MNNRS (2014) and the expected N load as per the MRTN in the 103 MLRA which includes the case study watersheds in IA and MN (see S4). The concomitant cost estimations were determined as reasonable based on prior analysis (for Upper Big Creek, see Zimmerman et al., 2019), and hand-calculations of direct costs using ACPF FiNRT BMP area data and the cost information presented in Table 1.

Planners need to be aware of the timing, nature, and permanence of BMP costs. The ACPF FiNRT annualizes total costs over a 20-year timeframe which, while useful for comparative analysis (Tyndall and Roesch, 2014), can mask fundamental differences in the timing of BMP costs (Janke et al., 2021). Cover crops featured in S1 are annual expenditures, whereas the nutrient removal wetlands, bioreactors, and saturated buffers featured in S2 all have significant upfront costs associated with design, site preparation, structural materials, and establishment. Nutrient removal wetlands, as noted above, have substantial opportunity costs for the landowners impacted. All three practices also have variable lifespans and expected replacement costs. Ultimately, as noted here from a decision support perspective, it is important to recognize that the variability in the distribution of costs across landowners and across time are essential considerations, in addition to comparisons of costs and cost effectiveness.

The costs of BMPs will change over time in real terms. Direct and opportunity cost estimates provided by the ACPF FiNRT are static baseline costs and are based on current price conditions. As noted prior, to capture these potential annual changes these data will be updated within the ACPF FiNRT on an annual basis. More broadly however, conservation planners should expect unique supply and demand related market dynamics relative to costs of BMPs. In the short run, if

conservation efforts increase, it is possible, perhaps even likely, that the costs of various practices will increase due to regional competition for technical and contracting services as well as for critical materials like seed and nursery stock for vegetation-based practices (Tyndall et al., 2021). In the long run however, continued research and development would be expected to enhance available technologies. Likewise, it would be expected that the supporting infrastructure for conservation including expanded material supplies and contracting capacity would grow to meet demand (Tyndall et al., 2021). At watershed scales throughout the region, costs may also fall due to the benefits of experience gained, shared resources and information among conservation partners, and economies of scale (Hayes et al., 2016).

## **Conclusion**

Enhancing environmental outcomes in agricultural landscapes is an ongoing process in US Corn Belt states like Iowa and Minnesota. Decision support tools, like the ACPF and its ACPF FiNRT, offer new opportunities for conservation planning at increased resolutions, across watershed- and field-level scales, and with increasingly robust geospatial data. While Iowa and Minnesota have a wealth of publicly available geospatial data, published information and tools to estimate fertilizer application, and assessments of nutrient reduction potential from BMPs, other states across the US Cornbelt are rapidly developing similar capacities. The ACPF and the ACPF FiNRT allow conservation planners to harness these data to evaluate and consider several critical aspects of conservation planning at watershed scales: menus of BMP opportunities for landowners, expected nitrate reduction, number of fields impacted, area of land removed from production, total cost (direct and opportunity), and cost-effectiveness. It also provides context for broader conservation planning analysis regarding farmer/landowner preferences, trade-offs, ecosystem services beyond water quality (e.g., habitat, recreation, aesthetics), available technical and financial support, and more.

While the ACPF and ACPF FiNRT are not prescriptive models, they are opening new discussions and sparking new ways of thinking about conservation and watershed planning.

### Acknowledgments

This project was funded through a USDA Cooperative Agreement # 5950308006, and the Iowa Nutrient Research Center, Project # 2018-08. The authors would like to thank the following people for their assistance with this project: Troy Bowman, Tom Isenhardt, Jessica Nelson, Haleigh Summers, Mark Tomer, Adriana Valcu Lisman.

### Author Contributions

Emma Bravard: Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing-original draft; Writing-review and editing.

Emily Zimmerman: Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing-review and editing. John Tyndall:

Conceptualization; Formal analysis; Methodology; Resources; Writing-review and editing. David

James: Formal analysis; Methodology.

### References

Bau, D., Nordquist, D., Loppnow, R., Van Nurden, P. (2020). Cropland rental rates. University of Minnesota Extension. Accessed at: <https://extension.umn.edu/farmland-rent-and-economics/cropland-rental-rates>

Bose, S., Dong, G., & Simpson, A. (2019). Conservation finance and payment for ecosystem services. *The Financial Ecosystem* (pp. 311-338). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Christianson, L., Tyndall, J., & Helmers, M. (2013). Financial comparison of seven nitrate reduction strategies for Midwestern agricultural drainage. *Water Resources and Economics*, 2, 30-56.

Christianson, R., Christianson, L., Wong, C., Helmers, M., McIsaac, G., Mulla, D., & McDonald, M. (2018). Beyond the nutrient strategies: common ground to accelerate agricultural water


quality improvement in the upper Midwest. *Journal of environmental management*, 206, 1072-1080.

- David, M. B., Drinkwater, L. E., & Mclsaac, G. F. (2010). Sources of nitrate yields in the Mississippi River Basin. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 39(5):1657–67.
- Delgado, J. A., & Berry, J. K. (2008). Advances in Precision Conservation. *Advances in Agronomy*. 98: 1-44. DOI: 10.1016/S0065-2113(08)00201-0
- Duncan, J. M., Respass, Z., Ryan, W., Austin, R., Royer, M., Osmond, D., & Kleinman, P. (2021). The Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework: Opportunities and challenges in the eastern United States. *Agricultural & Environmental Letters*, 6(3), e20054.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (2019). Mississippi River/Gulf of Mexico Hypoxia Task Force. Retrieved 22 Jan 2020 from <https://www.epa.gov/ms-htf>
- Gesch, K., Kiel, A., Sutphin, T., & Wolf, R. (2020). Integrating farmer input and Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework results to develop watershed plans in Iowa. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 75(4), 101A-104A.
- Hood, C.. (2020). Identifying Locations for Best Management Practices in the Middle Fork Whitewater River Sub-Watershed Using the Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework Tool. Volume 23, Papers in Resource Analysis. 16 pp. Saint Mary's University of Minnesota University Central Services Press. Winona, MN. Retrieved 3 Jan 2022 from <http://www.gis.smumn.edu>
- INRS (2017). Iowa Nutrient Reduction Strategy. Prepared by the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, Iowa Department of Natural Resources and Iowa State University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Iowa. Retrieved 16 Aug 2019 from [http://www.nutrientstrategy.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/documents/2017%20INRS%20C complete\\_Revised%202017\\_12\\_11.pdf](http://www.nutrientstrategy.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/documents/2017%20INRS%20C%20complete_Revised%202017_12_11.pdf)
- ISU GIS Facility (Iowa State University Geographic Information Systems Support and Research Facility). (2020). ACPF Watershed Database Land Use Viewing and Data Downloading. Available at: <https://acpfdata.gis.iastate.edu/ACPF/dwnldACPF.html>
- Kiel, A., & Pierce, G. (2011). Big Creek Lake Watershed Management Action Plan. Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Des Moines, IA, USA.
- Lawrence, J., & Benning, J. (2019). Reducing nutrient loss: Science shows what works. Iowa State University, Extension & Outreach. SP 435A
- Lawlor, P. A., Helmers, M. J., Baker, J. L., Melvin, S. W., & Lemke, D. W. (2008). Nitrogen application rate effect on nitrate-nitrogen concentration and loss in subsurface drainage for a corn-soybean rotation. *Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Publications*. 308. [https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/abe\\_eng\\_pubs/308](https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/abe_eng_pubs/308)


- Lazarus, W. F., Mulla, D. J., & Wall, D. (2014). A spreadsheet planning tool for assisting a state agency with cost effective watershed scale surface water nitrogen planning. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 69(2):45A-50A, doi:10.2489/jswc.69.2.45A
- Lewandowski, A. M., Tomer, M. D., Buchanan, J. I., Kiel, A., Olson, L., Power, R. L., & Sloan, J. J. (2020). Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework: Watershed applications, research opportunities, and training resources. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 75(4), 427-433.
- Mississippi River Gulf Hypoxia Nutrient Task Force. (2013). Reassessment 2013: Assessing progress made since 2008. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-03/documents/hypoxia\\_reassessment\\_508.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-03/documents/hypoxia_reassessment_508.pdf).
- Miller, G., & Burras, L. (2015). Corn Suitability Rating 2 Equation Updated. Integrated Crop Management. Iowa State University Extension and Outreach. ICM News. April 15, 2015.
- MNNRS. (2014). Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy. Chapter 5 Point and Nonpoint Source Reductions. Retrieved 30 Dec 2021 from <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-s1-80.pdf>
- Moiiasi, D. N., Duriancik, L. F., Sadler, E. J., Tsegaye, T., Steiner, J. L., Locke, M. A., Strickland, T. C., & Osmond, D. L. (2020). Quantifying the impacts of the Conservation Effects Assessment Project watershed assessments: The first fifteen years. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 75(3):57A-74A
- Naidoo, R., Balmford, A., Ferraro, P. J., Polasky, S., Ricketts, T. H., & Rouget, M. (2006). Integrating economic costs into conservation planning. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 21(12), 681-687.
- Pienkowski, T., Cook, C., Verma, M., & Carrasco, L. R. (2020). Conservation cost-effectiveness: a review of the evidence base. *Conservation Science and Practice*, e357.
- Plastina, A., Johanns, A., & Welter, C. (2021). Cash rental rates for Iowa 2021 survey. Ag Decision Maker, Iowa State University Extension and Outreach. File C2-10.
- Plevan, A., Taylor, K., Birkemeier, R., Davis, P., & MacLean, S. (2020). Watonwan River watershed total maximum daily load study. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Mankato, MN, USA.
- Porter, S. A., Tomer, M. D., James, D. E., Van Horn, J. D., Boomer, K. M. (2018). Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework: ArcGIS toolbox user's manual, Ver. 3. USDA Agricultural Research Service, National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment, Ames, Iowa. [www.northcentralwater.org/acpf/](http://www.northcentralwater.org/acpf/).
- Ranjan, P., Singh, A. S., Tomer, M. D., Lewandowski, A. M., & Prokopy, L. S. (2020). Farmer engagement using a precision approach to watershed-scale conservation planning: What do we know?. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 75(4), 444-452.

- Regents of the University of Minnesota. (2018). Soils data overview. Accessed at: <https://landeconomics.umn.edu/landdata/Productivity/Intro.aspx?RI=1487845>
- Robertson, D. M., & Saad, D. A. (2019). Spatially referenced models of streamflow and nitrogen, phosphorus, and suspended-sediment loads in streams of the Midwestern United States: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2019–5114, 74 p. including 5 appendixes, <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20195114>.
- Roley, S. S., Tank, J. L., Tyndall, J. C., & Witter, J. D. (2016). How cost-effective are cover crops, wetlands, and two-stage ditches for nitrogen removal in the Mississippi River Basin?. *Water Resources and Economics*, 15, 43-56.
- Rundhaug, T. J., Geimer, G. R., Drake, C. W., Amado, A. A., Bradley, A. A., Wolter, C. F., & Weber, L. J. (2018). Agricultural conservation practices in Iowa watersheds: Comparing actual implementation with practice potential. *Environmental monitoring and assessment*, 190(11), 1-17.
- Sawyer, J. (2006). Concepts and rationale for regional nitrogen rate guidelines for corn. Iowa State University Extension and Outreach. PM 2015.
- Sawyer, J., & Lundvall, J. (2018). Nitrogen use in Iowa corn production. Iowa State University Extension and Outreach. CROP 3073.
- Secchi, S., Tyndall, J., Schulte, L. A., & Asbjornsen, H. (2008). High crop prices and conservation: Raising the stakes. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 63(3), 68A-73A.
- Srinivas, R., Drewitz, M., & Magner, J. (2020). Evaluating watershed-based optimized decision support framework for conservation practice placement in Plum Creek Minnesota. *Journal of Hydrology*, 583, 124573.
- Stenback, G., Crumpton, W. G., Schilling, K. E., & Helmers, M. J. (2011). Rating curve estimation of nutrient loads in Iowa Rivers. *Journal of Hydrology*, 396, 158-169.
- Stoner, N. K. (2011). Working in partnership with states to address phosphorus and nitrogen pollution through use of a framework for state nutrient reductions. Office of Water, United States Environmental Protection Agency. Accessed at: [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/memo\\_nitrogen\\_framework.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/memo_nitrogen_framework.pdf)
- Tegtmeier, E. M., & Duffy, M. D. (2004). External costs of agricultural production in the United States. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Tomer, M. D., James, D. E., & Sandoval-Green, C. M. J. (2017). Agricultural conservation planning framework: 3. land use and field boundary database development and structure. *Journal of Environment Quality*, 46(3):676–686
- Tomer, M. D., Porter, S. D., Boomer, K. M. B., James, D. E., Kostel, J. A., Helmers, M. J., Isenhardt, T. M., & McLellan, E. (2015). Agricultural Conservation Planning Framework: 1. Developing multipractice watershed planning scenarios and assessing nutrient reduction potential. *Journal of Environment Quality*, 44(3):754. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2014.09.0386>.

- Tomer, M. D., Porter, S. D., James, D. E., Boomer, K. M. B., Kostel, J. A., & McLellan, E. (2013). Combining precision conservation technologies into a flexible framework to facilitate agricultural watershed planning. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 68(5):113A-120A. <https://doi.org/10.2489/jswc.68.5.113A>.
- Tyndall, J. C., & Roesch, G. (2014). A standardized approach to the financial analysis of structural water quality BMPs. *Journal of Extension*, 52(3), 3FEA10.
- Tyndall, J. C., Schulte, L. A., Liebman, M., & Helmers, M. (2013). Field-level financial assessment of contour prairie strips for enhancement of environmental quality. *Environmental management*, 52(3), 736-747.
- Tyndall, J. C. (2020). Being cautiously optimistic: A water quality story. SUS-RURI: Proceedings of a workshop on developing a convergence sustainable urban systems agenda for redesigning the urban-rural interface along the Mississippi River Watershed held in Ames, Iowa, August 12–13, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.31274/isudp.35>.
- Zimmerman, E. K, Tyndall, J. C., & Schulte, L. A. (2019). Using spatially targeted conservation to evaluate nitrogen reduction and economic opportunities for best management practice placement in agricultural landscapes. *Environmental management*, 64(3), 31.



**Figure 1.** Upper Big Creek watershed land use (map on left) and spatially targeted BMP placement Scenario 2 (map on right). Targeted BMPs include bioreactors, nutrient removal wetlands, and saturated buffers. Yields a nitrate load reduction of 26% for the watershed, assuming all BMPs are implemented on the landscape.



**Figure 2.** Middle South Fork Watonwan River Watershed (top map) and spatially targeted BMP placement Scenario 2 (bottom map). Targeted BMPs include bioreactors, nutrient removal wetlands, and saturated buffers. Yields a nitrate-load reduction of 28% for the watershed, assuming all BMPs are implemented on the landscape.