

1-2016

To Grow or not to Grow: A Tool for Comparing Returns to Switchgrass for Bioenergy with Annual Crops and CRP

Keri Jacobs

Iowa State University, kljacobs@iastate.edu

Rob Mitchell

United States Department of Agriculture

Chad Hart

Iowa State University, chart@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/pubs_agdm

Recommended Citation

Jacobs, Keri; Mitchell, Rob; and Hart, Chad, "To Grow or not to Grow: A Tool for Comparing Returns to Switchgrass for Bioenergy with Annual Crops and CRP" (2016). *Ag Decision Maker Information Files*. 1.

http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/pubs_agdm/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ag Decision Maker at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ag Decision Maker Information Files by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

To Grow or not to Grow: A Tool for Comparing Returns to Switchgrass for Bioenergy with Annual Crops and CRP

Description

Cellulosic biomass for biofuel remains a substantial part of the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) mandate and perennial grasses like switchgrass meet the RFS requirements for cellulosic biomass. Perennial grasses are a popular choice because of the benefits they can provide over traditional row crop production: numerous production years from a single planting, yield advantages on marginally productive cropland, increased soil carbon sequestration, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and other environmental benefits. Despite these benefits, scalable production of switchgrass in the Midwest faces substantial challenges. The largest of these is the need to compete economically with alternative land uses: row crop production, grazing, haying, or Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).

Rights

Works produced by employees of the U.S. Government as part of their official duties are not copyrighted within the U.S. The content of this document is not copyrighted.

designed to identify the field and production characteristics that will impact the expected returns to switchgrass production beyond the assumptions built in from the enterprise budget (found in the [worksheet](#) tab, “Advanced Inputs”). Depending on whether the producer selects ‘CRP,’ ‘Continuous Corn,’ ‘Corn/Soybean Rotation,’ or ‘Pasture for Grazing/Haying,’ the other prompts update to elicit the necessary information. On the right side of the worksheet, the producer can see several output values, including those for costs and revenues of switchgrass, breakeven factors for switchgrass, and a comparison of switchgrass returns with the alternative land use selected.

Comparing Per-Acre Net Returns

Producers can view the “Chart Comparison of Returns” worksheet to compare the expected net returns per acre to switchgrass and the alternative production system they chose. This chart calculates returns based on the user-supplied information in “Your Production Estimates.”

Advanced Inputs and Default Values

Per acre switchgrass production costs and field operations are detailed in the worksheet, “Advanced Inputs.” The producer who wishes to understand the underlying assumptions of the basic calculations for costs can refer to this sheet and also change the values in yellow to reflect alternative assumptions or costs of operations s/he faces. As these values

are changed, this impacts the outputs in the “Your Production Estimates” worksheet and also the “Chart Comparison of Returns” worksheet. To reset the “Advanced Inputs” information, the worksheet can either be re-downloaded or input from the “Default Values” worksheet.

Other Considerations That Impact the Switchgrass Production Decision

This tool is intended to give producers a guide to understanding best management practices for switchgrass production and also to compare the expected returns to switchgrass production with several alternative land uses. There are important factors to this decision that are not included, largely because associated market values do not exist or the extent of the benefit is to date, not well documented. These positive externalities include increased soil carbon sequestration, reductions in nutrient use, reduced erosion, and improved water quality. Individual producers must decide what value, if any, this contributes to their decision to switch to a perennial grass production system.

Keri L. Jacobs, Assistant Professor & Extension Economist, Iowa State University, kljacobs@iastate.edu

Rob Mitchell, Research Agronomist, USDA-ARS and Adjunct Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Rob.Mitchell@ars.usda.gov

Chad E. Hart, Associate Professor & Extension Economist, Iowa State University, chart@iastate.edu

... and justice for all

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Many materials can be made available in alternative formats for ADA clients. To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964.

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Cathann A. Kress, director, Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa.
