### Economics of Soil Health Results of PCM





Picci Management



CHECKOFF & MEMBERSHIP PROGRAMS

**ILLINOIS** Agricultural & Consumer Economics college of Agricultural, consumer & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

**Gary Schnitkey** 

#### Laura Gentry

**Sarah Sellars** 



www.precisionconservation.org

2015-2020 Data Summary

The Business Case The Business Case tor Conservation Practices Cost-Benefit Analysis of Conservation Practices

Precision Conservation Mar

inois Corn

## Conservation practices analyzed for their ROI

A program of the





**Growers Association** 

### **Data Collection**

- 1. Fields
- 2. Crops
- 3. Systems
  - Conventional
  - Non-GMO
  - Seed Corn/Bean
  - Organic/Transitioning
- 4. Programs
  - Every Pass Across Field
  - Inputs; Rates



# Home 🖾 News 🛛 Fields Agronomics - 🖻 Reports 👹 Users 🗯 Switch - 🔼 Glen Salo -





#### **I**ILLINOIS

## Calculating Economic Returns

farmdoc

**ILLINOIS** 

### Field Passes (Soybeans to Corn)

### **Cover Crop**

- 1. Plant cover crop seed
- 2. Apply DAP
- 3. Spray per-plant with N
- 4. Plant
- 5. Spray
- 6. Post-plant apply nitrogen
- 7. Harvest

### Conventional

- 1. Apply DAP
- 2. Perform primary tillage
- 3. Apply anhydrous ammonia as fall N
- 4. Spring tillage
- 5. Plant
- 6. Spray
- 7. Apply fungicide
- 8. Harvest

#### **I** ILLINOIS

Number of fields	928	952
	Com	Soybeans
500	124	124
SPR Nites and the set of the set	134	134
Nitrogen applied total	210	2
IN DAP/MAP	21	1
in Anhydrous Ammonia	93	0
in UAN	65	0
Revenue		
Yield per acre	205	65
Crop Revenue	714	613
ARC/PLC or ACRE	22	22
Crop Insurance		
Other Farm Receipts		
Gross Revenue	735	635
Expenses		
P, K and Lime	75	8
Nitrogen	62	0
Pesticides	46	40
Insecticides	1	1
Seed	121	57
Seed - cover crop	0	0
Drying	7	0
Storage	21	6
Crop Insurance	22	15
Direct Costs	354	128
Field work	15	14
Planting - crop	14	14
Planting - cover crop	0	1
Machine hire/lease/application cost	34	21
Harvest	36	32
Power Costs	101	81
Overhead Costs	36	30
Total Non-Land Costs	491	240
Operator and Land Return	244	395

### **Economic Report**

- Revenue and Cost calculations
  - Gross revenue, inputs and power costs are assigned according to standard commodity prices, input costs and field operation costs
    - Based on annual reports from IL FBFM and USDA-ERS

- Direct costs reflect the farmer's rate and source for inputs
- Power costs reflect the farmer's tillage practices
- Summaries are prepared based on aggregated values, by standard

### **Operator and land returns**

Crop revenue (Yield times the same price per year)

- Direct costs (fertilizer, seed, chemicals)
- Power costs (each pass has a cost)
- Overhead costs (same for each farm)

**Operator and land return** 





# **Corn -- Tillage**

**I**ILLINOIS



### Tillage & Profitability: Corn Top 25% Most Profitable for 2015-2020



### Average Return, Yield, and Cost, High SPR, 2015-2020

	% of Fields	Operator and Land Return	Yield	Direct Cost	Power Cost	Total Non- Land Cost
No-Till	13%	272	213	384	97	519
Strip-Till	15%	256	219	401	112	550
1-Pass Light	37%	279	218	387	106	530
2-Pass Light	13%	276	224	391	116	545
2-Pass Medium	20%	261	222	391	122	550
3+ Pass	2%	247	230	414	136	588

#### **I**ILLINOIS

# Soybeans -- Tillage

farmdo

ILLINOIS

### Tillage & Profitability: Soybean Top 25% Most Profitable for 2015-2020



### Average Return, Yield, and Cost, High SPR, 2015-2020

	% of Fields	Operator and Land Return	Yield	Direct Cost	Power Cost	Total Non- Land Cost
No-Till	45%	356	67	149	74	254
1-Pass Light	15%	362	68	143	84	258
2-Pass Light	5%	364	68	135	89	255
2-Pass Medium	19%	379	73	150	97	277
3+ Pass	14%	345	68	132	110	273

#### **I**ILLINOIS

### **N Management Cost Comparisons**

## N Timing Comparisons N Rate Comparisons



Q1

Q2

Q3

farmdoc

1,000

### Nitrogen standards

- Fall >40% of total nitrogen is applied in fall
- Mostly pre-plant majority of nitrogen is applied in spring before planting or at planting
- Mostly sidedress majority of nitrogen is applied after planting
- 50% pre-plant / 50% sidedress Split application
- 3-way split split application with three passes (<40% fall-applied)

Nitrogen values are total pounds of actual N, including that in dry fertilizer (DAP, MAP)

#### **I**ILLINOIS

# Percent of Fields in Nitrogen Benchmarks, 2015-2020



### Average Return, Yield, and Cost, High SPR, 2015-2020

	% of Fields	Operator and Land Return	Yield	N Rate Ib/acre	Direct Cost	Power Cost	Total Non- Land Cost
Fall	35%	258	220	212	400	113	550
Mostly Pre-Planting	24%	287	218	203	376	107	521
<b>Mostly Sidedress</b>	26%	276	220	201	388	112	537
50% Pre-Plant 50% Sidedress	10%	259	218	198	389	111	537
3-Way Split	5%	246	221	215	428	114	579

#### **I**ILLINOIS

### Average Nitrogen Cost, High SPR, 2015-2020

	2015 to 2020 \$/acre	2015 \$/acre	2016 \$/acre	2017 \$/acre	2018 \$/acre	2019 \$/acre	2020 \$/acre
Fall	79	96	86	74	72	85	82
Mostly Pre-Planting	78	89	80	70	70	81	86
Mostly Sidedress	75	91	71	69	69	77	81
50% Pre-Plant 50% Sidedress	80	102	79	75	72	82	88
3-Way Split	91	111	91	87	79	110	90

#### **I**ILLINOIS

### 2021 MRTN Recommendation (in pounds of N applied)<sup>1,2</sup>



This web site provides a process to calculate economic return to N application with different nitrogen and corn prices and to find rofitable N rates directly from recent N rate research data. The method used follows a regional approach for determining corn N rate guidelines that is implemented in several Corn Belt states.

	Corn-Followi	ng-Soybeans	Corn-Follo	wing-Corn
	Anhydrous Ammonia Ibs/acre	28% Nitrogen Solution Ibs/acre	Anhydrous Ammonia Ibs/acre	28% Nitrogen Solution Ibs/acre
North	178	159	213	194
Central	187	172	202	190
South	206	191	206	186

<sup>1</sup>Taken from Corn Nitrogen Rate Calculator (<u>http://cnrc.agron.iastate.edu/nRate.aspx</u>) on June 22, 2021

LLINOIS <sup>2</sup>MRTNs determined with a \$5.00 corn price, \$700 per ton anhydrous ammonia price, and \$360 per ton nitrogen solution price, farmdoc

### Nitrogen Application and Yield, 2015-2020



### Yield and Returns by MRTN Nitrogen Categories

	Yield	Returns
Category	bu/acre	\$/acre
Below MRTN	-16*	-16
MRTN		
Above 1	-1	-20*
Above 2	6*	-21*
Above 3	7*	-31*
Above 4	18*	-31*

**I** ILLINOIS

\*Indicates significant different at 5% levels from MRTN category after controlling for soil productivity

### Summary

1. For the PCM fields, 70% receive a nitrogen application greater than the MRTN profitable range

2. MRTN most profitable nitrogen application rates

3. On average, mostly pre-planting and mostly sidedress had the highest operator and land return

4. Mostly pre-planting and mostly sidedress also had the lowest nitrogen costs



## Cover Crops: Lessons for New Adopters

Need to "experiment" with cover crops

### **Cover Crop Standards**

- Overwintering
- Winter Terminal
- •None





### Cover Crop Benchmarks (2016 to 2020)

		Soybeans			Corn	
Cover crop	Yield Bu/Acre	Non-land Costs \$/Acre	Return \$/Acre	Yield Bu/Acre	Non-land Costs \$/Acre	Return \$/Acre
Overwintering	68	\$269	\$344	214	\$545	\$232
Winter Terminal	67	\$254	\$371	218	\$532	\$263
No cover crop	69	\$258	\$388	220	\$540	\$261
Count	3 2: 4,546	72 overwinterir 1 winter termin 5 no cover crop	ng al fields	15 65 2,815	50 overwinterir 5 winter termin no cover crop	ng al fields

#### **I**ILLINOIS

# Cover Crop on Soybeans, 2016 – 2020, High SPR Fields, All fields and no-till

_	All Fields			No-til	I	
	None	Over-wintering	diff	None Ove	r-wintering	diff
No of fields	2546	372		933	236	
Yield	69	68		67	67	
Gross Revenue	\$628	\$619	-\$9	\$613	\$611	-\$2
Direct non-cover costs <sup>1</sup>	141	139	-2	143	135	-8
Power non-cover costs	86	72	-14	67	67	0
Overhead	30	30	0	30	30	0
Cover crop costs <sup>2</sup>		28	28		26	26
Total Non-land costs	\$258	\$269	\$11	\$240	\$258	\$18
Operator and land returns	\$370	\$350	-\$20	\$373	\$353	-\$2(

1 Seed, pesticides, fertilizer, drying, storage, crop insurnace.

2 Cover crop seed, planting, and termination costs

#### **I**ILLINOIS

### **Cover Crops**

- Cover crops are key to reducing nutrient losses and reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- Soybeans don't find a yield drag, particularly when control for tillage.
- Need to keep cover crop costs in line
- Expect policy innovations in this area
- Ecosystem service markets offers farmers opportunity to benefit from conservation practice

#### **I**ILLINOIS





Precision Conservation Management



ILLINOIS Agricultural & Consumer Economics

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL, CONSUMER & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES



