



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*



The Lifecycle Carbon Footprint of Biofuels

*January 29, 2008
Miami Beach, FL*

The Lifecycle Carbon Footprint of Biofuels

Proceedings of a conference January 29, 2008, in Miami Beach, FL.

Edited by

Joe L. Outlaw

*Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX*

David P. Ernstes

*Agricultural and Food Policy Center
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX*

Sponsored by

Farm Foundation

**USDA's Office of Energy Policy and New Uses
Global Change Program Office, USDA Office of the Chief Economist**



Greenhouse Gas Impacts of Ethanol from Iowa Corn

Hongli Feng, Ofir D. Rubin and Bruce A. Babcock¹

Introduction

As the United States begins to move towards putting an economic value on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the need for improved accounting standards becomes acute. Lifecycle analysis (LCA), which involves the systematic collection and interpretation of material flow in all relevant processes of a product, has become the accepted procedure to use to determine greenhouse gas emissions of products ranging from transportation fuels, to building materials, to food production (Farrell *et al.*, 2006; Hill *et al.*, 2006; Owen, 2004). The basic motivation of LCA is that, to conduct a fair assessment of the environmental impacts of a product, it is necessary to take into account all of the processes throughout the product's lifespan, including the extraction of raw material, the manufacturing processes that convert raw material into the product, and the utilization and disposal of the product. For many products, including fossil fuels, a standard LCA is generally all that is needed to understand greenhouse gas emission implications.

Accounting procedures for biological-based products, however, require additional considerations. Consider a country that expands production of an agricultural feedstock to produce biofuels. To understand how such an endeavor affects GHG emissions requires analysis of the greenhouse gas contents of all the inputs used to produce the feedstock as well as the inputs used to create the fuel from the feedstock. This is as far as most LCAs go. But expanded production of the feedstock does not just magically happen. Either current uses of the feedstock must be reduced to free up supply for production of biofuels, or additional production must occur. If current uses are reduced, then the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the current use should be credited towards the biofuels because they are no longer being emitted. However, if an alternative product is used as a substitute for the current use of the feedstock then the GHG implications of increased production of the substitute should also be counted as a debit. If current use is maintained, then the implications of expanded production of the feedstock need to be accounted for, including changes in crop acreage, production practices,

and whether new land is brought into production. And lastly, if changes in land use in the biofuels-expanding region result in changed land-use decisions in other regions, then the GHG implications in these regions may have to be accounted for, depending on the definition of system boundary in an analysis.

The need for accounting systems that take into account changes in production systems has been recognized (Delucchi, 2004; Feehan and Peterson, 2004). In a recent report, the Clean Air Task Force noted that "current lifecycle analyses do not account for greenhouse gas emissions and other global warming impacts that may be caused by changes in land use; food, fuel, and materials markets (Lewis, 2007)." Righelato and Spracklen (2007) showed that carbon changes related to land use changes could outweigh the avoided emissions through the substitution of petroleum fuel by biofuels. The contribution of this chapter is two-fold: (i) to develop the beginnings of a protocol for system-wide accounting (SWA) systems that incorporates land use and other changes not included in LCA, and (ii) to apply the protocol to a case study of ethanol refined from Iowa corn. We will first lay out the basics of LCA for corn ethanol and gasoline. This serves as the beginning point for SWA because the components of LCA results can be used in SWA. We then assess the GHG impacts of ethanol from Iowa corn based on both types of accounting systems.

Lifecycle Accounting - Ethanol Versus Gasoline

How much does corn-based ethanol change GHG emissions? Because ethanol is used to replace petroleum gasoline as a transportation fuel, a natural way to answer this question is by comparing the GHG emissions of ethanol and gasoline. Although the consumption of both fuels emits CO₂, emissions from gasoline are considered as net additions to atmospheric GHG stock because the emitted carbon comes from underground reservoirs. In contrast, because ethanol is produced from plant material which obtains carbon from the atmosphere, net CO₂ emissions from the burning of ethanol is zero. However, this by no means implies that corn-based ethanol is completely carbon neutral. The production of corn and the production of ethanol from corn consume energy and emit GHGs. Thus, the accounting of GHG impacts in the two

¹ Feng is an adjunct assistant professor in the Department of Economics; Rubin is a graduate assistant in the Center for Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD); and Bruce Babcock is director of CARD and a professor in the Department of Economics; all at Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

production processes is central to the assessment of the net GHG benefits of ethanol.

Many studies have conducted LCA of the emissions from petroleum gasoline and corn-based ethanol. Different assumptions and data are often used in different studies. In Farrell *et al.* (2006), six representative analyses of fuel ethanol were evaluated to illustrate the range of assumptions and data found for the case of corn-based (*Zea mays* or maize) ethanol. The goal of most LCA for corn ethanol is to examine its net energy output and net GHG emissions, especially in comparison with petroleum gasoline. Defining system boundaries will be the most critical procedure in appropriately achieving the goal of an LCA. Although the system boundaries of corn ethanol can vary from study to study depending on the inclusion or exclusion of some specific processes, most LCA analyses would consider (i) the production of inputs used in growing corn including seed, fertilizer (*e.g.*, nitrogen, phosphorous, potassium), herbicide, pesticide, and energy; (ii) the application and utilization of inputs and the harvest of corn grain; (iii) the transportation of corn to biorefineries; and (iv) the conversion of corn to ethanol at biorefineries and the eventual burning of ethanol as transportation fuel. The life span of corn ethanol is often divided into two phases: the agronomy phase (the first two components) and the post-agronomy processing phase (the last two components). Dividing emissions into these two phases makes it easier to keep track of changes in GHG emissions attributable to ethanol.

The GHG impacts of ethanol are measured by GHG emissions intensity, *e.g.*, metric tons (MT) or kilograms (kg) of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e) per liter (L) of ethanol. The lower the GHG intensity, the more beneficial ethanol is in terms of climate change mitigation. The key factors that determine GHG intensity are corn yields, the conversion rate of corn into ethanol, GHG emissions per bushel of corn at the agronomy phase, and GHG emissions per liter at the post-agriculture phase. Some agricultural practices used in corn production make a significant difference in corn yields and GHG emissions. Crop rotation is one example and will be emphasized in our study. Most LCA studies have not accounted for the impacts of GHG intensity caused by different agricultural practices. Some notable examples are Kim and Dale (2005, 2008) who conducted LCA for biofuels based on various cropping systems. However, they did not go beyond LCA.

We use $E_{LCA,eth,rotation}$ to denote GHG emissions per liter of ethanol differentiating between different crop rotations. To simplify exposition, we use “one liter of ethanol” to mean the amount of ethanol that is equivalent to one liter of gasoline in terms of energy content. The energy contained in one liter of ethanol is about two thirds of the energy contained in one liter of gasoline. Let $E_{ag,c,rotation}$ and $E_{post,eth}$ be the emissions per liter of ethanol at the agronomy phase and the post-agronomy phase, respectively, then:

$$E_{LCA,eth,rotation} = E_{ag,c,rotation} + E_{post,eth} \quad (1)$$

Accounting at the agronomy phase is usually expressed in terms of emissions per unit (*e.g.*, hectare) of land. Thus $E_{ag,c,rotation}$ is derived through the following formula that converts emissions per hectare to emissions per liter:

$$E_{ag,c,rotation} = \frac{\hat{E}_{ag,c,rotation} \left(\frac{kg}{hectare} \right)}{corn\ yield \left(\frac{ton}{hectare} \right) \times conversion\ rate \left(\frac{liter}{ton} \right)} \quad (2)$$

We use “^” to make the distinction in units throughout this chapter. Emissions at the agronomy phase depend on the quantity of inputs such as diesel fuel and fertilizer used as well as the efficiency with which they are converted to crop yields. Emissions at the post-agronomy phase are mainly affected by energy use at biorefineries. It is easy to see from equation (2) that increases in corn yields or conversion rates, the lower will be the GHG intensity. Both corn yield potential and conversion rate have improved over time as science and technology advance. In addition, actual corn yields are affected by specific agricultural management practices. For example, different rotations and different input uses can result in quite different yields.

The GHG benefits of corn ethanol, denoted by $\Delta E_{LCA,c,rotation}$, can be derived by taking the difference between LCA emissions of one liter of ethanol and LCA emissions of one liter of gasoline, *i.e.*,

$$\Delta E_{LCA,c,rotation} = E_{LCA,gas} + E_{LCA,eth,rotation} \quad (3)$$

where $E_{LCA,gas}$ represents all GHG emissions in the “well to wheel” life of gasoline including carbon emitted from its eventual burning. In this chapter, our focus is on the accounting of ethanol’s GHG benefits, with gasoline used as a basis for comparison. Thus we will not examine LCA emissions of gasoline in detail. Rather, results from the literature will be employed.

System-wide Accounting - Comparing an Economy With and Without Ethanol

The purpose of assessing the net GHG benefits of corn-based ethanol is to understand whether replacement of some portion of gasoline used in an economy with ethanol causes GHG emissions to increase or decrease. To fully answer this question for an economy, we need to compare the GHG emissions in the absence of ethanol with those in the presence of ethanol. In other words, we need system-wide accounting that considers all GHG emissions in the economy with ethanol and all GHG emissions in the same economy but without ethanol. By contrast, LCA compares the emissions in the life span of two products: ethanol and gasoline. Baseline emissions, defined here as emissions in the absence of ethanol, are not accounted for, meaning that they are implicitly assumed to be zero or not affected by ethanol production. For example,

the quantity of corn produced in the baseline has no effect on LCA of corn. In addition, it makes no difference whether corn for ethanol is produced on previously idled land or on previously cropped land. By explicitly comparing two states of the economy (with and without ethanol), SWA makes it explicit that there are non-zero baseline emissions and what matters is the economy-wide net changes in GHG emissions.

In SWA, how the additional corn is produced and where it is produced are critical factors determining net GHG emissions. When the additional corn is grown on idle land, ethanol's net GHG benefits will be affected by baseline emissions from such idle land. Similarly, when additional corn for ethanol comes from land previously devoted to other crops, there are emissions associated with the production and use of other crops in the baseline. In addition, more corn and less acreage devoted to other crops will change corn production practices and crop rotations. Finally, additional corn for ethanol could be simply diverted from other uses that involve baseline emissions that should be subtracted from ethanol's contribution to GHG emissions. Without ethanol, corn is mainly fed to livestock. Diversion of corn to ethanol from livestock would likely decrease livestock production and change the way that livestock are fed: both of which involve changes in GHG emissions.

A SWA protocol for corn ethanol needs to explicitly account for all of these possibilities. To illustrate how one can develop such a protocol suppose that an economy has a total of $100L$ (L is an arbitrary scale factor such that the total land area divided by 100 equals L) ha of land available to grow corn and another crop (soybeans). Some land can be left idle. To simplify the presentation, we assume that corn grain is used to make ethanol that replaces gasoline. As a benchmark, we start with the baseline case without ethanol production, where land and output allocations are illustrated in Figure 1. In the figure, $10L$ ha are devoted to continuous corn production, $60L$ ha are devoted to corn pro-

duction in rotation with soybeans, and $30L$ ha are left idle. We assume that for land with rotational corn production, half of the acreage is in corn and half is in soybeans in any given year.

Crop rotation has a major influence on how corn is produced. In the US Corn Belt, corn is typically grown in rotation with soybeans. Let y_{cs} and y_{cc} be the corn yields for corn grown after soybeans and continuous corn, respectively; then total corn production in the baseline is $(30y_{cs} + 10y_{cc})L$. The yield of corn grown after soybeans is typically higher than corn grown after corn, *i.e.*, y_{cs} is in general higher than y_{cc} . In addition, the soybean crop reduces nitrogen fertilizer applications and reduces pest pressure so fewer pesticides are needed. And finally, corn grown after soybeans requires less tillage than corn grown after corn. The production of soybeans is $30Ly_s$; where y_s is soybean yield. Suppose total gasoline use is $100G$ (G is an arbitrary scale factor such that total gasoline use divided by 100 equals G) liters. Then emissions in the baseline are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} TE_{base,ag} &= L \times [30 \times \hat{E}_{ag,s,cs} + 30 \times \hat{E}_{ag,c,cs} + 10 \times \hat{E}_{ag,c,cc} + 30 \times \hat{E}_{ag,idle}] \\ TE_{base,post} &= L \times [(30y_{cs} + 10y_{cc}) \times E_{post,food,c} + 30y_s \times E_{post,s} + 0 \times E_{post,eth}] \\ TE_{base,gas} &= G \times 100 \times E_{LCA,gas} \\ TE_{base,all} &= TE_{base,ag} + TE_{base,post} + TE_{base,gas} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The definitions of all emissions coefficients are described in Table 1. Note that emissions at the agronomy phase are differentiated by the two rotations: continuous corn ($\hat{E}_{ag,c,cc}$) and corn in rotation with soybeans ($\hat{E}_{ag,c,cs}$). There are a few factors in that are important for SWA, but not included in LCA of corn ethanol: emissions from growing soybeans ($\hat{E}_{ag,s,cs}$), emissions associated with the use of soybeans ($E_{post,s}$), emissions from idle land ($\hat{E}_{ag,idle}$), and emissions associated with food use of corn ($E_{post,food,c}$).

Each of the three sources of corn used in ethanol (displaced corn from food use, displacement of soybeans, and corn planted on previously idled land) impacts net GHG emissions. If ethanol is based on corn that would have been




Figure 1: Illustration of SWA – Baseline.

Table 1: Definitions of Terms Regarding Emissions Coefficients.

Terms	Definition
$E_{LCA,eth_rotation}$	LCA emissions of ethanol (kg/ge L) from corn grown with a specific rotation (rotation = corn following corn (CC) or corn following soybeans (CS))
$E_{ag,c_rotation}$	emissions of ethanol (kg/ge L) at agronomy phase (from corn grown with a specific rotation, CC or CS)
$E_{post,eth}$	emissions of ethanol (kg/ge L) at post-agriculture phase
\hat{E}_{ag,s_cs}	emissions of soybeans (kg/ge L) at agronomy phase in CS rotation
\hat{E}_{ag,c_cs}	emissions of corn (kg/ha) at agronomy phase in CS rotation
\hat{E}_{ag,c_cc}	emissions of corn (kg/ha) at agronomy phase in CC rotation
$\hat{E}_{ag,idle}$	emissions of idled land (kg/ha)
$\hat{E}_{conv,idle_cc}$	emissions of land (kg/ha) in the conversion from idle to CC rotation
\hat{E}_{conv,cs_cc}	emissions of land (kg/ha) in the conversion from soybeans to corn
$E_{post,food_c}$	emissions of corn (kg/MT) used for food at post-agriculture phase
$E_{post,s}$	emissions of soybeans (kg/MT) used for food at post-agriculture phase
$E_{LCA,gas}$	LCA emissions of petroleum gasoline (kg/ge L)

produced in the baseline, then the GHG difference from ethanol occurs after corn leaves the farm gate. For every metric ton of corn diverted from the food chain, $\Delta E_{SWA,food}$ denotes the net GHG impacts per liter of ethanol based on SWA. It is easy to see that:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_{SWA,food} &= E_{LCA,gas} - E_{post,eth} + \frac{1}{d} E_{post,food_c} \\ &= \Delta E_{LCA,c_cc} + \frac{1}{d} E_{post,food_c} + \frac{1}{y_{cc}d} \hat{E}_{ag,c_cc},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where d converts metric tons of corn into liters of ethanol. When ethanol displaces gasoline, we avoid the GHG emissions, $E_{LCA,gas}$. However, this is not ethanol's net GHG benefits because of post-agronomy emissions generated when corn is devoted to food use and the emissions associated with corn production which should be given as credits to ethanol's GHG benefits. The GHG benefits from ethanol based on existing corn are higher under SWA than under LCA.

When corn for ethanol is grown on land that was idle in the baseline, SWA differs from LCA by two additional elements. The first is emissions from idle land in the baseline, which are likely negative as idle land, which was under production in recent past, typically sequesters carbon. The second is emissions from the conversion of idle land to corn production, which is usually positive because soil carbon will likely

be released when cultivation happens. Suppose continuous corn production is used on the newly converted area, then the net GHG impacts per liter of ethanol from corn grown on idle land can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_{SWA,idle} &= E_{LCA,gas} - E_{post,eth} + \frac{1}{y_{cc}d} [\hat{E}_{ag,idle} - \hat{E}_{ag,c_cc} - \hat{E}_{conv,idle_cc}] \\ &= \Delta E_{LCA,c_cc} + \frac{1}{y_{cc}d} [\hat{E}_{ag,idle} - \hat{E}_{conv,idle_cc}].\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

Accounting for GHG changes becomes more complicated when there is production shift from soybeans to corn. Suppose such production shift occurs on one hectare of land. For illustration purposes, assume that in the baseline the hectare is split equally between corn and soybeans in any given year. Also assume that only the increase in corn production is used for ethanol, *i.e.*, food use of corn remains unchanged. Then, the net GHG impacts of one liter of corn ethanol based on rotation shift can be counted as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_{SWA,cs_cc} &= E_{LCA,gas} - E_{post,eth} + \frac{1}{(y_{cc} - 0.5y_{cs})d} [0.5\hat{E}_{ag,s_cs} + 0.5\hat{E}_{ag,c_cs} \\ &\quad - \hat{E}_{ag,c_cc} - \hat{E}_{conv,cs_cc} + 0.5y_s \times E_{post,s}] \\ &= \Delta E_{LCA,c_cc} + \frac{1}{(y_{cc} - 0.5y_{cs})d} [0.5\hat{E}_{ag,s_cs} + 0.5\hat{E}_{ag,c_cs} \\ &\quad - 0.5\frac{y_{cs}}{y_{cc}} \hat{E}_{ag,c_cc} - \hat{E}_{conv,cs_cc} + 0.5y_s \times E_{post,s}].\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

The term $(y_{cc} - 0.5y_{cs})$ is the additional corn obtained through rotation shift from CS to CC on one hectare of land.

Several differences between SWA and LCA are clear from equation (7). First, since soybean production is replaced by corn production, the avoided emissions from soybeans ($\hat{E}_{ag,s_{cs}}$) are counted as part of ethanol's benefits. The coefficient 0.5 reflects that half of the hectare was originally in corn and half was in soybeans. Second, emissions from corn grown after soybeans are part of the baseline emissions ($\hat{E}_{ag,c_{cs}}$), thus they appear as a credit to ethanol because they no longer occur after the rotation shift. Third, SWA accounts for the additional emissions that occur at the agronomy stage from growing continuous corn rather than corn after soybeans ($\hat{E}_{ag,c_{cc}}$). Fourth, SWA incorporates potential changes in soil carbon, denoted as $\hat{E}_{conv,cs_{cc}}$ that occurs as rotation changes. And fifth, since soybeans are no longer grown on the hectare, the avoided emissions associated with the use of soybeans, $E_{post,s}$, are also considered as a benefit of corn ethanol in SWA.

Although the GHG impacts of corn going to ethanol have been presented in equations (5), (6), and (7) separately by source; in reality, corn for ethanol will come from all three sources. The share from each source will vary depending on total ethanol production and market forces. Thus the net GHG benefits of corn ethanol can be calculated as a weighted average across the three different sources. For example, suppose the amount of ethanol generated is $30y_{cc}dL$ liters, which is based on the following land use changes: $10L$ ha are converted from idle land to continuous corn production and $40L$ ha are converted from a corn-soybean rotation to continuous corn production. Conversion from idle land and rotation shift generates $10y_{cc}L$ and $40(y_{cc} - 0.5y_{cs})L$ MT of corn, respectively. The term $(y_{cc} - 0.5y_{cs})$ represents the additional corn per hectare obtained from rotation shift. Food use will be reduced by $20(y_{cs} - y_{cc})L$; so that the total corn for ethanol is $30y_{cc}L$ MT. The distribution of land and output is illustrated in Figure 2.

For the $30y_{cc}dL$ liters of ethanol generated this way, we can calculate the net GHG benefits as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta TE_{SWA} &= Ld[40(y_{cc} - 0.5y_{cs}) \times \Delta E_{SWA,cs_{cc}} + 10y_{cc} \times \Delta E_{SWA,idle} + 20(y_{cs} - y_{cc}) \times \Delta E_{SWA,food}] \\ &= \Delta TE_{LCA,c_{cc}} + 40L \times (0.5\hat{E}_{ag,s_{cs}} + 0.5\hat{E}_{ag,c_{cs}} - 0.5\frac{y_{cs}}{y_{cc}}\hat{E}_{ag,c_{cc}} \\ &\quad - \hat{E}_{conv,cs_{cc}} + 0.5y_s \times E_{post,s}) + 10L \times (\hat{E}_{ag,idle} - \hat{E}_{conv,idle_{cc}}) \\ &\quad + 20(y_{cs} - y_{cc})L \times (\frac{1}{d}E_{post,food_{cc}} + \frac{1}{y_{cc}d}\hat{E}_{ag,c_{cc}}), \quad (8)\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta TE_{LCA,c_{cc}} = 30y_{cc}dL \times (E_{LCA,gas} - E_{LCA,c_{cc}}) = 30y_{cc}dL \times (E_{LCA,gas} - E_{ag,c_{cc}} - E_{post,eth})$.

The total benefits based on LCA, $\Delta TE_{LCA,c_{cc}}$, are just the difference between the LCA emissions of gasoline and ethanol, assuming that corn was grown after corn. However, LCA can assume any rotation or an average. Equations (7) and (8) suggest that the LCA approach only provides a partial accounting of the GHG impacts of ethanol. However, this does not diminish the importance of LCA. In order to perform SWA, it is often necessary to have emission data for the agronomy and post-agronomy phases that are obtained in LCA of corn ethanol. It is not clear whether LCA will over-estimate or under-estimate the GHG impacts of corn ethanol because the emissions related to land use changes depend on soil properties, climate conditions, and other agricultural practices. We will illustrate below the impact of moving from LCA to SWA by analyzing the GHG implications of expanded ethanol production from corn in Iowa.

GHG Benefits of Ethanol from Iowa Corn

In this section, we examine the differences between LCA and SWA with an empirical example of ethanol refined from Iowa corn. Iowa is in the center of US corn and ethanol production in the nation: it supplies 30% of the corn utilized by the US ethanol industry and accommodates roughly the same percentage of overall ethanol plants capacity within its area (Iowa Corn Growers Association, 2007). We use




Figure 2: Illustration of SWA – Change from Baseline.

Table 2: Corn and Soybean Areas in Iowa (Million Hectares).

Year	Corn	Soybeans	Total
2006	5.10	4.11	9.21
2007	5.79	3.56	9.35

the EBAMM (1.1) model for our estimation. The model was constructed by Farrel *et al.* (2006), and can be downloaded from their website (<http://rael.berkeley.edu/EBAMM/>). Results from both the agronomy and the post-agronomy phases can be obtained from EBAMM. One clear advantage of this model is that data sources and parameters are transparent and so it is easy to see the impacts of different assumptions. GHG emissions differ for different ethanol processing plants. Given that our focus is on the agronomy phase, industry weighted averages are used regarding energy uses and conversion rates at the post-agronomy phase. Since the efficiency of ethanol plants advances over time, EBAMM was run with most recent parameter values. For the agronomy phase, we obtained data specifically for corn grown in Iowa.

Emissions at the Post-agronomy Phase

GHG emissions at the post-agronomy phase depend mainly on three factors: milling processes, energy sources, and coproduct distribution. Before 2000, wet mill plants dominated US ethanol production because they were more profitable than dry mill plants. But the sharp increase in ethanol prices has made dry mill plants more popular because of their greater efficiency at turning corn into ethanol. Based on Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute (FAPRI) (2007) forecasts for 2010, the conversion rates at dry and wet milling plants will be 415.75 and 405.32 liters per MT of corn, respectively. The 2010 shares of ethanol production will be 87% for dry mills and 13% for wet mills. Energy requirements per liter of ethanol produced in 2010 for dry and wet mill plants will be 10.03 MJ/ge L (i.e., megajoule per gasoline-equivalent liter) and 12.80 MJ/ge L respectively (GREET 1.8). We adopt these numbers given that they take into account ethanol plants that will be in operation in the near future. A major energy requirement in dry mill plants is the drying of distillers grains. Distributing the grains wet to local feedlots reduces energy use of a dry milling plant by 35% (Wang *et al.*, 2007). Iowa's ethanol plants market 75% of the distillers grains dry while the rest are sold wet (Hardy *et al.*, 2006).

For the post-agronomy phase, we computed an industry average of 1.26 kg CO₂e/ge L for GHG emissions. Baker and Babcock (2008) show that distillers grains will substitute for corn and soybean meal in cattle and hog rations. To calculate the amount of corn and soybeans displaced requires solving the least cost feed rations problem with and without distillers grains being allowed to enter the least cost solution and then comparing the amount of corn and soybeans in the two solutions. Baker and Babcock (2008) show that the greatest

displacement will be in the rations of fed cattle. Each gasoline-equivalent liter of ethanol produces 5.24 kg of distillers grains. Baker and Babcock (2008) estimate that each kg of distillers grains displaces 0.579 kg of corn and 0.473 kg of soybean meal at a corn price of \$4.26/bu and a soybean meal price of \$249/MT. With an emission rate of 0.356 kg CO₂ per kg of corn and 0.3321 kg CO₂e per kg of soybean meal implies a credit of 0.539 kg CO₂/ge L which makes the net contribution at the biorefinery stage equal to 0.72 kg/ge L. Credit for the production of byproducts offsets 43% of GHG emissions from the ethanol refinery.

Corn Production in Iowa

Over 90% of field crop acreage in Iowa is devoted to corn and soybeans. In 2006 the ratio of corn acreage to soybean acreage was 1.24 (See Table 2). Because of increased demand for corn from the ethanol industry, the ratio increased to 1.63 in 2007. The two crops are grown primarily in two rotations: CS and CC. Because soybeans are not planted after a crop of soybeans, we can deduce from Table 2 that 4.11 million ha of corn were planted following soybeans in 2007. Subtracting this from 2007 corn acreage we find that 1.68 million ha of corn were planted on 2006 corn acreage. We assume that the difference in total areas (0.14 million ha) between 2006 and 2007 was converted to corn from idle land and was planted using continuous corn production methods. If we consider the current distribution of rotation to be stationary, we have approximately 71% of Iowa corn produced in a corn-soybean rotation with 29% planted after corn.

The benefits of planting corn after soybeans rather than after corn are higher yields, lower levels of nitrogen (N) fertilizer and chemicals, lower tillage and more timely planting and harvesting. Thus, GHG intensity is lower for corn planted after soybeans than corn planted after corn because crop yield and N fertilizer rates are two key determinants of GHG emissions from the production of corn. A typical yield penalty associated with corn after corn relative to corn after soybeans is approximately 10-15% in Iowa (Erickson and Lowenberg-DeBoer, 2005; Hennessy, 2006; DeWitt, 2002; Duffy and Correll, 2006). For our analysis, we use a 10% yield drag as new corn hybrids and improved management have tended to shrink the disadvantage. Among inputs at the agricultural phase, N fertilizer has the highest energy content, which implies high GHG emissions (Graboski, 2002; Pimental and Patzek, 2005). In addition, part of N fertilizer applied to soil is emitted as nitrous oxide through denitrification and nitrification processes. The global warming potential of nitrous oxide is about three hundred times more potent than

Table 3: Iowa's Trend Corn Yields by Counties 2007, Inferred Distribution and Input Use.

Yield Classes	Corn Following Soybeans (CS)			Corn Following Corn (CC)		
	Lower	Middle	Upper	Lower	Middle	Upper
Yields (MT/ha)	9.68	10.54	11.17	8.71	9.49	10.05
N fixed (kg/ha)	146	146	146	202	202	202
N varied (kg/ha)	129	146	163	185	202	219
P (kg/ha)	62	67	78	49	62	67
K (kg/ha)	45	56	62	45	50	56
Limestone (kg/ha)	647	647	647	647	647	647

CO₂. Therefore, the difference in N fertilizer application between the two rotations can make a large difference in the GHG emissions from corn production.

Besides rotation, yields are affected by soil and land properties as well as climate conditions. To account for these differences, Iowa counties were classified as being either low yielding, medium yielding, or high yielding according to their trend yield level in 2007. In general, many farmers vary N rates according to yield potential. But some current guidelines for N application do not vary recommendations according to yield potential (Duffy and Smith, 2007; Sawyer *et al.*, 2006). There is little concrete empirical data to support either uniform or varied application across land with different yield potential. Thus, we consider both scenarios in our analysis. The uniform rates are assumed to be 146 and 202 kg/ha for corn following soybeans and corn following corn respectively. These rates are assumed to hold for the middle yielding class under the varied rate scenario. In this scenario, application rates are increased by 17 kg/ha for the high yielding counties and decreased by 17 kg/ha for low yielding counties. Table 3 lists yields and major input application rates for the two rotations by the three land classes.

While corn following soybeans requires lower levels of nitrogen than corn after corn, the rates of phosphorous (P) and potassium (K) are in general higher for corn after soybeans to compensate for the higher removal rate of phosphate (P₂O₅) and potash (K₂O). However, the GHG impacts of P and K fertilizer are minor relative to the effects of N fertilizer. We use P and K rates suggested by ISU Extension (Duffy and Smith, 2007). Another input in corn production that has important GHG implications is limestone, which is applied to fields to adjust for soil pH. Limestone is usually applied every few years. Applied limestone is converted to lime (CaO) in the soil. Approximately 44% of its mass is released to the air as CO₂ (Wang *et al.*, 2007). Farrell *et al.* (2006) indicated that limestone application rate data are very dispersed among corn

producing states and among various GHG emission reports. Unlike most peer studies, here we apply a state specific rate and avoid some of the associated variation. Based on the most recent data, Iowa's limestone application rate per year is 647 kg/ha in 2001 (USDA). Finally, we use a higher seed rate that matches Iowa's yields and omit energy related to irrigation which is rarely used in Iowa. For other input data and parameters, which are mostly time invariant, we adopt the values in the "Ethanol today" scenario of the EBAMM model.

Results-based on LCA

Table 4 reports the GHG emissions factors at the agronomy phase. Producing corn after a crop of corn emits on average 35% more GHGs than corn produced after a crop of soybeans. This result has important implications because most additional corn planted for ethanol in Iowa is currently obtained through a rotation shift from corn-soybeans to corn-corn (see Table 2). If land of different classes is applied with the same N rate, then there are marked differences in GHG emissions (as high as 47.24 kg/MT of corn) among the classes. However, if we assume that higher land classes require higher N application to reach its higher yield potential, then the differences among the classes are much smaller (at most 7.48 kg/MT of corn). In other words, the impact of higher (lower) yields is offset by the higher (lower) emissions associated with more (less) N application.

To obtain the LCA emissions of corn ethanol, we combine emissions at the agronomy and the post-agronomy phase. As shown by the first two columns of Figure 3, the results for the two rotations are 1.66 kg/ge L and 2.0 kg/ge L for corn in corn following soybeans (CS) and corn following corn (CC) rotations, respectively. The percentage difference between the rotations is smaller for the lifecycle than for the agronomy phase because both rotations have the same emissions at the post-agronomy phase. A commonly used estimate of gasoline's LCA emissions is 2.96 kg/ge L (Farrell *et al.*, 2006, and Hill *et al.*, 2006). Compared to gasoline, our results

Table 4: Emissions at the Agronomy Phase (kg CO₂e/MT of corn).

	Land Class	Emissions (uniform N rate)	Emissions (varied N rates)
\hat{E}_{ag,c_cs}	High	247.64	264.17
	Middle	260.24	260.24
	Low	281.5	262.6
	Average	262.99	262.2
\hat{E}_{ag,c_cc}	High	334.25	352.76
	Middle	352.76	352.76
	Low	381.5	360.24
	Average	356.3	355.12

mean that ethanol based on corn grown after soybeans reduces GHG emissions by 43.7%, while ethanol based on corn grown after corn achieves a 32.4% reduction. Both numbers are much larger than the results of some recent studies. For example, Farrell *et al.* (2006) reported a best estimate of 18% while Hill *et al.* (2006) reported a value of 12%.

To obtain an estimate of the overall GHG impacts of ethanol from Iowa corn, we can calculate the weighted average of LCA emissions of ethanol based on the amount of corn grown after soybeans and the amount grown after corn in Iowa. The weight is the share of the rotations which may change from year to year. If we assume the acreage of corn-soybean rotation is the same as the soybean acreage, then we

can obtain the share of each rotation in 2006 and 2007. Based on these shares, we computed that the average GHG emissions of ethanol based on Iowa corn was 1.72 kg/ge L in 2006 and 1.78 kg/ge L in 2007. These represent 41.7% and 39.7% reduction in GHG emissions, respectively.

It is perhaps more reasonable to consider that emissions at the agronomy phase of ethanol should be emissions associated with the production of “new” corn as a result of ethanol expansion. If we assume that all new corn, and only new corn, is used for ethanol production, then the GHG impacts of ethanol can be quite different from those based on the total amount of corn produced. The difference arises because additional corn is likely to be cultivated with more intensive


**Figure 3: GHG Emissions From of Corn Production in Iowa.**

Table 5: Tillage Practices in Iowa and Emissions of Corn and Soybeans.

Tillage Practice	Soybean's emission (kg/ha/yr)	Corn's emission (kg/ha/yr)	Tillage of soybeans in Iowa	Tillage of corn in Iowa
Conventional	106.99	228.07	7.6%	22.4%
Reduced	86.98	246.11	20.7%	35.6%
Conservation	86.98	246.11	43.2%	24.3%
No till	70.92	225.11	28.3%	17.7%

agricultural practices. In the case for Iowa, corn expansion comes through the conversion of idle land and a rotation shift from corn-soybeans to corn-corn. In addition to higher emissions per hectare of new corn, converting corn-soybeans to corn-corn increases emissions of corn that is not destined for ethanol but must be accounted for because of expanded ethanol production. Consequently, ethanol based only on new corn results in more emissions per liter of ethanol produced as shown by the last column of Figure 3. Accounting based on new corn decreases the GHG benefits to about 21.5%. The emission changes occurred in all corn production are attributed to the production of new corn, since the changes occurred as a result of the production of new corn. Given that it incorporates the impacts on corn production that is not destined for ethanol, such “new corn” accounting is in a way partial SWA. However, it is only partial since emission changes beyond corn production are not considered.

Results-based on SWA

To perform SWA, we need information on a few other GHG emission factors besides those considered for the LCA. As we discussed in the system wide accounting section, the factors are emissions from soybean production (\hat{E}_{ag,s_cs}), emissions generated in the change of rotation from corn-soybeans to corn-corn (\hat{E}_{conv,cs_cc}), emissions from idle land ($\hat{E}_{ag,idle}$), emissions resulted from the conversion of idle land ($\hat{E}_{conv,idle_cc}$), emissions related to the use of soybeans ($E_{post,s}$), and emissions related to the food use of corn ($E_{post,food_c}$).

West and Marland (2002) report the carbon emissions of corn and soybean production with respect to tillage practices in the United States. Soybean production is less energy intensive than corn and emits less carbon across all tillage practices. The difference is largely attributed to the use of N fertilizer. We combine these results with the distribution of tillage practices in Iowa as reported by Conservation Technology Information Center for 2002 to calculate the tillage-weighted average emissions of corn and soybean production (Table 5). Since West and Marland (2002) does not have conservation tillage, while the CTIC data do; we assume the emissions under conservation tillage are the same as emissions under reduced tillage. Since the latter is in general more energy in-

tensive than the former, our assumption would over-estimate emissions of corn and soybean production. From Table 5, we estimated that soybean production on average generates about 35% of the emissions generated by corn production. To obtain an estimate for the GHG emissions from soybean production, we multiply this percentage number by emissions from corn production in the CS rotation since it has been the dominant rotation. (We do not use estimates of emissions in West and Marland (2002) directly because their study has a different system boundary definition. In particular, they do not consider nitrogen emissions, but we do.)

It is not an easy task to estimate soil carbon changes on idle land at the state level because carbon flux differs by soil, climate, and specific vegetation on a field, which are all heterogeneous across the state. According to Brenner *et al.* (2001), conversion of annual cropland to grasslands, as under the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), sequesters on average about 6.78 MT of CO₂e (*i.e.*, 1.85 MT of carbon) per hectare per year in Iowa. In a protocol set out by Chicago Climate Change, carbon sequestration rate on CRP land is set at 2.47 MT/ha/year (Chicago Climate Exchange, 2007). In this chapter, we use the latter *i.e.* $\hat{E}_{ag,idle} = -2.47/\text{MT}/\text{ha}/\text{year}$; this means that our results on the GHG impacts of corn ethanol are on the conservative side. After 10 years, the usual contract length for the CRP program, CRP land would have added on average 2.47 MT/ha/year of CO₂e to the soil. Upon reverting back to agricultural production, a reasonable assumption is that the sequestered carbon will all be released back to the atmosphere, and assume further that this release also happens in 10 years, then $\hat{E}_{conv,idle_cc} = 2.47/\text{MT}/\text{ha}/\text{year}$. Soil carbon sequestration or release is a dynamic process during which the rate of soil carbon change differs from year to year, usually at greater rates immediately following land use change. Paustian *et al.* (1998) suggested that, when land is taken out of agricultural production, carbon sequestration would continue for about between 50 and 100 years before a new equilibrium is reached for soil carbon stock. Similarly, when land is cleared for production, the release of carbon also occurs over time (Mann 1986). Our use of annual average over a time period (ten years) is a simplification of this process that captures the overall change of total soil carbon stock.

Table 6: SWA Results Based on Two Different Baselines and Scenarios.

Change from Baseline	Maximum Ethanol Relative to No Ethanol Baseline	2007 Situation Relative to 2006 Baseline
Corn following corn (CC) area (million hectare)	9.21	1.23
Corn following soybeans (CS) area (million hectare)	-9.21	-1.09
Idle land area (million hectare)	0	-0.14
Corn production (million MT)	38.82	6.55
Total GHG emissions (million MT CO ₂ e)	10.46	1.06
GHG emissions (kg CO ₂ e per liter* of ethanol)	1.99	2.38
GHG reduction per liter of gasoline displaced	32.6%	19.6%

*As in rest of this chapter, here liter means “gasoline-equivalent liter” – the amount of ethanol that is equivalent to 1 liter of gasoline in energy content.

The rotation effects on soil carbon stock depend on soil properties and other farm management practices like fertilizer application and tillage systems. Paustian *et al.* (1997) indicated that soil organic carbon was higher for continuous corn than for a corn-soybean rotation. In Hao *et al.* (2002), similar results were obtained for reduced tillage; the two rotations had the same soil carbon under conventional tillage. Vyn *et al.* (2006) reported that continuous corn did not store more soil organic carbon than rotation corn. The possible reason, they conjectured, was that continuous corn emitted more CO₂ from the soil surface than a corn-soybean rotation. Based on their analysis of a global database of long-term field experiments, including sites in the US Midwest, West and Post (2002) concluded that there is no significant difference in soil organic carbon stock between continuous corn and corn-soybeans. The large amount of residue generated in a CC rotation presents a challenge for conservation tillage. Thus, the risk and magnitude of yield drag associated with continuous corn, compared to corn-soybeans, is greatest with high-residue no-till or minimum tillage systems (Nielson *et al.* 2006). Thus, even though a corn-soybean rotation may result in lower soil carbon level under the same tillage practice, overall this decrease is likely to be compensated by more use of conservation tillage. Taking into account all these factors, we assume that $\hat{E}_{conv,cs_cc} = 0$.

We consider SWA for two cases in Iowa. In the first case, referred to as “all CS baseline,” all baseline crop production is in a corn-soybean rotation and that there is no corn ethanol produced in the baseline. This is clearly a hypothetical case because corn has been processed into ethanol for three decades. In this baseline, corn and soybean area both equal 4.605 million ha so that their total equals the total area devoted to corn and soybeans in 2006. The scenario calls for “maximum ethanol.” Corn for ethanol is created by shifting all baseline corn and soybeans area to continuous corn. That is, 9.21 million ha are shifted from a corn-soybean rotation to continuous corn. No idle land is assumed to be converted. We assume that all additional corn comes from these land use changes and no

corn is diverted from food use. Furthermore, we assume that soybean consumption in Iowa does not change, which implies that reduction in soybean production in Iowa will be made up by soybean produced somewhere else in the United States or in the world. Essentially there is no emission changes related to the food use of corn and soybeans. Calculating the weighted sum of GHG changes in a way similar to that in equation (8), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta TE_{SWA} &= \Delta TE_{LCA,c_cc} + [9.21 \times 0.5 \times (\hat{E}_{ag,s_cs} + \hat{E}_{ag,c_cs} - \frac{y_{cs}}{y_{cc}} \times \hat{E}_{ag,s_cc}) \\ &\quad - (9.21) \times \hat{E}_{conv,cs_cc}] \\ &= 10.40 + 0.06 = 10.46 \text{ (million metric tons).}\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

Table 6 lists the results for other variables in this case including land uses, the total amount of additional corn used for ethanol, and GHG emissions. In total, the scenario generated 38.82 million metric tons more corn than the baseline. The GHG emission rate is 1.99 kg/ge L, which is equivalent to 32.6% reduction relative to the LCA emissions of the displaced gasoline. Thus, in this particular case, the GHG benefits of ethanol under SWA are about the same as those under LCA for ethanol produced from corn grown under CC rotation. Nonetheless, the apparent similarity between the results under SWA and LCA is derived through very different calculations and the similarity could disappear if different emissions coefficients were used in the analysis. The emissions associated with soybean production are given as benefits from corn ethanol under SWA, while the intensification of corn production was imposed as a penalty against corn ethanol's GHG impacts. These quantities were large in magnitude (4.47 million MT of CO₂e), but they happened to offset each other in this analysis.

In the second case, we take 2006 crop production as a baseline and consider the GHG benefits of ethanol based on the additional corn generated through land use changes in 2007. Assume the total area of CS rotation was just the double of soybean area, then the area for CS rotation was 8.22 million hectares (ha) in 2006 and 7.12 million ha in 2007 (see Table 2). This implies that 1.1 million ha was shifted from CS to CC. The difference in total area between the two years

(0.14 million ha) was assumed to have been converted from idle land to continuous corn. As in the previous case, food use of corn and soybeans is assumed to be the same as in the baseline. Then, we can compute corn ethanol's GHG benefits for this case as:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta TE_{SWA} &= \Delta TE_{LCA,cc} + [1.1 \times 0.5 \times (\hat{E}_{ag,cs} + \hat{E}_{ag,cc} - \frac{y_{cs}}{y_{cc}} \times \hat{E}_{ag,cc}) \\ &\quad - (1.1) \times \hat{E}_{conv,cs,cc} + 0.14 \times (\hat{E}_{ag,idle} - \hat{E}_{conv,idle,cc})] \quad (10) \\ &= 1.76 - 0.70 = 1.06 \text{ (million metric tons)}.\end{aligned}$$

Land use changes and GHG results are presented in Table 6. Dividing total GHG emissions by the ethanol produced from the additional corn, we obtain the GHG benefits for this case: 0.58 kg CO₂e per liter of gasoline displaced. This amounts to a 19.6% reduction from the LCA emissions of gasoline. This reduction is smaller than in the previous case because the increased emissions related to conversion of idle land is more important given the much smaller total reduction in emissions.

The Impacts of Geographical Boundaries

One potential criticism of the analysis presented in the previous section could be that the geographic boundaries put on the problem are too restrictive. After all, in both cases most of the additional corn for ethanol production is made available by reducing soybean acreage. Furthermore, soybean consumption is held to be the same as in the baseline scenarios for both cases. But if soybean consumption does not change in Iowa, then additional land will have to be devoted to soybean production in other regions of the United States or in South America.

Expansion of the SWA boundaries to include these indirect effects of expanded soybean production area is beyond the scope of this study. However, we can make some rough calculations. Suppose that the geographical boundary is expanded so that emissions of soybean expansion outside Iowa will have to be considered. Then, the credits given to ethanol's GHG benefits in SWA for soybean production would have to be taken away. If soybean expansion outside Iowa emits GHGs at the same rate as that used in our previous analysis, then broadening geographical boundary this way will reduce the GHG benefits of Iowa corn ethanol to 18.7% for the all CS baseline case and 8.6% for the 2006 baseline case.

If we further assume that land used for soybean expansion has never been tilled, and that the release of carbon in the untilled land is equal to the release of carbon from CRP land when it is tilled, then ethanol's benefits have to be reduced even more. If soybean expansion has the same yield as that in Iowa, which implies that new soybean production area outside Iowa has to equal the reduction in soybean area in Iowa to maintain total soybean production then the release of soil carbon increases GHG emissions by 16.8% and 16.4% for the all CS baseline case and the 2006 baseline case, respectively. Of course, emissions associated with soybean production and

conversion of grassland to soybean production will depend on the soil and climate condition of the relevant regions. But our estimates show how such benefits can be calculated and the possible magnitude of these numbers.

Conclusions

The degree to which corn ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions depends on how corn is produced, how corn is processed into ethanol, and what emissions would be without corn ethanol. Lifecycle analysis takes into account the first two factors, but not the third. But the third factor may be the most important determinant. The degree to which LCA-estimated emissions differ from SWA-estimated emissions can vary widely depending on the situation analyzed.

LCA estimates of the reduction in GHG emissions of corn ethanol themselves can vary widely. The GHG reduction of corn ethanol produced from Iowa corn vary according to the year analyzed, whether corn is grown in rotation with soybeans, and whether the average or marginal agronomy emissions of corn are measured. Corn grown after a crop of soybeans in Iowa emits 26% less CO₂e in the agronomy stage than corn grown after a crop of corn. Hence, Iowa corn grown in 2007 had higher average emissions than Iowa corn grown in 2006 because Iowa moved to more continuous corn spurred by the increased demand for ethanol. LCA of the marginal corn that Iowa farmers grew in 2007 to meet ethanol demand (rather than the 2007 average corn) reduces the net GHG reduction of corn ethanol relative to gasoline from 39.7% to 21.5%.

Moving to SWA accounting involves comparing total baseline emissions and emissions with corn ethanol. Thus care must be taken in specifying both the baseline and the scenario. If baseline ethanol production is zero, and all baseline Iowa corn is grown in a corn-soybean rotation, then a shift to continuous corn to provide corn for ethanol production would reduce net GHG emissions relative to baseline results by approximately 32.6% per liter of gasoline displaced. If 2006 planted acreage and ethanol production is taken to be the baseline and the 2007 changes in Iowa acreage represent the scenario to be analyzed, then emissions are reduced by 19.6% per liter of gasoline displaced. The difference results from the fact that 140,000 ha of idle land were brought into production in 2007.

For both SWA and LCA, the definition of boundaries is a key factor in determining estimated emissions. Which processes to include in the lifecycle of ethanol can make a big difference in LCA results. There is a general consensus on the definition of system boundaries for LCA (*e.g.* Farrell *et al.*, 2006). As we have demonstrated, SWA results are affected by the use of baseline emissions and the definition of geographical boundaries. Whether there are positive GHG benefits and the size of such benefits from Iowa corn ethanol depend on

the geographical region defined for analysis. This indicates that clearly identifying system boundaries is as important for SWA as for LCA.

References

- Baker, Mindy L. and Bruce A. Babcock. "Value Maximization from Corn Fractionation: Feed, Greenhouse Gas Reductions, and Co-integration of Ethanol and Livestock." Presented paper, Transition to a Bioeconomy: Integration of Agricultural and Energy Systems, Atlanta, GA, February 12-13, 2008. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.farmfoundation.org/news/templates/template.aspx?articleid=378&zoneid=34>
- Brenner, John, Keith Paustian, George Bluhm, Jan Cipra, Mark Easter, Ted Elliott, Tim Kautza, Kendrick Killian, Jill Schuler and Steve Williams. *Quantifying the Change in Greenhouse Gas Emissions due to Natural Resource Conservation Practice Application in Iowa*. Final report to the Iowa Conservation Partnership. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, May 2001. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.nrel.colostate.edu/projects/agroeco/projects/statelevel/ia.html>
- Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX). "CCX Agricultural Grass Soil Carbon Sequestration Offset Project Guideline." Chicago, IL: CCX, 2007. [Accessed December 2007.] Available from http://www.chicagoclimatex.com/docs/offsets/Grassland_Conversion_Protocol.pdf
- Delucchi, Mark A. *Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Lifecycle Analysis of Transportation Fuels*. Research Report UCD-ITS-RR-04-45. Davis, CA: Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis, CA., October 2004.
- DeWitt, Jerald, Michael Duffy, Gerald Miller, John Sawyer and John Creswell. "Crop Rotation." *Nutrient Management Information Sheet 5*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Extension, January 2002. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/Publications/NMEP5.pdf>
- Duffy, Michael and David Correll. "Where will the Corn Come From?" Ag Decision Maker(AgDM): An Agricultural Economics and Business Web Site. Ames, IA: Iowa State University extension, November 2006. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm/articles/duffy/DuffyNov06.html>
- Duffy, Michael and Darnell Smith. "Estimated Costs of Crop Production in Iowa 2007." Ag Decision Maker(AgDM): An Agricultural Economics and Business Web Site. Ames, IA: Iowa State University extension, 2007. [Accessed 2007.] Available from <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/AGDM/>
- Erickson, Bruce J. and Jess M. Lowenberg-DeBoer. "Weighting the Returns of Rotated vs. Continuous Corn." *Top Farmer Crop Workshop Newsletter*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, February 2005. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from http://www.agecon.purdue.edu/topfarmer/newsletter/TFCW2_05.pdf
- Farrell, Alexander E., Richard J. Plevin, Brian T. Turner, Andrew D. Jones, Michael O'Hare, Daniel M. Kammen. "Ethanol Can Contribute to Energy and Environmental Goals." *Science* 311(5760)(January 27, 2006): 506-508. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/311/5760/506>
- Feehan, Jane and Jan-Erik Petersen. "A Framework for Evaluating the Environmental Impact of Biofuel Use." In: *Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Biomass and Agriculture: Sustainability, Markets and Policies*. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 2004, pp.151-167. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://books.google.com/books?id=DcIk34hjV7wC>
- Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute. *FAPRI 2007 U.S. and World Agricultural Outlook*. FAPRI Staff Report 07-FSR 1. Ames, IA: Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute, January 2007. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.fapri.iastate.edu/outlook2007/text/Outlook-Pub2007.pdf>
- Graboski, Michael S. *Fossil Energy Use in the Manufacture of Corn Ethanol*. St. Louis, MO: National Corn Growers Association, August 2002. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from http://www.ncga.com/ethanol/pdfs/energy_balance_report_final_R1.PDF
- GREET 1.8. The Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, and Energy Use in Transportation (GREET) Model, version 1.8. Argonne, IL: UChicago Argonne, LLC, various. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from http://www.transportation.anl.gov/modeling_simulation/GREET/index.html
- Hao, Y., R. Lal, L.B. Owens, R.C. Izaurralde, W.M. Post and D.L. Hothem. "Effect of Cropland Management and Slope Position on Soil Organic Carbon Pool at the North Appalachian Experimental Watersheds." *Soil & Tillage Research* 68(2)(December 2002): 133-142. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MIImg&_imagekey=B6TC6-47904F7-3-9&_cdi=5162&_user=952835&_orig=search&_coverDate=12%2F31%2F2002&_sk=999319997&view=c&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkWA&md5=8d9f04849992fb7bf0dbef66c405caa&ie=/sdarticle.pdf
- Hardy, Connie L., Mary S. Holz-Clause, Howard E. Shepherd and Charles R. Hurburgh. *Sourcing Corn for Ethanol: Impacts of Local Processing*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Extension, November 2006. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.agmrc.org/NR/rdonlyres/4D0DAEC8-2E37-4E85-BE7F-580FDB9D5C48/0/SourcingCornforEthanol.pdf>
- Hennessy, David A. "On Monoculture and the Structure of Crop Rotations." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 88(4)(November 2006): 900-914.
- Hill, Jason, Erik Nelson, David Tilman, Stephen Polasky and Douglas Tiffany. "Environmental, Economic, and Energetic Costs and Benefits of Biodiesel and Ethanol Biofuels." *Proceedings of the National Academies of Sciences of the United States of America* 103(30)(July 25, 2006): 11206-11210. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.pnas.org/content/103/30/11206.full.pdf+html>
- Iowa Corn Growers Association (ICGA). "Ethanol Production Information" Johnston, IA: Iowa Corn Growers Association, 2007. [Accessed December 2007.] Available from <http://www.iowacorn.org/>
- Kim, Seungdo and Bruce E. Dale. "Life Cycle Assessment of Various Cropping Systems Utilized for Producing Biofuels: Bioethanol and Biodiesel." *Biomass and Bioenergy* 29(6)(December 2005): 426-439. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6V22-4GVGTFB-1&_user=952835&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=952835&md5=c340aa70eb9fa57f94c492f6a6a64
- Kim, Seungdo and Bruce E. Dale. "Life Cycle Assessment of Fuel Ethanol Derived from Corn Grain via Dry Milling" *Bioresource Technology* 99(12)(August 2008): 5250-5260.
- Lewis, Jonathan. *Leaping Before They Looked: Lessons from Europe's Experience with the 2003 Biofuels Directive*. Boston, MA: Clean Air Task Force, October 2007. [Accessed September 1, 2007.] Available from http://www.catf.us/publications/reports/Leaping_Before_They_Looked.pdf
- Mann, L.K. "Changes in Soil Carbon Storage After Cultivation." *Soil Science* 142(5)(May 1986): 279-288.
- National Agriculture Statistics Service. *Acreage*. Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture, National Agriculture Statistics Service, Agriculture Statistics Board, June 2007. [Accessed September 1, 2007.] Available from <http://www.usda.gov/nass/PUBS/TODAYRPT/acrg0607.pdf>
- Nielsen, R.L., William Johnson, Christian Krupke and Greg Shaner. *Mitigate the Downside Risks of Corn Following Corn*. Working paper. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University, 2006. [Accessed September 1, 2007.] Available from <http://www.agry.purdue.edu/ext/corn/news/timeless/CornCorn.html>
- Owen, Anthony D. "Environmental Externalities, Market Distortions and the Economics of Renewable Energy Technologies." *The Energy Journal* 25(3)(June 1, 2004): 127-156. [Accessed September 1, 2007.] Available from <http://www.ergo.ee.unsw.edu.au/Ej2004.pdf>
- Paustian, Keith, C. Vernon Cole, Dieter Sauerbeck and Neil Sampson. "CO₂ Mitigation by Agriculture: an Overview." *Climatic Change* 40(1)(September 1998): 135-162. [Accessed September 1, 2007.] Available from <http://www.springer-link.com/content/q1313870670755w2/fulltext.pdf>
- Paustian, Keith A, H.P. Collins, and Eldor A. Paul. "Management Controls on Soil Carbon." In: Paul, Eldor A., Keith A. Paustian, E.T. Elliott and C.Vernon Cole (eds.) *Soil Organic Matter in Temperate Agroecosystems Long-term Experiments in North America*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 1997, pp. 343-351.

- Pimentel, David and Tad W. Patzek. "Ethanol Production Using Corn, Switchgrass, and Wood; Biodiesel Production Using Soybean and Sunflower." *Natural Resources Research* 14(1)(March 2005): 65-76. [Accessed September 1, 2007.] Available from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/r1552355771656v0/fulltext.pdf>
- Righelato, Renton and Dominick V. Spracklen. "Carbon Mitigation by Biofuels or by Saving and Restoring Forests?" *Science* 317(5840)(August 17, 2007): 902. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/317/5840/902>
- Sawyer, John., Emerson Nafziger, Gyles Randall, Larry Bundy, George Rehm and Brad Joern. "Concepts and Rational for Regional Nitrogen Rate Guidelines for Corn." Ames, IA: Iowa State University Extension, April 2006. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.extension.iastate.edu/Publications/PM2015.pdf>
- Vyn, T.J., R.A. Omonode, D.R. Smith, A. Gal and P. Hegymegi. "Soil Sequestration and Gas Emissions of Carbon after 3 Decades of Tillage Systems for Corn and Soybean Production in Indiana." 17th Triennial Conference of the International Soil Tillage Research Organization (ISTRO) Conference Proceedings, Kiel, Germany, August 28 - September 3, 2006.
- Wang, Michael, May Wu and Hong Huo. "Life-Cycle Energy and Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts of Different Corn Ethanol Plant Types." *Environmental Research Letter* 2(May 22, 2007) 024001. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://www.iop.org/EJ/abstract/1748-9326/2/2/024001/>
- West, Tristram O. and Gregg Marland. "A Synthesis of Carbon Sequestration, Carbon Emissions, and Net Carbon Flux in Agriculture: Comparing Tillage Practices in the United States." *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 91(1-3) (2002): 217-232.
- West, Tristram O. and Wilfred M. Post. "Soil Organic Carbon Sequestration Rates by Tillage and Crop Rotation: A Global Data Analysis." *Soil Science Society of American Journal* 66(6)(2002): 1930-1946. [Accessed September 1, 2008.] Available from <http://soil.scijournals.org/cgi/reprint/66/6/1930>