Crop Production Management in Volatile Times

Terry L. Kastens -- tkastens@ksu.edu -- 785-626-9000 Kevin C. Dhuyvetter -- kcd@ksu.edu -- 785-532-3527 Department of Agricultural Economics Kansas State University



Fluid Fertilizer Foundation Forum Shifting Paradigms in Evaluating Plant Nutrition February 15-17, 2009. Scottsdale Plaza Resort, Scottsdale, Arizona



www.agmanager.info

Historical and forecasted oil and diesel fuel prices



Historical relationship suggests that NYMEX crude oil market can be used to forecast diesel prices.

Historical and forecasted crude oil and farm diesel fuel average Mar-Oct prices...

	Crude	Year-to-year change		Diesel	Year-to-year change	
Year	oil /1	\$/barrel	percent	fuel /2	\$/gal	percent
2004	\$41.84	\$11.31	37.0%	\$1.37	\$0.32	30.0%
2005	\$57.98	\$16.14	38.6%	\$2.04	\$0.67	48.5%
2006	\$68.07	\$10.09	17.4%	\$2.41	\$0.38	18.6%
2007	\$70.09	\$2.02	3.0%	\$2.52	\$0.11	4.4%
2008	\$114.19	\$44.10	62.9%	\$3.68	\$1.16	46.0%
2004-08 avg /3	\$70.44	\$43.54	161.9%	\$2.40	\$1.43	146.4%
2009 (F)	\$51.05	(\$63.14)	-55.3%	\$1.77	(\$1.91)	<mark>-51.8%</mark>
2009 less 04-08 avg	(\$19.39)	xxx	-27.5%	(\$0.63)) xxx	-26.3%

Crude Oil and Off-road Diesel Fuel Prices

/1 Mar-Oct average of NYMEX futures

/2 Mar-Oct average for Southwest Kansas

/3 Year-to-year and percent changes are calculated from the previous 5-year average (i.e., 1999-2003)

F = forecast based on 01/30/2009 futures prices

Machinery Costs Per Acre, Kansas 2008 vs. 2009* Source: 182 KFMA Members (Beaton) Repairs Depreciation Labor Fuel Interest Ins. & shelter 2008 2009 15.0% 17.5% 3.3% 3.8% 22.9% 15.1% 26.7% 27.4% 11.6% 23.2% 13.6% 19.8%

Fuel prices were an important driver of machinery cost in 2008

Total: \$101.84

* 2009 values are calculated based on fuel price changes and inflation adjustments for other categories. Fuel price forecasts are based on 1/30/09 crude oil futures prices.

Total: \$116.69

Impact of fuel prices on farm-level costs...



Cannot manage around unless you can predict fuel prices

But, how well can prices be predicted?



Do we need to "lock in" current price forecasts?



Purchasing fuel based on seasonal patterns?



Seasonal pattern is not particularly predictable...



Seasonal pattern used for analysis...





IF the only storage costs that existed were interest, then a strategy of buying in the months of Jan, Feb, Mar, Jun and Jul (based on 27-year seasonal pattern) would have resulted in a \$0.05/gallon advantage compared to buying as needed (i.e., every month). Purchasing fuel tanks turns gain into loss.

Pre-purchasing / locking in fuel prices

- Buy now and take delivery (need to have storage)
- Forward contract for later delivery
 - Availability of this option?
 - Quantity requirements?
- Hedge fuel in NYMEX crude oil (or heating oil) futures market
 - Quantity one crude oil contract (1,000 barrels) effectively hedges 30,000+ gallons of diesel
- Hedge using Exchange Traded Funds (ETF)



Group Home > DBO Home

PowerShares® DB Oil Fund



Description

The PowerShares DB Oil Fund is based on the Deutsche Bank Liquid Commodity Index - Optimum Yield Oil Excess Return™ and managed by DB Commodity Services LLC. The Index is a rules-based index composed of futures contracts on Light Sweet Crude Oil (WTI) and is intended to reflect the performance of crude oil.

You cannot invest directly in the index. Ordinary brokerage commissions apply.

Prospectus DBO Fund Card

bbo i una care



~	Fund Performance & In	ndex History	(%)*		As of 30 S	eptember 2007
		1 Year	3 Year	5 Year	10 Year	Fund Inception [‡]
	DB Crude Oil Index [†]	8.27	17.25	32.54	24.12	21.76
ě	S&P GS Crude Index+	11.26	2.34	18.95	14.51	32.10
P	DJ-AIG Crude Index ⁺	13.19	5.69	22.63	16.23	31.91
pun:	NAV¢					20.61
	Share Price Return					21.09

Index Base Date: December 2, 1988

Performance data quoted represents past performance. PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS. Investment returns and principal value will fluctuate and shares of the Fund, when redeemed, may be worth more or less than their original cost.

*Index returns are hypothetical and do not represent Fund returns. Hypothetical or simulated

DBO Financial Details

Ticker: DBO

Last Update	30-May-2008			
	04:14 PM			
Price	47.40			
DB Oil Index Level*	3,412.45			
Indicative Intra-day NAV**	47.29			
Last end of day NAV***	47.29572			
Last date for end of day NAV	30-May-2008			

Data Source: www.amex.com

(Data delayed 20 minutes)

- * Indicative intra-day and Index closing
- ** Indicative intra-day value of the Fund
- *** Last end of day DBO.NV

About the Fund's Index

DB Oil Index Commodities Base Weight[®] Light Sweet Crude Oil 100.0% Current Index Data Downloads DBO Prospectus Download PDF DBO Fund Card Download PDF SEC Filings Click here to view

Most Recent Monthly Reports



Relationship suggest you could reasonably hedge crude oil price (hence diesel fuel price) via buying DBO stock. One share of DBO stock would effectively hedge approximately 11.5-12.0 gallons of diesel (basis risk?).

Fertilizer prices

(should you be cutting back on fertilizer rates?)



N prices have fallen recently, but are still significantly above historical averages...















P and K prices have fallen recently, but are still significantly above historical averages...



* Price of phosphate is based on blend price less value of N (average of NH3, UAN 32, and Urea prices)











Big price drops in a short time span – now leveling off?



What do these high prices imply for fertilizer rates?

... perhaps not a great deal if expected crop prices also are really high ... sort of what we've been preaching the last year and a half Like fertilizer prices, crop prices have fallen recently, but they are still significantly above historical averages...



So, should we adjust fertilizer rates when fertilizer or crop prices change?



KSU nitrogen recommendations ... no prices

Corn and grain sorghum

N rec = (Yield Goal x 1.6) – (%SOM x 20) – Profile N – Manure N – Other N Adjustments + Previous Crop Adjustments

Wheat

N rec = (Yield Goal x 2.4) – (%SOM x 10) – Profile N – Manure N – Other N Adjustments + Previous Crop Adjustments + Tillage Adjustments + Grazing Adjustments

Sunflowers

N rec = (Yield Goal x 0.075) – (%SOM x 20) – Profile N – Manure N – Other N Adjustments + Previous Crop Adjustments

Kastens, Dhuyvetter, Schlegel, & Dumler started working on this in late 2005 . . .

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)

Nitrogen production function...

- In a limiting factor framework, it is generally believed that relationship between N and yield is linear for any given year and location (implies linear plateau production function)
- Linear plateau production function implies that optimal N will either be 0 or level where yield plateaus
- Average of multiple linear plateau production functions can be non-linear and this represents expectations of future N:yield relationship


Functions could and likely should have 0-intercept if response is to total N



Functions could and likely should have 0-intercept if response is to total N

Price won't matter until fertN = \$1.34/lb, then optimal is 0 lb/acre

Functions might be curvilinear





Same optimal N (slope there = 0.21/3.20) but about 1% lower yields

Yield response by year – linear plateau "fits" data quite well...



What would yield be for given fertN next year?

Average of linear plateaus can become non-linear...



Average of linear plateaus can become non-linear...



Blue line is NOT based on a mathematical function

Functional form...

- Numerous functional forms could be used that would meet objectives. We considered:
 - Linear plateau, along with four different curvilinear forms
- Based on nitrogen fertilizer research studies from north central and western Kansas on wheat, corn, and milo, quadratic plateau model fit data better than alternatives most often
- Most non-linear models "look" very similar, but results (i.e., optimal N versus N price) do vary

Functional form...

- Numerous functional forms could be used that would meet objectives. We considered:
 - Linear plateau, along with four different curvilinear forms
- Most non-linear models "look" very similar, but results (i.e., optimal N versus N price) do vary



Here, a linear plateau fit blue line the best



Here, a quadratic plateau fit blue line the best



Here, a quadratic plateau fit blue line the best

Back to the Belleville milo data

Functional form...

 Based on nitrogen fertilizer research studies from north central and western Kansas on wheat, corn, and milo, quadratic plateau model fit data better than alternatives most often

Nitrogen production function...

- Nice property of non-linear production function is that it implies diminishing marginal returns and thus prices matter
- Best-fitting functional form is quadratic plateau, which allows diminishing returns – consistent with linear plateau in any given year
- Estimate model parameters such that
 - KSU Nrec is economic optimum at historical average prices
 - Yield plateau is equal to yield goal
 - Intercept goes through origin (i.e., 0 N equates to 0 yield)





Same optimal N (slope there = 0.21/3.22) but yields about 1% lower than plateau



Slope at diamonds is 0.40/3.22



With more expensive N, you make more money by applying less

Operationalizing production function...

• 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

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



Corn \$4.29/bu; N \$0.71/lb, P2O5 \$1.09/lb, irrigation cost = \$6.00/in (20 in rain; YG=225) MF-2586 recs: 300 lb N, 38.0 P2O5; optimal rates: 13.1 in water, 226.9 lb N, 14.5 lb P2O5

🛛 Microsoft Excel - KSU-NPI_CropBudgets(OsageCo-JanO9).xls												
📳 File Edit View Insert Format Iools Data Window Help 🗸 🗗 🗙												
🗋 😂 🔒 🛃 🔩 🕵 💖 🎇 🕉 🛍 🛍 • 🖋 🇉 - 110% 🔹 🦉 Arial 🔹 - 11 🕒 🖪 Z 🙂 🚍 🚍 \$ % > 5% 🖧 🚎 🗐 - 110% 🔹 🚆 Arial												
A1 •	▼ fx											
A	B C D	E	F	G	Н	Ι	J	K	L	Μ	N	0 🔼
1												
3	KSU-NPL CronBudgets vis A spreadsheet budgeting program to compare economic returns of											
4	multiple crops and/or crop rotations where pitrogen and phosphate fertilizer and irrigation levels are											
5	determined ontimally based upon prices											
0	determined optimally based upon prices.											
7	Version 11.30.08											
8												
9	INPUTS vs CALCU	JLATED VALUE	S									
10	In the Budgets , Op	timal N&I , Fig	ures , and Iri	r energy co	s ts sheets a	ll <mark>blue</mark> numb	ers are inpu	its and all bla	ck			
11	numbers are calcul	ated from these	inputs. The	Irr energy	costs sheet	is included a	as a calculat	tor to assist v	vith			
12	determining irrigatio	n pumping cost , entered into th	s to enter int Budgets	:0 the Budge cheet)	ers sneet (co	osts calculat	ted in the irr	energy cost	s sneet			
14	need to be mandali		Dudgets	sneetj.								
15	DESCRIPTION OF	INPUTS										
16	Several of the input	cells (i.e., blue r	number) hav	e a red diam	<mark>ond</mark> in the u	pper right ha	and corner o	f the cell. By	moving			
17	your mouse cursor	over this diamo	nd, a brief de	escription of	the input will	be displaye	d on the scr	een.				
18												
19	COMPANION PUE	LICATION						100 1 1 1 2 1				
20	The mathematical a	pproach used ti commondations	o determine to Pofloof C	the economi rice" (availa	ic optimal N blo op www.	rates is desi	cribed in " <i>Wi</i> r info)	oditying Yield	l-Goal-			
21	Daseu rennizen ne	commendations	IU NENECI F	nce (avalia		agmanagei	.inio).					
23	Developed by:	Kevin C. D	huvvetter ·	785-532-3	3527 kcda	@ksu.edu						
24	, ,	Terry L. K	astens 78	85-626-9000	tkasten	s@ksu.edu						
25		Troy J. Du	mler 620	-275-9164	- tdumler@	ksu.edu						
26												
27		Extension	Agricultura	l Economis	ts							
28		Kansas St	ate Univers	sity								
27	KSU-NPI	CropBu	daets	xls – av	vailable	at ww	w.aam	anager	info			
31												
32	(C	lick on "D	ecision	100IS" (under "I	rojecte	d Budg	ets")				
Intro	, Budgets / OptimalRates	/ Irr energy costs	/ Tables /				<					>
Draw 🔹 🔓 🛛 Auto	5hapes 🔻 🔪 🔪 🖂 🔿 🔮	4 0 2 🛛	<u>⊘</u> , + <u>⊿</u> + <u>↓</u>	A - = = 3	# • • •							
Ready											NUM	

🗷 M	🛛 Microsoft Excel - KSU-NPI_CropBudgets(OsageCo-JanO9).xls											
🕮 File Edit View Insert Format Tools Data Window Help 🗸 🗗 🗙												
1 n	📬 🔲 🖪 🖂 🖪 🕄 🖑 🛍 👗 🖻 🛝 -	- 🍼 🖌 - 🛛	100% 👻 💾	Arial	•	10 - B I	U≣≣	= = a s	% ,		📖 - 🗞 - A	-
	A1 The state of th							, .				
	A B C	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J K	L	M	N	
1			2	-			-		. 2			
2	CROP BUDGETS OF TOTAL COSTS AND	RETURNS (litrogen & F	Phosphate F	ertilizer an	d Irrigation V	Vater at Eco	nomic Optin	um Levels) ¹			
3												
4	Crop/System	Wheat	Corn	Sorahum	Sovhean	Sunflower	∆lfalfa	DC Beans	Total	Per	Per	
5	Planted acres of each crop	25.5	20.5	8.5	25.5	0.0	0.0	20	100.0	Acre	Acre	
6	Tillable acres per planted acre	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	80.0	Planted	Tillable	
7												
8	INCOME PER ACRE											
9	A. Yield per acre	45.4	110.2	84.9	34.9	1.165.2	3.6	20.0				
10	B. Price per unit	\$5.58	\$3.85	\$3.30	\$8.47	\$0.1583	\$110.00	\$8.47	\$28,441	\$284.41	\$355.51	
11	C. Net government payments	\$11.39	\$11.39	\$11.39	\$11.39	\$0.00	\$11.39	\$0.00	911	9.11	11.39	
12	D. Indemnity payments	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
13	E. Miscellaneous income	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
14	F. Returns/acre ((A x B) + C + D + E)	\$264.67	\$435.14	\$291.18	\$306.65	\$184.44	\$406.20	\$169.40	\$29,352	\$293.52	\$366.90	
15												
16	COSTS PER ACRE											
17	1. Seed	\$14.40	\$40.56	\$14.22	\$34.91	\$20.02	\$12.60	\$40.00	\$3,010	\$30.10	\$37.62	
18	2. Herbicide	3.42	35.41	20.50	9.48	19.47	5.21	19.90	1,627	16.27	20.34	
19	3. Insecticide / fungicide	14.00	0.25	5.05	0.00	6.46	6.06	0.00	405	4.05	5.06	
20	4. Fertilizer and lime	56.92	74.98	65.37	38.13	36.28	25.66	23.70	4,991	49.91	62.38	
21	5. Crop consulting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
22	6. Crop insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
23	7. Drying	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.54	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
24	8. Miscellaneous	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	680	6.80	8.50	
25	9. Machinery expense	79.95	117.79	92.89	90.45	56.39	134.99	53.57	8,621	86.21	107.76	
26	10. Non-machinery labor	8.97	13.13	10.53	10.01	5.98	15.08	6.11	965	9.65	12.06	
27	11. Irrigation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	
28	12. Land charge / rent	55.00	55.00	55.00	55.00	0.00	55.00	0.00	4,400	44.00	55.00	
29	G. SUB TOTAL	\$239.66	\$344.12	\$270.57	\$244.98	\$155.14	\$261.59	\$149.28	\$24,698	\$246.98	\$308.72	
30	13. Interest on 1/2 nonland costs	7.39	11.56	8.62	7.60	6.02	8.26	5.97	812	8.12	10.15	
31	H. TOTAL COSTS	\$247.05	\$355.68	\$279.19	\$252.57	\$161.17	\$269.85	\$155.25	\$25,510	\$255.10	\$318.87	
32	I. RETURNS OVER COSTS (F - H)	\$17.62	\$79.46	\$11.99	\$54.08	\$23.27	\$136.35	\$14.15	\$3,842	\$38.42	\$48.03	
33	J. TOTAL COSTS/UNIT (H/A)	\$5.44	\$3.23	\$3.29	\$7.25	\$0.14	\$75.18	\$7.76				
34	K. RETURN TO ANNUAL COST (I+13)/G	10.43%	26.45%	1.62%	25.18%	18.88%	55.28%	13.48%		18.84%	18.84%	
35		* 2.22	*2 2 4	40.70	to 17	* 0.40	407.00	*10.17				
36	M. Breakeven price (w/ base crop)	\$6.38	\$3.61	\$3.79	\$8.47	\$0.18	\$87.08	\$10.47				
37	N. Breakeven yield (w/ base crop)	52.4	102.9	99.3	34.9	1,368.9	2.1	24.8				~
I 4	▶ ▶ \ Intro \ Budgets / OptimalRates / Irr er	nergy costs 🏒	Tables /				<				2	
Read	y	n							,	N	JM	

	🛛 Microsoft Excel - KSU-NPI_CropBudgets(OsageCo-JanO9).xls											
:2	Eile Edit View Insert Format Tools Data	<u>W</u> indow <u>H</u> elp								Type a question for he	elp 👻 🗕	. 8 ×
8 D	- 🖻 🗖 🖪 🗇 🖪 🖪 🥵 🥵 -	🛷 🖉 🚽 1	00% 🚽 🎽	Arial	•	10 - B 7	· π ≣ ∃		% • •		- 3 -	Α -
		· • · · · ·			_		<u> </u>		/0 /	.00 -\$10 =;- =;- <u></u>		- F
-		D	F	F	G	ч	т	I V	т	Ъл	N	
44			E	г	0	11	1	3 12	L	101	14	<u> </u>
45	TABLE 1. Production Inputs Used for Bu	daets								12·12 PM 0	1/19/09	-
45		agets									1/10/00	-
40	ITEM	Wheat	Corn	Sorahum	Sovhean	Sunflower	∆lfalfa	DC Beans				
48	Price scenarios to consider			oorginam	00,000	Juniouron		Dobumo		Use (Y=1, N=0)		-
49	Low price scenario	\$4.50	\$3.00	\$2.60	\$6.75	\$0.1250	\$94.88	\$6.75		0		
50	High price scenario	\$6.50	\$4.50	\$3.75	\$10.00	\$0.1658	\$119.67	\$10.00		0		
51	2009 bids (1/16/09)SEK & Burlington	\$5.58	\$3.85	\$3.30	\$8.47	\$0.1583	\$110.00	\$8.47		1		
52								7	_			-
53	Yield goal (YG), bu/ac	46.5	112.0	87.0	35.0	1,200	3.6	20.0		User enters	vield	d 📕
54	Enter 0 for dryland or 1 for irrigated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1
55	Annual rainfall	36.00	36.00	36.00	36.00	36.00	36.00	na	<u> </u>	goal, crop a	and	
56	Soil test P (STP), ppm	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	na		fertilizer nri	Ces	
57	Organic matter (OM), %	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	na			000,	
58	Soil test nitrogen (STN), Ibs/ac	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	na		and soil		
59	Other N adjustments, Ibs/ac	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	na		nronerties -	_	
60	KSU recommended nitrogen, lbs/ac	71.6	119.2	79.2	0.0	30.0	0.0			properties		
61	Econ Optimum fertN, Ibs/ac	51.9	95.9	55.4	0.0	11.7	0.0			optimal N a	nd P	
62	KSU recommended phosphate, lbs/ac	26.2	29.0	25.6	29.5	21.6	46.5			ratos aro		
63	Econ Optimum fertP, Ibs/ac	13.0	16.8	12.1	24.2	9.3	40.4			rates are		
65	Vield at entimal N. P. and I. bu/ac	43.7	107.6	91.7	34.5	1110.0	3.6	20.0		calculated.		
66	Change in STP npm	-0.49	.1 04	.1 14	.0 19	.0.41	.0.13	20.0	L			
67	change in Stri, ppin	-0.45	-1.04	-1.14	-0.15	-0.41	-0.15					-
68	Seeding rate (lbs. seeds. etc)	90	24	4.5	130	22	3	160				-
69	Seed price. \$/unit	\$0.16	\$1.69	\$3.16	\$0.27	\$0.91	\$4.20	\$0.25				
70						•				.		
71	Fertilizer:									\$/unit		
72	Nitrogen (N)	64.8	119.8	69.3	0.0	14.7	0.0	0		\$0.535 /lb		
73	Phosphate (P)	16.2	20.9	15.2	30.3	11.7	50.5	20.0		\$0.896 /lb		
74	Potash (K)	30	30	40	30	30	0	20		\$0.690 /lb		
75	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		\$1.000 /a	C	
76	Lime	333	333	333	333	0	333	0		\$0.010 /lb		
77	Herbicide											
78	Total herbicide	3.42	35.41	20.5	9.48		5.208	19.9		\$1.00 /a	C.	
79	xxx											
80	Bicep Lite II Magnum									\$11.28 /qt	[
	Intro Budgets / OptimalRates / Irr en	nergy costs 🔏 1	Fables / Misc	1		: <u>i</u>	<			: \$3.63 /n1	r	
Rea	dy									NUM		

Scenarios considered...

- Dry versus liquid N & P fertilizer prices
 - Dry: N = \$0.365 and P = \$0.495
 - Liquid: N = \$0.535 and P = \$0.896

• Three crop price scenarios

	Wheat	Corn	Sorghum	Soybean
Price scenarios to consider				
Low price scenario	\$4.50	\$3.00	\$2.60	\$6.75
High price scenario	\$6.50	\$4.50	\$3.75	\$10.00
2009 bids (1/16/09)SEK & Burlington	\$5.58	\$3.85	\$3.30	\$8.47

• Fertilizer rates

- Economic optimal
- 75% of economic optimal (under fertilize)
- 125% of economic optimal (over fertilize)

Crop yield at expected 2009 crop prices and various fertilizer scenarios...

Model-Estimated Yield vs Fertilizer Price and Rate (% of economic optimal)										
	Wheat	Corn	Milo	Soybean	DC Beans	Total	Average			
Acres	25.5	20.5	8.5	25.5	20.0	100.0				
Dry N & P F	Prices (N=\$0.365	and P=\$0.495))							
A. Econo	mic optimal rates	5								
	45.4	110.2	84.9	34.9		omic on	timal viold			
B. 75% of	f economic optim	are 1	are 1-1% higher at lower							
	42.8	104.0	80.7	34.2	price	priced fertilizer (drv).				
C. 125% o	of economic opti	mal rates (ove	r fertilize)		price					
	46.2	111.7	86.3	35.0	2) Over	2) Over-fertilizing results				
Liquid N &	P Prices (N=\$0.5	35 and P=\$0.8	96)		yield	yields about 1% higher				
D. Econo	mic optimal rates	5			than	optimal I	rate yields			
	43.7	107.6	81.7	34.5	3) Unde	2) Under fortilizing reculte				
E. 75% of	f economic optim	al rates (unde	r fertilize)		vjeld	vields about 5% lower				
	40.7	100.5	77.1	33.7	than	than ontimal rate vields				
F. 125% c	of economic optir	nal rates (ove	r fertilize)			- 10-11-01				
	44.6	109.8	83.5	34.9		xxx	xxx			

Return over costs at expected 2009 crop prices and various fertilizer scenarios...

Return Over Costs vs Fertilizer Price and Rate (% of economic optimal)										
	Wheat	Corn	Milo	Soybean	DC Beans	Total	Average			
Acres	25.5	20.5	8.5	25.5	20.0	100.0				
Dry N & P Prices (N=\$0.365 and P=\$0.495)										
A. Econom	A. Economic optimal rates									
	\$17.62	\$79.46	\$11.99	\$54.08		\$3,842	\$38.42			
B. 75% of e	economic optim	nal rates (und	er fertilize)							
	\$12.53	\$71.03	\$8.73	\$52.07		\$3,461	\$34.61			
C. 125% of economic optimal rates (over fertilize)										
	\$13.04	\$71.36	\$7.23	\$51.32		\$3,448	\$34.48			
Liquid N & P	Prices (N=\$0.5	35 and P=\$0.	896)				KSU			
D. Econom	ic optimal rates	5					rates \$17.03			
	\$1.66	\$54.53	-\$3.76	\$43.34		\$2,350	\$23.50			
E. 75% of economic optimal rates (under fertilize)										
	-\$3.53	\$46.85	-\$6.65	\$42.03		\$2,002	\$20.02			
F. 125% of	economic opti	mal rates (ove	er fertilize)							
	-\$3.53	\$44.68	-\$9.13	\$41.21		\$1,915	\$19.15			

Return over costs at expected 2009 crop prices and various fertilizer scenarios...

	Return Over Costs vs Fertilizer Price and Rate (% of economic optimal)								
	Wheat	Corn	Milo	Soybean	DC Beans	Total	Average		
Acre	s 25.5	20.5	8.5	25.5	20.0	100.0			
Dry l	N & P Prices (N=\$0.3		KSU						
Α.	Economic optimal ra	tes					rates \$36.75		
	\$17.62	\$79.46	\$11.99	\$54.08	-	\$3,842	\$38.42		
В.	75% of economic opt	timal rates (und	er fertilize)						
	\$12.53	\$71.03	\$8.73	\$52.07		\$3,461	\$34.61		
С.	125% of economic o	otimal rates (ov	er fertilize)						
	\$13.04	\$71.36	\$7.23	\$51.32		\$3,448	\$34.48		
Liqu	id N & P Prices (N=\$0	0.535 and P=\$0.	896)				KSU		
D.	1) Economic ir	npact of ov	er- or und	ler-fertiliz	ina is		\$17.03		
	about the sa	ame at lowe	er priced fo	ertilizer (d	lry).	\$2,350	\$23.50		
Е.			- //						
	2) At higher fe	rtilizer price	es (liquid)	, over-tert	llizing	\$2,002	\$20.02		
F. ¹	Starts Decol	ming worse	man und	er-tertilizi	ng.				
	3) Fertilizer pri	ice (dry vs.	liquid) ha	s bigger i	mpact on	\$1,915	\$19.15		
	returns thar								



Fertilizer prices and rates impact returns, but not near as much as commodity prices...

Side issues with P

- Depending upon crop and rotation, following MF-2586 N and Precs will end up over time at 11-14 ppm STP
- At crop prices and high fertilizer prices shown (esp P), would end up at much lower STP, perhaps 5-10 ppm
- Seems weird to end up that low, but is it wrong?
 - Haven't seen such prices before

Critical issues to think about

- Are MF-2586 rates really predicated on "other factors not limiting?"
- Can we fully compensate for low soil fertility with fertilizer?
- Might application methods and timing modify our results?
- What about using fertilizer P to compensate for low soil pH?

So, what should one do?

- Use the spreadsheet! If your intuition causes you to question the results:
 - Average the results with some other method
 - Use the adjustment factors in the spreadsheet
 - Question your intuition
- Likely, no one would ignore prices forever, i.e., regardless of their levels

There may be bigger issues to consider

- We're seeing local fertilizer prices vary as much as 2x to 3x from location to location
- Liquid vs. dry hire custom applicator?
- What will fertilizer prices do this spring?
- What about availability?
- Do I trust my provider's finances?

Keep things in perspective

- Over time, differences in farm profitability are driven mostly by:
 - Cost management, principally machinery costs
 - Scale of operation (farm size)
 - Technology adoption
 - Rarely by crop price and crop yield (revenue)
- The fertilizer rate decision matters, but isn't all that important in a relative sense
- That hasn't stopped us from focusing a great deal on fertilizer rates, especially on variable rate application of fertilizer

A couple of slides that capped a recent discussion on the last 10-15 years of variable rate fertilizer (VRA)

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?
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?

