IMPLEMENTATION OF 4R NUTRIENT STEWARDSHIP AND THE NERP IN ALBERTA (FARMING 4R LAND PHASE II)



Principal Investigator: Clyde Graham Sr. Vice President, Strategy and Alliances, Canadian Fertilizer Institute 350 Sparks Street, Suite 907, Ottawa, ON K1R 7S8 Phone : (613) 230-2600 Email: cgraham@cfi.ca

Project Advisor:

Dr. Susan Wood-Bohm Executive Director, GHG Management Alberta Innovates - Bio Solutions (AI Bio) Email: susan.wood-bohm@albertainnovates.ca

Project Completion Date: March 31, 2014

Project Submission Date: May 30, 2013

Total CCEMC Funds: \$227,500

CCEMC Holdback Amount: \$45,500

Executive Summary

Farming 4R Land Phase II built a unique network of Alberta farmers, agronomy experts, scientists, fertilizer and agri-business industry leaders, community leaders, and government officials. Farming 4R Land Phase II provided Alberta producers with science-based information and advice on how to use beneficial management practices under the 4R Nutrient Stewardship to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) through the use of the Nitrous Oxide Emissions Reduction Protocol (NERP) when they apply fertilizer or other crop nutrients on their fields.

Over the timeframe of May 2013 – March 2014 the Farming 4R Land Phase II project presented at 2 conferences, 4 association meetings and 2 Soil Fertility Courses. The project hosted 4 workshops, 1 webinar and received over 150 completed producer and agronomy expert surveys. Through these initiatives, over half a million acres and over 100 agronomic service providers, and other industry stakeholders and leaders are now assessing agronomic packages for 4R Nutrient Stewardship extension activities. The project also initiated three Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) with Capital Power, ARECA and Lakeland College, developed a promotional video for 4Rs and NERP in Alberta, saw the development of three 4R plans to be implemented in the 2014 growing season on over 15000 acres and established preliminary curriculum for 4R Nutrient Stewardship in Lakeland College.

Phase II Farming 4R Land Highlights

To summarize the Phase II findings, CFI wishes to highlight the following positive attributes of the project:

- Overall, it is conclusive that Alberta farmers continue to demonstrate their commitment to being strong stewards of the land;
- This phase also brought 4R Nutrient Stewardship into the agricultural classroom, targeting students to utilize their training on the 4Rs to make decisions for the Student Led Farm;
- Two pilot farms created 4R Nutrient Management Plans to be implemented in the 2014 growing season; one of which developed 2 Nutrient Management plans for different fields on their farm;
- The business case for 4R Nutrient Stewardship is being strengthened and aligned with the positive environmental attributes, including GHG reduction, of the framework;
- Uptake of 4R and NERP Certification by agricultural practitioners continued and will aid in achieving scale quickly.

Contents

Executive Summary	i
Project Background	3
Activities by Milestone	4
Project Partners and Final Deliverables	10
Project Activities and Findings	12
Conclusions	18
Challenges, Barriers and Opportunities	19
Appendices	21
Appendix A: Farming 4R Land Survey GAP Analysis	22
Appendix B Economic Analysis	26

Project Background

As Canadian and international agriculture markets develop in the 21st Century there is increasing pressure to demonstrate sustainability in the agri-food value chain. To meet these pressures the fertilizer industry has been headlining a sustainability and stewardship initiative that will utilize 4R (Right Source @ Right Rate, Right Time, Right Place[®]) Nutrient Stewardship System (4Rs) to increase production and profitability of farmers, while enhancing environmental protection and improving sustainability.

Farming 4R Future – Stewardship today to feed tomorrow strategy designed by the Canadian Fertilizer Institute (CFI) is a collaborative approach that provides producers across Canada with science-based information and advice on how to use beneficial management practices (BMPs) under 4R Nutrient Stewardship. In the Farming 4R Land Phase II project, CFI and the project partners built on the momentum from the first phase to develop NERP enabling tools and resources to operationalize several stages of the 4R strategic plan - Partnership and Outreach, Evaluation of Implementation, and Recognition and Advocacy. This approach assisted in defining what successful sustainable farming is, as well as how farmers, consumers, and society can include environmental and social goals in the assessment of stewardship.

Activities by Milestone

The following table outlines the proposed milestones and describes the activities which led to its completion.

Task ID	Task	Activity	Outcomes and Indicators	Start Date	End Date	Status		
		Mi	lestone 1					
1	Detailed Work plan and Project Partners meeting	 A detailed work plan was developed Defining the scope of work and roles and responsibilities for the specific partners A project team and project advisory committee were established 	 Execution of agreement between parties Agreements between project partners initiated The Project team and advisory committee were established 	21/05/ 2013	31/07/ 2014	Complete		
2	Stakeholder Outreach and Extension Plan	 Established a work plan Define the scope of the outreach and extension plan 	 Detailed work plan and outreach plan was finalized The engagement strategy for Producers was developed 	21/05/ 2013	31/07/ 2014	Complete		
3	Business Strategy	 Developed the business proposition and meetings with potential voluntary transaction partners Established partnerships with other stakeholders that are critical for the business opportunity 	 Business proposition for potential buyers and sellers in an enterprise to enterprise transaction was developed Communications with potential offset buyers and aggregators took place 	21/05/ 2013	31/11/ 2014	Complete		
4	Develop Quarterly Progress Report and Advisory Committee	 Developed a Quarterly Report Held first advisory committee meeting 	 Quarterly Report #1 Complete and submitted August 30, 2013 Advisory Committee meeting held August 28, 2013 and meeting minutes were distributed 	15/07/ 2013	31/07/ 2013			
		Mi	lestone 2					
1	Workshop and web based extension	 A full Communications strategy was developed for promoting extension workshops and developing a 	 Detailed communications strategy finalized Extension toolkits were finalized 	01/07/ 2013	30/09/ 2013	Complete		

Task	Task	Activity	Outcomes and Indicators	Start Data	End	Status
	development and implementation	 strategy for FarmTech 2014 An initial list of existing events was identified as potential extension venues Extension tool kits including 4R plans and 4R two pagers were amassed Initiated the FarmTech 2014 engagement strategy 		Date	Date	
2	GHG (NERP) Quantification – supporting documentation – Part 1	 Developed GHG quantification templates and data management templates Agronomic Resources were developed and made available to Producers and Agronomic Service Providers 	 Quantification template and data management templates were finalized 	01/07/ 2013	30/09/ 2013	Complete
3	4R Educational materials, education institutions, retailers and crop advisors	 Extension toolkits were developed including 4R Nutrient Stewardship Plans, 4R Checklists and 4R 2-pagers A 4R roundtable for colleges was initiated and involved engaging the various agricultural colleges in Alberta A 4R Nutrient Stewardship webinar was held to describe the benefits of nutrient stewardship and facilitate a discussion on integrating it into the curriculum 	 Extension toolkits were finalized Initiated 4R roundtable for colleges The 4R Nutrient Stewardship webinar for colleges was developed and delivered on January 24, 2014. Attendees included members of Olds College, Lakeland College and Lethbridge College 	01/07/ 2013	30/09/ 2013	Complete
4	Economic Analysis of 4R	Initiated economic analysisDeveloped a literature review which	• Developed scenarios based on the literature, imperial models and expert	01/07/ 2013	30/09/ 2013	Complete

Task	Task	Activity	Outcomes and Indicators	Start Data	End	Status	
	BMPs to support NERP implementation in the value chain – Phase 1	 clearly shows that extensive land use results in improved sustainability on a unit area basis. Developed a GHG lifecycle model that included field operations and the upstream GHGs associated with manufacture of fertilizer and other agricultural chemicals to evaluate the scenarios. 	 opinion to represent a baseline of wheat and canola production in Alberta The results showed that overall GHG emissions per hectare increased substantially with cropping intensity. However, emissions per kilogram crop produced were similar at the different levels of intensity (Appendix B). 	Date	Date		
5	Develop Quarterly Progress Report and Advisory Meeting	 Developed the second Quarterly Report Held the second advisory committee meeting 	 Quarterly Report #1 Complete and submitted November 30. 2013 Advisory Committee meeting held November 4th, 2013 and meeting minutes were distributed 	15/09/ 2013	30/09/ 2013	Complete	
		Mi	estone 3				
1	Extension delivery by workshops, web based extension, and education institutions – Part 1	 Deploy extension tools Continuation of communications strategy Extension and engagement activities took place across Alberta 	 Project partners in person meetings in Alberta Grain Grower of Canada Event took place 4R College Roundtable Webinar took place 	01/10/ 2013	31/12/ 2013	Complete	
2	4R and NERP information extension packages to retailers and crop advisors	 4R and NERP extension packages for retailers and crop advisors was initiated and ready for upcoming workshop and extension opportunities 	 4R and NERP Extension Packages Finalized 	01/10/ 2013	31/12/ 2013	Complete	
3	GHG (NERP) quantification –	NERP Toolkit for GHG offset buyers was developed which included	The NERP Toolkit was finalized	01/10/ 2013	31/12/ 2013	Complete	

Task	Task	Activity	Outcomes and Indicators	Start Date	End	Status
	supporting documentation – Part 2	quantification templates, producer information and documentation requirements, 4R plan template, a guidance document on applying the Alberta NERP, eligibility requirements and data considerations and the 4R Designation Checklist		Date	Date	
4	Develop Quarterly Progress Report and Advisory Meeting	 Developed the third Quarterly Report Held the third advisory committee meeting 	 Quarterly Report #3 Complete and submitted January. 2014 Advisory Committee meeting held January 16th, 2014 and meeting minutes were distributed 	01/12/ 2013	31/12/ 2013	Complete
		Mi	lestone 4			
1	Extension Delivery by workshops, web based extension and education institutions – Part 2	 Outreach activities continued Working with ARECA, existing workshops and meetings were utilized to raise awareness about the 4Rs 	 Peace Agronomy Update Meeting in Fairview 4R Recommendation Workshop for Farmers Edge (14 Attendees) Soil Fertility Course with a 4R Component (48 Attendees, 34 of which were Producers) Chinook Applied Research Association Soil Workshop in Oven (28 Attendees) Canadian Association of Farm Advisors in Red Deer (52 Attendees) Environmental Services Association of Alberta Training (20 Attendees) Precision Ag Conference in Calgary (45 Attendees) Gray Wooded Forage Association (8 	01/01/ 2014	31/03/ 2014	Complete

Task	Task	Activity	Outcomes and Indicators	Start Data	End	Status
2	Economic Analysis of 4R BMPs to support the NERP implementation in the value chain	• Economic analysis of the 4Rs was completed to support NERP implementation	 attendees) GRO Winter Workshop with AGM in Westlock (17 attendees) SARDA Winter Workshop and AGM in Fahler (30 attendees) FarmTech 2014 - Over 250+ interactions, promotional video developed, 183 surveys completed An economic analysis comparing the BMP scenarios for the two crops and three regions 	01/10/ 2013	01/02/ 2014	Complete
	– Phase II, plenary at FarmTech					
3	Farm Tech 2014	 Continuation of communications strategy Participation in FarmTech 2014 Deploy survey at FarmTech Collect results from FarmTech Complete GAP Analysis of surveys 	 Communications advisory committee meeting – strategy for FarmTech and workshops FarmTech 2014 - Over 250+ interactions, promotional video developed, 183 surveys completed A survey report was completed following Farm Tech and wad distributed to all participants A GAP Analysis of surveys completed to date in comparison to national and provincial surveys (Appendix B) 	01/01/ 2014	01/02/ 2014	Complete
4	Farm 4R and NERP plans developed and prepared for	• 2 4R Plans were developed by ARECA members for implementation in the 2014 growing season	 4R Plans were developed, reviewed and finalized 	01/01/ 2014	31/03/ 2014	Complete

Task	Task	Activity	Outcomes and Indicators	Start Date	End Date	Status
	2014 growing season	• Engagement with buyers and offset providers continued and culminated with an MOU		Dutt	Date	
5	Analysis of results and reporting of activities	 Analyze results from workshops Finalize economic analysis and project communications to stakeholders 		01/02/ 2014	31/03/ 2014	Complete
6	Project Financial Audit	 Submit project reporting and financial audit 		15/03/ 2014	30/04/ 2014	TBD

Project Partners and Final Deliverables

In order to achieve the Phase II project objectives, CFI formed a strong group of expert partners to deliver on the project. The following table outlines the project team roles and responsibilities to undertake specific tasks to achieve the milestones.

Organization	Roles & Responsibilities	Contributions and Final Deliverables
ClimateCHECK	 Overall project management for reporting and project partners including CCEMC information management system requirements Technical documentation and stakeholder engagement Content development Secretariat to Project and Communications Advisory Committee 	 Organized various Project Advisory Committee meetings and Communications Advisory Committee meetings Submitted budgetary reports and interim report to CCEMC Travelled to Alberta to meet with project partners, for FarmTech 2014 and the workshop series Development of Alberta specific 4R NERP Toolkit Development of GHG quantification (NERP) and data management documentation Creation of 4R Performance Level Survey and review with identified experts for FarmTech 2014 Organized survey responses from Farm Tech and developed a report of Survey Trends and a GAP analysis of surveys completed to date in comparison to Provincial and National Surveys Managed the 4R College Roundtable including development of a 4R College Webinar Lead the enterprise engagement strategy Assisted with financial management
Canadian Fertilizer Institute	 Financial management and administration Contractor agreements Project advisory committee Communications lead with Emerging Ag Approvals of strategy and content 	 Created list of Alberta contacts for promotion of activities Development of communications strategy Reviewed and approved communications messaging Managed media for workshops Logistics for workshops and webinar Identified potential speakers and experts
Technical team Random Cross Consulting	Stakeholder promotion	 Developed workshop framework and content Developed materials and content and presented at Webinars

	• 4R Extension	 Created short on-line 4R Nutrient Stewardship course Presented at: Peace Agronomy Update Meeting in Fairview 4R Recommendation Workshop for Farmers Edge (14 Attendees) Chinook Applied Research Association Soil Workshop in Oven (28 Attendees) Canadian Association of Farm Advisors in Red Deer (52 Attendees) Environmental Services Association of Alberta Training (20 Attendees) Precision Ag Conference in Calgary (45 Attendees) Gray Wooded Forage Association (8 attendees) Presentations and interacting with participants at FarmTech 2014 Provided supporting quotes to news and media Provided supporting to apply the 4Rs and complete 4R Nutrient Management Plans
ARECA	 4R Extension Stakeholder promotion 	 Facilitate participation at extension events Support communications by sharing Farming 4R Land promotion with members
Communication Team (Emerging Ag)	Communications consultant	 Support all communications initiatives from CFI Communications and outreach Identifying key messages and stakeholder audiences
Agri-Economics team (George Morris Centre)	 Economic Analysis of priority 4R practices for western producers of selected crop type(s) 	 Created Economic Analysis of applying 4R BMPS to support NERP implementation and the value chain

Project Activities and Findings

Since the official launch of the Farming 4R Land Phase II project; team members have collaborated with agricultural stakeholders in order to share and encourage the adoption of 4R Nutrient Stewardship practices on farms with the intention of reducing nutrient loss and GHG emissions. 4R Nutrient Stewardship is designed to protect soil quality, optimize fertilizer efficiency, and minimize nutrient loss by using the Right source, at the Right rate, at the Right time, and in the Right place[®]. This project brought together producers, scientists, fertilizer and agri-business industry leaders, conservation experts, colleges and governments to develop and share Alberta specific BMPs based on the principles of 4R Nutrient Stewardship and strategies to implement them across the province. With the use of various webinars, in person surveys at FarmTech 2014, events, and in person workshops and meetings, we engaged a wide variety of stakeholders.

The surveys administered at FarmTech 2014 were aimed at showing producers the potential economic benefits and reduction in GHG emissions they could achieve based on the scenario they selected. The 'business as usual' scenario that was used to conduct this analysis was based on expert opinions of Alberta agronomists regarding what BMPs would typically be implemented if the 4Rs and NERP were not implemented. The Alberta AFFIRM model was used for all of the scenarios to simulate soil-crop and climate interactions while considering fertilizer prices. With over 180 surveys completed, representing about half a million acres of farmland, we found that almost all of the producers were already at or close to achieving the basic 4R level. This trend was dominant regardless of the soil zone or the predominant crop grown, and translated to a potential reduction in GHG emissions of 15%, depending on the soil and crop type.

Two in-person workshops were held on March 10, 2014 and March 13, 2014 as part of a basic soils course presented in Fort Vermilion and LaCrete. The course was designed to inform Producers on basic soils principles including concepts like the role of pH in determining bioavailability of nutrients for plants, the role of soil processes in maintenance and the depletion of soil quality. These Soil Courses were taught over six weeks for two hours and the fourth session was dedicated to the 4R Nutrient Stewardship Program. In total there were 48 attendees, 34 of which were Producers.

In addition, other in-person workshops and seminars were held, including a presentation at the Peace Agronomy Update which the North Peach Applied Research Association (NPARA) organized. The event was held on January 16, 2014 in Fairview with 72 attendees. Dr. Dan Heaney presented on "4R Nutrient Stewardship: The Right Source, The Right Rate, Time & Place." Dr. Dan Heaney also presented at the Precision Ag conference from Feb 11-12, 2014 in Calgary with approximately 125 participants. A presentation by Peter Gamache was also provided at the GRO AGM on February 26, 2014 in Westlock, AB. The presentation covered 4R Nutrient Stewardship and other agronomic and conservation practices such as no-till farming and the use of cover crops and had 17 attendees. GRO also published an article in the December Issue highlighting 4R Nutrient Stewardship and reaching approximately 90 members.

Events were also held at the Falher Regional Recreation centre with approximately 28 attendees and a Grey Wooded Forage Association (GWFA) event in Ponoka on March 27, 2014 devoted to 4R Fertilizer

Management with all attendees receiving a 4R Certificate for attending. In total, these workshop events reached approximately 200 Producers representing 200,000 acres in Alberta.

The 2014 Farm Tech Survey was developed to promote the economic benefits and GHG emission reductions of 4R Nutrient Stewardship. The engagement program reached over 250 attendees with 183 choosing to complete the survey. Producers selected BMPs that that they may be willing to implement on their fields and were then provided with the economic benefits and approximate GHG reduction potential they could achieve when compared to a 'business as usual' scenario (baseline). The baseline scenario was determined from the expert opinions of Alberta agronomists regarding what BMPs would typically be implemented if the 4Rs and the NERP were not implemented.

- 80% of Producers responded that they do or plan on doing annual soil test at, at least two depths
- 91% of Producers chose spring banding over surface broadcast
- 20% of Producers chose to use Urea with a urease inhibitor
- 67% are using or planning to use agronomy service providers
- 60% of participants chose a scenario that would result in savings of \$35-65/acre and a 15% reduction in GHG emissions

Once examination of the survey was completed, a GAP Analysis was developed to compare and contrast the results from the Farm Tech Surveys (both 2013 and 2014) to national and provincial survey results. This helped to determine if results were comparable, to analyze any gaps in the Farm Tech Surveys and to provide recommendations based on the learning's from these programs (The full report is included in Appendix B). The focus of these surveys varied. While the Farm Tech 2013 was developed to understand what Producers are currently doing in terms of BMPS on-farm, the 2014 Farm Tech Survey was developed to promote the economic benefits and GHG reductions that are possible with the 4Rs. In contrast, the Statistics Canada Farm Environmental Management System (FEMS) Survey focused on both livestock and crop operations with an objective of determining the present status of farm environmental management across Canada and to identify areas that are in most need of environmental management movements to generate information for targeting policy. Lastly, the Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development (AARD), Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey (ESATS) took a more behavioral approach focusing on Alberta Producers' awareness of, attitudes toward, and adoption of environmentally sustainable agriculture practices¹. Some of the key environmental issues examined in this most recent survey were soil conservation; management practices that impact water quality and/or quantity; manure management; energy and climate change; and general practices. Some of the main recommendations from this GAP analysis include:

• Investigation into why the adoption of some 4R BMPs is higher than others is crucial; is it due to regulation, grants, education, perceived return on investment or other aspects? By identifying key success factors for certain practices, CFI should be able to apply these to other areas.

¹ 2012 Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey, Government of Alberta. May 2012

- Understanding barriers to adoption and developing strategies to address these key issues are essential. In terms of the 4Rs, a key barrier to Producers is cost or the perception of cost. The economics of 4R BMPs need to be investigated further so when emphasizing the benefits to adoption, economics can play a part (as well as environmental, social, etc.).
- Continuing education and extension of 4R Nutrient Stewardship should aid in the adoption of BMP practices. Moreover, CFI should strive for increased 4R visibility at farm shows, workshops and producer education on the advantages to implementing the 4Rs.
- Development of a data management system to aid Producers in consistent record keeping that could be used for a variety of regulations and programs (i.e. Environmental Farm Plan, 4R Nutrient Stewardship, Walmart's Sustainable Agriculture Guidelines, and Unilever's Sustainability Agriculture Code).
- Alignment with national and provincial surveys would be an asset so results could be more comparable. However, these surveys first should be evaluated and re-designed in order to ensure that all aspects of nutrient stewardship are assessed and measureable.
- Future surveys should be conducted at other conferences and workshops in order to obtain a larger dataset from Producers across Alberta. The survey should encompass:
 - Investigation into why the Producer has chosen to implement certain BMP over others;
 - Investigation into the stage of operation and gross revenue of the farm operation to better determine the size and type of Producer most likely to implement BMPs. This will aid in targeted marketing and education to select Producers;
 - Exploration into the types of data Producers are currently collecting to better understand the gaps in documentation;
 - National and Provincial surveys such as the Farm Environmental Management Survey and the Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey should be considered when developing potential 4R Surveys.

Online and interactive activities such as webinars, videos and websites were used to communicate information, provide extension materials and encourage discussion and support around 4R Nutrient Stewardship adoption. The online 4R Nutrient Stewardship Courses on CFI's GrowZone continued to be promoted as a comprehensive resource for nutrient stewardship and NERP training. In total, 33 people were certified under the Full 4R course this year (5.5 Continuing Education Units (CEU's) per course), and there have been 33 registered participants for the Full NERP course (1.5 CEU's).

Three Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) were announced on April 8', 2014 between CFI and Capital Power, Lakeland College and Agricultural and Research Extension Council of Alberta (ARECA). The partnership between Capital Power and agronomy service providers is to develop NERP-based pilots in 2014 which could represent 25,000 tonnes of carbon offsets and 50,000 acres under 4R Nutrient

Stewardship. The MOU between CFI and Lakeland College is aimed at achieving CFI's goals of capacity building and knowledge transfer of the 4Rs in Alberta. Lakeland College will be a strategic partner to provide support and access to its student managed farm to pilot innovative nutrient stewardship practices including, but not limited to; the development of a detailed 4R nutrient stewardship plan and testing of the requirements for implementation the NERP. Strategically, this program encourages the adoption of 4R practices for economic (nutrient use efficiency and productivity) and environmental (i.e. water, land and air quality) improvements while providing innovative training and knowledge transfer to Lakeland College students and faculty as well as Alberta's producers.

The ARECA MOU represents an excellent opportunity for ARECA to advance extension council understanding of BMPs for the use of fertilizer and other on-farm nutrient (e.g. manure) management. A key pillar of CFI's strategy is to develop strategic relationships for the implementation of nutrient stewardship programs through knowledge and capacity building. ARECA has an exceptional consortium of applied research and stewardship-focused institutions that strive for innovative educational programs by offering hands on training and demonstration projects for farmers in Alberta. As part of the ARECA MOU; 3 4R Nutrient Management Plans were developed for the 2014 growing season on select fields within ARECA member association research group plots:

- 300 acres of canola in the Peace River Region
- 260 acres of peas in the Peace River Region
- 1000 acres of barley in East Central Alberta

This has provided ARECA with an opportunity to acquire valuable agronomic data, while testing 4R practices, training, and planning materials in the context of applied research plots.

A webinar on 4R Nutrient Stewardship for Colleges was held on January 24, 2014. As part of this webinar and the MOU with Lakeland College, 4R Nutrient Stewardship has also been added to the curriculum of a 2nd year Crop Technology Class. This included dedication of seven, 50 minute classes on Nutrient Stewardship and a final assignment where students have to compare decisions made for the student managed farm against 4R Nutrient Stewardship BMPs.

George Morris Economic Analysis

Agricultural land use in Alberta has evolved through a shift from an extensive land use system to increasing intensification over time. This is evident in increased yields and increasing crop production over time, on what has been essentially a constant agricultural land base. Shifts have occurred toward annual crops from pasture, accompanied by increased use of fertilizers and pesticides. This evolution has been accompanied by refinements in practices for sustainability of the production base; for example, in a short period of time, direct seeding/zero-till systems have become heavily adopted in Alberta. The literature clearly shows that extensive land use results in improved sustainability on a unit area basis. More intensive management employs relatively more inputs to obtain higher yields on

relatively less land. When these higher yields are factored in, intensive management is found to be more sustainable (in terms of greenhouse gases, nutrient application, etc) on a unit output basis than extensive management. The reality of a limited land base thus suggests that intensification of existing agricultural land is more sustainable than converting land from other uses to agricultural production as a means of increasing output.

The agronomy and crop management literature provides the scientific basis for fertility management that can generate significantly increased yields in a western Canadian environment. However, to be efficacious, this requires the selection of appropriate cultivars, timely seeding, using appropriate pest management, and assessment of the soil nutrient status through soil testing in addition to increased rates of fertilizer. Based on this literature, empirical models of yield response to fertilizer, and expert opinion, agronomic scenarios were developed to represent wheat and canola production in Alberta. A baseline scenario representing current practice was developed, along with two BMP scenarios consistent with the NERP that produce higher yields with increased fertilizer use. These were developed for three regions of Alberta- EcoDistrict 791 (South-central Alberta, dark brown soil zone), EcoDistrict 727 (Central Alberta, black soil zone), and EcoDistrict 596 (Peace River region- grey soil zone). The scenarios developed envision significantly increased yields. For canola, the BMP scenarios contain yield increases between 37 and 69%. The BMP scenarios involve range of changes in seeding rate, weed control, fungicide and growth regulator treatments compared with the baseline to achieve these yield increases as well as increased fertilizer application.

A GHG lifecycle model was constructed that included field operations and the upstream GHGs associated with manufacture of fertilizer and other agricultural chemicals to evaluate the scenarios. The results showed that overall GHG emissions per hectare increased substantially with cropping intensity. However, emissions per kilogram crop produced were similar at the different levels of intensity- in other words; the increase in yield offset the increase in greenhouse gas emissions. When the GHG emissions from the land base required to produce the same amount of crops are compared there is no substantial difference in the GHG emissions among intensification scenarios (see Figure). Conversely, increasing production through an extension of the area farmed in lieu of intensification involves conversion of lands from grassland, wetland or forest, which will result in a substantial release of GHGs and the loss of net sequestration capability as well as the other ecological goods and services provided by natural ecosystems.

An economic analysis compared the BMP scenarios for the two crops and three regions. The analysis considered agronomic costs and returns; other costs such as combining, equipment depreciation, etc. were not considered as they do not vary significantly by scenario. Thus the economic analysis estimated agronomic costs, revenues, and margin (revenue less agronomic costs) to evaluate the scenarios. In each case, input and output prices were based upon historical averages. The results showed that the margin over agronomic costs increased the BMP scenarios compared with the baseline, with the most intensive BMP scenario providing the largest return over agronomic cost (Table 1). This was particularly

significant for canola which saw an increased margin of up to \$180/acre; for wheat the potential increased return per acre under the high intensification BMP was up to \$64/acre.

		Canola				Wheat			
		Yield (bu/acre)	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)	Yield (bu/acre)	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)
rea '91	Baseline	34	145.04	428.64	283.59	42	104.44	272.06	167.62
k Al	Medium	45	218.09	567.31	349.22	56	187.69	362.75	175.06
Ris 2-	High	56	250.31	705.99	455.68	70	273.79	453.43	179.64
rea 727	Baseline	37.00	136.30	466.46	330.16	52	116.27	336.84	220.57
k A ED	Medium	48.00	210.51	605.14	394.63	69	186.93	446.95	260.02
Ris 11	High	60	246.23	756.42	510.19	87	279.21	563.55	284.34
a 6	Baseline	35	145.04	441.24	296.20	53	116.27	343.31	227.04
k Are ED59	Medium	45	215.17	567.31	352.14	71	195.68	459.91	264.23
Ris 19-	High	55	245.06	693.38	448.32	88	293.79	570.03	276.24

Table 1: Economic Analysis Results

There are feasible nitrogen fertility strategies with a basis in the scientific literature that can significantly increase yields in western grain/oilseed crops. For example, in canola, it should be possible to move from a yield base of 34-36 bushels per acre under common practices to a yield of 55-60 bushels per acre under more intensive management. Implementing this fertility and yield management involves broader agronomic changes relating to higher application rates of fertilizer, more precise timing and method of application, improved use of management information, and alternative pest control approaches. These are not broadly in use in Alberta today.

Conclusions

To summarize the overall findings, Farming 4R Land Phase II continued to build awareness and provided stakeholders with relevant extension materials to support 4R Nutrient Stewardship and GHG reductions from on farm operations. The second phase engaged over 400 producers, certified crop advisors and/or Professional Agrologists and led to the development of three 4R Nutrient Management Plans for implementation in the 2014 growing season. This phase also brought 4R Nutrient Stewardship into the agricultural classroom, targeting students to utilize their training on the 4Rs to make decisions for the Student-Led Farm.

The Farm Tech 2014 survey found that most producers would consider adopting a basic level of 4Rs, which represents over half a million acres in Alberta. If all participants adopted the Basic level of 4R, based off of NERP methodology they could see a potential 15% reduction in GHG emissions. According to the economic analysis, completed by the George Morris Centre, there could be material economic incentive for producers to adopt an advanced 4R or NERP level thereby resulting in a potential 25% reduction in GHG emissions from all participating acres.

It is believed that the success of the 4Rs can be effectively enhanced by recognizing resource constraints and by integrating and aligning the 4Rs with other key pillars of grower success (chiefly, farm profitability). For example, incentives encouraging sustainable practices, such as GHG offset programs; need to be set at levels that are not viewed as trivial by producers. Policy makers need to ensure that the gains made by intensification on existing acres is not cancelled out by programs that discourage land sparing elsewhere in the industry or in other industries.

While continuing the extension approach with producers, a concerted effort should also continue to stimulate widespread support from other key stakeholders in the agri-food value chain (crop advisors, fertilizer retailers, processors, retailers etc.). Throughout this process, consistent communications efforts should be maintained, highlighting the continuous improvement (i.e. the sustainability "wins") that have been achieved through CFI's programs. This will require not only appropriate levels of rigor in data and management systems, but a commitment to further the granularity and oversight of the data as sustainability programs evolve.

This project has highlighted how progressive and responsive Albertan producers are to both market and environmental pressures. This project measured and improved awareness of 4R Nutrient Stewardship in Alberta and created momentum and potential for widespread adoption of 4R Nutrient Stewardship and NERP compliance.

Alberta producers are good Stewards of the land.

Challenges, Barriers and Opportunities

The following summarizes challenges, barriers and opportunities from this project:

- To achieve the 4R benefits for economic, environment and social benefits we will work together to provide the resources so that Alberta's producers, in partnership with agronomy experts, can measure and document the benefits of 4Rs on their farm.
- How to effectively demonstrate that better nutrient management through implementation of 4R leads to better economic returns on nutrient inputs and improves environmental outcomes. At present, producers make many nutrient management decisions without understanding the agronomic, environmental and economic pros and cons of those decisions. There is an opportunity to synthesize the literature on nutrient management practice effects on GHG emissions into more practice based information for Producers.
- It's pertinent to develop a dependable sustainability data reporting system that is both relevant and robust in terms of data acquisition and retention procedures. Such a system would be beneficial so that producers can proactively meet the diverse, and often convoluted, sustainability requirements of food processers and retailers downstream.
- Opportunity to work with producers and farm advisors to implement 4R practices and GHG reduction protocols at the farm level through field demonstrations, 4R planning activities, and partnerships with farmer organizations.
- The scarcity of research on the co-benefits of 4R Nutrient Stewardship (or nutrient stewardship practices) has presented a challenge; however, there is an opportunity to identify areas for future research.
- With more practitioners achieving 4R Certification and NERP training leads to more 4R acres across the country. However, support is needed from retailer and agronomy service providers to achieve scale quickly.
- Successes from these projects and initiatives need to be communicated locally and as an aggregate in support of policy objectives.
- Streamlining of the NERP Protocol should be pursued to encourage more widespread uptake.
- Consider strategies to integrate 4R and fertility indicators with AARD and AAFC producer surveying cycles.
- Although an agricultural intensification strategy enhances all three criteria for sustainability by improving economic, environmental, and social outcomes, it is not intuitively obvious. The

current paradigm held by much of the non-farm public is that agricultural intensification and the use of advanced technology is the problem rather than the solution. There will be a considerable challenge in educating them otherwise.

- Agricultural intensification can increase economic risk, when additional inputs increase costs but higher yields are not realized. While intensification is a sound strategy for minimizing GHG emissions per unit of food produced, it can increase other environmental risks, such as pollution of ground and surface waters, if nutrients are not managed correctly. Producers, agronomists and retailers will need better tools to manage the risk associated with intensive use of nutrients and other inputs and education on how to use the tools to consistently achieve the desired ends.
- Incentives encouraging sustainable practices, such as GHG offset programs, need to be set at levels that are not viewed as trivial by producers. Policy makers need to ensure that the gains made by intensification on existing acres is not cancelled out by programs that discourage land sparing elsewhere in the industry or in other industries.

Canadian Fertilizer Institute Disclaimer: This project is meant to facilitate adoption of 4R-consistent BMPs and uptake of the NERP. CFI will not engage in any commercial activities or profit from the extension of the BMPs or the generation of offsets.

Appendices

Appendix A: Farming 4R Land Survey GAP Analysis

Appendix A: Farming 4R Land Survey GAP Analysis



Farming 4R Land

Supporting farmers and communities with practical tools to implement Beneficial Management Practices that protect soil quality and grow agriculture.

Project Background

The Canadian Fertilizer Institute (CFI) in partnership with Alberta Innovates Bio Solutions and financial support from the Climate Change and Emissions Management (CCEMC) Corporation, has initiated Phase II of the Farming 4R Land program in Alberta; demonstrating economic, social and environmental returns by implementing 4R Nutrient Stewardship (Right Source @ Right Rate, Right Time, Right Place)[®]. Phase I of the Farming 4R Land project established a strong foundation of awareness, knowledge and interest in adopting the 4Rs on-farm and subsequent greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction potential by Alberta's producers. Farming 4R Land Phase II has provided producers in Alberta with science-based information and advice on how to use beneficial management practices (BMPs) under the 4Rs. Producers demonstrated their commitment to stewardship and many of them are well positioned to achieve a basic 4R level. Both of these programs have facilitated a unique network of Alberta producers, agronomy experts, scientists, fertilizer and agri-business industry leaders, community leaders, academic leaders and government officials to participate in a dialogue and demonstrate continuous stewardship progress.

As part of both Phase I and II, surveys were developed for participants of the Farm Tech Conference (Phase 1: Jan $29^{th} - 30^{th}$, 2013; Phase 2: Jan $28^{th} - 30^{th}$, 2014). The surveys were designed to understand the Producers current operation (i.e. Baseline 4R practices) and to investigate the potential economic benefits and possible reductions in GHGs they could achieve if the BMPs were implemented.

The objectives of this Analysis is to compare and contrast the results from the Farm Tech Surveys to national and provincial survey results to determine if results are comparable. This document also analyzes the gaps in the two Farm Tech Surveys and provides recommendations based on the learning for Phase I and II.

Overview of Farm Tech 2013 Survey and Results:

The 2013 Farm Tech Survey was developed to understand what Producers are currently doing on their farms (i.e. to establish a baseline) and to investigate what BMPs Producers would be willing to implement on their farms. In total 100 surveys were completed representing approximately 300,000 acres; with the main crop type being spring wheat/canola/barley (87%), potatoes (4%), forages (4%) or 'Other' (5%). The survey results demonstrated that almost all of Producers were already or close to achieving the basic 4R level, with widespread willingness to adopt BMPs in the future. For instance 70% of respondents who currently broadcast fertilizer indicated they would be willing to try banding or injection in the future and 80% of respondents would be willing to try one enhanced efficiency product (controlled release, nitrogen inhibitor or stabilized nitrogen) in the future.

Overview of Farm Tech 2014 Survey and Results:

The 2014 Farm Tech Survey was developed to promote the economic benefits and GHG emission reductions of 4R Nutrient Stewardship. Producers selected BMPs that that they may be willing to implement on their fields and were then provided with the economic benefits and approximately GHG reduction potential they could achieve when compared to a business as usual scenario (baseline). The baseline scenario was based on the expert opinions of Alberta agronomists regarding what BMPs would typically be implemented if the 4Rs and the Nitrous Oxide Emission Reduction Protocol (NERP) were not implemented.

In total 183 surveys were completed by producers representing approximately half a million acres in Alberta; 62% of respondents grew canola, 26% grew wheat and 12% grew barley in the 2013 growing season. The survey found that Alberta Producers are prepared to meet the basic requirements of 4R Nutrient Stewardship. For instance, 20% of Producers stated that would choose to use urea with a urease inhibitor and In terms of fertilizer timing and placement 91% chose spring banding over surface broadcast.

Statistics Canada 2011 Farm Environmental Management Survey (FEMS)

Statistics Canada conducts a Farm Environmental Management System Survey every five years, the last survey was completed in 2011. The FEMS survey focuses on both livestock and crop operations and allows for the establishment of baselines and development of updates of an expanded set of agrienvironmental indicators². These indicators are needed to: determine the present status of farm environmental management across Canada; identify areas that are most in need of environmental management movements; and generate the information to design effective and well targeted policy and program responses.

² http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/21-023-x/21-023-x2013001-eng.htm

According to the survey, 35% of Canadian farms has completed an Environmental Farm Plan (EFP) and of those farms almost 95% had either fully or partially implemented the BMPs recommended in their EFP. There are BMPs for a wide variety of agri-environmental risks such as pesticide storage and use, fertilizer storage and use, grazing and surface water management. The main reason given for not implementing BMPS was economic pressures and almost four out of ten farms in Canada had received financial assistance to implement the beneficial management practices included in their EFP.

AARD's 2012 Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey (ESATS):

Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development (AARD) conducts an Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey (ESATS) every few years, the last survey was completed in 2012 with a sample of 500 respondents. The ESATS measured Alberta Producers' awareness of, attitudes toward, and adoption of environmentally sustainable agriculture practices³. Some of the key environmental issues examined in this most recent survey were soil conservation; management practices that impact water quality and/or quantity; manure management; energy and climate change; and general practices.

When Producers were asked the level of concern regarding environmental issues the majority responded disposal of agricultural waste and soil issues as their top concerns. The two soil related issues Producers were concerned about were 'loss of soil fertilizer' (49% were concerned) and 'soil erosion from wind and water' (45% were concerned). Issues of least concern include 'greenhouse gas emissions on your farm' (21% were concerned) and 'adapting to climate chance on your farm' (35% were concerned). In terms of 'groundwater or surface water contamination due to runoff from commercial fertilizers/crop protection products' only 27% and 28% of respondents were concerned, respectively.

One of the main findings of the EEATS survey was the connection between the size of the operation (gross revenue) and adoption trends. Although the FarmTech 2014 survey did not ask for gross revenue; based solely on the size of the operation (acreage) and the adoption of BMPs the 2014 Survey found no correlation between size of operation (acreage) and level of adoption. That is to say, over 95% of Producers in all acreage categories chose adoption of BMP at a basic level of implementation.

In terms of soil sampling the EEATS survey found that 76% of respondents were sampling fields at least once every three years while the 2013 Farm Tech Survey found that 60% of Producers are soil testing annually and the 2014 Farm Tech Survey found that 80% of Producers are soil testing annually at, at least two depths.

³ 2012 Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey, Government of Alberta. May 2012

Next Steps and Recommendations

- Investigation into why the adoption of some 4R BMPs is higher than others is crucial; is it due to regulation, grants, education, perceived return on investment or other aspects? By identifying key success factors for certain practices CFI should be able to apply these to other areas.
- Understanding barriers to adoption and developing strategies to address these key issues are essential. In terms of the 4R's a key barrier to Producers is cost or the perception of cost, the economics of 4R BMP needs to be investigated further so when emphasizing the benefits to adoption, economics can play a part (as well as environmental, social, etc.)
- Continuing education and extension of 4R Nutrient Stewardship should aid in the adoption of BMP practices. Moreover, CFI should strive for increased 4R visibility at farm shows and workshops and producer education on the advantages to implementing the 4R's.
- Development of a data management system to aid Producers in consistent record keeping that could be used for a variety of regulations and programs (i.e. Environmental Farm Plan, 4R Nutrient Stewardship, Walmart's Sustainable Agriculture Guidelines, Unilever's Sustainability Agriculture Code).
- Alignment with national and provincial surveys would be an asset so results could be more comparable. However, these surveys first should be evaluated and redesigned in order to ensure that all aspects of nutrient stewardship are assessed and measureable.
- Future surveys should be conducted at other conferences and workshops in order to obtain a larger dataset from Producers across Alberta. The survey should encompass:
 - Investigation into why the Producer has chosen to implement certain BMP over others;
 - Investigation into the stage of operation and gross revenue of the farm operation to better determine the size and type of Producer most likely to implement BMPs. This will aid in targeted marketing and education to select Producers;
 - Exploration into the types of data Producers are currently collecting to better understand the gaps in documentation.
 - National and Provincial surveys such as the Farm Environmental Management Survey and then Environmentally Sustainable Agriculture Tracking Survey should be considered when developing potential 4R Surveys.

Appendix B Economic Analysis

Sustainably Increasing Crop Production in Alberta: Land Use, Nutrient Management, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Economics



June, 2014

Al Mussell and Claudia Schmidt George Morris Centre

Dan Heaney RandomCross Consulting

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to provide an analysis of the sustainability and economic effects of increasing crop production from the existing land base rather than bringing new land into production through improved nitrogen management in the Alberta.

To meet this purpose, the literature regarding tradeoffs between increasing crop production through intensification in land use vs generating increased production through extensification and land conversion was reviewed, along with the agronomy literature outlining the prospects for increased crop yields through increased nitrogen application and associated adjustments in management. Based on this, scenarios representing low intensification (baseline) medium, and high intensification were developed. These scenarios were analyzed based on nitrous oxide emission and economic efficiency.

Findings

- Agricultural land use in Alberta has evolved through a shift from an extensive land use system to increasing intensification over time. This is evident in increased yields and increasing crop production over time, on what has been essentially a constant agricultural land base. Shifts have occurred toward annual crops from pasture, accompanied by increased use of fertilizers and pesticides. This evolution has been accompanied by refinements in practices for sustainability of the production base; for example, in a short period of time, direct seeding/zero-till systems have become heavily adopted in Alberta.
- The literature clearly shows that extensive land use results in improved sustainability on a unit area basis. More intensive management employs relatively more inputs to obtain higher yields on relatively less land. When these higher yields are factored in, intensive management is found to be more sustainable (in terms of greenhouse gases, nutrient application, etc) on a unit output basis than extensive management. The reality of a limited land base thus suggests that intensification of existing agricultural land is more sustainable than converting land from other uses to agricultural production as a means of increasing output.
- The agronomy and crop management literature provides the scientific basis for fertility management that can generate significantly increased yields in a western Canadian environment. However, to be efficacious, this requires the selection of appropriate cultivars, timely seeding, using appropriate pest management, and assessment of the soil nutrient status through soil testing in addition to increased rates of fertilizer
- Based on this literature, empirical models of yield response to fertilizer, and expert opinion, agronomic scenarios were developed to represent wheat and canola production in Alberta. A baseline scenario representing current practice was developed, along with two BMP scenarios consistent with the NERP that produce higher yields with increased fertilizer use. These were developed for three regions of Alberta- EcoDistrict 791 (South-central Alberta, dark brown soil zone), EcoDistrict 727 (Central Alberta, black soil zone), and EcoDistrict 596 (Peace River regiongrey soil zone).
- The scenarios developed envision significantly increased yields. For canola, the BMP scenarios contain yield increases over the baseline range between 32 and 65%. For wheat, the scenarios contain yield increases between 37 and 69%. The BMP scenarios involve range of changes in

seeding rate, weed control, fungicide and growth regulator treatments compared with the baseline to achieve these yield increases as well as increased fertilizer application.

- A GHG lifecycle model was constructed that included field operations and the upstream GHGs associated with manufacture of fertilizer and other agricultural chemicals to evaluate the scenarios. The results showed that overall GHG emissions per hectare increased substantially with cropping intensity. However, emissions per kilogram crop produced were similar at the different levels of intensity- in other words, the increase in yield offset the increase in greenhouse gas emissions. When the GHG emissions from the land base required to produce the same amount of crops are compared there is no substantial difference in the GHG emissions among intensification scenarios. Conversely, increasing production through an extension of the area farmed in lieu of intensification involves conversion of lands from grassland, wetland or forest, which will result in a substantial release of GHGs and the loss of net sequestration capability as well as the other ecological goods and services provided by natural ecosystems.
- An economic analysis compared the BMP scenarios for the two crops and three regions. The analysis considered agronomic costs and returns; other costs such as harvesting, equipment depreciation, etc. were not considered as they do not vary significantly by scenario. Thus the economic analysis estimated agronomic costs, revenues, and margin (revenue less agronomic costs) to evaluate the scenarios. In each case, input and output prices were based upon historical averages.
- The results showed that the margin over agronomic costs increased the BMP scenarios compared with the baseline, with the most intensive BMP scenario providing the largest return over agronomic cost. These are presented in the table below. This was particularly significant for canola which saw an increased margin of up to \$188/acre; for wheat the potential increased return per acre under the high intensification BMP was up to \$72/acre.

Thus, there appear to be good prospects to significantly increase crop yields and production Alberta on an environmentally and economically sustainable basis, through more intensive management.

		Canola				Wheat					
		Yield (bu/acre)	Price (\$/bushel)	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)	Yield (bu/acre)	Price (\$/bushel	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)
a 2-ED791	Baseline										
Are		34	12.61	148.99	428.64	279.64	42	6.48	104.44	272.06	167.62
isk	Medium	45	12.61	214.04	567.31	353.27	56	6.48	179.69	362.75	183.06
R	High	56	12.61	246.26	705.99	459.73	70	6.48	265.79	453.43	187.64
11-ED727	Baseline										
rea		37	12.61	140.25	466.46	326.21	52	6.48	116.27	336.84	220.57
kΑ	Medium	48	12.61	206.46	605.14	398.68	69	6.48	178.93	446.95	268.02
Ris	High	60	12.61	242.18	756.42	514.24	87	6.48	271.21	563.55	292.34
a 19-EC	Baseline	25	12 61	440.00		202.25	50	6.40	116.27	242.24	227.04
Are		35	12.61	148.99	441.24	292.25	53	6.48	116.27	343.31	227.04
isk	Medium	45	12.61	211.12	567.31	356.19	71	6.48	187.68	459.91	272.23
R	High	55	12.61	241.01	693.38	452.37	88	6.48	285.79	570.03	284.24

Cost, Revenues, and Margins by Intensification Scenarios

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	33
1.1	Purpose and Objectives	
1.2	Organization of the Report35	
2	Agricultural Land Use Intensity in Alberta	36
2.1	Environmental Management Practices in Alberta	
2.2	Observations	
3	Agricultural Intensification, Extensification and Land Sparing	45
3.1	Intensification vs. Extensification in Land Use45	
3.2	Biodiversity	
3.3	Observations	
4	Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Fertilizer, Source, Rate, Time and Place Effects	50
4.1	Introduction	
4.2	4R Nutrient Stewardship and the NERP51	
4.3	4R Best Management Practices54	
4.4	Observations	
5	Intensification Scenarios GHG Emissions and Economics	66
5.1	Introduction	
5.2	Climate and Intensification66	
5.3	Potential for Intensification in Alberta67	
5.4	Quantification of Nitrous Oxide Emissions69	
5.5	Nitrous Oxide Emissions and Cropping Intensity73	
5.6	Economics of Intensification in Alberta	
5.6.2	Data	
5.6.2	2 Results	
5.6.3	Sensitivity to Nitrogen Costs	
6	Conclusions	93
7	References Cited	94
8	Appendix A	105

Introduction

The demand for crops is increasing worldwide (Tilman et al. 2011). The Royal Society stated in 2009 that increased demand of food can only be satisfied if: "there is also a substantial increase—by between 50 and 100%—over today's levels of production of all major food crops. This increase demands urgent action, with clear short-, medium- and long-term goals." (Davies et al, 2009). At the same time, there are no large tracts of high quality land that can be brought into production to extend the agricultural land base. In fact, globally the extent of the agriculture land base may have already peaked and be in decline (Ausbel et al. 2013). This scenario suggests that any response to increased demand for agriculture products will come largely through intensification of production on a reduced agricultural land base rather than bringing more acres into production.

In the same time frame that the world population is expected to grow from 7 to 9 billion and food demand increase potentially double, Alberta's population is expected to nearly double from the current level of 3.5 million people (Alberta Treasury Board and Public Finance 2013). Furthermore, almost all of the increase will come in urban areas with continuing land conversion from rural to urban further reducing the agricultural land base. This represents an opportunity for rural economic development in Alberta but also present many challenges particularly in the area of conflicting land use.

There is also an enhanced interest and awareness regarding the sustainable use of natural resources used in food and agricultural production to satisfy this growing demand. This relates to greenhouse gases, losses of nutrients and reduced fertility of soils, consumption of water, and other factors. Sustainability is increasingly viewed as an integrated approach that seeks to balance among economic, social, and environmental goals. The economic viability of farms, particularly small and medium farms, is viewed almost globally as an ongoing issue. The main environmental areas of concern are greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, losses of nutrients and soil degradation, and consumption and pollution of surface and groundwater. Responsible agriculture chemical use in relation to human health and employment conditions for farm workers are examples of social issues often included under the sustainability umbrella.

Increasingly, downstream customers for food products are monitoring and seeking assurances of the sustainability of products they sell. Much of the current focus is on greenhouse gas emissions associated with agriculture products. Major retailers⁴ have sustainability programs in place that seek to reduce the GHG all along the supply chain. This is important to the farm segment of the supply chain as retail food members and their intermediate suppliers have made significant commitments to sourcing agricultural products from sustainable suppliers. As a result, the supply chain has become keenly interested in the differences in GHG emissions associated with various farm practices. Since the major greenhouse gases associated with crop production is nitrous oxide, there is particular interest in improving nitrogen fertilizer management of all major crops.

In Alberta, the interests of the agriculture supply chains in reducing GHGs coincides with public policy aimed at reducing GHGs from large final emitters such as power plants. Alberta's Specified Gas Emitters

⁴ For example Walmart, Pepsico, and McDonalds all have sustainability programs with a strong focus on the energy life cycle and carbon footprint of the products they sell as well as their internal energy efficiencies.

Regulations allow regulated final emitters to use GHG offset credits produced by non-regulated industries such as agriculture. These offsets must be produced using protocols approved by the regulator and trade within Alberta's regulated carbon market. The Nitrous Oxide Emission Reduction Protocol (NERP) is an approved protocol that focuses on improving nitrogen use efficiency and concomitantly reducing nitrous oxide emissions. The mechanism for improving nitrogen use efficiency in NERP is the 4R Nutrient Stewardship Program developed by the International Plant Nutrition Institute (IPNI). The 4R approach seeks to integrate nutrient management practices among four interrelated factors namely the source of nutrients, the rate of application, the time of application, and the placement of the nutrients. The 4R approach is summarized as the right source @ the right rate, right time and right place.

Within the NERP protocol, source, rate, time and place practices known to reduce nitrous oxide emissions are prescribed by a professional advisor and integrated within a 4R Plan. The plan is implemented by the producer and nitrous oxide emissions are estimated based on crop type and nitrogen use using Canada's Tier II inventory methodology developed by Rochette et al. (2008) with modification for use on individual farms.⁵ The estimate assumes average baseline practices before application of the 4R plan based on either current year nitrogen application and yields using a dynamic baseline or a three-year historic baseline approach. A reduction coefficient is applied to the current year or project estimate to account for the reductions associated with improved nitrogen management, the magnitude of the reduction varying depending on the suite of practices implemented by the producer. The allowable offsets (expressed as tCO₂e) are calculated as the difference between the baseline condition estimate and the project condition estimate for nitrous oxide. The use of specific practices within a professionally developed 4R Plan provides the assurance of additionality, while a rigorous verification process insures the reduction activities actually took place.

In addition to nutrient management practices, land use change can have a significant impact on GHG emissions associated with crop production. Conversion of land from perennial forage crops to annual crops reduces carbon sequestration and depending on crops grown, tillage practices and nutrient management can change the cropping system from a net sink to a net source of GHG emissions (reference required). Bringing additional acres into production through wetland drainage or clearing of woodlots and/or forested areas not only incurs considerable costs for the producer, it can also change the system from a sink to a source of GHGs mainly through the emission of carbon dioxide associated with oxidation of stored soil carbon and/or burning of woody materials. Land use change also leads to the loss of other ecological goods and services such as water retention and filtering, erosion prevention, wildlife habitat, and recreation. These losses of natural areas can have considerable economic as well as environmental impacts. For example, in a study in Saskatchewan's Upper Assiniboine Watershed, the net benefit of services provided through the region's natural capital was estimated as ranging from \$29 to \$107/ha/yr with a best estimate at \$67/ha/yr (Olewiler, 2004).

⁵ For a more complete explanation of NERP refer to <u>https://www.cfi.ca/_documents/10-10-</u> <u>18 NERP v1 Protocol FINAL.pdf</u>.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to provide an analysis of the sustainability and economic effects from increasing production from the existing land base rather than bringing new land into production through improved nitrogen management in the Alberta.

The specific objectives are:

- To document and review the existing work on the tradeoffs between increasing crop production through intensification in land use vs generating increased production through extensification and land conversion
- To understand the potential for improved nitrogen management in intensification of land use
- To provide an economic analysis enhanced nitrogen management to generate increased crop production
- To communicate results and insights to stakeholders and decision makers

Organization of the Report

Section 2 below provides an overview of trends in agricultural land use in Alberta. Section 3 reviews the literature of intensive and extensive agricultural land management. Section 4 reviews the literature on intensive crop management to increase yields. Section 5 develops intensification scenarios and evaluates these scenarios based on nitrous oxide emissions and economic feasibility. Section 6 concludes the report.
Agricultural Land Use Intensity in Alberta

This section provides an overview of land use and management in Alberta over the past three to four decades. Farmland in Alberta has increased slightly through much of the previous two decades, but total farmland area fell by 3 percent or 1.62 million acres between the 2006 and 2011 census (Figure 2.1). Even with the reduction in farmland in the 2011 census, more than 31% of total farmland in Canada is in Alberta. Agricultural Land as a percent of total land, in Alberta, increased in each census period since 1981, prior to the 2011 census (Figure 2.2)⁶.



Figure 2.1 Total Farmland, Alberta

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture

Most of the agricultural land in Alberta is used for crop production (Figure 2.3). Land in crops has been stable over the past decade, increasing 0.03% from 2001 to 2011 and pasture (managed and natural) has been essentially constant. Summer Fallow acreage has declined 59% over the same period. Due to variations in census categories the land use categories do not add to the total acres as shown

Looking at the top 3 field crops back to 1970, total acres in wheat, barley and canola have grown from 8.6 million to 16.9 million acres in 2013 (Figure 2.4). At the same time production has increased at a faster rate than acreage increases for these three crops. Record crop production was produced in 2013, but even using the 5 year average from 2009 to 2013, production of the top three Alberta field crops were 163% greater than in 1970, while acreage was only 97% greater than in 1970. This is evident from the yield data (

⁶ Note that land that was not seeded due to abnormally wet conditions in 2010 is included in the data, so the change in acreage cannot be attributed to those conditions.

Figure 2.5), showing that the average yields for these crops have increased over time.

Figure 2.2 Agricultural Land as Percent of Total Land, Alberta



Source Statistics Canada, Cansim Table 153-0039; Statistics Canada Census of Agriculture



Figure 2.3 Land Use by Category, Alberta

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture

Table 2.2 Change in land use between census years

	Percent Change 2006-2011	Percent Change 2001-2011
Land in Crops	1%	0%
Summer Fallow	-44%	-59%
Tame or Seeded Pasture	-4%	7%
Natural Land for Pasture	-1%	-4%







Source: Statistics Canada, Cansim Table 01-0017





Source: Statistics Canada, Cansim Table 01-0017

Cattle herds per square kilometer in Alberta reached a peak in the 2001 census year, in each of the last two census period cattle volumes and cattle density has decreased (Figure 2.6). However, the general trend in cattle herd density remains upward.



Figure 2.6 Cattle Herd Density, Alberta

Source: Statistics Canada, Cansim Table 153-0039; Statistics Canada Census of Agriculture

2.1 Environmental Management Practices in Alberta

Irrigation

Irrigated land in Alberta occupies less than 6% of the arable land base while accounting for 19% of primary agriculture production (Alberta Water Portal 2014). In 2010, 1.24 million acres of farmland were irrigated, down from 1.33 in 2005. Most of the irrigated land in 2010 (73%) was seeded to field crops. Alberta accounts for the majority of irrigated farmland in Canada, at 65% in 2010. The long-term trend over the past 20 years has been a slight increase in irrigated land (Figure 2.7). Intensity of irrigation in Alberta varies significantly depending mainly on growing season precipitation and in some cases irrigation water availability. For example, in 2010, a year when all Alberta irrigation districts received well above average precipitation, irrigation levels, at 1,350 cubic meters per hectare, were slightly above the Canadian average of 1,334 for field crops (Statistics Canada, 2014)



Figure 2.7 Land under Irrigation

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture

By comparison in 2012, a near normal precipitation year in most irrigation districts, intensity of water use for irrigation of field crops in Alberta increased to 3,280 cubic meters per hectare, and 3,040 cubic meters per hectare for all crops (Statistics Canada, 2013). Both of these values were above the national average of 2,093 for field crops, and 2,863 for all crops.

Although there is significant annual variation, the actual water volumes diverted by the irrigation districts in Alberta shows a modest downward trend (Figure 2.8). This downward trend in total water volume combined with the slight increase in irrigated acres over the same time period suggests water use efficiency has improved. A number of technology factors such as lower transmission losses (improved canal linings), improved application methods (pivots replacing flood and wheel moves), and more accurate irrigation scheduling techniques have contributed to higher efficiency. Improvements in the water use efficiency of crops and enhanced nutrient management have also contributed to this trend.



Figure 2.8 Water Diverted for Irrigation Purposes by Alberta's Irrigation Districts

Source: Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development

Tillage Practices

There has been a consistent move towards no till/zero till practices in field preparation in Alberta and away from tillage practices that incorporate crop residues into the soil (Figure 2.9). In 1991 only 3% of land was prepared for seeding using no till/zero till methods. In 2011, 65% of fields were prepared with no till/zero till, consistent with ongoing improvements in direct seeding technology. This is much higher than the national average for no till/zero till in 2011 at 41%.

In addition to conserving seedbed moisture and preventing wind and water erosion, reduced tillage systems tend to sequester more carbon than systems that use intensive tillage. In Alberta, net carbon dioxide removals from the atmosphere on land under reduced tillage regimes have been eligible for carbon offset under the Reduced Tillage Protocol (2008-2012) and more recently its replacement the Conservation Cropping Protocol. Total credited emission reductions under these protocols were in excess of 2.3 MtCO₂e and accounted for



Figure 2.9 Tillage Practices on Alberta Cropland

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture



Figure 2.10 Pest and Weed Management Practices on Alberta Cropland

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Agriculture

approximately 45% of total credits generated through approved protocols as of 2011.⁷ These values illustrate the substantial contribution that can be made to reducing GHG when appropriate agricultural practice changes are broadly applied.

⁷ Data presented at the 2013 AESRD Industry Update.

Pest and Weed Management

Most of the crop land in Alberta is treated with both commercial fertilizer and pesticides (Figure 2.10). This is consistent with relatively more land in crop production, and with the development and adoption of herbicide resistant varieties of canola. Insecticide and fungicide use on Alberta farms has also increased. While the data do not speak to this, the nature of fertilizer and pesticide use has changed over time, as new pesticide chemistries have been developed, as well as new fertilizer products such as urease treated nitrogen fertilizers. One of the major factors that contributed to the increased use of herbicides was the switch from tillage to chemical weed control as producers converted to reduced and zero till systems. No till along with the adoption of herbicide tolerant varieties has made glyphosate the most widely applied active ingredient in Alberta as well as the rest of Canada. Insecticide and fungicide use on Alberta farms has also increased partly in response to higher commodity prices. Wide spread adoption of high clearance sprayers has also contributed to higher use as they reduce application time and enable later season applications.

Increased pesticide use over the past three decades reflects the shift towards more intensive crop production practices. Poor handling and application practices can result in pesticides having significant negative impacts on the ecosystem. For herbicides, this needs to be balanced against their role in reducing soil erosion and increasing yields. Fungicides are used to maintain quality as well as increase yield, as are insecticides. When pesticide use results in significant yield increases there tends to be a concomitant drop in GHG emissions per unit of crop produced. This is because the increase in GHG emissions from manufacture, transport, and application that contribute to the numerator tend to be relatively small relative to the increased mass of crop in the denominator. The obvious corollary to the above is that applications that do not raise yield or result in only minor yield gains increase GHG intensity per unit of crop. Economically pesticide applications must increase crop value beyond the cost of the application to increase net revenue. With respect to GHG intensity per unit of crop produced, reduced environmental impact can be convergent with improved economic performance when pesticides are used appropriately.

2.2 Observations

The evolution of Alberta agricultural land use is characterized by a shift from more extensive land use agriculture toward more intensive management and land use consistent with a dry prairie climate. This is evident in several respects. In a relatively short period, the use of fallowing has declined dramatically in favour of land management that allows continuous cropping. Similarly, in a short period of time, tillage practices have shifted with minimum tillage and direct seeding technologies. Agricultural land has experienced subtle shifts toward annual crops from pasture, accompanied by increased use of fertilizers and pesticides. Irrigated acreage is stable to increasing.

This is illustrated in the data and discussion throughout this section. In the 5 year average from 2009 to 2013, production of the top three Alberta field crops were 163% greater than in 1970, while acreage was only 97% greater than in 1970. In addition, the general trend in cattle herd density is upward. Alberta accounts for the majority of irrigated farmland in Canada. When it comes to intensity of irrigation, application rates tend to be slightly above the Canadian average for field crops. Irrigated land accounts

for 6% of total arable acres in the province but produces 19% of total primary production suggesting that irrigation farming is already considerably more intensive than dry land farming in the province. These figures also illustrate that available water tends to be an important limiting factor in dry land production.

This evolution is consistent with the development of more intensive agricultural production systems, particularly in relation to land use. However, the benefits and tradeoffs associated with more intensive land use vs. extensive land use systems in which production increases occur primarily through increases in land are need to be better understood. The improvement in the management of nutrients that can both meet increasing demands for product and meet sustainability expectations is a core element of this tradeoff, and thus a key issue for ongoing agricultural development in Alberta.

Agricultural Intensification, Extensification and Land Sparing

This section provides a brief review of studies in which the sustainability effects of agricultural intensification versus extensification in agricultural land use are evaluated.

Intensification vs. Extensification in Land Use

A growing world population has led to an increased use of non-land resources such as improved genetics, fertilizer and pesticides to produce farm products and food. The effect has been to increase output through improved agricultural technology and increased yields on existing farmland, and to leave other lands in a more pristine state. Intensification in agricultural land use can also have unintended consequences, such as increased GHG emissions per hectare, decreased diversity in crops, and regional concentration of farms (Bos et al. 2013). Agriculture is estimated to be responsible for 14-24% of global greenhouse gas emissions (Vermeulen et al. 2012). Concerns have been raised that agricultural intensification can lead to lower soil fertility, reduced biodiversity, increased soil erosion, accelerated eutrophication of lakes and rivers, and adverse climatic effects (Matson et al. 1997). According to Foley et al. (2011), the irrigated cropland area in the world has approximately doubled in the last 50 years, where 70% of global freshwater withdrawals are devoted to irrigation. Over the same time period global fertilizer use increased by 500% (over 800% for nitrogen alone). However, it must be acknowledged that some of the adverse environmental effects could also occur under extensification in which increased production comes from increasing the agricultural land base. Thus, we look to the broad literature on agricultural sustainability for insight.

Burney *et al.* (2010) estimated the net effect on global GHG emissions of historical agricultural intensification between 1961 and 2005. Fertilizer production and land application emissions have increased over this time frame. However, because of higher yields, the net effect has been to avoid emissions of up to 161 gigatons of carbon (GtC) (590 GtCO2e) since 1961. The authors estimated that in comparison to 1961 technology, each dollar invested in agricultural yields has resulted in 68 fewer kgC (249 kgCO2e) emissions (1961: \$14.74/tC, or ~\$4/tCO2e), which avoided essentially 3.6 GtC (13.1 GtCO2e) annually. The authors concluded that crop yield gains should rank high among a portfolio of strategies to reduce global GHG emissions over direct emissions of methane and nitrous oxide from agricultural systems, and suggest that the climatic impacts of historical agricultural intensification were preferable to those of a system with lower inputs that instead expanded cropland to meet global demand for food". Extending from Burney *et al.*, recent work by Stephenson *et al* (2013) found that genetic improvements in major field crops between 1965 and 2004 prevented the need for between 18 and 27 million hectares of land conversion into agricultural use.

The environmental impacts of meeting global food demand will depend on how global agriculture expands. Tillman et al (2011) focus on a shift from extensification of land in less developed countries to moderate intensification of existing agricultural land. They estimate that the impact of continuing current intensification in rich countries and extensification in poor countries would result in about 1 billion ha of land cleared by 2050, approximately 3 Gt per year CO₂-C equivalent greenhouse gas emissions and about 250 Mt per year Nitrogen use. The alternative of moderate intensification of

existing land, paired with continued current intensification of agricultural land in developed countries would result in only about 0.2 billion ha of land cleared, 1 Gt per year CO₂-C equivalent greenhouse gas emissions and 225 Mt per year nitrogen use.

Baker at al.(2013) conducted an empirical analysis on U.S. historical agricultural growth rates, investigating different scenarios for future changes in agricultural productivity. The authors found that, based on observed yield growth from 1960-2009, increased crop productivity in the United States was land-saving and thus directly greenhouse gas emission reducing. However, the downstream relationships of crop productivity are complex. Increased feed grain yields decrease feed grain prices, resulting in increased livestock production with its associated greenhouse gas output.

The environmental effects of intensification are thus diverse and not entirely unequivocal. Increasing yields per acre initially increase profitability, but can also have a secondary effect of decreasing prices. This has been hypothesized to result in a secondary effect of decreasing agricultural land use (or land "sparing"). However, this has generally not occurred. For example, Rudel *et al* (2009) used global data from 1970 to 2005 and national data from 1990 to 2005 for 10 crops to determine whether intensification had reduced the agricultural land base. For the most part land "sparing" due to increases in yields and decreases in prices were not observed; however, the authors noted a number of other contextual changes that help explain this- such as increased trade, growth in livestock demand, political shifts, etc. In noting that empirical studies indicate that biodiversity protection is more effective under land sparing over land "sharing" (managing land less intensively to provide for both agricultural production and biodiversity) Ramankutty and Rhemtulla (2012) point out that it is unclear whether land sparing has ever actually reduced acreage under agricultural use, because a reliable baseline has never been established.

Kastner *et al* (2012) found that potential land savings through intensification and agricultural yield increases, were generally offset by increasing populations and dietary change. Change in technology such as increased use of fertilizers, pesticides, fossil fuels and infrastructure, globally was estimated to decrease farmland requirements by 654 million ha between 1963 and 2005, almost 60% of this decrease is attributed to the period between 1963 and 1984. In North America, technology was estimated to reduce land requirements by 42 million ha, with 57% of this occurring between 1963 and 1984. However, total land requirements between 1963 and 2005 to meet dietary needs increased 267 million ha globally, and 5 million ha in North America, as the result of population and dietary shifts.

More than half of the additional land requirement was the result of increased livestock production, and vegetable oils along with coffee, tea and cocoa were also noted as categories that contributed to increased agricultural land requirements.. These results indicate that intensification of current agricultural land is not wholly sufficient to prevent extensification at current rates of technological change and adoption, as the global population increases and dietary preferences are also significant influences. They also note that stagnant population growth is usually accompanied by economic development that results in dietary shifts, which has resulted in an increase in land requirements for food production.

Snyder et al. (2009) conducted a review of available scientific information on the effects of nitrogen timing, source, rate and placement, in combination with different cropping and tillage practices on greenhouse gas emissions. Intensification of agricultural land with effective and efficient nutrient uptake to achieve high yields was found to be the main approach to reduce GHG emissions and meet demands for crops. According to Snyder et al. (2009), GHG emissions per unit of crop or food production do not necessarily increase under intensive crop management systems; rather, natural areas are spared from cropland conversion, or can be converted back to forests for GHG mitigation. Other conclusions derived from the literature reviewed included: a) BMPs for nitrogen fertilizers are important to reduce residual soil nitrate, which decreases the risk of nitrous oxide (N2O) emissions; b) soil organic carbon levels increase if tillage practices that reduce soil disturbance and maintain crop residue on the soil surface can, and if crop productivity is maintained or increased, c) proper nitrogen fertilizer use helps to increase biomass production, which helps to restore and maintain soil organic carbon levels; and site-and weather-specific conditions determine differences among fertilizer N sources in N2O emissions (Snyder et al., 2009).

Organic farming has been promoted as a more extensive method of farming that is aimed at reducing the environmental impact of agriculture. Tuomisto et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of European studies that investigated whether organic agriculture reduces environmental impacts in comparison to conventional agriculture. The results generally showed that, compared with conventional farming practices, organic farming practices had positive environmental impacts per unit area, but not necessarily per unit of product. For example, the results show that, based on median response ratios, nitrogen leaching per unit area was 31% lower for organic farms (because of lower levels of nitrogen inputs applied) but 49% higher per unit product, due to lower yields on organic farms.

Firbank et al. (2013) sought to identify examples of sustainable intensification among British farmers, by conducting 20 case studies. The authors considered a farm to be practicing sustainable intensification if none of the predetermined environmental variables deteriorated while the food production per unit area increased during the study period. A single variable was chosen from the following ecosystem services: "agricultural production, biodiversity, climate regulation, regulation of air quality and regulation of water quality" to present the whole farm area. Three of the 20 farms were found to have increased production while enhancing biodiversity and reducing pollution. Producers that increase meat and milk yields were not able to achieve sustainable intensification in the study. Most sustainability efforts were undertaken to increase profits, by reducing inputs and increasing production. Over 85 percent of the farmers used payments from agri-environment schemes to support the enhancement of biodiversity on their farms.

Biodiversity

Intensification by nature leads to a reduction in biodiversity on agricultural land. However, many studies do not consider the accompanying secondary gains when habitat is spared from conversion to agricultural land. For example, Benton et al. (2003) state that agricultural intensification leads to a loss of farmland biodiversity with the main cause being homogeneity of agricultural habitats caused by simplification of crop rotation, increasing size of farm machinery, crop breeding and advances and

agricultural policy (using the example of the EU's agri-environment schemes). According to Benton et al. (2003) conservation management should ensure heterogeneity of farmland to secure biodiversity.

The meta-analysis by Tuomisto et al. (2012) found that organic farms have on average 50 percent higher abundance of organisms and a 30 percent higher species richness. However, this finding differed widely among the studies analyzed and some studies even found a negative biodiversity effect of organic farming. The question still remains if conventional farming with targeted species protection practices can result in even higher levels of species richness than organic farming systems.

Some of the best evidence on biodiversity relative to agricultural land use comes from developing countries where new land has recently been converted to agricultural use on a significant scale. Phalan *et al* (2011) compared the densities of tree and bird species according to varying levels of agricultural intensity in India and Ghana. They found that more species were negatively impacted by agriculture than benefitted from it, indicating a benefit to intensifying the land base and leaving other lands undisturbed. Similar effects were observed by Guitierrez-Velez *et al* (2011) in oil palm production in Peru, and across a range of crops in tropical countries by Phalan *et al* (2013).

Matson and Norris (2005) argue that wildlife-friendly farming is not the only land use strategy that can be used to conserve biodiversity and to research alternative options such as land sparing. There is also a need for social scientists and ecologists to bring their approaches together, so that land use change and its consequences can be investigated in a more holistic way." According to Phalan et al. (2011), a number of trade-offs between biodiversity and yield are prevalent. A large proportion of wildlife species will not exist "even in the most benign farming systems". It is therefore important to keep wild land to ensure the survival of these species.

Observations

The literature that relates to the environmental impact of intensification in agricultural land use is voluminous, and a complete review is well beyond the scope of this study. However, this review of recent studies suggests the following. More extensive land use results in improved sustainability on a unit area basis. This is not at all surprising as increasing production through extensification involves lower inputs per acre of land managed. More intensive management employs relatively more inputs on relatively less land to obtain higher yields. When these higher yields are factored in, intensive management is found to be more sustainable (in terms of greenhouse gases, nutrient application, etc) on a unit output basis than extensive management. This perhaps most evident in the literature estimating the environmental benefits of the green revolution and the implied saving of land and emissions. It is somewhat more equivocal regarding biodiversity- although it does seem that attempting to modify agricultural practices to provide habitat appears to be generally less effective than more intensively managing farmland and allowing other lands to be focused on supplying biodiversity habitat.

The broad implication of these observations seems fairly clear. In a world that is stretched to produce sufficient farm products and food, the most sustainable means to do this by using land more intensively. This is implied by Foley et al (2011) in arguing that "to meet the world's future food security and sustainability needs, food production must grow substantially while, at the same time, agriculture's environmental footprint must shrink dramatically".

The arguments supporting extensification must thus relate to the specifics of technologies employed to implement more intensive production; this is explicit in the case of organic production. This reflects a concern toward, and focus on, the potential for unintended consequences and offsite effects associated with agricultural technologies used to increase yields. This focus on the efficacy and safety of specific agricultural technologies is appropriate, and critical to supporting intensive management; but this should not diminish the broader point- using land more intensively is more sustainable than extensive land use.

Nitrous Oxide Emissions from Fertilizer, Source, Rate, Time and Place Effects

Introduction

Intensification of crop production has often been approached simplistically with producers increasing inputs in hopes of reaching maximum yield. This goal has often been pursued without regard for the collateral damage that the maximum yield approach can have on a producer's overall economic and environmental performance. A more intelligent approach to intensification involves increasing productivity within a framework of economic optimization of input resources and minimization of environmental impacts. Practices that result in simultaneous agronomic, economic, and environmental benefits are referred to as sustainable or best management practices (BMPs). These BMPs can be developed for all aspects of crop production including crop and variety selection, tillage management, pest management and nutrient use.

In Canadian prairie agriculture, fertilizer expenditures typically represents the largest proportion of the variable costs in crop production with significantly more dollars spent on nitrogen than the other nutrients. Consequently, improving nutrient use efficiency in general and nitrogen use efficiency in particular is an important tool in the profitable intensification of crop production. Poor nitrogen management practices result in losses of nitrogen from the cropping system that not only reduce a producer's economic efficiency they also impair air and water quality. Nitrogen losses occur through



Figure 4.1. The Nitrogen Cycle

surface runoff and deep leaching as well as gaseous emissions from the soil surface (Figure 2.1). One of the gases emitted is nitrous oxide (N₂O), a potent green house gas (GHG) with a global warming potential (GWP) about 300 times greater than carbon dioxide. Nitrous oxide contributes more than half of the global warming potential attributable to Canadian cropping systems (Janzen et al. 2008). Consequently, reducing nitrous oxide is an important part of balancing economic and environmental outcomes within intensive cropping systems.

Nitrous oxide is lost directly from the cropping system through the processes of nitrification and denitrification. Other nitrogen loss pathways also contribute nitrous oxide indirectly. Ammonia (NH₃) lost through the process of volatilization and nitrate (NO₃⁻) lost through runoff and leaching are eventually deposited in terrestrial or aquatic ecosystems where a small proportion will be converted to nitrous oxide. Nitrogen that is taken up by the crop is in the short-term removed from the pathways that lead to nitrous oxide emissions. Managing nitrogen source, rate, time and place decisions in ways that prevent nitrate accumulation, reduce loss and improve crop uptake reduces nitrous oxide emissions.

The purpose of this section then is to examine the recent scientific literature with respect to nitrogen management practices. This was not intended as a comprehensive review of nitrogen management rather the literature was filtered through the lens of 4R Nutrient Stewardship and the Nitrous Oxide Emission Protocol (NERP). Although a wide range of literature was examined, the studies reported here involved experimental or modeling work where nitrogen source, rate, time and place practices were manipulated and data on yield and nitrogen use efficiency and/or nitrous oxide emissions were measured. The approach used was to find recent review articles or articles where meta-analysis was used to examine recent work on a particular set of nitrogen management practices or technologies. If a practice or technology appeared to have merit in reducing nitrous oxide emissions and improving productivity, a deeper exploration was undertaken to find studies that were relevant to the crops and climates of the Canadian Prairies. The end purpose was to use the recent scientific literature to:

- Identify or verify nitrogen management practices that achieved the desired results of improving nitrogen use efficiency, increasing yield and/or reducing nitrous oxide emissions and were likely applicable within Alberta's crop production systems.
- Examine the magnitude of nitrous oxide reductions reported for various practices and combinations of practices and compare them to the current reduction coefficients used in the NERP protocol.
- Examine whether the current suite of practices prescribed for the different levels of NERP should continue to be viewed as effective in reducing nitrous oxide emissions and whether the current list is too restrictive or needs to be more restrictive in prescribing BMPs.

The focus for the purposes of this report as described above was relatively narrow. For a broader perspective and more thorough review of nitrogen management and nitrous oxide emissions refer to Snyder et al. (2007, 2009); Asgedom and Kebreab (2011); and Snyder and Fixen (2012).

4R Nutrient Stewardship and the NERP

The International Plant Nutrition Institute (IPNI) developed 4R as a principle-based and evidence-driven approach that is applicable to any cropping system (Bruulsema et al. 2008). 4R is built on a foundation of sustainable agriculture and aims to help crop producers balance among economic, social, and environmental goals. Within 4R, nutrient management is organized into four interconnected sets of

decisions with the idea that by adopting locally appropriate practices for nutrient source, rate, time, and place, crop managers can optimize nutrient use. The central principle of 4R is captured in the axiom *the Right Source @ the Right Rate, Time and Place*. One of the key principles of 4R is site-specific management in which farmers adjust their nutrient management practices to match the nutrient requirements and manage environmental risks at the individual field or sub-field level as required.

The NERP was developed as a science based tool for driving adoption of nitrous oxide reducing nitrogen management practices and quantifying those reductions as fungible offset credits within Alberta's regulated carbon market (Climate Check, 2008). The quantification of nitrous oxide and other greenhouse gas emissions associated with nutrient management is based on life cycle analysis and an adaption of Canada's Tier II inventory method for nitrous oxide developed by Rochette et al. (2008a,b).

NERP uses a 4R Nutrient Stewardship Plan as the vehicle for promoting farmer adoption of management practices that reduce nitrous oxide emissions. Since the main driver of these emissions is additions of nitrogen, particular attention is paid within a NERP project to nitrogen management practices that increase nitrogen use efficiency by the crop and subsequently reduce nitrous oxide emissions. While there is an emphasis on nitrogen management on NERP project farms, nitrogen cannot be effectively managed independently from other required nutrients. So even within the rather narrow confines of a NERP project, 4R is expected to improve overall nutrient management and provide better economic, social, and environmental outcomes.

NERP uses a comprehensive approach to accounting for nitrogen additions and nitrous oxide emission pathways within the cropping system. Fertilizer, manure, compost and any other sources of added nitrogen are accounted for through direct quantification. Nitrogen returns through crop residues are estimated from harvested yield and average nitrogen concentration values taken from the literature. Direct emissions from the cropping system through the two major processes responsible, nitrification and denitrification, are captured using an emission factor specific for the ecodistrict containing each field.⁸ Indirect emissions from ammonia loss are estimated using a volatilization fraction (partitioning coefficient) to quantify the proportion of added nitrogen volatilized and then applying an emission factor to the lost nitrogen. Leaching is handled in a similar manner using a leaching fraction to estimate leached nitrogen and an emission factor to quantify nitrous oxide emissions from the leached fraction. The leaching fraction is ecodistrict specific to account for regional variability in precipitation, evapotranspiration, and soil type. Irrigated crops are treated as a separate case and appropriately higher factors are applied to account for the increased direct and indirect emissions.

⁸ Ecodistricts, the smallest units of area within Canada's National Ecological Framework, are differentiated on the basis of regional landform, local surface form, permafrost distribution, soil development, textural group, vegetation cover/land use classes, range of annual precipitation, and mean temperature. Ecodistrict size is a function of regional variability of these defining attributes. Minimum size is approximately 100,000 ha (250,000 acres).

Performance Level	Right Source	Right Rate	Right Time	Right Place	Reduction Modifier
Basic	Ammonium- based formulations.	Apply N according to 4R Plan, using annual soil testing and/or N balance to determine application rate.	Apply in spring; or split apply; or apply after soil cools to 10 ⁰ C.	Apply in bands / Injection	0.85
Intermediate	Ammonium- based formulation; and/or use slow /controlled release fertilizers; or inhibitors.	Apply N according to qualitative estimates of field variability (landscape position, soil variability) as outlined in the 4R Plan	Apply fertilizer in spring; or split apply; or apply after soil cools to 10 ⁰ C.	Apply in bands / Injection	0.75
Advanced	Ammonium- based formulation; and/or use slow / controlled release fertilizers; or inhibitors; or stabilized N	Apply N according to quantified field variability (e.g. digitized soil maps, grid sampling, or satellite imagery).	Apply fertilizer in spring; or split apply; or apply after soil cools to 10 ⁰ C using slow / controlled release fertilizer or inhibitors / stabilized N.	Apply in bands / Injection	0.75

Table 4.1. NERP BMP Performance Levels for the Drier Soils in Canada¹

¹ Relevant examples for Alberta shown for complete and current details of required BMPs at each performance level consult the most current version of the protocol.

Estimating reductions in nitrous oxide emissions, the basis for generation of carbon credits or offsets in NERP, is done on an intensity basis (Δ kg N₂O/kg crop). The reduction is calculated as the difference between a baseline value, average emissions for each crop on the project farm using three years of historic data on nitrogen application and yield, and a project value, the emissions for the current year. The project value is corrected using a reduction modifier that reflects the suite of BMPs applied (Table 4.1) and then subtracted from the baseline.

The values used for the reduction modifiers were set conservatively based on the best available evidence at the time the NERP was developed and are subject to periodic review. A useful way to view the reduction modifiers is that unlike strictly nitrogen rate driven approaches, NERP produces an initial rate based emission and then adjusts it for the mitigating effects of right source, time and place practices. Adopting BMPs that optimize nitrogen rate is an important strategy both economically and environmentally. Optimizing source, time and place practices maximizes nitrogen efficiency and yield while minimizing nitrous oxide emissions at whatever rates are used. Adoption of right source, time and place BMPs will lead to further rate adjustments as producers seek to continuously improve productivity, profitability, and environmental performance. These ongoing adjustments may be to increase or to decrease rates depending on the production potential and environmental risks for each field on the farm.

An important principle to keep in mind when applying NERP is that it is designed to achieve 'accuracy in aggregate'. NERP is not intended to achieve the site-specific predictive capability of a full process model nor does it require the detailed and time stepped data required to run a full process model. As a farm based tool, NERP can provide an important metric for tracking environmental benefit that is easily understood and can be initiated using data farmers collect routinely to improve their crop management decisions. As a compliance option within a regulatory framework like Alberta's, the uncertainties of quantification at the farm field level are minimized as the NERP is applied over a large number of fields.

4R Best Management Practices

The right source @ the right rate, time and place expresses the synergy that can be obtained through integration of practices. Determining the quantitative effects of this synergy is challenging. The peer review literature contains reports on numerous experiments where one or two 4R factors are manipulated while holding the remaining 4R factors constant. This is necessary as performing a fully integrated experiment on the 4Rs even for a single crop at a single site rapidly becomes unwieldy both operationally and statistically. For example, comparing three urea nitrogen sources (urea, polymer coated urea, urease inhibited urea) at four rates (check, below-recommended, recommended, above-recommended) using the three most common placements (broadcast, surface banded, subsurface banded) and two timings (spring and fall) would require seventy-two treatments. Given these limitations, the synergistic effects when all 4Rs are combined into a nutrient management system must to a large extent be inferred from multiple datasets through tools such as modeling and meta-analysis as they cannot realistically be measured directly.

Right Source

The most commonly used conventional nitrogen fertilizers sources in Western Canada are in order of nitrogen applied: urea, anhydrous ammonia, urea-ammonium nitrate (UAN), and ammonium sulfate (Canadian Fertilizer Institute, 2014). All these sources when used with appropriate management practices increase yield of small grains and oilseeds on the prairies about equally well per unit of nitrogen applied (Johnston et al. 1997; Grant et al. 2002). Agronomists and farmers have approached source selection within the paradigm of a pound of N is a pound of N. Choosing the right N source has generally been based on price; grower preferences for placement equipment; and blending, storage, safety, and handling characteristics.

Different conventional sources may in some circumstances vary in nitrous oxide emissions. Halvorsen et al. (2014a) found that UAN produced lower emissions than urea in irrigated cropping systems in Colorado. Tenuta and Beauchamp (2003) compared sources in laboratory and field studies and found that emissions ranked urea > ammonium sulfate > ammonium nitrate. Urea has been reported to lower emissions compared to anhydrous ammonia in rain-fed corn production systems in Minnesota (Venterea et al. 2010). On the other hand, Burton et al. (2008) found no difference between urea and anhydrous ammonia in Manitoba. Decock (2014) in a recent review and meta-analysis of nitrogen management practices in mid-west corn systems, found that source differences can have a considerable impact on

fertilizer induced emissions. In her analysis, conventional sources ranked anhydrous ammonia > UAN > ammonium nitrate > urea when emissions were compared per unit of nitrogen applied, with emissions from urea being on average less than half of those from anhydrous ammonia.

At present, there is insufficient evidence to indicate which conventional sources and under what circumstances might produce lower emissions in Alberta cropping systems. While there has been considerable work done in the past decade comparing conventional and enhanced efficiency fertilizers for yield and nitrous oxide emissions, there has been very little focused directly on comparing emissions from conventional sources.

The gradual improvement of enhanced efficiency fertilizer has been the major development in nitrogen source over the past two decades. One approach to enhanced efficiency is to physically control release of nutrients out of granular products with a membrane or coating. Polymer coated urea sold by Agrium as ESN[™] has been available commercially in Western Canada for a decade and is being increasingly adopted by producers. The price premium relative to uncoated urea has narrowed considerably as ESN has become a more mainstream product and is currently 10-20%. ESN can be applied alone but there is a growing trend to apply it in blends with uncoated urea. One of the benefits of ESN is increased seed safety relative to uncoated urea when seed row applied (Hadelein et al. 2001; Malhi and Lemke, 2013; McKenzie et al. 2007). Another may be preventing early season nitrogen uptake by weeds (Blackshaw et al. 2011).

Yield benefits from ESN appear to be variable depending on the cropping system and site-specific conditions of the experiments. Haderlein et al. (2001) in their comparison of seed-placed ESN to sidebanded conventional urea at multiple rates reported no yield advantage. But seed-placed ESN did consistently increase nitrogen uptake. Grant et al. (2012), in a multiple site, multiple year study in W. Canada, found no consistent improvement in yield relative to uncoated urea when ESN was side-banded in spring. McKenzie et al (2007) measured no yield differences relative to uncoated urea when ESN was side-banded at time of seeding on winter wheat in S. Alberta but substantial positive differences when it was seed-placed. In later experiments, they found ESN banded at seeding increased yield slightly but was comparable to other forms when spring broadcast (McKenzie et al. 2010). Beres et al. (2010) also working with winter wheat in Southern and Central Alberta, reported ESN side-banded at seeding consistently outperformed conventional urea broadcast in spring. Working in Northern Alberta and Saskatchewan over a four year rotation, Malhi et al. (2010) reported enhanced yield and nitrogen recovery in crops receiving ESN in wetter than normal years. Blackshaw et al. (2011) found canola yield with ESN was similar to urea in 14 of 20 site-years and increased canola yield in 4 site-years. In a Minnesota study, ESN blends showed positive protein and yield benefits in spring wheat production under warm moist spring conditions while yield decreased and protein increased under cool dry spring conditions (Farmaha and Sims 2013).

Khakbazan et al. (2113) estimated net revenue differences among treatments using the data from Grant and colleagues and found that overall ESN provided no economic benefit. Interestingly when spring banded, the most common application method on the Canadian Prairies, at the recommended rate was broken out, ESN provided equal (19) or better (1) net revenue relative to urea in 20 of the 24 site-years where a statistical comparison was provided. This suggests there may be situations where realizing the environmental benefits of ESN may be revenue neutral for the producer.

A second approach to enhancing efficiency is by adding chemical inhibitors to the fertilizer source. The principle behind these products is to slow conversion of urea to ammonium and reduce the rate of volatilization and/or limit the conversion of ammonium to nitrate through nitrification and prevent nitrate accumulation, potentially reducing denitrification and leaching. Use of these stabilized nitrogen sources reduces risk of loss and when timed appropriately can synchronize supply with crop demand. Since nitrification and denitrification are the major processes responsible for direct nitrous oxide emissions and volatilization and leaching the processes contributing to indirect emissions slowing the conversions potentially lowers nitrous oxide contributions from fertilizer.

The most commonly used urease inhibitor is N-(n-butyl) thiophosphoric triamide (NBPT), has been extensively field and laboratory tested in North America and elsewhere with well over a thousand individual trials completed to date (Saggar et al. 2013). In Canada NBPT is sold under the brand names Agrotain[™] as a stand-alone product or in combination with the nitrification inhibitor dicyandiamide (DCD) as Agrotain Plus[™]. These products can be added to granular or liquid urea containing fertilizers. Urea pre-treated with urease inhibitor and DCD is also available under the trade names SuperU[™]. In Western Canadian soils, NBPT has been shown to prevent losses through ammonia volatilization when urea is surface applied (Rawluk et al. 2001). This has not consistently resulted in agronomic benefit. Experiments on the use of NBPT to improve seed-row safety in Western Canada have met with mixed results. Research showing improved seedling emergence with NBPT treated urea on wheat, barley, or canola has been reported by Xiaobin et al. (1995); Grant and Bailey (1999); Malhi et al. (2003); and Karamanos et al., (2004). More recently, Malhi and Lemke (2013) found no benefit on seedling emergence in a three-year study on canola and wheat. Grant (2014) found NBPT was not effective in increasing grain yield of spring wheat when applied with urea but did have some positive effects when used with UAN in broadcast (spray) applications. McKenzie et al. 2010 measured small yield increases with NBPT treated urea relative to ESN when broadcast in early spring on winter wheat but no difference relative to urea. He concluded that the negligible improvements were likely due to the low risk of nitrogen loss in the S. Alberta study area.

Treating nitrogen fertilizer with nitrification inhibitors is the third approach to creating an enhancedefficiency fertilizer. There are three nitrification inhibitors that are commercially available in North America: nitrapyrin, dicyandiamide (DCD), and ammonium thiosulfate (ATS). Nitrapyrin is the active ingredient found in the DOW[®] product N-Serve[®] and Instinct[®]. Nitrapyrin was initially registered for the US market in 1974. Although tested in Canadian soils in the 1970's and 80's, it was never registered. Nitrapyrin is quite effective even at relatively low rates. Originally nitrapyrin was difficult to handle and only available for use with anhyrous ammonia (N-Serve). More recent microencapsulated formulations (Instinct and Instinct II) can be used with UAN and granular products as well as liquid manure. Dow Agrosciences is currently conducting field tests on nitrapyrin in Canada. Dicyandiamide (DCD) is the active ingredient in nitrification inhibitors such as Agrotain Plus[®], SuperU[®], and Guardian[®]. Dicyandiamide is required at a significantly larger concentration to be effective. Ammonium thiosulfate is used as a sulfur source in fluid fertilizer blends. Akiyama et al. (2010) performed a meta-analysis on the effectiveness of enhanced-efficiency fertilizers as mitigation options for nitrous oxide emissions using 113 datasets from 35 studies. They found nitrification inhibitors and polymer coated urea reduced nitrous oxide emissions 38% and 35% respectively. Reductions varied with cropping system and soil type. The results were more equivocal for urease inhibitors, which over all showed little or no effectiveness in reducing nitrous oxide emissions in the study. Three of the six data sets analyzed for NBPT were from a site at Brandon, Manitoba where nitrous oxide emissions from treated urea, untreated urea and the zero nitrogen control were similar in two out of three years (Burton et al 2008). In a recent summary of experiments on irrigated corn systems in Colorado performed over multiple sites and multiple years, Halvorson et al. (2014a) found that controlled release and stabilized nitrogen sources consistently reduced direct nitrous oxide emissions during the growing season relative to untreated urea and UAN. The controlled release source ESN, reduced nitrous oxide emissions by 42% compared with urea and 14% compared with UAN in notill and strip-till systems but had no effect in a conventional tillage system. Granular urea treated with both a urease and a nitrification inhibitor (SuperU) emitted 46% less nitrous oxide than urea and 21% less than UAN. A UAN source similarly stabilized with urease and nitrification inhibitors (UAN+Agrotain Plus) reduced nitrous oxide emissions by 61% compared with granular urea and 41% compared with UAN alone. Interestingly, UAN reduced nitrous oxide emissions by 35% compared with urea in their studies.

In an Alberta study focused on canola production systems, nitrous oxide emissions across three sites and three years were reduced by an average of 20% for spring side-banded ESN compared to uncoated urea on canola (Li et al 2012). Soon et al. (2011), in a study in Dark Gray soils, compared emissions from fall and spring banded urea and ESN at two sites over three years. They concluded that ESN can increase available N during the growth period and reduce nitrous oxide loss in some years compared with urea. Other studies from cool dry regions in the interior plains generally show a reduction of direct emissions with enhanced efficiency sources in a range of soil types and cropping systems (Burton et al. 2008; Hyatt et al. 2010; Venterra et al. 2011). In more humid climates, enhanced efficiency sources may have little or no positive benefits on direct emissions and may actually increase emissions depending on the timing and intensity of rainfall events (Sistani et al. 2011; Parkin et al. 2014).

Experimental work in cool dry areas shows that the positive effects of enhanced efficiency fertilizers are site specific. The use of these sources does not consistently result in yield increases and in some cases can result in lower yields relative to conventional sources. They typically increase fertilizer use efficiency and reduce nitrous oxide emissions. Overall the enhanced efficiency sources have a modest potential of improving yield and return on fertilizer dollars and a substantial potential for reducing nitrous oxide emissions. The challenge going forward will be to provide producers and agronomists with tools to identify the circumstances where enhanced efficiency fertilizer will have a high likelihood of providing both economic and environmental benefits. If that can be accomplished they will be an important technology for managing nitrous oxide emissions under intensified productions regimes.

Right Rate

Nitrogen fertilizer is the major yield driver for non-leguminous field crops in the Northern Great Plains, followed by phosphorus, potassium, sulphur and to lesser extent micronutrients, in particular copper

and chloride depending on crop and region (Karamanos et al. 2010). Fertilizer costs are typically the largest single variable expense for cereal and oilseed producers with the majority of fertilizer dollars spent on nitrogen (MAFRI 2014). Growers in Alberta are generally sensitive to nitrogen costs and are becoming increasingly aware that fertilizing for the economic optimum involves lower rates than those required to achieve maximum yield. The focus in this discussion is the relationship between fertilizer rate, production and nitrous oxide emissions. But keep in mind that insuring a balanced nutrient supply is a BMP for sustainable production. Cropping systems that are inadequately supplied with other nutrients will not make efficient use of nitrogen resulting in higher emissions, lower yields and greater quantities of residual nitrate (Snyder et al. 2009, Johnson et al. 1997).

Economic optimization of fertilizer rates requires consideration of expected growing conditions, crop prices, and fertilizer costs. Of these only fertilizer cost is usually known with certainty at the time of making the rate decision. Crop yield response to nitrogen fertilizer typically follows a pattern of near linear response giving way to a diminishing return and finally a plateau as rates increase. Since return on nitrogen fertilizer is maximized at the rate where marginal revenue from the extra crop produced and marginal cost of the nitrogen are equal, under or over fertilizing in any given year results in reduced profit suboptimal economic performance. Finding the economic optimum nutrient rate (EONR) is difficult with so many unknowns but one thing that is know is that it is by definition less than the minimum rate required to achieve maximum yield or agronomic optimum nutrient rate (AONR) (IPNI 2012).





In the studies examined in this review, there was almost invariably a yield response to added nitrogen. The few exceptions involved experiments where environmental conditions, such as lack of moisture, placed limitations on crop growth. Several authors have theorized that the rise in nitrous oxide emissions in response to fertilizer rates is relatively moderate until the nitrogen uptake capacity of

the cropping system is exceeded (Bouwman et al. 2002, Grant et al. 2006, and Snyder et al. 2007) (Figure 4.2).

In a recent meta-analysis, Kim et al. (2013) examined 26 published datasets where at least four different levels of N input had been applied. They found the relationship of direct nitrous oxide emission to N input was nonlinear (exponential or hyperbolic) in 18 datasets while the relationship was linear in four datasets. They proposed based on their analysis a general sigmoidal model with a lag or low rate of

increase phase, an exponential phase, and a plateau or steady state phase with the cross over point from low to exponential increase occurring at the optimal N uptake by vegetation (Figure 4.3). The optimal uptake rate for vegetation will typically be the same or very close to the agronomic optimum nitrogen rate in cropping systems as shown in the figure.

The field studies that supported this model were largely from temperate cropping systems. For example, Hoben et al. (2011) working with corn in Michigan reported that nitrous oxide emissions increased substantially once the optimal



Figure 4.3. Three Phase Emission in Response to Nitrogen Rate

rate was exceeded. Working with corn in Ontario, Ma et al. (2010) found that rates over 90 kg N/ha substantially increased nitrous oxide emissions but not yield. In a Manitoba potato study, Gao et al. (2013) found that emission were linear overall but in their study, optimum yield as measured by marketable tubers was reached at the lowest fertilizer nitrogen rate.

While there is a large degree of variability among sites and years in the reported experimental data the emerging trend appears to be that direct N₂O emission factors increase markedly at N input rates above plant uptake capacity. This would suggest that while nitrous oxide emissions per unit of land may go up with increasing nitrogen rates, the emissions intensity (kg N₂O/kg crop) is not likely to increase substantially as long as rate are kept below the agronomic optimum (Figure 4.4). If the aim of sustainable production is to find the balance point among economic, environmental and social goals, then economic optimization of nitrogen rates will result in maximum return to the producer on their nitrogen expenditures and reduction in nitrous oxide emissions relative to the over fertilization inherent in a maximum yield approach.

Over fertilization can occur for a number of reasons. One of the more common ones in prairie agriculture systems is lower than expected precipitation during the growing season. Several relevant studies have shown that nitrous oxide emissions tend to be driven by high moisture (for example, Gao et al. 2013; Soon et al. 2011). Consequently, excess nitrogen as a result of water limitations does not immediately result in higher nitrous oxide emission. However, excess nitrogen additions in a dry year generally end up as residual nitrate at the end of the growing season and contribute to subsequent direct and indirect emissions. The second common reason for over application of fertilizer is driven by growers' desire to maximize yield. While the idea that economic optimum rates are less than the agronomic optimum or maximum yield rate is widely understood by agronomists, fertilizer recommendations based on maximum yield are common and maximizing yield is still widely encouraged in the industry.



Figure 4.4. Nitrogen Rate, Yield, and Nitrous Oxide Emissions.

Under application of N rather than over application is more likely the norm in prairie cropping systems as evidenced by the difference between average reported yields and yields achieved under higher fertility regimes.⁹ There is little current data available on farmer used nitrogen rates in Alberta and unlike phosphorus and potassium which are largely conserved within the cropping system, gross nitrogen balances based on total fertilizer use and crop removal are essentially meaningless.

Technologies available for optimizing nitrogen rates for Alberta growing conditions include optimizations programs such as AFFIRM¹⁰ which take in account fertilizer and crop prices and provide an estimate of the economic optimum rate under different moisture probabilities. Unfortunately AFFIRM and many of the recommendation system like it are driven from out dated data that doesn't fully reflect advances made in both genetics and management factors such as direct seeding. For example, Smith et al. (2010), found major differences in the nitrogen response functions between older open pollinated canola varieties and hybrid canola varieties.

Furthermore, AFFIRM and other programs like it generally depend on soil test nitrogen as an input variable. While soil test use remained the same in Saskatchewan and rose substantially in Manitoba, it appears to have

declined by approximately 30 in Alberta in the period 2000 to 2010 (IPNI 2010). Soil test nitrogen is considered one of the important variables for determining right rates for nitrogen on a field specific basis under Alberta growing conditions. In a 2012 survey of production practices in Western Canada, canola growers that soil tested reported on average a 2 bu/acre advantage over those that didn't (Smith

⁹ See Section 5 for discussion of intensification potential and nitrogen use.

¹⁰ Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager, Available from Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development as a free download at www1.agric.gov.ab.ca.

2013). NERP prescribes soil testing as a best management practice at all levels of application of the protocol.

Variable rate fertilization is another technology that has the potential to optimize nitrogen rates by more closely matching nitrogen inputs to spatial differences in crop uptake requirements and soil supplying power. Little direct work has been done in Western Canada on using variable rate to mitigate nitrous oxide emissions.

Suboptimal economic performance of nitrogen can result from both under and over application. Over application results in economic inefficiency and increased risk. Under application may result in lower emissions per unit of land and potentially better environmental, if not economic performance, of a given cropping system. Keep in mind, however, that in a market with increasing demand, the reduced production would likely be made up in similar cropping systems. There is likely no GHG advantage overall in reducing nitrogen rates and yield on one piece of land if it is only to be made up on another piece of land. There may in fact be considerable disadvantage, if the new piece is brought into production from alternative uses that are GHG sinks under their current management regime. Whether this occurs locally or in another region is immaterial to the global balance between food production and GHG reduction. Since under fertilization also reduces total production, it also works against global society's requirement for increased food production on existing land.

Right Time and Place

Nitrogen timing and placement can have significant effects on yield, nitrogen use efficiency and nitrous oxide emissions. In Alberta, most nitrogen is spring applied at or just before seeding (Korol 2004). Fall-application appears to be declining as producers have adopted single pass seeding systems. Use of split-application, with some of the nitrogen applied at or before seeding and the remainder in crop, is increasing but is still a minor practice.

Fall nitrogen application reduces workload during the seeding window and takes advantage of lower fall fertilizer prices. Many producers have solved the price differential by purchasing in fall and storing onfarm. Fall application also avoids the seedbed drying that can occur as a result of spring tillage to incorporate broadcast or subsurface band fertilizer, an important consideration in the drier brown and dark brown soil zones of S. Alberta.

The choice of fall over spring application timing can reduce nitrogen use efficiency and yield response particularly in finer textured soils and moister regions. Placement interacts strongly with timing and site conditions in determining the relative efficiency but there is a considerable body of evidence demonstrating that in prairie cropping systems spring-applied N generally out performs fall (Harapiak 1979; Nyborg and Leitch 1979; Bole et al. 1984; Malhi et al. 1984; Ukrainetz 1984; Nyborg and Malhi 1986, 1992; Malhi et al. 2001). The ranking from most to least effective under conventional tillage can be summarized as spring banded > fall banded > spring broadcast > fall broadcast (Table 4.2). The table suggests correctly that fall-application performs about equally well to spring application in drier regions under normal moisture conditions. Under wetter than normal conditions, overwinter losses of fall-applied nitrogen can occur in all regions of the province.

Table 4.2. The relative effectiveness of methods and time of nitrogen application for increasing crop yield.

	Soil Moisture				
Time and Place	Dry	Medium	Wet	Irrigated	
Spring Broadcast and Incorporated	100	100	100	100	
Spring Banded	120	110	105	110	
Fall Broadcast and Incorporated	90	75	65	95	
Fall Banded	120	110	85	110	

Dry = Well drained soils that are seldom saturated during spring thaw. Medium = Well to moderately drained soils that are occasionally saturated during spring thaw for short periods. Wet = Poorly to moderately drained soils that are saturated for extended periods during spring thaw. Irrigated = Well drained soils in southern Alberta that are seldom saturated during spring thaw.

Source: Adapted from Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development, Agdex 542-11 (revised 2013), Fall-applied nitrogen risks and benefits. http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca

The common fertilizer nitrogen sources used in Alberta, either contain nitrogen in the ammonium form or convert to ammonium following application. (The notable exception is UAN with nitrate-N accounting for 25% of its nitrogen content.) The subsequent conversion of ammonium to nitrate is temperature dependent and early fall application allows formation of more nitrate prior to the soil freezing and increases the potential for losses prior to crop uptake the following growing season (Malhi and Nyborg 1979; Malhi and McGill 1982; Malhi et al.1984; Malhi and Nyborg 1983; Monreal et al. 1986; Malhi and Nyborg 1990a,b; Nyborg et al.1990; Nyborg et al. 1997).

The risk of overwinter loss and reduced yield response varies regionally largely dependent on soil moisture and the probability of spring saturation. Research conducted largely in the wetter black, dark gray and gray soil zones generally indicates large reductions in efficiency that can only be partly overcome by band placement, use of inhibitors and late fall timing (Malhi and Nyborg 1979; Malhi and Nyborg 1984; Monreal et al. 1986; Malhi and Nyborg 1988a,b; Yadvinder-Singh et al. 1994; Malhi et al. 2001). Results from the brown and dark brown soil zones indicate lower risk of overwinter loss, which can be largely overcome at least in most years by banding (Bole et al. 1984; Kucey 1986; Kucey and Schaalje 1986; Malhi et al. 2001).

Site-specific factors can substantially modify these regional trends. Grant et al. (2001, 2002) found in black soils in Manitoba that grain yields with fall-applied urea and UAN tended to be lower than spring-applied on a finer textured soil but similar on a coarser textured soil. In these studies, the two sites were approximately 50 kilometers apart. Efficiency of fall application can also vary markedly with landscape position in the same field. Tiessen et al. (2005, 2006) reported grain yield and apparent recovery of fertilizer N were significantly greater for spring and late fall applications at low landscape positions, when compared with early and mid-fall applications but found no difference at high landscape positions.

The potential for loss is higher when fertilizer nitrogen is fall-applied. Denitrification during the the

spring thaw can account for a substantial portion of annual nitrous oxide emissions from soils subject to freeze thaw cycles (Risk et al. 2013). This makes it likely that nitrous oxide emissions are higher with fall compared to spring fertilizer timing. However, experimental results have varied. Burton et al. (2008) found that cumulative emissions from fall-applied nitrogen were marginally greater than spring applied over a three-year study in Manitoba. Soon et al. (2011) found significantly greater emissions from fall-applied plots in some site years but not others. They did, however, report large apparent losses of nitrate that may have contributed to indirect emissions.

Subsurface band placement tends to increase nitrogen use efficiency and more effectively increase yield than broadcasting nitrogen. Placing N fertilizer in bands also reduces volatilization losses, lowers the risk of immobilization, and slows the rate of nitrification of fertilizer N to nitrate in the fall, which reduces the risk of overwinter loss (Yadvinder-Singh et al. 1994). Reduction of ammonia volatilization and leaching infers reduction of indirect nitrous oxide emissions. Whether banding (fall or spring) results in lower emissions overall is still unclear. Burton et al. (2008) found little difference in direct emissions between broadcast and banded urea in two Manitoba soils. Based on their meta-analysis of emission measurements from experiments comparing tillage and placement, Van Kessel et al. (2013) concluded that deep placement (>5 cm) of nitrogen was an effective strategy for reducing emissions in no-tillage and

reduced tillage systems. Banding urea can increase ammonia volatilization on dry acidic soils compared to surface placement (Rochette et al. 2009) and ammonia losses contribute to indirect nitrous oxide emissions. However, practices that reduce direct emissions but increase ammonia emissions may still be important mitigation strategies depending on the balance between the two processes. A kilogram of volatilized ammonia-N would have a GWP of approximately 4.87 kg CO₂e, while a kilogram of N lost through direct emissions of nitrous oxide results in a GWP of 487 kg CO₂e.¹¹

Banding after the soil has cooled below 10°C is considered a BMP for fall nitrogen application under NERP at the basic level. Use of an enhanced efficiency fertilizer with fall-banded N is a BMP at the advanced level. The inclusion of fall application timing as an appropriate BMP under NERP will need to be reconsidered once results from some of the research currently underway become available. Early indications are that switching from fall to spring application may be one of the more effective practice changes growers can make for both improving nitrogen use efficiency and reducing nitrous oxide emissions.

The other main timing consideration in prairie agriculture is whether to apply all nitrogen at or before seeding, after seeding, or use a split application approach. Agronomically there are a number of reasons to use split applications including reducing the fertilizer volume handled at seeding, managing risk of low moisture in dryland cropping, matching application to uptake timing, and fine-tuning of nitrogen rates with growing conditions. Holzapfel et al. (2007) reported no yield reduction in canola from split application, but yield was depressed in wheat when little precipitation was received after N application. Karamanos et al. (2005) suggested that applying N post emergent was higher risk than applying all N at

 $^{^{11}}$ Based on the default IPCC emission factor for redeposited ammonia of 0.01 kg NO₂-N/kg NH₃-N and a the GWP conversion of 310 currently used in NERP.

the time of seeding and that adding a significant portion of nitrogen at seeding was required to reduce that risk. Split application that places a third to half the nitrogen at or before seeding, more in drier and less in wetter conditions, combined with timely in-crop application yield about equally well under normal moisture conditions and provide growers with a tool to avoid over or under application (Lafond et al. 2008, Malhi et al. 2001).

NERP allows in-season or split application of fertilizer provided a band placement is used. This currently eliminates broadcasting either urea or spraying UAN as a BMP in NERP project fields. The protocol is not clear whether the post emergent application portion of a split application needs to be subsurface banded using granular or fluid through a coulter or can be surface banded using granular urea or streamer bars and UAN. The stream bar approach is an attractive option to growers as they increasingly adopt high clearance sprayers, while a coulter system requires specialized equipment including guidance to ensure correct placement and minimize crop damage.

There appears to be little difference in yield between in-soil and surface banding using UAN under prairie conditions (Holzapfel et al. 2007). Grant (2014), working in no-till wheat production in Manitoba, compared surface application techniques applied immediately after seeding. She found that concentrating surface application in a band increased yield when UAN was the source but yields were comparable when broadcast urea was compared to surface banded urea.

Split application using surface banding or in-soil bands both appear to be viable options agronomically but little work has been done comparing nitrous oxide emissions from the different placements. Halvorson et al. (2012) measured nitrous oxide emissions from ESN, SuperU, UAN+Agrotain Plus compared to subsurface banded ESN, surface banded UAN, and surface banded urea in irrigated strip-till and no-till corn systems in Colorado. They found that all sources and placements produced the same yield but sources varied significantly in cumulative growing season emissions. Surface banded UAN and SuperU reduced cumulative emissions by approximately half compare to surface applied urea, while UAN+Agrotain Plus reduced emissions by 67%. Interestingly surface banded ESN, while reducing emissions by 53% relative to urea, also had 38% lower emissions than subsurface banded ESN.

Split-applications have the potential to be a useful BMP for nitrous oxide emission in Alberta cropping systems. They may be particularly effective in areas of the province where growing season precipitation is more variable and applying all nitrogen at seeding represents a financial and environmental risk. In all likelihood the mechanism of nitrous oxide reduction would be a lower nitrogen application rates in years when the in-crop application was not applied or applied at a reduced rate. Split application is an allowable practice in NERP but producers may not have the equipment necessary to subsurface band in crop. Surface banding using UAN or UAN+Agrotain Plus appears to have relatively low emissions compared to broadcasting or surface banding urea and fits with the growing use of high clearance sprayers in cereal and oilseed production. The use of enhanced efficiency fertilizers in-crop can be an agronomic issue if it significantly delays conversion or release and uptake by the crop and needs to be approached with caution but does warrant more attention as a possible BMP under NERP.

Observations

A significant body of work examining the effects of the 4Rs on nitrous oxide emissions has been completed since the original scientific review of the NERP in 2008. This new work generally supports the conceptual framework and suggested BMPs found in the NERP while at the same time pointing out areas where benefits can be increased by reconsidering practices at the different levels. The most important points and recommendations are as follows:

- Conventional nitrogen sources do not appear to vary much in agronomic performance but can differ markedly in emissions when compared side by side. These differences need to be further clarified and recognized within the framework of NERP BMPs at the advanced level.
- The efficacy of enhanced efficiency fertilizers in increasing yield and reducing nitrous oxide emissions is highly site specific and interacts strongly with time and place. Further efforts should be made to provide agronomists and growers with guidance to their appropriate use as both agronomic and environmental BMPs.
- Nitrous oxide emissions are not linear with respect to nitrogen rate but increase exponentially once sufficient nitrogen has been applied to maximize yield. Since the economically optimal rate is less than the rate required to maximize yield, a strategy of economic rate optimization will generally improve economic performance and reduce emission intensity. Furthermore, the newer rate research supports the use of economic rate optimization in conjunction with a yield based intensity approach to calculating offsets.
- Fall-application is agronomically inferior to spring in the higher moisture areas of Alberta. Nitrous oxide emissions during spring thaw can be a considerable portion of annual emissions and work nearing completion in Alberta shows that switching from fall to spring application would significantly reduce overall emissions. The inclusion of fall-application as a BMP in the moister ecodistricts at the advanced level of NERP should be reconsidered.
- Split application has potential to help growers improve economic performance and mitigate emissions by avoiding over application. Presently cereal and oilseed growers require specialized equipment to subsoil band in-crop. Existing research suggests that source selection can significantly reduce emissions from surface banding. Allowing in-crop surface banding with specified sources as part of a split-application or on forages should be considered for inclusion as a NERP BMP.
- Researchers often found application of source, rate, time, and place BMPS reduce emissions more than the current reduction modifiers of 15% for basic and 25% for intermediate and advanced NERP. The newer research supports the view that the reduction modifiers are conservative. A reduction modifier of 30-35% is scientifically supportable for the advanced NERP with revisions to the required BMPs.

Overall the research supports the concept that optimization of nitrogen fertilizer use is an important part of a strategy to sustainably intensify production on existing crop land and using a 4R approach can ensure that any increases in nitrous oxide emissions per unit of crop produced are minimized.

Intensification Scenarios GHG Emissions and Economics

Introduction

The purpose of sections 3 and 4 of this report was to examine the issues involved in increasing total production through higher output on existing acres (more intensive production) relative to increasing the acreage of land under production (more extensive production). Central to this discussion was the concept of land sparing, can land be kept out of agriculture use and serve alternate purposes such as delivery of ecological goods and services particularly carbon sequestration that provide environmental and social benefit. The other main theme is the role of nitrogen fertilizer in increasing productivity of Alberta's cropping systems and what effect changes in nitrogen management will have on nitrous oxide emissions.

Section 4 examined the recent literature on nitrous oxide emissions from cropping systems and identified technologies and practices that would help support intensification within a framework of sustainable agriculture with a major focus on the impact of 4R based fertilizer management on GHG emissions.

The purpose of this section is to first examine the question of whether is further intensification possible given Alberta's biophysical resource base. A second purpose is to quantify the discussion on the potential for intensification using economic analysis and projected greenhouse gas emissions. Third, for

comparative purposes, to examine the costs and change in GHG emissions associated with intensification to the costs and GHG emissions associated with the land use changes required to bring more land into annual crop production.

Climate and Intensification

Alberta's climate can be challenging for crop production. The moisture regimes in the major crop production areas range from sub-arid to sub-humid with mean annual precipitation ranging from 300 to 600 mm (Figure 5.1). There are normally significant growing season moisture deficits ranging from 380 mm in the southeast near Medicine Hat to 25 mm in cooler west central areas. Rain fed crop production is significantly water limited within the Prairie ecozone and while water limitations are less in the Boreal Plain region of Northern Alberta, there are significant limitations due to insufficient heat units and shortness of the



Figure 5.1. Alberta's Mean Annual Precipitation

frost-free period (Figure 5.2). Within Alberta's current and projected future climate is there room for further intensification of crop production? If so what are the fertilizer management practices that will allow this intensification?

What are the costs associated with intensification on existing arable land and how do those costs compare to bringing new land into production? Finally, what are the environmental risks associated with intensification on existing acres compared to bringing land currently in alternate uses into annual or perennial crop production?

Within the framework of these questions this report will focus on the role of improved nutrient management in the intensification of crop production. Where intensification is defined as an increase in units of harvestable product per unit of land area or more simply put increased yield. Greenhouse gas emissions are the main environmental risk of interest. Since the GHG of most interest in cropping systems is nitrous oxide, the role of nitrogen management in improving crop yields is of particular interest.



Figure 5.2. Alberta's Frost Free Period

Potential for Intensification in Alberta

The potential for intensification, within the context of this report, is defined as increased production per unit area of land or yield increase. The potential for intensification can be illustrated in several ways. Using canola as an example and 2012 as a base year¹², comparison of average reported yields for Agriculture Financial Service Corporation crop insurance purposes (AFSC 2013) to yields achieved on field scale test plots set up by the Canada Canola Council suggests that even with current genetics and technology, yields might be considerably increased (Figure XX2). The comparisons are only for those risk areas where a significant acreage of canola is grown and field scale trials were successfully taken to yield for the 2012 growing season. Since AFSC yields are reported by variety and acres harvested, the

¹² The year 2012 was chosen as the base year because it is recent enough to reflect current practices and genetics and had closer to normal growing season conditions across the province than either 2011 or 2103 when growing conditions were considerably better than normal. Several factors significantly impacted canola yield in certain areas during the 2012 growing season including high temperatures during canola flowering and aster yellows. None-the-less yields were above the 10-year average in most regions. For greater detail refer to the publication *Yield 2013* on the AFSC website.

reported yields shown are the area weighted means in the risk area. The AFSC yields are compared to the top performing and check varieties in the field scale trial. The field scale trials were replicated and performed using the farmer's equipment and current practices. Canola varieties turn over fairly rapidly in Western Canada, in these trials the checks were widely grown herbicide tolerant hybrids.

The difference between reported yields and the field scale trial yield using the top yielding varieties in each trial is considerable in all risk zones except Zone 22. The increases range for a low of 5 bu/acre in Zone 22 to a high of 31 bu/acre in Zone 5. The latter value is double the reported average for the zone. Complete details of the practices used at the individual trial sites were not readily available; however, field notes taken at each site by either the grower or a local agronomist show generally higher fertilizer rates, above average weed control, as well as the use of fungicides were typical practices.



Figure 5.3 – Canola Yields by AFSC Risk Areas



Comparable regional data based on field scale trials are not readily available for other major crops but looking at small plot variety trials shows a similar trend to canola at the provincial level (Table 5.1). Small plot trials tend to yield 10-15% higher than what is achievable at field scale under similar growing conditions and optimal management. Even with discounting at the 15% level the results achieved are above average AFSC reported yields for 2012. Well above for trials performed at high productivity sites. The comparison with older genetics (varieties that are no longer widely grown but included in the trials for continuity and to enable comparisons across years) that were included in the 2012 cereal variety trials suggests that the potential for improvement is more than just the selection of superior varieties. While these old varieties did not perform as well as best genetics, they still yielded well above the reported averages in all cases. High yield at a specific site is not simply a product of high fertility but depends on complex interaction among genetic, environmental and management factors. However, nutrients must be in adequate supply for superior genetics, optimal growing conditions and management factors to produce high yields. It is safe to say that the higher yields illustrated in the data below were realized under high fertility regimes in particular high nitrogen fertility even if the source of that nitrogen is not known with certainty.

	AFSC Averages ¹		Alberta Variety Trials 2012 Averages			
Crop	10 Year	2012	Overall Check ²	High Test ³		
				Check	Best Genetics	Old Genetics
	bu/acre ⁴					
HRS Wheat	41	46	58	79	90	77
HRW Wheat	44	57	76	118	119	104
Durum	35	48	65	95	98	87
Barley	59	61	100	133	153	130
Field Peas	34	40	175 ⁴			

able 5.1. Cereal Yields at High Te	est Sites Compared to	AFSC Provincial Averages
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

¹ Farmer reported yields for crop insurance purposes.

² Check variety averages over all sites.

³ Averages from trials at high productivity sites.

⁴ Pea trials check variety averaged over multiple years.

Source: Derived from AFSC Yield Alberta 2013, Varieties of Cereals and Oilseed Crops for Alberta (Agdex 100/32 2013), and Varieties of Pulse Crops for Alberta (Agdex 142/32-1 2013).

While the comparisons shown above are not scientifically rigorous in the strictest sense, the differences between yields reported by growers and those achieved under more intensive management regimes in the same region in the same year illustrate the current productivity gap between average and high end growers. The other pertinent observation is that while continued improvements in genetics and technology will open the way for future productivity gains, there is considerable potential for increasing productivity by wider adoption of currently available genetics and practices. The proviso is that there will be situations were inherent productivity issues like soil salinity will severely limit yield regardless of practices used.

Quantification of Nitrous Oxide Emissions

To quantify intensification, scenarios were developed with canola and wheat (the two largest acreage annual crops grown in Alberta) using the 2012 growing season as a model year. The scenarios were developed as a matrix of the two crops in three agroclimatic areas of Alberta using a representative ecodistrict from what are commonly referred to as the Dark Brown, Black and Dark Gray-Gray Peace regions of Alberta.

These scenarios were developed to fall well within the range of yields discussed in the previous section. Namely at the current yield levels as reported by ASFC, an advanced level of intensity representing the yields that could be achieved with optimal management including increased fertility, pest management and superior genetics. Finally at an intermediate level of intensification that would include better management practices than are currently used but not the complete optimization of the advanced scenario.

The yields chosen for canola for the current levels were the yields reported for the AFSC risk area that contained the representative ecodistrict. Since the approximate location of the field scale canola trials was available and could be placed within a specific ecodistrict, the intense scenarios used yields in the high end of the range achieved in the plots using best available genetics. The intermediate scenario yields were the midpoint between the two (Table 5.2).

AFSC Risk Zone	Representative Ecodistrict	Ecodistrict Name	AFSC Reported	Intermediate	Intense ¹
				bushel/acre	
2 ²	791	Vulcan Plain	34	45	56
5	798	Delacour Plain	31	46	62
7	737	Red Deer Plain	34	40	46
11	727	Leduc Plain	37	48	60
12	731	Daysland Plain	38	43	48
13	728	Andrew Plain	33	42	52
19	596	Dunvegan Plain	35	45	55
20	612	Heart River Upland	35	45	65
22	587	Boyer Plain	25	28	30
¹ Vields based on best available genetics from field scale canola trials in 2012					

Table 5.2. Scenarios for Canola Production Economics and GHG Emissions.

best available genetics from field scale canola trials in 2012.

² Scenarios shaded in grey were used in the economic and GHG analysis.

Since no comparable field scale data was available for wheat, the percent improvement of the provincial best genetics yields in the 2012 small plot variety trials relative to the provincial AFSC average reported yield in 2012 was used as a starting point for estimating yields under high intensity. This relative improvement was applied to the AFSC reported yield for the risk zone containing the representative ecodistrict to estimate the upper yield limit. The upper yield limit was discounted by 15% to account for the difference between small plot and field scale yields under optimal management. The midpoint between the low and high yield scenarios was assigned for the intermediate level (Table 5.3).

AFSC Risk Zone	Representative Ecodistrict	Ecodistrict Name	AFSC Reported	Intermediate	Intense ¹
				bushel/acre	
2 ²	791	Vulcan Plain	42	56	70
11	727	Leduc Plain	52	69	87
19	596	Dunvegan Plain	53	71	88
¹ Intense vields based on best available genetics from small plot trials in 2012 adjusted for ecodistrict.					

Table 5.3. Scenarios for HRS Wheat Production Economics and GHG Emissions.

Nitrogen fertilizer requirements to meet the yield goals were estimated using an N balance approach where the nitrogen deficit was calculated as the required crop uptake for canola or wheat minus soil test nitrogen and the expected nitrogen mineralization from soil organic matter. Soil test nitrogen for all cases was assumed to be 40 lbs N/acre to a depth of 24 inches, a fairly typical value found under stubble. Soil organic matter release was based on the estimated nitrogen release equations used in the AFFIRM software using the average soil organic matter values for the appropriate soil zone. The fertilizer nitrogen requirement was the nitrogen deficit adjusted for fertilizer use efficiencies of 50, 60, and 65% respectively for the low, medium and intense scenarios to reflect improvements in nitrogen

Table 5.4. Fertilizer Nutrient Rates Used in the Different Intensification Scenarios¹

management practices (Table 5.4).
-			Canola				Whe	eat	
Ecodistrict	Intensity	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O	S	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O	S
					lbs/a	acre			
	Low	65	20	0	20	44	20	0	0
Vulcan Plain	Med	106	25	0	25	87	25	0	0
751	High	145	25	0	30	115	30	0	0
	Low	50	20	0	20	60	25	0	0
Leduc Plain	Med	93	25	0	25	90	20	0	0
121	High	138	25	0	30	120	35	0	0
Dunvegan	Low	65	20	0	20	60	25	0	10
Plain	Med	101	25	0	25	105	30	0	15
596	High	136	25	0	30	145	35	0	15

¹ N and S assumed to be broadcast prior to seeding in the low intensity scenario and midrow banded at time of seeding in the medium and high scenarios. P was placed close to the seed using an appropriate opener in all scenarios. Sources of N, P, and S were assumed to be urea, monoammonium phosphate, and ammonium sulfate respectively.

Phosphorus, potassium and sulfur rates were assigned based on standard sufficiency recommendation tables based on soil test values and yield goals. The recommendations assumed low soil test values for phosphorus, sufficient values for potassium, and marginal values for sulfur. These assumptions resulted in phosphorus and sulfur but not potassium recommendations for canola. For wheat, phosphorus but not potassium recommendations for canola. For wheat, phosphorus but not potassium recommendations were included in all scenarios but sulfur was included only in the scenarios for the Dunvegan Plain ecodistrict. Most Alberta soils are well supplied with potassium but are deficient in phosphorus. Sulfur levels tend to be highly variable in the landscape, often ranging from less than 5 to over a 1,000 lbs/acre in the same field. Applying sulfur to canola is standard practice regardless of soil test values. The Gray and Dark Gray Luvisolic soils of the Peace River region tend to be lower in available sulfur and application to cereals is a more common practice than elsewhere in the province. Micronutrient deficiency in cereal and oilseeds is relatively rare in Alberta with the exception of copper (Karamanos et al. 2010).

Intensification goes beyond increased fertilizer rates and generally includes practices such as increased seeding rates and improved crop protection. These practices tend to work together with increased fertility and superior genetics to increase yield. The assumption was that all crops were grown in a no-till system, as direct seeding into no-till is common practice in Alberta and typically gives superior economic and environmental performance than conventional tillage systems. The general approach used in creating these scenarios was to move to higher seeding rates for wheat, more effective weed control, and improved disease management through the use of fungicides as the scenarios moved from low to medium to high. The model for the medium and high canola intensity scenarios were based on the *Canola Growers Manual* (Canada Canola Council, 2014) and discussions with agronomists working

directly with intensive growers. The wheat medium and high intensity scenarios were modeled after the agronomic practices used in the currently underway *Wheat 150 Project* (Dr. Sheri Strydhorst pers. comm.) and in discussions with agronomists working with intensive growers. The scenarios are fully described in Appendix A.

Nitrous Oxide Emissions and Cropping Intensity

Estimation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Nitrous oxide emissions for the different scenarios were estimated using the equations from the NERP, which are derived from the National Inventory Methodology developed by Rochette et al. (2008a). For the medium and high scenarios, the assigned practices meet the threshold for the basic and advanced NERP respectively so the appropriate reduction modifiers of 15 and 25% were applied to reflect the impact of an integrated 4R Plan on emissions. NERP only accounts for GHG emissions associated with infield nutrient management practices that affect nitrogen and ignores baseline emissions from soil and field operations that occur under both baseline and project conditions. Since one of our objectives was to compare the relative difference in GHGs required to grow equivalent amounts of grain extensively versus intensively a more complete GHG lifecycle was constructed that included field operations and the upstream GHGs associated with manufacture of fertilizer and other agricultural chemicals. The emission factors used for fuel, fertilizer, and pesticides used in the different scenarios were obtained from various sources (Table 5.5). Downstream emissions associated with grain transport off farm was not included on

Table	5.5.	Emission	Factors	Used in	Calculating	GHG	Emissions	for	Intensity	/ Scena	rios
TUDIC	5.5.	Ennosion	i accors	0.500 111	Carcalating	0110	Ennissions	101	meensie	Jeena	1105

Inputs Emission Factor ¹ Units	Souce
-------------------------------------------	-------

the basis that the comparisons among systems were on equal amounts of grain produced and emissions from transporting a tonne of grain grown extensively would be no different than intensively.

Seed	0.734	kg CO ₂ e/kg	Biograce
Urea	3.31	kg CO ₂ e/kg N	Ecoinvent
Ammonium Sulphate	2.87	kg CO₂e/kg N	GHGenius
Monoammonium Phosphate	1.29	kg CO ₂ e/kg P ₂ O ₅	Ecoinvent
Pesticides	10.16	kg CO₂e/kg a.i.	Ecoinvent
Diesel	2.86	kg CO ₂ e/L	NERP Appendix G
1			

¹ For emission factors used in calculation of nitrous oxide emissions from added fertilizer refer to the Quantification Protocol for Agriculture Nitrous Oxide Emission Reductions (NERP), 2010.

The assumption was that all crops were grown in a zero tillage direct seeding system and were actively sequestering carbon. The carbon sequestration coefficients, with adjustment for yield differences to reflect higher residue inputs, were approximated from values for dry prairie (ED 791) and moist parkland (ED 727 and ED 596) developed for the Canadian agriculture national inventory method by VandenBygaart et al. (2008) and are similar to values from Campbell et al. (2005). The carbon sequestration values were subtracted from the gross emissions to calculate the final net emissions.

The calculation of nitrous oxide based carbon credits followed the NERP methodology. Since medium and high intensity scenarios involved extra trips of the sprayer across the field relative to the low or baseline scenario, the carbon dioxide equivalents associated with estimated fuel consumption by the additional sprayer operations were subtracted from the initial estimate of credits. Carbon credits per Alberta's Conversation Cropping Protocol (CPP) were not calculated but would be similar in magnitude to the sequestration values at low intensity in each ecodistrict. All scenarios would meet the no-till criteria for CPP, where as only the medium and high scenarios include the practices required for NERP eligibility. The CPP and NERP protocols do not overlap and can be applied to the same field provided the BMP criteria for each is met.

Offset Credits Generated under NERP through Adoption of 4R.

Growers currently using or willing to adopt an integrated set of right source @ right rate, time, and place BMPs as described in the protocol are eligible for NERP offset credits. The 4R practices are incorporated within a 4R Nutrient Stewardship Plan. The medium and high intensity scenarios in this study assumed nutrient management practices that would make them eligible in Alberta for generation of carbon offset credits under NERP. These BMPs included ammonium based N sources, rates based on soil testing and nitrogen balance (variable rate for the high intensity scenario), spring application timing, and narrow band placement (see Table 4.1). Under NERP the plan is developed for the farm enterprise with the involvement of an Accredited Professional Advisor (APA) with credentials such as Certified Crop Advisor (CCA) and/or Professional Agrologist (PAg) and certification in NERP through training provided by the Canadian Fertilizer Institute. Offset programs must be additional or beyond business as usual to be recognized internationally. The additionality requirement is met in NERP through creation and implementation of the 4R Plan. NERP is not retroactively applicable. Sign-off of the 4R Plan by the APA initiates eligibility for the current cropping year and a project can run for up to eight years. At present, offsets generated in Alberta under NERP can be traded in the regulated Alberta market.

The NERP approach calculates offsets on a yield-basis rather than an area-basis using the difference between intensity of emissions (kg N₂O/kg crop) in a baseline and a project condition. As explained earlier, the project emissions are corrected for the emission reducing effect of 4R by applying a reduction modifier (RM) prior to subtraction of the baseline. Once the difference is converted to carbon dioxide equivalents and converted from an intensity to a mass basis by multiplying by the total kilograms of crop produced, the value is corrected for any additional emissions from field operations in the project that were not part of the baseline operations.

$$kg CO_2 e_{credit} = \left(\frac{kg N_2 O_{baseline}}{kg \, crop_{baseline}} \quad \left(\frac{kg N_2 O_{project}}{kg \, crop_{project}} \times RM\right)\right) \times \frac{310 \, kg \, CO_2 e}{kg \, N_2 O} \times kg \, crop_{project} \qquad CO_2 e_{operations}$$

The NERP credits and their nominal value over the life of an 8-year project at different levels of carbon are shown in Table 5.6. For the purposes of this table, we used a dynamic baseline approach that uses current year data for both baseline and project. This provides a conservative estimate of credits for the scenarios. The dynamic baseline approach is currently being considered as a flexibility mechanism in NERP. Using this approach would allow growers with insufficient records to develop a baseline using the 3-year historic approach to participate in offset projects while they collected baseline data.

			Eco	district and Pr	oduction Inter	nsity		
		7	91	72	27	59	96	
	Units ²	Medium	High	Medium	High	Medium	High	
Offset Credits	tCO₂e/ha/vr	0.109	0.242	0.171	0.389	0.165	0.364	
		(0.044)	(0.098)	(0.069)	(0.157)	(0.067)	(0.147)	
Credit Dollars @ \$15 Cap &	\$ /ha/ur @ \$10.00+CO a	1 00 (0 44)	2 42 (0.09)	1 71 (0 60)	2 90 (1 57)	1 65 (0 67)	2 = 1 (1 , 17)	
\$10.00 to Farmer ³	\$/11d/y1 @ \$10.00 tCO ₂ e	1.09 (0.44)	2.42 (0.98)	1.71 (0.09)	5.69 (1.57)	1.05 (0.07)	5.54 (1.47)	
Credit Dollars @ \$25 Cap &	¢/h=/@ \$10.05 +00 -	1.02 (0.74)	4.04 (4.62)	2.05 (4.45)	C 40 (2 C2)	2 74 (4 44)	(0,0,7,(2,4,6))	
\$16.65 to Farmer	\$/na/yr @ \$16.65 tCO ₂ e	1.82 (0.74)	4.04 (1.63)	2.85 (1.15)	6.48 (2.62)	2.74 (1.11)	6.07 (2.46)	
Credit Dollars @ \$35 Cap &	6/ha/um@622.20+00.a	2 5 2 (1 0 2)	F (2 (2 28)	2.07(1.61)	0.02 (2.65)		9 45 (2 42)	
\$23.30 to Farmer	\$/na/yr @ \$23.30 tCO ₂ e	2.53 (1.02)	5.62 (2.28)	3.97 (1.61)	9.02 (3.65)	3.82 (1.55)	8.45 (3.42)	
	Offset Credit	Credit Revenue on 1000 ha ($pprox$ 2500 acre) Farm over an 8 Year Project Life 4						
Credit Dollars @ \$15 Cap &	ද්	60 770	\$10,202	\$12,704	¢21 116	\$12.169	¢20,142	
\$10.00 to Farmer	5 @ \$10.00 iCO ₂ e	<i>३०,12</i> ०	\$19,595	\$15,704	ŞS1,110	\$15,100	ŞZ9,145	
Credit Dollars @ \$15 Cap &	¢ @ \$10 05 +00 a	¢14 522	¢22.200	¢22.017	¢51.000	621 02F	Ć40 522	
\$10.00 to Farmer	ş @ ξ10.05 ιCO26	Ş14,SSS	Ş3Z,Z8Y	۶۷۷,۵۱/	\$01,808	ŞZT'AZQ	Ş4ŏ,⊃∠3	
Credit Dollars @ \$15 Cap &	\$ @ \$22.20 +CO o	\$20.250	¢11 001	\$21 702	¢72 100	\$20 EE0	\$67.612	
\$10.00 to Farmer	ş @ \$23.30 ιCO2e	Ş∠U,∠SU	Ş44,991	Ş2T'/A2	\$72,189	Ş30,SSU	\$07,01Z	

Table 5.6. Nominal Value of Carbon Offset Credits Generated through NERP for the Medium and High Intensity Scenarios.¹

¹ Values shown are average of canola and wheat.

² Values shown in brackets, for example (0.05) are tonnes or dollars per acre per year.

³Cap is the price per tonne final emitters can pay to the Emissions Management Fund as an alternative to meeting their targets through operational

reductions or offset purchases.

⁴ Under the Alberta regulations offset projects can initially run for 8 years.

At present, the price per tonne for offsets in Alberta is effectively capped by the regulator allowing large final emitters that cannot meet their reduction targets to pay \$15/tonne into the Emissions Management Fund.¹³ Since fund payment is a no risk solution to regulatory compliance, offsets are generally discounted relative to the fund cost. In the calculation shown, we used a price point of \$10.00/tonne to the farmer as a starting point.¹⁴ The price to farmers was then increased using the ratio of 0.67:1 as the fund price was raised from \$15 to \$25 to \$35/tonne.

The estimates show that at medium and high intensities the offsets fall in the range of 0.1 to 0.5 tCO₂e/ha/yr and are higher in the ecodistrict representing the more productive black soil zone (727) than in the drier dark brown soil zone (791) or cooler dark gray Peace (596). At the current cap of \$15, revenue per acre generated through NERP would likely cover the farms marginal cost of participation in a project such as 4R Plan development and sign-off and improved record keeping but not the cost of agronomic practice changes. The real value of implementing the 4R Plan as part of NERP would come through improved agronomic and economic efficiency of fertilizer, other inputs, equipment, and land. The economic analysis of intensification in this report approximates what those gains might be as a producer moved from low to medium to high intensity production. The higher level of accuracy for farm metrics such as yield required by NERP as well as the high standard for farm records imposed by the verification making.

Since the offsets and revenue shown were calculated using the conservative dynamic baseline approach, the question arises how much higher could they be if the 3-year historic baseline approach were used. The answer depends on the level of improvement in nitrogen use efficiency and the consequent improvement in emission intensity (kg N₂O/kg crop) from baseline to project. Without improvement in yield per unit of nitrogen applied the difference between the dynamic and 3-year historic baseline approached would be minimal. With improvement it would increase substantially. The value would be unique for each crop on each farm but can be explored using our scenarios. To illustrate, the value of offset credits over the life of an 8-year project were calculated with nitrogen rates held constant and baseline yields set at 100, 95, and 90% of project yield in the medium and high scenarios (Figure 5.4).

The calculated yield increases baseline to project for the 95 and 90% baselines are 5.3 and 11.1% respectively. The estimated increase in offset credit revenue with these yield improvements ranged from a low of \$2,173 to a high of \$10,671. The revenue increases were similar in Ecodistricts 727 and 596 and on average 78% higher than the matching case in Ecodistrict 791. Whether the yield increase took place at time of project implementation or was the average yield increase achieved over the life of

¹³ The Emissions Management Fund is administered by the Climate Change and Emissions Management Corporation at arms length from the Alberta Government. Funds collected under the regulations are reinvested in research and development projects aimed at developing new technologies for reducing GHG emissions.

¹⁴ Offset credits are aggregated in large projects that might involve dozens of farms and tens of thousands of hectares before sale to a final emitter. The prices contracted for offsets between farmer and aggregator and aggregator and final emitter are not regulated or reported. Prices to farmers for conservation tillage credits within the same market appear to have ranged from \$6 to \$12/tonne over the past 5 years.

the project through annual incremental improvements is immaterial to the nominal revenue values.¹⁵ Although, the nominal value is not affected, the future value would increase substantially if the increase occurred at time of project implementation rather than gradually.



Production Intensity and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Estimated greenhouse gas emissions per hectare increased markedly with cropping intensity (Figure 5.5). Proportionally the increases range from 29 to 53% for medium intensity relative to low and from 47 to 83% for high intensity relative to low. The largest source of these increases was nitrous oxide released from the cropping system attributable to incremental fertilizer nitrogen additions followed by the upstream GHGs from the manufacture of the additional fertilizer (Appendix Table A2). The contributions from additional use of chemicals and fuel in the medium and high scenarios relative to the baseline were comparatively minor. Total emissions differed by ecodistrict for the same crop at the same level of intensity. These are mainly attributable to the differences in nitrogen rate and the emission factors used to calculate direct and indirect emissions of nitrous oxide.

¹⁵ To be clear a 10% average yield increase over an 8-year project would require annual yield increase of approximately 2.1% per year and the yield at project end would be approximately 18% higher than baseline.



Comparison among cropping intensities based on yield-based emissions expressed per kilogram of crop produced shows a completely different trend (Figure 5.6). Change in yield-based emissions relative to the baseline scenario varies from a reduction of -11% to an increase of 13%. The dampening of yield-based emissions with increased cropping intensity is in part due to the reduction modifiers used in calculating nitrous oxide emissions for the medium and high scenarios and in part to the increased yield projected for higher intensity. The reduction modifiers incorporate the effect of improved nitrogen management through implementation of 4R, while the increased yields reflect the higher nitrogen rates plus the assumed effects of better weed and disease management.

Since it takes less area to grow equivalent amounts of crop, when emissions are expressed on the basis of the area required to grow the same quantity of canola or wheat produced under the low scenario (equivalent area basis), there is little difference in emissions with intensity or among crops (Figure 5.7). The equivalent areas varied slightly by ecodistrict and crop but averaged out to 0.76 ha to grow the equivalent amount of crop at medium intensity and 0.61 ha under high intensity.

Field operations; such as seeding, in-crop weed control, swathing, and combining; are essentially similar regardless of intensity. It may take more fuel to combine a higher yielding crop but the incremental GHG emissions are small relative to the total emissions for the system and more than compensated for by the increased yield when emissions are expressed per unit of crop produced. Intensity does add additional operations, in our scenarios fungicide and plant growth regulators, but these operations generally involve relatively low emission equipment like





high clearance sprayers. Approaches like enhanced crop protection that maintain yield close to its full potential with only minor concomitant increases in GHGs tend to minimize yield-based emissions in intensive management systems. To be fully effective economically and minimally damaging to the environment, crop protection practices need be incorporated within integrated pest management systems (IPM). There is considerable opportunity for synergy between 4R and IPM in developing cropping systems with high yield and low GHG emission intensity.

While some of the leveling out among scenarios comes from equipment travelling over less hectares to produce the same amount of crop, it is the nitrogen applications that have the major dampening effect on GHG emissions. Using wheat for an example, the average nitrogen rate at low, medium and high scenarios were 61, 105, and 142 kg N/ha. When adjusted on an equivalent area basis quantity of nitrogen applied remains at 61 for the low intensity scenario but drops to 79 and 85 on average under the medium and high intensity scenarios. There is a decrease in the nitrous oxide quantities proportional to the reduction in the land footprint when equivalent areas are compared.

The emission values obtained are a result of the assumptions, crop input and yield values used in setting up the scenarios, consequently different assumptions or field derived input data for nitrogen use and yield would result in somewhat different results. One of our assumptions was to use yields associated with normal moisture conditions. Below normal moisture would have a significant depressing effect on yield particularly in the dark brown soil zone containing Ecodistrict 791 where the moisture deficit tends to be greater. Similarly above normal moisture would tend to increase yields more in the dark brown soil zone than in black or dark gray zones containing ecodistricts 727 and 596. Available moisture poses a significant limit to intensification and inter-year variability likely imposes greater risk in drier areas.

The values obtained are estimates of the marginal change in emissions associated with intensifying production. The scenarios while synthetic rather than based on a comprehensive experimentally derived data set are reasonable and the outcomes illustrative of likely trends in field situations. In that sense, the increased emission per hectare with increased intensity comes as no surprise. Perhaps more surprising was the much smaller differences among cropping intensities when the comparison is made on a GHG emissions per kilogram crop produced or equivalent area basis. That the intensity of emissions did not necessarily increase with higher levels of inputs is reflective of the field research on the mitigating effects of BMPs reviewed in Section 4. This suggest that when intelligently pursued intensification of cropping systems can be relatively neutral or beneficial in terms of GHGs and the total food supply. This will become particularly apparent in the next section when the GHG footprint of the alternative to intensification, bringing more land into cereal and oilseed production, is examined.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Associated with Land Use Change

Globally demand for crop products is rising and will continue to rise in response to population growth. Increased production to meet this demand has the potential to place considerable additional strain on the environment. Increased primary production is not the entire solution to rising demand. For example, Foley (2014) recently suggested five steps necessary to increase food supply while reducing environmental impacts. They included no further expansion of agriculture land, shifting diets away from animal protein, reducing food waste, more efficient resource use, and intensification. Although a comprehensive approach can reduce, it cannot eliminate the need for increasing primary production. Increasing total crop production will be a major factor in meeting human food requirements.

The alternative to increasing total crop production through intensification is by increasing the area under cultivation. Whether considered locally or globally, extending the cropping area brings land into production that may be better suited for other uses and typically reduces or eliminates the ecological goods and services provided by the converted land. These services include sequestration and storage of atmospheric carbon through the uptake of carbon dioxide. Conversion of natural areas or perennial crops to arable agriculture can result in significant release of carbon dioxide and other GHGs and turns lands that are currently sinks into sources.

In the scenarios used in this study, up to one third more land area was required to grow an equivalent amount of canola or wheat under low compared to medium intensity systems and up to two thirds more

Crop	Ecodistrict	Low/Low	Low/Medium	Medium/High	Low/High
			hecto	ares	
Canola	791	1	1.32	1.24	1.65
	727	1	1.32	1.25	1.62
	596	1	1.32	1.22	1.57
Wheat	791	1	1.33	1.25	1.67
	727	1	1.33	1.26	1.67
	596	1	1.33	1.24	1.67

Table 5.7. Area Required to Grow Equivalent Amount of Grain at Different Intensities

under low compared to high intensity (Table 5.7). In Alberta, there are two sources of additional land for annual crop production. One is conversion of seeded forage land to annual cropping either through reducing the perennial component of crop rotations or changing land that was used exclusively for perennial crop production to exclusively annuals. The other is the conversion of native grassland, forest or wetland to annual crops through cultivation, clearing, and drainage. Development of any new annual or cropland through conversion of natural lands can result in significant transitional releases of GHGs. The objective of this section is to examine the relative GHG emissions when natural land is converted relative to intensification on existing cropland.

Conversion of natural lands for arable agriculture in Alberta initially involved plowing under native grasslands in the prairie ecozone and clearing of aspen parkland and boreal forest in the boreal plain ecozone. Subsequent conversions have included draining wetlands and removal of woodlots considered obstacles within existing arable parcels. High grain and oilseed prices relative to the value of forage for cattle has driven more recent trends in conversion of hay and pasture lands for annual crops. These

practices continue as well as the clearing of aspen parkland and boreal forests for agriculture in Northern Alberta.

Land use change from native vegetation to annual crops can result in large losses of soil organic carbon. Guo and Gifford (2002) performed a meta analysis of research projects where changes in soil carbon stocks were measured with land use changes. They found that on average soil carbon stocks declined with conversion of native forest or grassland to crop by 42% and 59% respectively. Much of the soil carbon loss is through increase carbon respiration and release as carbon dioxide although erosion can also be a significant factor. Forested land, whether in plantation or natural forest, tend to be net sinks of GHGs (Goodale et al. 2002; Luyssaert et al. 2008). For example, Robertson et al. (2000) reported that hybrid poplar plantations in Michigan had net negative emissions of 1050 kg CO₂e/ha/yr.

Stinson et al. (2011) estimated that forests in the semiarid prairie, subhumid prairies, and boreal plain contain approximately 150, 200, and 220 Mg C/ha with about half of the total carbon above ground. While clearing practices vary in Alberta, bulldozing trees and brush into windrows and burning the windrows is still common. Even with incomplete combustion (charcoal formation can be high as 40% of the original carbon), the oxidation of half of the above ground carbon to carbon dioxide would likely result in GHG emissions in excess of 135 tCO2e/ha for all forest types. Harvesting the useable above ground biomass, depending on end use of the harvested biomass, would change the net GHG balance but still result in substantial direct emissions if the residual slash were then burned on-site. Putting the above ground debris or slash following forest harvest at 25-50% of total pre-harvest material, burning the slash on-site would results in approximate direct emissions in the range of 20 to 60 tCO₂e/ha depending on the initial density of carbon present above ground. These values are one to two orders of magnitude higher than the values estimated for high intensity cropping systems in the last section but are still much lower than those used in Canada's national GHG inventory estimates that set forest conversions release at approximately 360 tCO2e/ha. However, that figure accounts for all conversions not just conversions to agriculture (National Inventory Report 1990–2011: Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks in Canada, Part 1).

Conversion of wetlands to croplands also results in change from a net sink to a net source as the soil carbon that has accumulated during development is exposed to air and mineralized. Euliss et al. (2006) estimated that wetland conversion in the prairie pothole region of North America has resulted in an average carbon loss of 10.1 Mg C/ha on over 16 million hectares of wetlands. This would be equivalent to as much as 37.1 tCO₂e/ha if the average carbon loss was converted to carbon dioxide. Soil carbon losses through wetland conversion approaching 90 Mg C/ha were estimated by Bedard-Haaughn et al. (2006) and Badiou et al. (2011). Losses of this magnitude through oxidation to carbon dioxide once the soil carbon is exposed to air would result in emissions in excess of 300 tCO₂e/ha. While wetlands can sequester carbon they also release nitrous oxide and methane, so net effect on GHGs for any individual wetland can be variable depending on water chemistry, pond hydrology, landscape position, climate, and vegetation (Philips and Berri, 2008; Pennock et al. 2010). Bridgham et al. (2006) in reviewing the literature on wetland emissions concluded that although uncertainty was high, freshwater mineral soil wetlands (the type commonly found on agricultural lands in Alberta) were likely net sinks for GHGs. Other author's have been more positive in their assessment of wetland maintenance and/or restoration

as a GHG mitigation strategy. Badiou et al. (2011) estimated that restored wetlands in the prairie pothole region of Canada could sequester carbon at a rate of approximately 9.9 tCO₂e/ha/yr with a net sink effect of 3.25 tCO₂e/ha/yr after accounting for methane and nitrous oxide emissions. Wetlands in the prairie pothole region also provide many other ecological goods and services such as water filtering, flood mitigation, biodiversity, wildlife habitat, and recreation (Gleason et al. 2008).

The conversion of tame hay or pasture or grassland into cropland under conventional tillage results in soil carbon loss and increased carbon dioxide emissions. Forage production tends to sequester up to twice as much carbon as no till (see Hutchinson et al. 2007 for a review). Whether the effect is one of reduced sequestration rather than net loss of soil carbon when a forage system is converted to zero tillage, conversion results in higher emissions. Gelfand et al. (2011) estimated the GHG balance immediately following conversion of Conservation Reserve Grasslands in the states to corn or cornsoybean rotations for bioenergy production. The carbon debt from conversion, which included the net reduction in sequestration potential, was estimated at $68 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}/\text{ha}$ for conversion to no-till corn and 222 tCO₂e/ha for conversion to conventional tillage corn. The payback period representing the time required for net credits for biofuel displacement of fossil fuel from the corn equaled the GHGs released on conversion was 40 years for no-till and 123 years for conventional till.

While conversion to annual crop will reduce net sequestration, it should be remembered that forage crops and grasslands are primarily used for ruminant livestock production. Beef production systems in Alberta, have net GHG emissions in the range of 13 kg CO_2e/kg beef on a live weight basis (Beauchemin et al. 2010). In contrast, a recent life cycle analysis found that GHG emissions for Alberta produced canola varied from 0.259 to 0.409 kg CO_2e/kg canola (Canola Council of Canada, 2014). Forage land is an important sink for atmospheric carbon but the life cycle of the production system needs to be considered when deciding if maintaining forage land is a GHG mitigation strategy.

Land conversion of grasslands, forests, and wetlands to annual crops results in considerable short-term release of GHGs through carbon oxidation associated with change processes. On an on-going basis what was once a sink for GHGs becomes a source. These short-term emissions due to land conversions tip the balance strongly in favor of intensification as a strategy for maintaining low emissions per kilogram of crop produced. To illustrate, GHG emissions per kilogram of crop produced at low and high intensity cropping scenarios are shown with the GHGs from various conversion included (Figure 5.8). The quantity of additional direct emissions was set at 37, 135, and 20 tCO₂e/ha for wetland conversion, forest conversion with on site disposal of the trees, and forest conversion with tree harvest with low residuals to be disposed of on site respectively. The additional GHG emissions from conversion were averaged over 10 years of subsequent canola and wheat production from our low and high intensity scenarios.



These projections used fairly modest values for the GHG release with land conversion and don't take into account the loss of ongoing sequestration if the land was left in its natural state. Several trends stand out. First, the order of magnitude difference between projected emission intensity on existing compared to converted land. Second, low intensity production on converted land results in a higher intensity per kilogram of crop produced than high intensity production. This latter observation points out that converting land for low intensity cropping is an extremely poor strategy in relation to minimizing GHGs per unit of crop produced.

Observations on Greenhouse Gas Findings

In our scenarios, GHG emissions per hectare increased substantially with cropping intensity while emissions per kilogram crop produced were similar at the different levels. The substantial dampening of the increase in the medium and high intensity scenarios resulted from application of the reduction modifiers from NERP. These modifiers are conservative estimates of the impact of integrated 4R practices on GHG emissions.

Use of other agronomic practices that increase or preserve yield; such as superior genetics, increased seeding rates, improved weed control, and disease management with fungicide; add little to GHG emissions per hectare while substantially dropping the GHG emissions per kilogram of crop. There are issues with agriculture chemical use that must be addressed going forward but their impact on GHG intensity is typically positive.

Reducing inputs, in particular nitrogen fertilizer, can reduce emissions per hectare. However, if the end result is simply extension of acreage, there has been little or no gain in terms of emissions per unit of production. Extension of area will invariably involve conversion of lands from grassland, wetland or forest, which will result in a substantial release of GHGs and the loss of net sequestration capability as

well as the other ecological goods and services provided by natural ecosystems. Whether the extension occurs in Canada or elsewhere is immaterial. An intelligent approach to intensifying crop-based agriculture needs to be enacted globally using all the tools in the toolbox. The 4R approach can provide the global framework for nutrient stewardship that increases productivity per hectare while minimizing GHG emission intensity per kg of crop produced.

Economics of Intensification in Alberta

As identified above, the intensification scenarios broadly involve higher rates of input use (fertilizer, seed, crop protection products) as well as additional passes over the field. On this basis, intensification creates additional costs. At the same time, intensification can significantly increase yields and thus revenues. The purpose of this section is to provide an evaluation of these costs and benefits from intensification.

The procedure for the economic analysis follows that employed in Mussell and Heaney (2013). The per acre agronomic costs (inputs and application) are calculated under the baseline and intensification scenarios. These are then combined with revenues under the alternative scenarios to give a per acre margin (revenue less agronomic costs). This approach focuses on the differences between the scenarios, rather than on total of production costs, including elements that do not vary according to intensification scenarios, such as machinery depreciation and interest expenses.

Data

In order to estimate costs and returns under the baseline and intensification scenarios, data on fertilizer prices were obtained from Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development (AFRD)¹⁶. These were the following:

- Mono-Ammonium Phosphate (11-52-0), 2010-2013 monthly average price (\$715/tonne),
- Urea (46-0-0), 2010-2013 monthly average price (\$591/tonne).

Other values were assumed based on industry information:

• Ammonium Sulphate (21-0-0-24) priced at \$425/tonne,

Data on custom rates were also obtained from AAFRD¹⁷. These were generally presented as a range, and the approximate midpoint of the range was used.

- Double depth soil testing, complete nutrient analysis \$160/field (interpreted as \$1/acre)
- Spraying costs at about \$7/acre (observed range was \$3.25/acre to over \$9/acre)

Advanced soil testing with VRT map building was assumed at \$8/acre based on industry information.

¹⁶ <u>http://www.agric.gov.ab.ca/app21/rtw/surveyprices/graph.jsp?groupId=5&dataId=39</u>

¹⁷ http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/inf14269

Estimated costs of pesticide products used in the baseline and intensification scenarios were obtained from industry sources. These are presented in Table 5.8 below. Where possible, product prices for individual products were obtained; in other cases the combined product costs of common tank mixes were estimated. The costs in the table do not include application costs.

Chemical Name	Trade Name	Estimated Product Cost/litre	Product Cost/acre at recommended rate
Glyphosate 360 g/L	Roundup	5.4	2.7*
Glufosinate ammonium	Liberty	7.7	8.47
Glyphosate+ Carfentrazone	CleanStart	14.7	7.35
Clethodim + Penflufen + Trifloxystrobin+ Metalaxyl	Prosper EverGol	158	9.95
Prothioconazole	Proline	162	22.71
Clethodim	Centurion	158	3.95
Florasulam	PrePass	13.04	6.6
2,4-D		12.5	3.75
Pyraclostrobin	Headline	108	25.93
tebuconazole	Prosaro	55.78	17.85
ethephon	Etherel	20	8
Clodinafop+propargyl,Bromoxynil +	Horizon + Buctril M		
MCPA tank mix	tank mix		15
thiencarbazone-			
methy+Pyrasulfotole+Bromoxynil	Velocity M3		27
Florasulam + clopyralid+ MCPA,	Spectrum + Axial tank		
Pinoxaden tank mix	mix		35

Table 5.8 Crop Protection Product Cost/Pricing Assumptions

* .5 L/acre rate

Alberta prices for canola and wheat were obtained from AAFRD¹⁸. For canola, an average of Alberta daily price quotes delivered to crusher from January 2012 to late March 2014 were used to develop a price reference. For canola, the price quote delivered to a crusher was used. Alberta-basis wheat price quotes were not available for the same period. Instead, #1/2 Canada Western Red Spring Wheat quotes were obtained from AAFRD for the first week of the months of March 2013, June 2013, September 2013, December 2013 and March 2014 and averaged.

Results

To evaluate the intensification scenarios relative to the baseline, the agronomic costs associated with the alternative fertilizer management scenarios were computed and compared with the associated

¹⁸ <u>http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/sdd6248</u>

revenue, given the specifics of the scenarios described above and presented in Appendix A. Based upon this, the margin over fertility cost (fertilizer ingredients plus application/agronomy cost) was calculated.

To do so the basic nutrient requirements were obtained from the scenarios and the fertilizer costs were calculated by balancing the requirements for P_2O_5 with mono-ammonium phosphate (MAP) and requirements for sulfur with Ammonium Sulfate. The nitrogen content of these ingredients were credited against nitrogen requirements, and the remaining residual nitrogen requirements provided by urea. Based on the per acre requirements of these fertilizer ingredients and the prices of fertilizer ingredients, the implied costs of fertilizer per acre were calculated. This is illustrated below in Table 5.9. Under the "Low" intensity or baseline scenario, fertilizer costs range between about \$45 and \$54/acre for canola, and between \$39 and \$50/acre for wheat. Under increased intensification, nitrogen use rates increase up to about 145 lbs/acre for both canola and wheat, increasing fertilizer costs up to over \$100/acre.

				11-52-0 amount	21-0-0-24 amount	Actual N amount	11-52-0 Cost	21-0-0-24 cost	46-0-0 Cost	Total Fertilizer
				(Lbs/acre)	(lbs/acre)	(lbs/acre)	(\$/acre)	(\$/acre)	(\$/acre)	Ingredient Cost (\$/acre)
						Car	nola			
	5	Ξ	Low	38	83	65	12.32	16.00	25.30	53.62
Risk	ea	50	/ledium	48	104	106	15.57	20.05	46.00	81.61
	Ar	Ξ	High	48	125	145	15.57	24.09	66.17	105.83
	÷	5	Low	38	83	50	12.32	16.00	16.55	44.88
lisk	ea 1	21	/ledium	48	104	93	15.57	20.05	38.42	74.03
	Are	Ξ	High	48	125	138	15.57	24.09	62.09	101.75
	6	9	Low	38	83	65	12.32	16.00	25.30	53.62
Risk	ea 1	50	/ledium	48	104	101	15.57	20.05	43.08	78.69
Ľ.	Ar		High	48	125	136	15.57	24.09	60.92	100.58
						Wh	eat			
	5	1	Low	38	41.67	44.00	12.47	8.03	18.09	38.59
Risk	ea.	50	/ledium	48	62.50	87.00	15.59	12.05	39.99	67.63
	Ar	Ξ	High	58	62.50	115.00	18.71	12.05	55.71	86.46
	4	5	Low	48	41.67	60.00	15.59	8.03	26.80	50.43
Risk	ea 1	Er	/ledium	38	62.50	90.00	12.47	12.05	42.36	66.88
	Are	E	High	67	62.50	120.00	21.83	12.05	58.00	91.88
	6	9	Low	48	41.67	60	15.59	8.03	26.80	50.43
Risk	ea 1	220	/ledium	38	62.50	105	12.47	12.05	51.11	75.63
	Are		High	67	62.50	145	21.83	12.05	72.58	106.46

Table 5.9 Fertilizer Use and Cost by Region, Scenario

The above costs are exclusive of application, soil testing/analysis, and variable rate technology. Under the baseline or low scenario, nitrogen application is broadcast with phosphorus applied at seeding; in the intensification scenarios all fertilizer application is banded at seeding. Soil testing occurs under both of the intensification scenarios. Variable rate technology is applied under the high intensity scenario. In order to accommodate this increased fertilizer use and intensity of yields, crop management and protection must adjust. A summary of seed and crop protection adjustments and associated costs is presented in Table 5.10 below. The table shows that seed and crop protection costs are initially (Low intensity scenario) about \$87/acre for canola and about \$58/acre for wheat. Under more intensive management these increase to about \$131/acre for canola and up to \$170/acre for wheat.

The output of the above is summarized in terms of total costs, yield, price, revenue, and margin over agronomic costs. This is illustrated in Table 5.11 below. The table shows that total agronomic costs increase significantly with the intensification scenarios. Moving from the baseline (low) scenario, total costs increase in the range of 50% for both canola and wheat under the medium intensification scenario, and the costs for wheat under the high intensification scenario more than double. However, revenues under increased yields with intensification more than offset the increases in costs. Across the board, the highest intensity scenarios gave the highest returns per acre. This was especially the case for canola, but was also the case for wheat.

Sensitivity to Nitrogen Costs

In the spring of 2014, nitrogen fertilizer prices in Alberta have increased. For example, according to Alberta Agriculture urea prices have increased to around \$700/tonne, and industry sources suggest ammonium sulphate prices have increased to around \$530/tonne. This increases have occurred without a concomitant increase in canola or wheat prices.

To test the impact of higher nitrogen fertilizer prices, the fertilizer pricing assumptions described above were altered to increase urea pricing up to \$700/tonne and ammonium sulphate prices up to \$530/tonne. All other parameters were held constant.

The results are summarized in Table 5.12 below. Not surprisingly, agronomy costs increase and margins over agronomy costs decrease under higher nitrogen fertilizer prices. The effect on costs per acre is greatest for the high intensity scenarios, since these employ the highest levels of nitrogen fertilizer use. Thus, the higher fertilizer prices decrease the profitability advantage of the intensification scenarios. However, these fertilizer price increases do not influence the profitability rankings of the intensification scenarios; the high intensity scenarios are still the most profitable, followed by the medium intensity scenario, followed by the low (baseline) scenario.

		Seed Variety	Seed Rate Ibs/ac	Seed Treatment	Seed and seed treatment Cost \$/acre	Pre-plant burndown	Pre-plant burndown cost \$/acre	ln-crop Herbicide	In-crop Herbicide cost \$/acre	Growth regulator	Fungicide App 1	Fungicide App 2	Fungicide/Growth Regulate cost \$/acre	r Post crop burndown	Burndown cost \$/acre	Total Seed and Crop Protection
									Canola							
'n ×	5 LO	L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	Glyphosate .5L/acre	9.7	Liberty + Centur	ic 19.4	12						87.37
Ris	6 Medi	ım L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	CleanStart	14.35	Liberty + Centur	ic 19.4	12	Proline		29	.71 Glyphosate 360	9.70) 131.43
<	^{LL} Hig	n L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	CleanStart	14.35	Liberty + Centur	ic 19.4	12	Proline		29	.71 Glyphosate 360	9.70) 131.43
ц, к	LOV	L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	Glyphosate .5L/acre	9.7	Liberty+Centurio	or 19.4	12						87.37
Risl ea	6 Medi	ım L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	CleanStart	14.35	Liberty+Centurio	or 19.4	12	Proline		29	.71 Glyphosate 360	9.70) 131.43
Ā	^ш Hig	n L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	CleanStart	14.35	Liberty+Centurio	or 19.4	12	Proline		29	.71 Glyphosate 360	9.70) 131.43
2 -61	y Lov	L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	Glyphosate .5L/acre	9.7	Liberty+Centurio	or 19.4	12						87.37
Ris! ea	හි Medi	um L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	CleanStart	14.35	Liberty+Centurio	or 19.4	12	Proline		29	.71 Glyphosate 360	9.70) 131.43
A	^ш Нід	n L130	5	Prosper Evergl	o 58.25	CleanStart	14.35	Liberty+Centurio	or 19.4	12	Proline		29	.71 Glyphosate 360	9.70) 131.43
									Wheat							
2-	Lov	AC Harves	t 86	Rancona	15.394	Glyphosate (0.5 L/acre)	9.7	Horizon+Buctril	22.0	00	Headline			2,4-D Glyphosate (1	10.75	57.84
Area	m	AC Harvest	t 108	cereals	19.332	Glyphosate (1 L/acre)	12.4	Velocity M3	34.0	00	(0.24L/ac)		32	.92 L/acre)	12.40	0 111.05
Risk	i Hig	CDC Go	162	CruiserMax cereals	28.998	PrePass	13.5208	Spectrum + Axia	I 42.0	00 Ethrel (0.4 L/acre)	Headline (0.24L/ac)	Prosaro (0.32L/ac)	65	.77 PrePass	20.04	170.33
11-	Lov	AC Harvest	t 86	Rancona	15.394	Glyphosate (0.5 L/acre)	9.7	Horizon+Buctril M	22.0	00				2,4-D	10.75	5 57.84
Area	Mec m	AC Harves	t 108	CruiserMax cereals	19.332	Glyphosate 1 L/acre	12.4	Velocity M3	34.0	00	Headline (0.24L/ac)		32	Glyphosate (1 .92 L/acre)	12.40	0 111.05
Risk	, Hig	n CDC Go	162	CruiserMax cereals	28.998	PrePass	13.5208	Spectrum + Axia	I 42.0	00 Ethrel (0.4 L/acre)	Headline (0.24L/ac)	Prosaro (0.32L/ac)	65	.77 PrePass	20.04	170.33
19-	Lov	AC Harvest	t 86	Rancona	15.394	Glyphosate (0.5 L/acre)	9.7	Horizon+Buctril M	22.0	00				2,4-D	10.75	5 57.84
c Area	Mec m	AC Harves	t 108	CruiserMax cereals	19.332	Glyphosate	12.4	Velocity M3	34.0	00	Headline (0.24L/ac)		32	.92 Glyphosate (1 L/acre)	12.40	0 111.05
Risk	Hig	CDC Go	162	CruiserMax cereals	28.998	PrePass	13.5208	Spectrum + Axia	I 42.0	0 Ethrel (0.4	Headline (0.24L/ac)	Prosaro (0.32L/ac)	65	.77 PrePass	20.04	170.33

Table 5.10 Seed and Crop Protection Profile by Region, Scenario

			Canola				Whe	eat			
		Yield (bu/acre)	Price (\$/bushel)	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)	Yield (bu/acre)	Price (\$/bushel	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)
a 2-ED791	Baseline										
Are		34	12.61	148.99	428.64	279.64	42	6.48	104.44	272.06	167.62
Risk	Medium	45	12.61	214.04	567.31	353.27	56	6.48	179.69	362.75	183.06
	High	56	12.61	246.26	705.99	459.73	70	6.48	265.79	453.43	187.64
11-ED727	Baseline										
rea		37	12.61	140.25	466.46	326.21	52	6.48	116.27	336.84	220.57
sk A	Medium	48	12.61	206.46	605.14	398.68	69	6.48	178.93	446.95	268.02
ž	High	60	12.61	242.18	756.42	514.24	87	6.48	271.21	563.55	292.34
a 19-EC	Baseline										
Area		35	12.61	148.99	441.24	292.25	53	6.48	116.27	343.31	227.04
sk <i>F</i>	Medium	45	12.61	211.12	567.31	356.19	71	6.48	187.68	459.91	272.23
Ri	High	55	12.61	241.01	693.38	452.37	88	6.48	285.79	570.03	284.24

Table 5.11 Cost, Revenues, and Margins by Intensification Scenarios

			Ca	nola				Whe	eat		
		Yield (bu/acre)	Price (\$/bushel)	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)	Yield (bu/acre)	Price (\$/bushel	Agronomy Cost (\$/acre)	Revenue (\$/acre)	Margin (\$/acre)
rea 791	Baseline	34	12.61	157.59	428.64	271.05	42	6.48	109.74	272.06	162.32
sk A ED:	Medium	45	12.61	227.43	567.31	339.88	56	6.48	190.00	362.75	172.74
Ris 2-	High	56	12.61	264.35	705.99	441.64	70	6.48	278.99	453.43	174.44
vrea 0727	Baseline	37	12.61	147.24	466.46	319.22	52	6.48	123.17	336.84	213.66
sk A 1-El	Medium	48	12.61	218.46	605.14	386.67	69	6.48	189.68	446.95	257.27
is (1	High	60	12.61	259.52	756.42	496.90	87	6.48	284.83	563.55	278.72
vrea 0596	Baseline	35	12.61	157.59	441.24	283.65	53	6.48	123.17	343.31	220.14
sk A 9-ED	Medium	45	12.61	223.98	567.31	343.33	71	6.48	200.04	459.91	259.87
Ri 19	High	55	12.61	258.14	693.38	435.24	88	6.48	302.08	570.03	267.94

Table 5.12 Cost, Revenues, and Margins Under Higher Nitrogen Fertilizer Prices

Conclusions

Agricultural land use in Alberta has evolved over time on a path toward increasing intensification and away from growth through extensive land use. This is consistent with a world in which land in increasingly scarce, increasingly expensive to convert from alternative uses, and one in which maintaining pristine lands for services such as wildlife habitat, groundwater recharge, and carbon sequestration are seen as increasingly valuable. Within this context there is a recognition that demands for farm products and food are growing, and that increasing food prices amounts to the most regressive form of tax.

This study shows that there is significant further prospect for intensification in agricultural land use to increase output. In a world in which demand forms the binding constraint, the literature finds that intensive management is more clearly sustainable (in terms of greenhouse gases, nutrient application etc) on a unit output basis than extensive management. The reality of a strong demand and limited land base thus suggests that intensification of existing agricultural land is more sustainable than converting land from other uses to agricultural production as a means of increasing output.

Evidence in Alberta exists of significant potential to increase wheat and canola yields through augmented fertility management, coupled with broader changes in seeding and crop protection practices. The increases in yields envisioned are significant, and range well over 50% compared with baseline yields. This, in turn, will require effective management of inputs at higher levels of use compared with existing systems.

This study has provided, in effect, an analysis of the feasibility on increasing output of canola and wheat in Alberta based on more intensive management, from both an environmental and economic perspective. The results show that the intensification scenarios result in little change in nitrous oxide emissions on a unit output basis; when the equivalent alternative means of increasing output by expanding the land base is considered, the intensification scenarios result in a significant benefit.

Intensification also provides significant economic benefits to adopting producers. While the costs of production are much higher on an area basis under intensification, the increased yields and revenue appear to more than offset these increased costs. The implication is for significantly increased profitability for adopting producers.

References Cited

Akiyama, H., Yan, X. and Yagi, K. 2010. Evaluation of effectiveness of enhanced-efficiency fertilizers as mitigation options for N₂O and NO emissions from agricultural soils: meta-analysis. Glob Change Biol. 16: 1837-1846.

Alberta Treasury Board and Public Finance. 2013. Alberta Population Projections, 2013-2041. http://finance.alberta.ca/aboutalberta/population-projections/2013-2041-alberta-population-projections.pdf

Asgedom, H. and Kebreab, E. 2011. Beneficial management practices and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions in the agriculture of the Canadian Prairie: a review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development. 31: 433-451.

Ausubel, J. H., WernIcK, I. K. and Waggoner, P. E. 2013. Peak farmland and the prospect for land sparing. Population and Development Review. 38: 221-242.

Badiou, P., McDougal, R., Pennock, D., and Clark, B. 2011. Greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration potential in restored wetlands of the Canadian prairie pothole region. Wetlands Ecol. Manage. 19: 237-256.

Baker, J. S., Murray, B. C., McCarl, B. A., Feng, S. and Johansson, R. 2013. Implications of Alternative Agricultural Productivity Growth Assumptions on Land Management, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Mitigation Potential. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 95: 435-441.

Beauchemin, K.A., Janzen, H.H., Little, S.M., McAllister, T.A., McGinn, S.M. 2010. Life cycle assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from beef production in western Canada: A case study. Agricultural Systems 103: 371-379.

Bedard-Haughn, A., Yongbloed. F., Akkerman, J., Uijl, A., de Jong, E., Yates, T., Pennock, D. 2006. The effects of erosional and management history on soil organic carbon stores in ephemeral wetlands of hummocky agricultural land-scapes. Geoderma 135: 296-306

Benton, T. G., Vickery, J. A. and Wilson, J. D. 2003. Farmland biodiversity: is habitat heterogeneity the key? Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 18: 182-188.

Beres, B. L., Harker, K. N., Clayton, G. W., Bremer, E., O'Donovan, T. T., Blackshaw, R. E. and Smith, A. M. 2010. Influence of N fertilization method on weed growth, grain yield and grain protein concentration in no-till winter wheat. Canadian Journal of Plant Science. 90: 637-644.

Blackshaw, R. E., Hao, X., Brandt, R. N., Clayton, G. W., Harker, K. N., O'Donovan, J. T., Johnson, E. N. and Vera, C. L. 2011. Canola response to ESN and urea in four-year no-till cropping system. Agron. J. 103: 92-99.

Bole, J. B., Harapiak, J. T., Malhi, S. S. and Penny, D. C. 1984. Regional and environmental influences of nitrogen use efficiency. Proc. Alberta Soils Science Workshop. Edmonton, AB.

Bos, J. Smit, A. L.; and Schröder, J. J. 2013. Is agricultural intensification in The Netherlands running up to its limits? NJAS - Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences 66: 65-73.

Bouwman, A. F., Boumans, L. J. M. and Batjes, N. H. 2002. Emissions of N₂O and NO from fertilized fields: summary of available measurement data. Global Biogeochem. Cycles 16: 6-1–6-13.

Bridgham, S.D., Megonigal, J.P., Keller, J.K., Bliss, N.B., and Trettin, C. 2006. The carbon balance of North American wetlands. Wetlands 26: 889–916

Bruulsema, T. W., Witt, C., Garcia, F., Li, S., Rao, T. N., Chen, F. and Ivanova, S. 2008. A global framework for fertilizer BMPs. Better Crops with Plant Food. 92: 13-15.

Bucholtz, S., Claassen, R., Roberts, M. J., Cooper, J. C., Gueorguieva, A. and Johansson, R. 2006. Environmental effects of agricultural land-use change. Washington, DC, USA: US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Burney, J. A., Davis, S. J. and Lobell, D. B. 2010. Greenhouse gas mitigation by agricultural intensification. Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences. 107: 12052-12057.

Burton, D. L., Li, X. and Grant, C. A. 2008. Influence of fertilizer nitrogen source and management practice on N2O emissions from two Black Chernozemic soils. Can J. Soil Sci. 88: 219-227.

Campbell, C. A., Janzen, H. H., Paustian, K., Gregorich, E. G., Sherrod, L., Liang, B. C. and Zentner, R. P. 2005. Carbon storage in soils of the North American Great Plains: Effect of cropping frequency. Agron. J. 97: 349-363.

Canadian Fertilizer Institute. 2014. Fertilizer Shipments Survey – July 2013 to March 2014. http://www.cfi.ca/_documents/21-022-x2014001-eng.pdf

Climate Check. 2008. Science Discussion Document for Nitrous Oxide Emission Reduction Protocol. http://carbonoffsetsolutions.climatechangecentral.com/files/microsites/OffsetProtocols/ABProtocolDev elopmentWorkshops/NitrousOxideReduction09/SCIENCE_DISCUSSION_DOCUMENT_NERP_WORKSHOP. pdf

Davies, B., Baulcombe, D., Crute, I., Dunwell, J., Gale, M., Jones, J. and Toulmin, C. 2009. Reaping the benefits: science and the sustainable intensification of global agriculture.

Decock, C. 2014. Mitigating nitrous oxide emissions from corn cropping systems in the midwestern U.S.: potential and data gaps. Environ Sci Technol. 48: 4247-4256.

Euliss Jr., N.H., Gleason, R.A., Olness, A., McDougal, R.L., Murkin, H.R., Robarts, R.D., Bourbonniere, R.A., Warner, B.G. 2006. North American prairie wetlands are important nonforested land-based carbon storage sites. Science of the Total Environment 361: 179–188.

Farmaha, B. S. and Sims, A. L. 2013. The influence of polymer-coated urea and urea fertilizer mixtures on spring wheat protein concentrations and economic returns. Agronomy Journal. 105: 1328-1334.

Firbank, L. G., Elliott, J., Drake, B., Cao, Y. and Gooday, R. 2013. Evidence of sustainable intensification among British farms. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment. 173: 58-65

Foley, J. 2014. A Five-Step Plan to Feed the World. National Geographic. 225(5): 26-58

Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., Mueller, N. D., O'Connell, C., Ray, D. K., West, P. C., Balzer, C., Bennett, E. M., Carpenter, S. R., Hill, J., Monfreda, C., Polasky, S., Rockström, J., Sheehan, J., Siebert, S., Tilman, D., and Zaks, D. P. M. 2011. Solutions for a cultivated planet. Nature. 478: 337-342.

Gao, X., Tenuta, M., Nelson, A., Sparling, B., Tomasiewicz, D., Mohr, R. M. and Bizimungu, B. 2013. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer rate on nitrous oxide emission from irrigated potato on a clay loam soil in Manitoba, Canada. Can. J. Soil Sci. 93: 1-11.

Gelfand, I., Zenone, T., Jasrotia, P., Chen, J., Hamilton, S.K., Robertson, G.P. 2011. Carbon debt of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) grasslands converted to bioenergy production. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 108, 13864–13869

Gleason, R.A., Laubhan, M.K., and Euliss, N.H., Jr., eds., 2008, Ecosystem services derived from wetland conservation practices in the United States Prairie Pothole Region with an emphasis on the U.S. Department of Agriculture Conservation Reserve and Wetlands Reserve Programs: U.S. Geological Professional Paper 1745, 58 p.

Goodale, C.L., Apps, M.J., Birdsey, R.A., Field, C.B., Heath, L.S., Houghton, R.A., Jenkins, J.C. Kohlmaier, G.H., Kurz, W., Liu, S., Nabuurs, G., Nilsson, S. and Shvidenko, A.Z. 2002. Forest carbon sinks in the northern hemisphere. Ecological Applications 12: 891-899.

Grant, C. A. 2014. Use of NBPT and ammonium thiosulphate as urease inhibitors with varying surface placement of urea and urea ammonium nitrate in production of hard red spring wheat under reduced tillage management. Can. J. Plant Sci. 94: 329-335.

Grant, C. A., and Bailey, L. D. 1999. Effect of seed-placed urea fertilizer and N-(n-butyl) thiophosphoric triamide (NBPT) on emergence and grain yield of barley. Can. J. Plant Sci. 79: 491-496.

Grant, C. A., Brown, K. R., Racz, G. J. and Bailey, L. D. 2002. Influence of source, timing and placement of nitrogen fertilization on seed yield and nitrogen accumulation in the seed of canola under reduced- and conventional-tillage management. Can. J. Plant Sci. 82: 629-638.

Grant, C. A., Brown, K. R., Racz, G. J. and Bailey. L. D. 2001. Influence of source, timing and placement of nitrogen on grain yield and nitrogen removal of durum wheat under reduced- and conventional-tillage management. Can. J. Plant Sci. 81: 17-27.

Grant, C. A., Wu, R., Selles, F., Harker, K. N., Clayton, G. W., Bittman, S., Zebarth, B. J. and Lupwayi, N. Z. 2012. Crop yield and nitrogen concentration with controlled release urea and split applications of nitrogen as compared to non-coated urea applied at seeding. Field Crop. Res. 127: 170-180.

Grant, R. F., Pattey, E., Goddard, T. W., Kryzanowski, L. M., Puurveen, H. 2006. Modeling the effects of fertilizer application rate on nitrous oxide emissions. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 70: 235-248.

Guo, L. B. and Gifford, R. M. 2002. Soil carbon stocks and land use change: a meta analysis. Global Change Biology. 8: 345–360. doi:10.1046/j.1354-1013.2002.00486.x

Gutierrez-Velez, V. H., DeFries, R., Pinedo-Vasquez, M., Uriarte, M., Padoch, C., Baethgen, W., Fernandes, K. and Lim, Y. 2011. High-yield oil palm expansion spares land at the expense of forests in the Peruvian Amazon. Environmental Research Letters. 6: 044029.

Haderlein, L., Jensen, T. L., Dowbenko, R. E. and Blaylock, A. D. 2001. Controlled release urea as a nitrogen source for spring wheat in western Canada: Yield, grain N content and N use efficiency. The Scientific World Journal. 1: 114-121.

Halvorson, A. D., and Bartolo, M. E. 2014a. Nitrogen source and rate effects on irrigated corn yields and nitrogen-use efficiency. Agron. J. 106: 681-693.

Halvorson, A. D., Snyder, C.S., Blaylock, A. D. and Del Grosso, S. J. 2014b. Enhance deficiency nitrogen fertilizers: Potential role in nitrous oxide emission mitigation. Agron. J. 106: 715-722.

Harapiak, J. T. 1979. Comparison of fall and spring applied nitrogen. p.37-43. In Proc. Alberta Soil Science Workshop, Lethbridge, AB. 26–27 Feb. 1979. Faculty of Extension, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Harvey, M., and Pilgrim, S. 2011. The new competition for land: food, energy, and climate change. Food Policy. 36: S40-S51.

Hoben, J. P., Gehl, R. J., Millar, N., Grace, P. R., Robertson, G. P. 2011. Nonlinear nitrous oxide (N₂O) response to nitrogen fertilizer in on-farm corn crops of the U.S. Midwest. Global Change Biol. 17: 1140-1152.

Holzapfel, C. B., Lafond, G. P., Brandt, S. A., May, W. E. and Johnston, A. M. 2007. In-soil banded versus post-seeding liquid nitrogen applications on no-till spring wheat and canola. Can. J. Plant Sci. 87: 223-232.

Hutchinson, J.J., Campbell, C.A., and Desjardins, R.L. 2007. Some perspectives on carbon sequestration in agriculture. Agric. Forest. Met. 142: 288-302.

Hyatt, C. R., Venterea, R. T., Rosen, C. J., McNearney, M., Wilson, M. L. and Dolan, M. S. 2010. Polymercoated urea maintains potato yields and reduces nitrous oxide emissions in a Minnesota loamy sand. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 74: 419-428. Ingle, H. L., Koenig, R. T. and Stowe, M. S. 2010. Effect of seed-row placement of conventional and polymer-coated urea on winter wheat emergence. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis. 41: 887-896.

IPNI. 2010. Soil test levels in North America. International Plant Nutrition Institute. http://www.ipni.net/ipniweb/portal.nsf/0/C13F0CF310F1903E062577C7005A4BD7

IPNI. 2012. 4R Plant Nutrition Manual: A Manual for Improving the Management of Plant Nutrition, North American Version, Eds. Bruulsema, T. W., Fixen, P. E. and Sulewski, G.D. International Plant Nutrition Institute, Norcross, GA. USA.

Janzen, H. H., Desjardins, R. L., Rochette, P., Boehm M. and Worth, D. 2008. Better farming better air: a scientific analysis of farming practices and greenhouse gases in Canada. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2009/agr/A52-83-2008E.pdf

Johnson, J. M. F., Reicosky, D.C., Allmaras, R. R. and Sauer, T. J. (2005). Greenhouse Gas Contributions and Mitigation Potential of Agriculture in the Central USA. Soil & Tillage Research. 83: 73-94.

Johnson, J. W., Murrell, T. S., Reetz Jr., H. F. 1997. Balanced fertility management: a key to nutrient use efficiency. Better Crops. 81: 3-5.

Johnston, A. M., Lafond, G. P., Harapiak, J. T. and Head, W. K. 1997. No-till spring wheat and canola response to side banded anhydrous ammonia at seeding. J. Prod. Agric. 10: 452-458.

Karamanos, R. E., Flore N. A. and Harapiak, J. T. 2005. Effect of post-emergence nitrogen application on the yield and protein content of wheat. Can. J. Plant Sci. 85: 327-342.

Karamanos, R. E., Harapiak, J. T., Flore, N. A. and Stonehouse, T. B. 2004. Use of N-(n-butyl) thiophosphoric triamide (NBPT) to increase safety of seed-placed urea. Can. J. Plant Sci. 84: 105-116.

Karamanos, R., McKenzie. R. H., Gan, Y. T., Lafond, G. P., Jones, C. A. and Malhi S. S. 2010. Fertilizer management for maximum yield of common crops in the Northern Great Plains of North America. pp 33–72. In: Malhi, S. S., Gan, Y. T., Schoenau, J. J., Lemke, R. L., Liebig, M. A. (eds) Recent trends in soil science and agronomy research in the Northern Great Plains of North America. Research Signpost, Kerala, p 427

Kastner, T., Rivas, M. J. I., Koch, W., Nonhebel, S. 2012. Global changes in diets and consequences for land requirements for food. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 109: 6868-6872.

Khakbazan, M., Grant, C. A., Finlay, G., Wu, R., Malhi, S. S., Selles, F., Clayton, G. W., Lupwayi, N. Z., Soon, Y. K. and Harker, K. N. 2013. An economic study of controlled release urea and split applications of nitrogen as compared with non-coated urea under conventional and reduced tillage management. Can. J. Plant Sci. 93: 523-534.

Kim, D.G., Hernandez-Ramirez, G. and Giltrap, D. 2012. Linear and nonlinear dependency of direct nitrous oxide emissions on fertilizer nitrogen input: A meta-analysis. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 168: 53-65.

Korol, M. 2004. Fertilizer and pesticide management in Canada. Farm Environmental Management in Canada. Catalogue no. 21-021-MIE, http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/21-021-MIE/free.htm.

Kucey, R. M. N. 1986. Effect of fertilizer form, method and timing of application on barley yield and N uptake under dryland conditions in southern Alberta. Can. J. Soil Sci. 66: 615-621.

Kucey, R. M. N. and Schaalje, G. B. 1986. Comparison of nitrogen fertilizer methods for irrigated barley in the northern great plains. Agron. J. 78: 1091-1094.

Lafond, G. P., Brandt, S. A., Irvine, B., May, W. E. and Holzapfel, C. B. 2008. Reducing the risks of in-crop nitrogen fertilizer applications in spring wheat and canola. Can. J. Plant Sci. 88: 907-919.

Li, C., Hao, X., Blackshaw, R. E., O'Donovan, J. T., Harker, K. N., Clayton, G. W. 2012. Nitrous oxide emissions in response to ESN and urea, herbicide management and canola cultivar in a no-till cropping system. Soil and Tillage Research. 118: 97-106.

Luyssaert S, Inglima I, Jung M et al. 2007. CO: balance of boreal, temperate, and tropical forests derived from a global database. Glob. Change Biol. 13: 2509–2537.

Ma, B. L., Wu, T. Y., Tremblay, N., Deen, W., Morrison, M. J., Mclaughlin, N. B., Gregorich, E. G. and Stewart, G. 2010. Nitrous oxide fluxes from corn fields: on-farm assessment of the amount and timing of nitrogen fertilizer. Glob. Change Biol. 16: 156-170.

MAFRI. 2014. Guidelines for estimating crop production costs 2014. <u>http://www.gov.mb.ca/agriculture/business-and-economics/financial-management/pubs/cop_crop_productionwesternmb.pdf</u>

Malhi, S. S. and Lemke, R. L. 2013. Effectiveness of Seedrow-placed N with polymer-coated and NBPT-treated urea for canola and wheat. J. Plant Nutr. 36: 2205-2224.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1990a. Efficiency of fall-applied urea for barley: influence of date of application. Fert. Res. 22: 141-145.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1990b. Evaluation of methods of placement for fall-applied urea under zero tillage. Soil Tillage Res. 15: 383-389.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1988a. Effect of ATC, N-Serve 24E and thiourea nitrification inhibitors on yield and N uptake of barley fertilized with fall-applied N. Plant Soil. 105: 223-229.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1988b. Control of nitrification of fertilizer nitrogen: effect of inhibitors, banding and nesting. Plant Soil. 107: 245-250.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1984. Inhibiting nitrification and increasing yield of barley by band placement of thiourea with fall appliedurea. Plant Soil 77: 193-206.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1983. Release of mineral N from soils: influence of inhibitors of nitrogen. Soil Biol. Biochem. 15: 581-585.

Malhi, S. S., and McGill, W. B. 1982. Nitrification in three Alberta soils: Effect of temperature, moisture and substrate concentration. Soil Biol. Biochem. 14: 393-399.

Malhi, S. S. and Nyborg, M. 1979. Nitrate formation during winter from fall-applied urea. Soil Biol. Biochem. 11: 439-441.

Malhi, S. S., Soon, Y. K., Grant, C. A. Lemke, R. and Lupwayi, N. 2010. Influence of controlled-release urea on seed yield and N content, and N use efficiency of small grain crops grown on Dark Gray Luvisols. Can. J. Soil Sci. 90: 363-372.

Malhi, S. S., Oliver, E., Mayerle, G., Kruger, G. and Gill, K. S. 2003. Improving effectiveness of seedrow placed urea with urease inhibitor and polymer coating for durum wheat and canola. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 34: 1709-1727.

Malhi, S. S., Grant, C. A., Johnston, A. M. and Gill, K. S. 2001. Nitrogen fertilization management for notill cereal production in the Canadian great plains: a review. Soil Tillage Res. 60: 101-122.

Malhi, S. S., Nyborg, M., Solberg, E. D. and Heaney, D. J. 1992. Fall compared to spring application of nitrogen fertilizers in Alberta. Technical Bulletin 8E. Research Branch Agriculture Canada, Lacombe, AB.

Malhi, S. S., Nyborg, M. and Solberg, E. D. 1990. Potential for nitrate-N loss in central Alberta soils. Fert. Res. 25: 175-178.

Malhi, S. S., Nyborg, M., Harapiak, J. T. and Penny, D. C. 1984. Efficiency of fall-applied N as influenced by methods of placement and date of fall application. Proc. Alberta Soil Science Workshop, Agriculture Secretary, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Matson, P. A., Parton, W. J., Power, A. G. and Swift, M. J. 1997. Agricultural intensification and ecosystem properties. Science. 277: 504-509.

Mattison, E. H. and Norris, K. 2005. Bridging the gaps between agricultural policy, land-use and biodiversity. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 20: 610-616.

McKenzie, R. H., Bremer, E., Middleton, A. B., Pfiffner, P. G. and Dowbenko, R. E. 2007. Controlledrelease urea for winter wheat in southern Alberta. Can. J. Soil Sci. 87: 85-91.

McKenzie, R. H., Middleton, A. B., and Pfiffner, P. G. 2010. Evaluation of polymer-coated urea and urease inhibitor for winter wheat in Southern Alberta. Agron. J. 102: 1210-1216.

Monreal, C., McGill, W. B. and Nyborg, M. 1986. Spatial heterogeneity of substrates: effects on hydrolysis, immobilization and nitrification of urea-N. Can. J. Soil Sci. 66: 499-511.

Mullen, R. and Lentz, E. 2011. Nitrogen inhibitors, what is what and should you consider their use? C.O.R.N Newsletter 2011-08. Ohio State University. http://corn.osu.edu/newsletters/2011/2011-08-1

Mussell, Al, and Dan Heaney. 2013. An Economic Analysis of Farming4RLand program in Alberta. George Morris Centre. http://www.farming4rfuture.ca/assets/4R_economicanalysis_report.pdf

National Inventory Report 1990–2011: Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks in Canada, Part 3. Spurces and Sinks in Canada. http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/443225/publication.html

Nyborg, M. and Malhi, S. S. 1992. Effectiveness of fall- versus spring-applied urea on barley: pellet size and depth of placement. Fert. Res. 31: 235-239.

Nyborg, M. and Malhi, S. S. 1986. Comparison of fall and spring application of nitrogen fertilizers in northern and central Alberta. Can. J. Soil Sci. 66: 225-236.

Nyborg, M. and Leitch, R. H. 1979. Losses of soil and fertilizer nitrogen in northern Alberta – a review. Proc. Alberta Soil Science Workshop. Lethbridge, AB.

Nyborg, M., Laidlaw, J. W., Solberg, E. D. and Malhi, S. S. 1997. Denitrification and nitrous oxide emissions from a black chernozemic soil during spring thaw in Alberta. Can. J. Soil Sci. 77: 153-160.

Nyborg, M., Malhi, S. S. and Solberg, E. D. 1990. Effect of date of application on the fate of 15N-labelled urea and potassium nitrate. Can. J. Soil Sci. 70: 21-31.

Olewiler, N. 2004. The Value of Natural Capital in Settled Areas of Canada. Published by Ducks Unlimited Canada and the Nature Conservancy of Canada. 36 pp.

Parkin, T. B., and Hatfield, J. L. 2014. Enhanced efficiency fertilizers: Effect on nitrous oxide emissions in Iowa. Agron. J. 106: 694-702

Pennock, D., Yates, T., Bedard-Haughn, A., Phipps, K., Farrell, R., McDougal, R. 2010. Landscape controls on N₂O and CH₄ emissions from freshwater mineral soil wetlands of the Canadian Prairie Pothole region. Geoderma 155: 308–319.

Phalan, B., Bertzky, M., Butchart, S. H. M., Donald, P. F., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Stattersfield, A. J. and Balmford, A. 2013. Crop Expansion and Conservation Priorities in Tropical Countries. PLoS ONE 8: e51759. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0051759.

Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A. and Green, R. E. 2011 **Reconciling food production and biodiversity** conservation: land sharing and land sparing compared. *Science* 2. 333: 1289-1291.

Phillips, R. and Beeri, O. 2008. The role of hydropedologic vegetation zones in greenhouse gas emissions for agricultural wetland landscapes. Cantena 72:386–394

Ramankutty, N. and Rhemtulla, J. 2012. Can intensive farming save nature? Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment. 10: **455.**

Rawluk, C. D. L., Grant, C. A. and Racz, G. J. 2001. Ammonia volatilization from soils fertilized with urea and varying rates of urease inhibitor NBPT. Can. J. Soil Sci. 81: 239-246.

Risk, N., Snider, D. and Wagner-Riddle, C. 2013. Mechanisms leading to enhanced soil nitrous oxide fluxes by freeze-thaw cycles. Can. J. Soil Sci. 93: 401-414.

Robertson, G.P., E.A. Paul, and R.R. Harwood. 2000. Greenhouse gases in intensive agriculture: Contributions of individual gases to the radiative forcing of the atmosphere. Science 289: 1922–1925.

Rochette, P., MacDonald, J. D., Angers, D. A., Chantigny, M. H., Gasser, M. O. and Bertrand, N. 2009.Banding of urea increased ammonia volatilization in a dry acidic soil. Journal of Environmental Quality.38: 1383-1390.

Rochette, P., Worth, D. E., Lemke, R. L., McConkey, B. G., Pennock, D. J., Wagner-Riddle, C. and Desjardins, R. L. 2008a. Estimation of N₂O emissions from agricultural soils in Canada. I. Development of a country-specific methodology. Can. J. Soil. Sci. 88: 641-654.

Rochette, P., Worth, D. E., Huffman, E. C., Brierley, J. A., McConkey, B. G., Yang, J., Hutchinson, J. J., Desjardins, R. L., Lemke, R. and Gameda, S. 2008b. Estimation of N₂O emissions from agricultural soils in Canada. II. 1995-2005 inventory. Can. J. Soil Sci. 88: 655-669.

Rudel, T. K., Schneider, L., Uriarte, M., Turner, B. L., DeFries, R., Lawrence, D. and Grau, R. 2009. Agricultural intensification and changes in cultivated areas, 1970–2005. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 106: 20675-20680.

Saggar, S., Singh, J., Giltrap, D. L., Zaman, M., Luo, J., Rollo, M., Kim, D. G., Rys, G. and van der Weerden, T. J. 2013. Quantification of reductions in ammonia emissions from fertiliser urea and animal urine in grazed pastures with urease inhibitors for agriculture inventory: New Zealand as a case study. Science of the Total Environment. 465: 136-146.

Sistani, K. R., Jn-Baptiste, M., Lovanh, N. and Cook, K. L. 2011. Atmospheric emissions of nitrous oxide, methane, and carbon dioxide from different nitrogen fertilizers. J. Environ. Qual. 40: 1797-1805.

Smith, E. G. 2013. Survey of canola growers: practices, inputs, and production. Presentation at Soils and Crops Conference, March 5-6, 2013. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. http://www.usask.ca/soilsncrops/conference-proceedings/2013%20pdf/Day_2_Presentations/001-

Elwin_Smith.pdf

Smith, E. G., Upadhyay, B. H., Favret, M. L. and Karamanos, R. E. 2010. Fertilizer response for hybrid and open-pollinated canola and economic optimal nutrient levels. Can. J. Plant Sci. 90: 305-310.

Smith, W. K., Cleveland, C. C., Reed, S. C. and Running, S. W. 2014. Agricultural conversion without external water and nutrient inputs reduces terrestrial vegetation productivity. Geophysical Research Letters. 41: 449-455.

Snyder, C. S. and Fixen, P. E. 2012. Plant nutrient management and risks of nitrous oxide emissions. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. 67: 137A-144A.

Snyder, C. S., Bruulsema, T. W., Jensen, T. L., and Fixen, P. E. 2009. Review of greenhouse gas emissions from crop production systems and fertilizer management effects. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment. 133: 247-266.

Snyder, C. S., Bruulsema, T. W. and Jensen, T. L. 2007. Greenhouse gas emissions from cropping systems and the influence of fertilizer management—a literature review. International Plant Nutrition Institute, Norcross, Georgia, U.S.A.

Soon, Y. K., Malhi, S. S., Lemke, R. L., Lupwayi, N. Z. and Grant, C. A. 2011. Effect of polymer-coated urea and tillage on the dynamics of available N and nitrous oxide emissions from Gray Luvisols. Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst. 90: 267-279.

Statistics Canada. 2014. Agricultural Water Use in Canada: Tables. Table 4.

Statistics Canada. 2013. Agricultural Water Use in Canada 2013. Table 2.

Stevenson, J. R., Villoria, N., Byerlee, D., Kelley, T. and Maredia, M. 2013. Green Revolution Research Saved an Estimated 18-27 Million Hectares from Being Brought into Agricultural Production. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 110: 8363-8368.

Stinson, G., Kurz, W.A., Smyth, C.E., Neilson, E.T., Dymond, C.C., Metsaranta, J.M., Boisvenue, C., Rampley, G.J., Li, Q., White, T.M., Blain, D., 2011. An inventory-based analysis of Canada's managed forest carbon dynamics, 1990 to 2008. Glob. Change Biol. 17, 2227–2244.

Tenuta, M. and Beauchamp, E. G. 2003. Nitrous oxide production from granular nitrogen fertilizers applied to a silt loam soil. Can. J. Soil Sci. 83: 521-532.

Tiessen, K. H. D., Flaten, D. N., Bullock, P. R., Burton, D. L., Grant, C. A. and Karamanos, R. E. 2006. Transformation of fall-banded urea: Effect of application date, landscape position, and fertilizer additives. Agron. J. 98: 1460-1470.

Tiessen, K. H. D., Flaten, D. N., Grant, C. A., Karamanos, R. E. and Entz, M. H. 2005. Efficiency of fallbanded urea for spring wheat production in Manitoba: Influence of application date, landscape position and fertilizer additives. Can. J. Soil Sci. 85: 649-666.

Tilman, D., Balzer, C., Hill, J. and Befort, B. L. 2011. Global food demand and the sustainable intensification of agriculture. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 108: 20260-20264.

Tuomisto, H. L., Hodge, I. D., Riordan, P., and Macdonald, D. W. 2012. Does organic farming reduce environmental impacts?-A meta-analysis of European research. Journal of environmental management. 112: 309-320.

Ukrainetz, H. 1984. Fertilizer placement for maximum effectiveness. Proc. Alberta Soil Science Workshop, Agriculture Secretary, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

VandenBygaart, A. J., McConkey, B. G., Angers, D. A., Smith, W., de Gooijer, H., Bentham, M. and Martin, T. 2008. Soil carbon change factors for the Canadian agriculture national greenhouse gas inventory. Can. J. Soil Sci. 88: 671-680.

Van Kessel, C., Venterea, R., Six, J., Adviento-Borbe, M. A., Linquist, B. A. and van Groenigen, K. J. 2013. Climate, duration, and N placement determine N2O emissions in reduced tillage systems: a meta analysis. Global Change Biol. 19: 33-44

Venterea, R. T., Maharjan, B. and Dolan, M.S. 2011. Fertilizer source and tillage effects on yield-scaled nitrous oxide emissions in a corn cropping system. J Environ Qual. 40: 1521-1531.

Venterea, R. T., Dolan, M. S. and Ochsner, T. E. 2010. Urea decreases nitrous oxide emissions compared with anhydrous ammonia in a Minnesota corn cropping system. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 74: 407-418.

Vermeulen, S. J., Campbell, B. M. and Ingram, J. S. I. 2012. Climate change and food systems. *Annual Review of Environmental Resources*. 37: 195-222.

Xiaobin, W., Jingfeng, X., Grant, C. A., and Bailey. L. D. 1995. Effects of placement of urea with a urease inhibitor on seedling emergence, N uptake and dry matter yield of wheat. Can. J. Plant Sci. 75: 449452.

Yadvinder-Singh, Malhi, S. S., Nyborg, M. and Beauchamp, E. G. 1994. Large granules, nests or bands: Methods of increasing efficiency of fall-applied urea for small cereal grains in North America. Fert. Res. 38: 61-87.

Appendix A

Inputs	Emission Factor	Units	Source
Seed	0.7337	kg CO₂e/kg	Biograce
Urea	3.31	kg CO₂e/kg N	Ecoinvent
Ammonium Sulfate	2.87	kg CO₂e/kg N	GHGenius
Monoammonium Phosphate	1.29	kg CO ₂ e/kg P ₂ O ₅	Ecoinvent
Pesticides	10.16	kg CO₂e/kg a.i.	Ecoinvent
Diesel	2.86	kg CO₂e/L	NERP Appendix Table G1

Table A1. Emission Factors Used in Estimating net GHGs from Cropping Scenarios.

Table A2. Seed and Crop Protection Inputs for Canola Scenarios of Different Intensities.

Intensity	Seed	Herbicide	Foliar Fungicide				
Low	Invigour L130, Liberty Link	0.5 L/ac glyphosate ² prior to seeding, 1.1 L/ac glufosinate ammonium and 25 mL/ac clethodim in crop. Cost: \$15.12/ac	Not included				
Med	O.64 L/100 lb/seed Prosper Everglo. ¹ Direct seeded at a rate of 5 lbs/acre.	0.5 L/ac glyphosate and 15 mL/ac carfentrazone-ethyl prior to seeding, 1.1 L/ac glufosinate ammonium and 25 mL/ac clethodim in crop, 1 L/ac glyphosate post harvest. Cost: \$25.17/acre	128 mL/ac prothiaconazole at full bloom. Cost: \$22.71/acre				
High	Cost: \$56.25/acre	0.5 L/ac glyphosate and 15 mL/ac carfentrazone-ethyl prior to seeding, 1.1 L/ac glufosinate ammonium and 25 mL/ac clethodim in crop, 1 L/ac glyphosate post harvest. Cost: \$25.17/acre	128 mL/ac prothiaconazole at full bloom. Cost: \$22.71				
¹ Propser Everglo manufactured by Bayer Crop Science is the current standard fungicide and insecticide seed treatment for Bayer's Invigour line of canola. It contains the active ingredients clothianidin 290 g/L, penflufen 10.7 g/L, trifloxystrobin 7.15 g/L, and metalaxyl 7.15 g/L.							
² Glyphosate rate based on 360 g/L acid equivalent formulation.							

	Table A3. Seed and Cro	p Protection In	puts for Wheat S	Scenarios of Differen	t Intensities.
--	------------------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------------	----------------

Intensity	Seed	Herbicide	Foliar Fungicide	PGR								
Low	AC Harvest CWRS treated with tebuconazole and metalaxyl at recommended rates. Seeded at 86 Ibs/acre (20 plants/ft ²). Cost: \$18.10/acre	0.5 L/ac glyphosate ¹ prior to seeding, off-patent wild oat and broadleaf control in crop, 0.3 L/ac 2,4-D post harvest. Cost: \$21.45/ac	Not included	Not included								
Med	AC Harvest CWRS treated with tebuconazole and metalaxyl at recommended rates. Seeded at 108 lbs/acre (25 plants/ft ²). Cost: \$22.75/acre	1 L/ac glyphosate prior to seeding, patent wild oat and broader spectrum broadleaf control in crop, 1 L/ac glyphosate post harvest. Cost: \$37.80/acre	240 mL/ac pyraclostrobin at flag leaf. Cost: \$25.92/acre	Not included								
High	CDC Gro CWRS treated with tebuconazole and metalaxyl at recommended rates. Seeded at 140 lbs/acre (30 plants/ft ²). Cost: \$30.30/acre	0.5 L/ac glyphosate and 40 mL/ac florasulam prior to seeding, patent wild oat and broader spectrum broadleaf control in crop, 0.5 L/ac glyphosate 40 mL/ac florasulam post harvest. Cost: \$48.20/acre	240 mL/ac pyraclostrobin at flag leaf and 320 mL/ac prothioconazole plus tebuconazole at head emergence. Cost: \$43.77/acre	0.4 L/ac ethephon at early flag. Cost: \$8.00/acre								
¹ Glyphosate rate based on 360 g/L acid equivalent formulation.												
	Ecodistrict 791					Ecodi	istrict 727		Ecodistrict 591			
-------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	-------------------------------	----------------	---------	------------------	-------------------------------	----	-----------------	----------	-------------------------------	----
	Yield	N	P ₂ O ₅	S ³	Yield	N	P ₂ O ₅	S	Yield	N	P ₂ O ₅	S
	bu/acre	lbs/acre			bu/acre	bu/acre Ibs/acre			bu/acre	lbs/acre		
Canola												
Low	34	65	20	20	37	50	20	20	35	65	20	20
Med	45	106	25	25	48	93	25	25	45	101	25	25
High	56	145	25	30	60	138	25	30	55	136	25	30
	Wheat											
Low	42	44	20		52	60	25		53	60	25	10
Med	56	87	25		69	90	30		71	105	30	15
High	70	115	30		87	120	35		88	145	35	15
¹ Fertilizer ² Nitrogen Phospho	 ¹ Fertilizer sources were urea, monoammonium phosphate, and ammonium sulphate. ² Nitrogen and sulphur broadcast in spring before seeding in low intensity scenario and midrow banded at seeding in medium and high intensity scenarios. Phosphorus seed placed to maximum safe rate balance placed in midrow blend or broadcast as appropriate for scenario. 											

Table A4. Yield and Fertilizer Inputs for Scenarios of Different Intensities.^{1,2,3}

³ All values were converted to metric prior to GHG calculations.

⁴ Sulphur is added routinely to canola regardless of sulphur soil tests.

Oneration	Canola										
Operation	Diesel Use		Emissions		Low		Med	High			
	L/ac	L/ha	kg CO₂e/ha	Passes	kg CO₂e/ha		kg CO₂e/ha		kg CO₂e/ha		
Fertilizer Broadcast	0.7	1.73	4.95	1	4.96						
High Clearance Sprayer	0.3	0.75	2.14	2	4.28	4	8.56	4	8.56		
Seeder	2.0	4.94	14.13	1	14.13	1	14.13	1	14.13		
Swather	1.08	2.67	7.64	1	7.64	1	7.64	1	7.64		
Combine Pick-up	nbine 4.7 11.61		33.20 1		33.20	1	33.20	1	33.20		
	Тс	otal Emissic	ons Canola Field Operat	ions	64.2		63.5		63.5		
					Wheat	Wheat					
Fertilizer Broadcast	0.7	1.73	4.95	1	4.96						
High Clearance Sprayer	0.3	0.75	2.14	3	6.42	4	8.56	6	12.84		
Seeder	2.0	4.94	14.13	1	14.13	1	14.13	1	14.13		
Combine Direct	3.4	8.40	24.02	1	24.02	1	24.02	1	24.02		
	Тс	otal Emissic	ons Wheat Field Operat	49.52		46.71		50.99			
¹ Diesel use values from ARECA's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Project (<u>www.areca.ab.ca</u>). Diesel conversion factors Appendix Table G1, page 99, NERP 2010 edition (<u>http://www.cfi.ca/ documents/10-10-18 NERP v1 Protocol FINAL.pdf</u>).											

Table A5. Greenhouse Gas Emission Estimate for Field Operations.

Courses		Ecodistrict 791			Ecodistrict 727		Ecodistrict 596		
Source	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High
	kg CO ₂ e/ha								
Field Operations	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
Seed Production ¹	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Fertilizer Production	219	355	482	170	314	459	219	338	453
Pesticides Production	9	19	19	9	19	19	9	19	19
Soil N ₂ O 4R ²	547	704	827	746	1015	1248	759	937	1081
Carbon Sequestration ³	-70	-93	-115	-160	-208	-259	-160	-206	-251
Net Emissions	782	1062	1289	841	1217	1543	903	1165	1378
	kg crop/ha								
Yield	1905	2522	3138	2074	2690	3363	1962	2522	3082
	kg CO ₂ e/kg crop								
Intensity	0.410	0.421	0.411	0.406	0.452	0.459	0.460	0.462	0.447
	ha								
Equivalent Area ⁴	1.00	0.76	0.61	1.00	0.77	0.62	1.00	0.78	0.64
	kg CO ₂ e								
Emissions Equivalent ⁵	782	803	783	931	1028	1041	993	996	967
Delta	0	21	1	0	97	110	0	3	-27
	kg CO2e/ha								
NERP Credits ⁶		118	269		173	410		159	354

Table A6. GHG Emissions from Different Cropping Intensities of Canola

¹ Emissions factors for seed, fertilizer, pesticides from Biograce or Ecoinvent.

² Calculated using methodology used in NERP with reduction modifier applied at 0.85 for medium and 0.75 for high intensity scenarios.

³ Calculated using factors for dry prairie (ED 791) and moist parkland (ED 727 and 596) from VandeBygaart et al. (2008) adjusted for yield.

⁴ Area required to produce the equivalent amount of crop produced in the low intensity scenario.

⁵ Emissions associated with growing the equivalent amount of crop as the low intensity scenario.

⁶ NERP credits calculated for medium and high scenarios using dynamic baseline approach.

Course		Ecodistrict 791	L		Ecodistrict 727	,	Ecodistrict 596		
Source	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High
					kg CO₂e/ha				
Field Operations	50	47	51	50	47	51	50	47	51
Seed Production ¹	70	89	115	70	89	115	70	89	115
Fertilizer Production	156	303	398	213	316	418	210	360	496
Pesticides Upstream	16	27	21	16	27	21	16	27	21
Soil N ₂ O 4R ²	399	581	666	801	975	1124	725	977	1150
Carbon Sequestration ³	-70	-93	-117	-160	-212	-268	-160	-214	-266
Net Emissions	621	953	1134	991	1241	1462	910	1286	1567
	kg crop/ha								
Yield	2825	3766	4708	3497	4640	5851	3564	4775	5918
	kg CO₂e/kg crop								
Intensity	0.220	0.253	0.241	0.283	0.268	0.250	0.255	0.269	0.265
					ha				
Equivalent Area ⁴	1	0.75	0.60	1	0.75	0.60	1	0.75	0.60
	kg CO ₂ e								
Emissions Equivalent ⁵	621	715	681	991	936	874	910	960	944
Delta		94	60		-55	-117		49	33
NERP Credits ⁶	0	100	215	0	170	368	0	170	375

Table A7. GHG Emissions from Different Cropping Intensities of Wheat

¹ Emissions factors for seed, fertilizer, pesticides from Biograce or Ecoinvent.

² Calculated using methodology used in NERP with reduction modifier applied at 0.85 for medium and 0.75 for high intensity scenarios.

³ Calculated using factors for dry prairie (ED 791) and moist parkland (ED 727 and 596) from VandeBygaart et al. (2008) adjusted for yield.

⁴ Area required to produce the equivalent amount of crop produced in the low intensity scenario.

⁵ Emissions associated with growing the equivalent amount of crop as the low intensity scenario.

⁶ NERP credits calculated for medium and high scenarios using dynamic baseline approach.