

# Variable Rate (fertilizer) Economics

Terry L. Kastens, KSU Ag Economics; [tkastens@ksu.edu](mailto:tkastens@ksu.edu)

Kevin C. Dhuyvetter, KSU Ag Economics; [kcd@ksu.edu](mailto:kcd@ksu.edu)

KARA's 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Ag Technology Conference

Salina, Kansas

January 22-23, 2009




## We have been involved for years

- Considerable amount of original research
  - But also reported on work of others
- Nutrients: N, P, K, Lime
- Scale: big fields and little fields (grid/zone mgt)
- We've argued with everyone
  - Agronomists
  - Engineers
  - Other economists
  - Farmers
  - Often ourselves (when no one else would argue with us)
- Many unexpected nuggets along the way . . .
- Motivation:
  - Others just aren't "getting it"
  - We're just not "getting it"

Oh, no. Another trip down memory lane.  
... you got it.

3



Accuracy matters, but will it matter enough to overcome cost of acquisition?

4

January 2000

## Conclusions

- basing fertilizer decisions on farm or site-specific data demands more complex response functions
- P-response function considerations
  - treat fertP and STP as substitutes
  - consider buildup over time
  - should consider dynamic models along with discounting
  - operator time horizon matters
  - in short horizons the steady-state path is not optimal
- site-specific P management for study farm
  - breakeven at best at the 2.5 acre scale
  - easy to justify at some scale

There is a scale at which VRA will pay, but perhaps not the one we envisioned.

5

August 2000

## Crude Generalizations from FICPA

1. No current precision ag activities (typically agronomic ones) stand out as being extremely profitable
2. Despite years of research, returns to VRT N are likely to be small or non-existent
  - Will be a tagalong activity
  - Better yield goals would help
  - Sugar beets are an exception
  - Pollution concerns are an exception
3. Yield-goal research has died down
  - Are yield goals merely a holdover of old ways?

1 and 2 still true; 3 was not quite right – yield goals still quite important to N recommendations

6

August 2000

## Crude Generalizations from FICPA

### 4. Remote sensing is the hot topic (64 studies)

- Spatially dense, low cost per data point
- Multiple images during the year
- Non-invasive (don't have to go to field)
- Notable profits haven't surfaced
- Geo-rectification and registering

### 5. Electrical soil conductivity sensors

- Spatially dense, low cost per data point
- Gains are site-specific
- Soil moisture influences

Maybe we can lower the cost of information to improve profitability of VRA?

- RS and EC measure everything

Remote sensing was really hot then and hasn't gone away (still building slowly)  
EC interest really hot a few years ago, but not disappearing either

7

August 2000

## Crude Generalizations from FICPA

### 6. Management zones are appealing but not especially successful

- 4 successful, 4 not, 8 unsure
- Thought to maximize the information acquired from a single soil sample
- Rely on farmer intuition
- Each factor needs different zone classifications, P-mgt, K-mgt, RS, EC, yield-based, and farmer-drawn zones are all different
- Optimal zones become grids

Management zones, where they exist, are mostly intuitive – persist because of the lack of feasible alternatives (actually, they are losing ground)

8

## Crude Generalizations from FICPA

### 7. Grid sampling works but is too expensive

- At some sufficiently small scale it works
- At some sufficiently large scale it's profitable
- Optimal cell size is site-specific
- Despite attempts by research and business to discredit, it remains viable
  - At 2% of farms (1999), USDA deems most popular PA activity

### 8. Yield monitors & yield mapping here to stay

- 55% (26% w/ mapping) of CHAMP combines (1999)
- Adoption based on faith
- Some frustration after multiple years


Is grid sampling growing? Probably slowly?

#8 likely still true today

9

An aside . . . a lot of yield monitors but not much mapping

## CHAMP Program (custom harvesters)



- Members providing maps – 33.3%
  - For providers, this % of customers mapped – 6.6%

10

August 2000

## Crude Generalizations from FICPA

### 11. VRT lime is likely to be profitable

- Yields turn down with excess pH
- Kansas has a transition area where only some parts of a field gain from lime


### 12. VRT P is also likely to be profitable

- It is the capital investment characteristics of lime and P that make VRT potentially profitable. Information-gathering and VRT costs can be spread across years.

These probably were overstatements

11

September 2000




$$\text{prediction} = \frac{\frac{1}{2^2} \times 10 + \frac{1}{3^2} \times 12 + \frac{1}{4^2} \times 18}{\frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{4^2}} = 11.7$$

Along the way we spent considerable time both learning ourselves and training others how to do the math



January 2001



Some farms likely are managing lime/pH better than they did as a result of PA  
Are they using VRA on lime? Well, maybe sort-of. . .

13

August 2001

## Problem #1

- Models behind university fertilizer recommendations are usually not explicit
  - What happens to yields at less or more than the recommended fertilizer rates?
  - What happens to profits?
- Difficult to assess expected profits for VRT/PA without an explicit yield/fertilizer relationship

So began a whole line of research that tried to get mathematical models for decision-making from agronomy understanding

It wouldn't have happened without PA

Better field-scale decisions result


14

## Yield models

- We've always used yield models in our work
- Yield models are always questionable
- We have always striven for increased buy-in of agronomists and farmers
  - Try to do a better job incorporating what THEY believe
- But unexpected, hard-to-explain, results still routinely emanate from our work

15


Early 2002



Following different fertilizer recommendations over time will lead to different levels of soil fertility

16

Early 2002



Optimal fertilizer P decisions are different if one considers time horizon

17

December 2003

## Managing Fertilizer Programs on Leased Land in the Eastern Corn Belt

Indiana Crop Advisor Conference  
Indianapolis, Indiana  
December 16-17, 2003

This work was keyed off of the Tri-State (MI, OH, IN) fertilizer recommendations


Terry L. Kastens, Ag. Economist  
Kevin C. Dhuyvetter, Ag. Economist  
John P. Schmidt, Agronomist  
Kansas State University

tkastens@ksu.edu – 785-532-5866  
kcd@ksu.edu – 785-532-3527  
schmidt@ksu.edu – 785-532-7211

paper at [www.agmanager.info](http://www.agmanager.info)

December 2003


### High STP case



An aside: 50% higher phosphate prices would increase all premiums 50%


December 2003

### Low STP case



December 2003


### High and low soil pH



21

December 2003

### In KS, we likely would believe this



22

## Herbicide VRA (Rider et al.)

- Estimated profit
  - average margin between site-specific and uniform full label rate application
    - \$22.33/ac from the quadratic models
    - \$17.95/ac from the Mitscherlich models
  - average margin between site-specific and uniform optimal rate application
    - \$1.96/ac from the quadratic models
    - \$2.08/ac from the Mitscherlich models

Benefits there but insufficient to cover costs of information gathering

23

## Ever more believable yield models

- We're motivated by
  - “The models we're using don't seem to work right”
- Maybe we should quit arguing about whose fertilizer recommendations are most correct and simply start with some particular research-based fertilizer recommendations, e.g., KSU's, and take them as a given.
- What must the researchers believe about yield response given their recommendations?
- Can we get to this point?
  - “If you accept KSU's fertilizer recommendations, it pretty much follows that you have to believe what we're telling you now.”



24

March 2006

## N Response Functions for Today's Production Costs



Terry L. Kastens – ag economist, KSU  
Kevin C. Dhuyvetter – ag economist, KSU  
Alan J. Schlegel – agronomist, KSU  
Troy J. Dumler – ag economist, KSU

Presented at:  
Great Plains Soil Fertility Conference  
March 7-8, 2006, Denver, Colorado

Sometimes outside forces motivate our work.  
Work started in fall of 2005, in the face of high  
fertilizer prices and low crop prices.  
We all were making ad hoc suggested rate  
cutbacks at the time.

March 2006



Kansas State University  
Department of Agronomy

MF-2586

Soil Test Interpretations and  
Fertilizer Recommendations

Nutrient Management

### KSU nitrogen recommendations...

#### Corn and grain sorghum

$N \text{ rec} = (\text{Yield Goal} \times 1.6) - (\% \text{SOM} \times 20) - \text{Profile N} - \text{Manure N} - \text{Other N Adjustments}$   
+ Previous Crop Adjustments

#### Wheat

$N \text{ rec} = (\text{Yield Goal} \times 2.4) - (\% \text{SOM} \times 10) - \text{Profile N} - \text{Manure N} - \text{Other N Adjustments}$   
+ Previous Crop Adjustments + Tillage Adjustments + Grazing Adjustments

#### Sunflowers

$N \text{ rec} = (\text{Yield Goal} \times 0.075) - (\% \text{SOM} \times 20) - \text{Profile N} - \text{Manure N} - \text{Other N Adjustments}$   
+ Previous Crop Adjustments


March 2006

## KSU nitrogen recommendations vs. N price

- Recommendations do not explicitly include prices
- Mathematical relationship between expected yield and nitrogen (i.e., production function) is needed in order to adjust recommendations for prices
- Similar issues pertain to P & K recommendations (i.e., no way to adjust them for prices)
- We assume KSU had in mind these prices:
  - Wheat \$3.22/bu
  - Corn \$2.35/bu
  - fertN \$0.21/lb N (fertP, used later, \$0.24/lb P2O5)


March 2006

### Site-year response is linear but average appears curvilinear



March 2006


Site-year response is linear but average appears curvilinear



29

March 2006

Defined points that allowed quadratic-plateau function to be defined...



30


March 2006

- We believe we got to the point of “if you believe KSU’s fertilizer recommendations you have to believe our price-dependent profit-maximizing rates”
- Everything was embedded in an Excel spreadsheet so that users could determine optimal fertilizer N rates based on fertilizer N prices and crop prices
- We could use the spreadsheet to recommend some “typical” percentage cutbacks on fertilizer – dealers had been requesting such info throughout 2005

## What about N rates under irrigation?

KSU Nrec does not distinguish between irrigated and dryland  
(other than to have different max rate)


We barely got the N spreadsheet completed and we felt the need to incorporate information regarding pumping costs – not surprising given that the issue in 2005 was higher fuel prices along with stagnant crop prices



- **KSU N recs don't distinguish between irrigators and non-irrigators, which means:**
  - Recommended N rates assume water is not limiting yield (or that producer picks a reduced yield goal based on water cost)
- **With high pumping cost and high N prices and low crop prices, our spreadsheet recommended large cutbacks in both N and irrigation water**

March 2006


When considering irrigation and N together, optimal values decrease significantly...



Sorghum price = \$2.10/bu, N price = \$0.40/lb, irrigation cost = \$6.50/inch

**P information more valuable than N information**

March 2006




Fall 2008

**Late summer early Fall 2008 ...**

- Very high fertilizer prices and not just N
- Falling crop prices
- Producers asking about price-based adjustments again, especially related to high P prices (\$1.20/lb P2O5??)
- And so we adjust the decision spreadsheet again ... this time incorporating P
  - Use MF-2586 sufficiency P recs
- Very large cutbacks in P were suggested in October

January 2009



38


2007-2008

- We've showed over and over again the economic benefits to GPS technologies
  - Autoguidance
  - Boom and section control
    - VRA can be on or off
- Yield monitors here to stay
- Investment in much of the yield and input data collection stuff, and rate controlling stuff, is easily justified outside the world of traditional VRA

We've daydreamed about and researched many aspects of VRA over the years.

So, what are our thoughts today?

Percent of service providers offering services



VRA is not dead, but growing very slowly.

## VRA Economics

- Yield response function
  - In a 1-year story, problem is pretty much licked
- VRA equipment cost – no big deal any more
- So, a couple of hurdles are gone
- Soil test thinking
  - Soil tests generally pay at some spatial scale
  - Soil tests are still expensive at a small scale
  - Infrequent small-scale tests sort of work for some nutrients
  - Basing N rates on soil tests a big problem, let alone VRA
  - So, at best small profit if depend upon small-scale soil tests
  - No cheap (and accurate) soil test proxies
- Will we be able to get past soil test thinking?
  - Can we charge ahead, chasing some new idea, relegating analysis to a monitoring role rather than a determining one?

42

## The Time Dimension

- Soils are alive and change over time
- Does fertilizer impact yield or does it impact soil fertility, which in turn impacts yield?
- We've thought some about P and soil pH over time, but have only daydreamed about N in this context
- Continuous no-till: many time-dimension facets
  - Changes in soil structure that can modify yield goals?
  - Increases in soil organic matter, which might greatly buffer the impact of annual decisions around fertilizer
    - Quantity and timing of fertilizer becomes less important?
  - With no-till, can we simply use grain-removal based fertilizer rates, ensuring “correct” rates only when averaged across time? Might that work for N, as well as P?
    - . . . tune in to tonight's discussion group

43

# *Questions ???*



[www.agmanager.info](http://www.agmanager.info)