



**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](mailto: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.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

# **Nitrogen Cycling and Economic Viability of Corn Residue for Energy**


Juan Sesmero and Ben Gramig

*Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association's 2012 AAEA Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington, August 12-14, 2012*

*Copyright 2012 by authors. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.*

## Background

- RFS requires 36 billion gallon ethanol equivalent mandate of renewable transportation fuels per year by 2022.
- Corn residue was identified by EPA and USDA as the third feedstock in importance to meet the annual mandate.
- Due to high density and yields the bulk of corn residue is expected to come from the Corn Belt.



## Limitations of Current Knowledge

- Previous literature assumes replacement of nutrients removed with residue ( $\cong 20\%$  of harvesting cost) and exogenous crop rotation choice.
- Evidence suggests improvement in N cycling after harvest may reduce need for nutrient replacement.
- Positive net revenue from corn residue may affect optimal rotation choice triggering land cover changes.

## Model


- Farmers choose rotation and stover harvest rate to maximize profits.
- Farmers choice is a function of prices (corn, soybean, and nitrogen) and agronomic parameters.
- Agronomic parameters capture yield and nutrient effects of rotation and harvest choice.
- Profit conditions determine price and agronomic thresholds triggering management practices.
- We construct profit conditions comparing four different management practices with the baseline (corn-soybean rotation without stover harvest):

$$V(CRCR) \geq V(CNS) \quad V(CRS) \geq V(CNS)$$


$$V(CNCN) \geq V(CRCR) \quad V(CNCR) \geq V(CNCN)$$

$$V(CNCR) \geq V(CRCR)$$

## Results (agronomic effects)



## Prices and management



## Conclusions

- Nitrogen replacement and hence cost of harvesting stover may be overestimated.
- Increases in stover price may trigger changes in land cover (rotation and residue coverage).
- We find lower cost of harvesting stover. This is because:
  - 1) Stover removal enhances N-cycling
  - 2) High stover price increases corn planting density and stover harvesting density.

## Data Sources

- Own simulations with Daycent
- Coulter and Nafziger, Pantoja et al., Maskina et al., Power et al., Coulter et al. 2010

## Authors Information

<sup>1</sup> Both authors are Assistant Professors of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University. Email: [jsesmero@purdue.edu](mailto:jsesmero@purdue.edu) and [bgramig@purdue.edu](mailto:bgramig@purdue.edu)