ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT OF A CATTLE FEEDYARD

How is it Affected by Water Use?

THE DREAM

An American beef industry that is compatible with long-term, global, sustainability principles grounded in credible, consensus-based science, economic freedom and geopolitical security.

MOTIVATION

• “Sustainability” is ultimately both an ecological and an economic question.
• Water resources play a key role in both the ecology and the economy of the High Plains.
• Linking ecology and the economy has always been a vexing challenge…
• …How does one trade environmental benefits in one medium (e.g., air) for benefits in another (e.g., water) using a common basis of measure?

WHERE WE’RE GOING

• What is the water-use intensity of the feedyard industry?
• What the Sam Hill are “ecological footprints” and “embedded energy?”
• What are some benchmark values for a typical cattle feedyard?

WATER-USE INTENSITY OF CATTLE FEEDYARDS
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= Concentration of feedyards in U.S.
= 25% of nations beef
The Fed Cattle Industry in the United States

- The trend to fewer, larger feedyards continues
- Nearly 60% of cattle are marketed from about 200 feedyards
- The number of cattle marketed from yards with fewer than 1,000 head has declined to under 3 million
- Average capacity in Texas High Plains: 40,000+

Fed Cattle Industry

- Provides 90%+ of ag water supply
- Surface water over-subscribed
- Irrigation use ~ 90% of total
- Increasing livestock water use by CAFOs ~ 3-6%
- Depleting aquifer, TX, OK, NM, KS, CO
- Economic competition for water

Example, gross receipts:
- Irrigated crops - $9 - $23/ac-in
- Feedlot or dairy ~ $ 3,000/ac-in as drinking water
- Grain (rainwater!) imports from rain-fed states >50%
- "Long-range strategies needed"

Ogallala Situation (Sweeten, 2006)

Irrigation vs. Livestock

(expressed as % of gross agricultural water use)

Seasonal Water Use
(excludes dust control; adapted from Parker et al., 2000)

Reducing Feedyard Water Use

- More efficient water troughs
- Electric tank heaters for existing troughs
- Repair water trough leaks at threaded standpipe
- Collect & reuse overflow water for:
  - Water treatment/reuse system—filtration/chlorination
  - Irrigation, with or without effluent blend
  - Dust control, pens and/or roads
  - Feedmill

Influence of Sprinkler Dust Control on Gross Water Use
Summertime, 3/16" per day
The “Rebound Effect” (Is more efficient necessarily better?)

- Decline of the High Plains Aquifer has accelerated despite irrigation regimes that approach or exceed 95% application efficiency (Marek, 2005; Allen, 2006)
- American farms have doubled their energy efficiency since 1978...still, due to more advanced processing, U.S. agriculture uses at least ten calories of fossil energy for every calorie of food energy produced (Miranowski, 2004; [asb] Lovins, 2005)
- My new 3GHz PC still takes 4 minutes to boot up
- We plow efficiency savings back into the enterprise to maximize profit instead of reducing net inputs

As we approach the limits of our easy access to energy, the defining economic currency will be dominated by availability of energy units rather than by an artificial currency, be that gold or dollars.

Paul Weisz
2004

Reducing Feedyard Water Use

- More efficient water troughs (CE)
- Electric tank heaters for existing troughs (EE)
- Repair water trough leaks at threaded standpipe (LE)
- Collect & reuse overflow water for:
  - Water treatment/reuse system—filtration/chlorination (EE)
  - Irrigation, with or without effluent blend (EE)
  - etc., etc.

Ecological Footprints and Embedded Energy

Some General Truisms

- Domestic extraction of [ ] will cease when one barrel of it is required to extract one barrel of it from its most accessible reservoir
- Extraction of fossil fuels – among other things it accomplishes, and whatever the ecological implications might be – moves energy and carbon from the lithosphere to the ecosphere

Adapted from Rees (2003)
Sources of Primary Energy in the Ecosphere

Net Solar Radiation

Exogenic Input Flows

Internal Stocks

- Enthalpic
- Organic/ fossil
- Nuclear

Ecological Footprint

(W. Rees et al.)

The per capita area of ecologically productive land and/or ocean needed to sustain an ecosystem continuously by:

- Providing all of the material and energy resources that it requires; and
- Safely assimilating all of the wastes that it generates

Does it exceed the EP area available?

Trade Couples Ecosystems

AFO

Excess Manure

Surplus Eco-footprint

Fam

Surplus Productivity

2nd Law – Energy Sink

Globalization Couples Distant Ecosystems

Advanced Economy

Labor, Raw Materials, Surplus Eco-footprint

Substandard Economy

2nd Law – Energy Sink

Why Energy, and Not Matter?

- Both matter and energy are conserved
- There is no “mass sink” equivalent to the inevitable increase in system entropy
- We can conceivably recycle matter ad infinitum…
- …given an inexhaustible source of available energy to do so
- Irreversible processes are the norm: energy is conserved, but its ability to do work is not!

Ecological Footprint

- Average daily insolation is roughly 3.09E+10 joules per square meter (3.09E+10 J/m²)
- The closer to the Equator, the greater the daily insolation
- “Ecologically productive” land area and ocean absorb the solar energy and convert it to higher-order, organic-energy stocks (e.g., CHONS as biomass), wind, precipitation etc.
- EF converts incident solar energy to incremental ecological services
**Emergy: Embedded Energy**
(H. T. Odum et al.)

The available energy having an arbitrary reference quality (e.g., solar radiation) previously required – directly and indirectly – to make a product or service

- Normalizes available energy to common units ("emjoules")
- Accounts for transformations among energy types that differ in their ability to do useful work

**One Key Assumption**

- I assume that we can design/engineer systems to accomplish just about anything worthwhile to an arbitrarily high degree of reliability

**Example #1**

- **Recommendation:** Build an advanced weapon to bring the war to a rapid close and save American lives
- **Application:** $^{235}$U enrichment at K-25/Y-12 in Oak Ridge, TN, 1942-1945
- **Marginal Energy Costs:**
  - Mechanical energy to transport, pulverize ore; compress UF$_6$
  - Thermal energy to accelerate isotope diffusion
  - Electromagnetic energy to enhance isotope separation
  - Implication: From an ecological perspective, "Fat Man" and "Little Boy" were highly concentrated fossil-fuel bombs

**Example #2**

- **Recommendation:** Increase N&P use efficiency by increasing feed digestibility and nutrient availability
- **Application:** Steam-flake grain
- **Marginal Energy Costs:**
  - Thermal energy to generate steam and pressure
  - Fluid energy to pump water, transport grain
  - Mechanical energy to drive rollers

**Example #3**

- **Recommendation:** Increase break-even distance for hauling manure profitably as a phosphorus source, and reduce weed and pathogen viability and pesticide use
- **Application:** On-farm composting
- **Marginal Energy Costs:**
  - Mechanical energy to handle manure, turn compost
  - Biological energy to increase pile temperature, evaporate water, oxidize organic matter to CO$_2$, NH$_3$, and trace gases
  - You get the idea by now

**Applying Energy-Based Currencies to Feedyard Water Use**

Implications and Benchmark Values
Odum Studied Texas Agriculture (1987)

- Farm and ranch marketing were ~4% of GSP
- Energy consumption was ~13% of total state energy consumption
- Odum interpreted this as suggesting Texas agriculture’s contribution to the state economy (measured as equivalent solar energy) was 4.5 times the value Texas was reaping in gross receipts

Example #4

- Recommendation: Take advantage of sparse populations by importing water from other places to perpetuate the feedyard industry in the Texas Panhandle
- Application: Coastal desalination plants and pipelines to the High Plains
- Marginal Energy Costs:
  - Electrical energy to drive reverse osmosis systems, pump desalinated seawater, etc., etc.
  - Again, we’re trying to accelerate what the ecosphere already does for us using solar energy

Emergy of Feedyard Water Use

- Groundwater (GW) used for sprinkler dust control represents 50-80% more emergy than cattle drinking water (solar distillation basis)
- Pumping GW for sprinkler dust control represents 47,000 times as much energy than the emergy content of the water itself
- Manure harvesting consumes ~85% more energy (in labor and diesel) than sprinkler dust control
- Corn grown locally to satisfy a feedyard’s grain requirements consumes 100 times the emergy in irrigation alone than the water pumped for cattle drinking

A Reminder

- We can design/engineer systems to accomplish ecological sustainability to an arbitrary degree of reliability
- But can we afford it at current levels of energy use?
- What about at future levels?
A Sustainability Conjecture

No terrestrial ecosystem of can be considered sustainable if it must be subsidized indefinitely by non-renewable energy.

The Black-Gold Standard: A Working Definition

Given a certain enterprise, a certain level of ecological stress or a certain product, assuming no energy were available from non-renewable sources, how much equivalent solar energy (or power) would have to be set aside and dedicated to sustain that enterprise, manufacture that product or mitigate that stress?

Future Directions

- One need not accept all of Rees’ and Odum’s conclusions in order to adopt their analytical perspectives.
- We are seeing today a rapid lurch toward a more plausible linkage between energy scarcity and market prices.
- Water resources play a key role in the Green Revolution, but Hubbert’s Peak looms.
- Can we use embedded-energy analysis to evaluate the sustainability of our water-resource technologies?
- Net emergy would be a good basis for comparing sorghum diets to corn diets.

In the long run, we’re all dead.

John Maynard Keynes
1923
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