

TEXAS A&M AGRILIFE

#### The Economics of Regenerative Agriculture in the Texas High Plains

Andrew Wright, Will Keeling, Donna M. McCallister, Bridget Guerrero, Joseph A. Burke, and Katie Lewis

> 2025 Southwest Cotton Physiology Conference February 13, 2025







# Regenerative agriculture (#RegenAg)



Sustainable agricultural intensification and using regenerative agricultural practices USDA Award Number: 2021-68012-35897











Sustainable agricultural intensification and enhancement

Our project goal is to intensify agricultural production in an environmentally sustainable manner that enhances the agronomic, economic, and community resiliency in the Southern Great Plains.

# Acknowledgements

C.D. Ray White, Ph.D., J. Wayne Keeling, Ph.D., Cecil Haralson, Aileen Malabanan



Sustainable agricultural intensification and enhancement using regenerative agricultural practices USDA Award Number: 2021-68012-35897

#### Collaborators -

Texas Water **Resources Institute** 



This work is supported by the Sustainable Agriculture Systems program grant no. 2021-68012-35897 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.







## Introduction

#### Two Issues

#### Study objectives

- production in the Southern Texas High Plains
- practices



Soil health & impact of regenerative and climate-smart agricultural practices Declining water availability due to reduced irrigation capacity from Ogallala Aquifer

Evaluate the impact of regenerative agricultural practices on deficit-irrigated cotton

Evaluate the potential short-term profitability and long-term risk associated with these





#### Treatments

- Cropping Systems
  - Continuous cotton, conventional tillage, established in 1990
  - Continuous cotton, no-tillage, winter rye cover crop, est. in 2014
  - Cotton-wheat-fallow rotation, notillage, est. in 2014
- Irrigation Treatments
  - ➢ Base (60% ET)
  - Low (Base 50%)
  - ➢ High (Base + 50%)



#### Continuous Cotton - Conventional Tillage

Continuous Cottor No-Tillage Rye Cover Crop Cotton- Wheat Rotation No-Tillage



## Production by Year (LB/ac)





## Production by Year (LB/ac)





## Production by Year (LB/ac)





### There's Been Some Hot, Dry Years... 2020 vs. 2022





#### There's Been 2023 & 2024





#### There's Been Some Hot, Dry Years...

#### Average Production (LB/ac)







## Revenue (\$/ac)

\$0.70/LB (lint) & \$210/ton (cottonseed)

> \$5.60/BU wheat





## Variable Costs-Base Irrigation

- Documented inputs from each cropping system
- Rates obtained from the 2020 Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Custom Rates survey and the 2024 Texas A&M AgriLife Extension crop budgets.



Expenses	CC-No Cover	CC-Cover	Rotation- Cotton	Rotation- Wheat
eed	\$75	\$90	\$75	\$15
erb.	\$91	\$110	\$110	\$20
ert.	\$58	\$58	\$58	\$29
illage	\$94	\$15	\$-	\$
rop. Ins.	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$
rigation	\$53	\$56	\$52	\$20
nterest	\$15	\$13	\$12	\$3
inning	\$65	\$57	\$76	
arvest	\$62	\$54	\$73	\$25
otal	\$513	\$453	\$456	\$112



### Variable Costs-High Irrigation



Expenses	CC-No Cover	CC-Cover	Rotation- Cotton	Rotation- Wheat
eed	\$75	\$90	\$68	\$14
erb.	\$91	\$110	\$110	\$20
ert.	\$58	\$58	\$58	\$29
illage	\$94	\$15	\$-	\$
rop. Ins.	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$
rigation	\$64	\$67	\$63	\$20
nterest	\$15	\$14	\$12	\$3
inning	\$82	\$73	\$93	
arvest	\$78	\$70	\$89	\$25
otal	\$557	\$496	\$493	\$111



#### Variable Costs-Low Irrigation



Expenses	CC-No Cover	CC-Cover	Rotation- Cotton	Rotation- Wheat
eed	\$75	\$90	\$68	\$14
lerb.	\$91	\$110	\$110	\$20
ert.	\$58	\$58	\$58	\$29
illage	\$94	\$15	\$-	\$
rop. Ins.	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
rigation	\$38	\$41	\$37	\$20
nterest	\$14	\$13	\$11	\$3
inning	\$46	\$38	\$56	\$
arvest	\$44	\$37	\$53	\$25
otal	\$459	\$401	\$393	\$111



## Average Cost (\$/ac)







#### **Returns Above** Variable Costs







	CC-No Cover	CC-Cover	W/C Rotation
Base	\$81	\$65	\$148
High	\$190	\$170	\$235
Low	\$(42)	\$(53)	\$115

## **Discussion- Returns Above Variable** Cost

> Wheat/cotton rotation results in the highest yields and returns across all irrigation treatments

- irrigation treatments
- irrigation levels decline



 $\succ$  Continuous cotton w/ cover results in the lowest yields and returns across all

> Wheat/cotton rotation becomes more profitable relative to continuous cotton as



## **Risk Simulation-**Production

Probability of yields:

- Less than 480 LB/ac
- Between 480 LB/ac and 960 LB/ac
- Greater than 960 LB/ac







### **Risk Simulation-**Returns

Probability of Returns Above Variable Cost:

- Less than \$0/ac
- Between \$0/ac and \$150/ac
- Greater than \$150/ac







## **Discussion- Risk**

> Yield risk is similar for continuous cotton with and without a cover crop

Less yield risk for the wheat/cotton rotation

The likelihood of high returns over variable costs (> \$150/ac) is low for all cropping systems; best for the W/C rotation

Significant risk of negative returns above variable costs for continuous cotton systems





#### Conclusions

Regenerative agriculture is not a "silver bullet" for profitability

> Wheat/cotton rotations appear to do well in deficit-irrigation scenarios

The best-suited cropping system will depend on the local characteristics of each operation





#### Sources

AG-CARES data, 2017-2023.

McCallister, D., B. Guerrero, W. Keeling, A. Wright, J. Burke, and K. Lewis. 2023. Profitability comparisons of regenerative agricultural practices in deficit-irrigated systems. 2023 Annual Water Resources Conference, Fort Collins, CO.

Keeling, W., D. McCallister, A. Wright, and B. Guerrero. 2025. Economics of Regenerative Agriculture in the Texas High Plains. Selected poster presented at the Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings, Irving, TX, February 2025.



Malabanan, A. and D. Mitchel. (2024). Personal Communication. Risk simulation results for





