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## Why quantify soil health outcomes?

- Several examples of anecdotal \& scientific evidence supporting the environmental \& soil health benefits of conservation practices
- Less information available quantifying the on-farm economic benefits associated with improving soil health
- The agricultural community (including retailers, bankers, landlords, farmers, and others) continuously request information
 that considers the "bottom line"


## Why quantify soil health outcomes?

- From NRCS:
"With soil health management, producers can increase profits and reduce costs and risk all while conserving our nation's resources for the benefit of all. .....the extent of these economic benefits has not been consistently quantified - a major constraint to soil health management adoption identified as a priority by NRCS, partners, and customers"


## Other economic case studies

- NACD \& Datu (2017)

4 farmers; 16-page each; partial budget analysis

- EDF (2018)

2 farmers; total enterprise budgets

- NRCS NY (2017)

2 farmers: Kemmeren \& Magos; 2-pages each; PBA
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ECONOMIC CASE STUDY
Farmer Profile: Dave Magos
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## Meet the Team



Michelle Perez
Project Leader
AFT Water Initiative Director


Florence Swartz
Project Economist Retired NRCS NY Economist

## Meet the AFT Authors



Justin Bodell
CA Stewardship Manager


Brian Brandt
Ag Innovations Director, OH


Emily Bruner
Midwest Science Director


Aaron Ristow
NY Stewardship Mgr American Farmland Trust

## External Reviewers

- NRCS Economists
- Bryon Kirwan, State Economist of Illinois
- Lynn Knight, Economist, East Region
- Lakeitha Ruffin, State Economist of Oregon
- NRCS Soil Health Specialists
- Kabir Zahangir, West Regional Soil Health Specialist
- James Hoorman, NE Region Soil Health Specialist
- NTT Reviewer
- Mindy Selman, USDA OEM
- COMET-Farm Reviewer
- Matthew Stermer, Colorado State University


## Project Goal



Drive adoption of soil health practices by:
$\checkmark$ Quantifying the economic and environmental outcomes associated with these management changes
$\checkmark$ Developing a persuasive education tool to convince farmers to adopt these practices on owned and rented land
$\checkmark$ Increasing awareness
Improving landowner and operator communication and interaction
$\qquad$

# - <br> American Farmland Trust 

## DESIGNING THE PROJECT



# Locations selected to leverage already existing AFT work 

- California: Lower Stanislaus River Watershed
- Illinois: Vermilion Headwaters Watershed
- Ohio: Portage and Toussaint Watershed
- New York: Genesee River Basin Watershed


## Materials developed for the Authors

- Criteria to Identify Soil Health Successful Farmers
- 4-page Handout: About the Project; Why Participate; Consent Form; Questionnaire Explanation
- List of Information to Collect Ahead of Time
- 20-page Questionnaire in Word
- 11-tab Excel Economic Calculator
- 6-tab NTT \& COMET Questionnaire in Excel
- Case Study Template


## METHODS FOR ECONOMIC ANALYSIS



## Partial Budget Analysis

|  | Data Sources: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ove | Item | Source |
|  | Labor Rate: 45-1011 First-Line Supervisors of Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Workers | Bureau of Labor Statistics - 2018 Labor Rates |
| This | Machinery Cost Estimates | Field Operations, Farm Business Mngmnt., University of Illinois, June 2017 |
|  | Machinery Costs for Fertilizer Application | 2018 Iowa Farm Custom Rate Survey, Iowa State University Extension and Outreach |
|  | Fertilizer Prices | Estimated Costs of Crop Production in Iowa - 2018 |
|  | Index for Agricultural Costs | Producer Prices Paid Index, National Agricultural Statistics Service |
|  | Crop Prices - Non-organic, Commodity | USDA, Economics, Statistica \& Market Information System, Agricultural Prices (NASS) |
|  | Crop Prices - Non-organic, Hay/Forage | Agricultural Prices, NASS, February 29, 2019 |
|  | Crop Prices - Organic, Corn, Soybeans, Hay | National Organic Grain and Feedstuffs Report, National Ag. Statistics Service, December 19, 2018 |
| Witl | Crop Prices - Organic Wheat | Baking Business November 2018 Prices |
|  | Nutrient Values | Estimated Costs of Production in Iowa, Iowa State University Extension and Outreach |
|  | Value of Nutrients in Soil (for erosion reduction benefit) | Interim Final Benefit-Cost Analysis for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, 2009 |
|  | Net Returns, Corn, Soybeans, | Commodity Costs and Returns, Economic Research Service |
|  | Production Costs, Hay | Estimated Costs of Crop Production in Iowa-2019, Iowa State University, Extension and Outreach |
|  | National Average Hay Yield | Statistics by Subject, NASS, 2018 |



## Nutrient Tracking Tool


http://ntt.tiaer.tarleton.edu/welcomes/new?locale=en


## COMET FARM

# COMET <br> Farm <br> USDA United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service 

Whole Farm and Ranch Carbon and Greenhouse Gas Accounting System.



Why should I use COMET-Farm?


USDA GHG methods
 do I need?


How are my results calculated?


Is my information safe?


How do I use COMET-Farm?


Overview video
http://cometfarm.nrel.colostate.edu/

THE RESULTS

## 4 AFT-NRCS Soil Health Case Studies



## 4 AFT-NRCS Soil Health Case Studies

## Ralf Sauter, Okuye Farms, CA



## Economic benefits of soil health practices outweigh the costs of implementation

Economic Effects of Soil Health Practices on Thorndyke Farms (2018)

| Increases in Net Income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase in Income |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| Yield Impacts due to Cover Crops | \$12.95 | 700 | \$9,067 |
| Total Increased Income |  |  | \$9,067 |
| Decrease in Cost |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| Nutrient Savings Due to Nutrient Management | \$66.00 | 700 | \$46,200 |
| Reduced Machinery Cost due to Reduced Tillage | \$17.68 | 1,400 | \$24,746 |
| Reduced Machinery Cost due to Nutrient Mgt. | \$2.73 | 1,400 | \$3,815 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total Decreased Cost |  |  | \$74.761 |
| Annual Total Increased Net Income |  |  | \$83,828 |
| Total Acres in this Study Area |  |  | 1,400 |
| Annual Per Acre Increased Net Income |  |  | \$60 |


| Decreases in Net Income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decrease in Income |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| None Identified |  |  | \$0 |
| Total Decreased Income |  |  | \$0 |
| Increase in Cost |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| Nutrient Management Learning Activities | \$0.87 | 1,400 | \$1,221 |
| Cover Crops Learning Activities | \$1.74 | 700 | \$1,221 |
| Cover Crop Costs | \$39.00 | 700 | \$27,300 |
| Increased Pesticide Cost due to Reduced Tillage | \$5.00 | 1,400 | \$7,000 |
| Total Increased Cost |  |  | \$36.742 |
| Annual Total Decreased Net Income |  |  | \$36,742 |
| Total Acres in this Study Area |  |  | 1,400 |
| Annual Per Acre Decreased Net Income |  |  | \$26 |

## Larry Thorndyke, IL, corn-soybeans



- Ford County, Vermilion Headwater Watershed
- Soil health practices: No-till \& strip-till, cover crops, \& nutrient management
- Study area: 1,400 / 2,600 acres

Annual SH Benefits: $\$ 83,828$
Annual SH Costs: \$36,742
Annual SH PROFITS: \$47,086 or \$34/ac


129\% ROI
(2018 dollars)
NTT results: On a 110-acre field, N, P, \& sediment reduced by $45,89, \& 76 \%$

COMET results: Same field, total GHGs emissions reduced by 192\%

## Economic benefits of soil health practices outweigh the costs of implementation

Economic Effects of Soil Health Practices on MadMax Farms (2018)

| Increases in Net Income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase in Income |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | total |
| Yield Impact Due to Soil Health Practices | \$69.00 | 1,250 | \$86,250 |
| Total Increased Income |  |  | \$86,250 |
| Decrease in Cost |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | total |
| Nutrient Savings due to Soil Health Practices | \$17.51 | 1,250 | \$21,881 |
| Reduced Seeding Rate for Soybeans | \$5.00 | 625 | \$3,125 |
| Pesticide Savings due to Soil Health Practices | \$18.75 | 1,250 | \$23,438 |
| 50\% Reduction in Treated Soybean Seed | \$6.00 | 625 | \$3,750 |
| Reduced Machinery Costs Due to Reduced Tillage | \$35.45 | 1,250 | \$44,317 |
| Field Repair Savings due to Soil Health Practices | \$1.00 | 1,250 | \$1,250 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total Decreased Cost |  |  | \$07,761 |
| Annual Total Increased Net Income |  |  | \$184,011 |
| Total Acres in this Study Area |  |  | 1,250 |
| Annual Per Acre Increased Net Income |  |  | \$147 |


| Decreases in Net Income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decrease in Income |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| None Identified |  |  | \$0 |
| Total Decreased Income |  |  | \$0 |
| Increase in Cost |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | total |
| Variable Rate Application Cost | \$3.00 | 1,250 | \$3,750 |
| Increased Soil Testing Every Two Years | \$10.00 | 1,250 | \$12,500 |
| Residue and Tillage Mgt. Learning Activities | \$1.17 | 1,250 | \$1,465 |
| Cover Crops Learning Activities | \$5.86 | 1,250 | \$7,326 |
| Nutrient Management Learning Activities | \$3.32 | 1,250 | \$4,151 |
| Using Biologicals in Furrow | \$30.00 | 1,250 | \$37,500 |
| Increased Machinery Costs due to Change in Nutrient Management | \$6.30 | 1,250 | \$7,875 |
| Cover Crop Costs | \$49.50 | 1,250 | \$61,875 |
| Total Increased Cost |  |  | \$136,442 |
| Annual Total Decreased Net Income |  |  | \$136,442 |
| Total Acres in this Study Area |  |  | 1,250 |
| Annual Per Acre Decreased Net Income |  |  | \$109 |

## Eric Niemeyer, OH, corn-soybeans



- Marion \& Delaware Counties, Upper Scioto River Watershed
- Soil health practices: No-till, cover crops, \& nutrient management
- Study area: All 1,250 acres operation

Annual SH Benefits: $\$ 184,011$
Annual SH Costs: $\$ 136,442$
Annual SH PROFITS: \$47,569 or \$38/ac


35\% ROI (2018 dollars)
NTT results: a 70 -acre field $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \&$ sediment reduced by $58,74,88 \%$

COMET results: Same field, total GHG emissions reduced by $494 \%$

## Economic benefits of soil health practices outweigh the costs of implementation

Economic Effects of Soil Health Practices on Gary Swede Farm, LLC (2018)

| Increases in Net Income |  |  |  | Decreases in Net Income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase in Income |  |  |  | Decrease in Income |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL | ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| Yield Impact Due to Soil Health Practices | \$71.95 | 600 | \$43,168 | None Identified |  |  | \$0 |
| Total Increased Income |  |  | \$43,168 | Total Decreased Income |  |  | \$0 |
| Decrease in Cost |  |  |  | Increase in Cost |  |  |  |
| ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL | ITEM | PER ACRE | ACRES | TOTAL |
| Reduced Machinery Cost due to Reduced Tillage | \$23.43 | 1,500 | \$35,152 | Cost of Setting up Planter to Handle Residue | \$0.72 | 600 | \$432 |
| Nutrient Savings due to Nutrient Mngmnt. | \$40.65 | 600 | \$24,390 | Cover Crop Costs | \$51.00 | 450 | \$22,950 |
| Value of Decreased Erosion due to Soil Health Practices | \$2.25 | 1,500 | \$3,369 | Residue and Tillage Mgmt. Learning Activities | \$0.07 | 1,500 | \$98 |
|  |  |  |  | Cover Crops Learning Activities | \$0.22 | 450 | \$98 |
|  |  |  |  | Nutrient Management Learning Activities | \$0.16 | 1,500 | \$244 |
| Total Decreased Cost |  |  | \$02,011 | Total Increased Cost |  |  | \$22,822 |
| Total Increased Net Income |  |  | \$106,079 | Annual Total Decreased Net Income |  |  | \$23,822 |
| Total Acres in the Study Area |  |  | 1,500 | Total Acres in this Study Area |  |  | 1,500 |
| Per Acre Increased Net Income |  |  | \$71 | Annual Per Acre Decreased Net Income |  |  | \$16 |
|  |  |  |  | Netincome |  |  |  |
| Annual Change in Total Net Income $=\mathbf{8} 82,257$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Change in Per Acre Net Income = \$55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

343\% ROI

## Jay Swede, NY, diversified crop rotation



- Genesee County Genesee River Watershed;
- Sweet corn, alfalfa, corn silage, grain corn
- Soil health practices: No-till, strip-till, cover crops, \& nutrient management
- Study area: 1,500 / 4,500 acres

Annual SH Benefits: $\$ 106,079$
Annual SH Costs: $\$ 23,822$
Annual SH PROFITS: \$82,257 or \$55/ac (2018 dollars)


NTT results: On a 25 -acre field, N, P, \& sediment reduced by $40,92, \& 96 \%$

COMET results: Same field, total GHGs emissions reduced by $560 \%$

## OVERARCHING FINDINGS



## Yield \& Income Benefits of Soil Health Practices Across Three Farms



- Improved Yield:

2 to $15 \%$ yield increases attributable to soil health practices

- Annual Change in Per Acre Net Income: Average increase for 3 row crop farmers was \$42/ac/yr
- Return on Investment:

Average ROI for 3 row crop farms was $169 \%$, ranging from $35 \%$ to $343 \%$

## Input Benefits \& Costs of Soil Health Practices Across Three Farms

- Changes to Fertilizer Costs:

3 row crop farmers saving \$17 to \$66/ac/yr

- reduced P applications 35 to 50\%
- reduced K applications 50\% 1 farmer reduced N on corn by $5 \%$
- Changes to Machinery, Fuel, and Labor Costs:
3 row crop farmers saving $\$ 18$ to \$35/ac/yr, averaging \$26/ac/yr


[^0]
# Input Benefits \& Costs of Soil Health Practices Across Three Farms 



## Herbicide Usage:

Mixed results:
1 farmer saves \$19/ac/yr
1 farmer spends \$5/ac/yr more
1 farmer was unchanged

## Learning Costs:

Total cost ranged from \$440 to \$12,940/yr
Per acre costs range from 44 cents to \$10.35
$\qquad$

## Environmental Benefits of Soil Health Practices Across all Four Farms

- Water Quality Improvement:

3 row crop farmers observed reduced soil and water runoff On selected fields, NTT estimated N losses were reduced 40 to 58\%;
P losses reduced 74 to $92 \%$; \& sediment losses reduced 76 to $96 \%$

- Climate Improvement:

COMET-Farm estimated total GHG emissions were reduced on each field by 192 to $560 \%$, equivalent to taking to 17 cars off the road.

## Farmer Uses of the Case Studies



## We hope farmers will share the case studies with:

- Existing landowners - To discuss sharing the risks and rewards of the soil health investments
- New landowners - To add new fields
- Bankers -To secure additional financing for the farm expansion


# - -1. <br> American Farmland Trust 





## THANK YOU!

## AFT Site:

farmland.org/soilhealthcasestudies NRCS Site:
American Farmland Trust

Michelle Perez mperez@farmland.org

Emily Bruner
ebruner@farmland.org

## 19 + Tasks for Authors

1. Find Soil Health Successful Famers that match the Criteria
2. Meet \& discuss project with each farmer, complete the List of Things, complete signed consent form
3. Schedule interviews
4. Learn the 3 quantitative methods
5. Conduct economics interview, record it, \& clean-up notes
6. Conduct NTT \& COMET interview, record it, \& clean-up
7. Enter economics data into the Calculator \& compute results
8. Enter NTT data into NTT online \& compute results
9. Enter COMET data into COMET online \& compute results
10. Discus economics results with Flo \& Michelle
11. Discuss NTT results with Mindy Selman, NTT lead for USDA OEM
12. Discuss COMET results with Matt Stermer, COMET lead for CSU
13. Write the case study
14. Go through review \& editing by Flo \& Michelle
15. Go through NRCS review

[^0]:    American Farmland Trust

