

---

# Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager

AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide  
Len Kryzanowski, P.Ag.,  
Symon Mezbahuddin, Ph.D.,  
Trevor Wallace, P.Ag.



Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager (AFFIRM) Version 3 user Guide | Agriculture and Irrigation  
© 2025 Government of Alberta | June 19, 2025

Other contributors to the publication include David J. Spiess P. Eng. Editor.

This publication is issued under the Open Government License – Alberta  
(<http://open.alberta.ca/licence>).

This publication is available online at [https://www.alberta.ca/system/files/custom\\_downloaded\\_images/4.agi-affirm-v3-user-guide.pdf](https://www.alberta.ca/system/files/custom_downloaded_images/4.agi-affirm-v3-user-guide.pdf)

Statement of availability of other formats.

# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>What is AFFIRM v3.0?</b> .....              | <b>1</b>  |
| 1. Introduction .....                          | 1         |
| 2. Required information .....                  | 1         |
| <b>What is new for version 3?</b> .....        | <b>2</b>  |
| 1. User access .....                           | 2         |
| 2. Alberta.ca account .....                    | 2         |
| 3. User menu .....                             | 2         |
| 4. Supporting documents.....                   | 2         |
| 5. Interpretation of results .....             | 3         |
| 6. Agronomic information.....                  | 3         |
| 7. Laboratory information.....                 | 3         |
| 8. Nutrient sources.....                       | 3         |
| a. Soil nitrogen release estimates .....       | 3         |
| b. Previous crop residue nitrogen credit ..... | 4         |
| c. Manure nutrients .....                      | 4         |
| d. Fertilizer sources.....                     | 4         |
| 9. Nutrient stewardship .....                  | 4         |
| 10. Crop yield response.....                   | 5         |
| 11. Whole farm optimization .....              | 5         |
| <b>Components of AFFIRM v3.0</b> .....         | <b>5</b>  |
| 1. Nutrient recommendation module .....        | 5         |
| 2. Crop yield response module.....             | 6         |
| 3. Nitrogen economic analysis module .....     | 7         |
| 4. Farm optimization module .....              | 8         |
| <b>Limitations of AFFIRM v3.0</b> .....        | <b>9</b>  |
| 1. Current field research .....                | 9         |
| 2. Crop yield response model .....             | 10        |
| 3. Farm optimization .....                     | 10        |
| <b>Nutrient recommendation modules</b> .....   | <b>10</b> |
| 1. Fertilizer recommendations .....            | 10        |
| a. Soil sample depth.....                      | 10        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| b. Soil sampling time .....  | 11        |
| c. Soil test laboratory.....                                       | 11        |
| d. Current crop and nutrient requirements .....                    | 11        |
| 2. Fertilizer recommendation adjustments .....                     | 12        |
| a. Soil test regions.....  | 12        |
| b. Soil texture .....  | 13        |
| c. Spring soil moisture.....                                       | 15        |
| d. Growing season precipitation.....                               | 18        |
| e. Irrigation levels .....   | 18        |
| f. Soil pH.....  | 18        |
| e. Soil salinity .....   | 19        |
| 3. Additional considerations.....                                  | 20        |
| a. Soil organic matter (SOM).....                                  | 21        |
| b. Estimated nitrogen release (ENR) from soil organic matter ..... | 21        |
| c. Previous crop residue management .....                          | 22        |
| d. Manure application.....   | 23        |
| e. Fertilizer application .....                                    | 24        |
| f. Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC).....                             | 26        |
| g. Soil tillage system .....                                       | 26        |
| <b>Crop yield response to nitrogen and moisture module.....</b>    | <b>27</b> |
| 1. Crop yield response model.....                                  | 27        |
| 2. Nitrogen supply (Ns).....                                       | 28        |
| a. Available soil test nitrate .....                               | 28        |
| b. Estimated nitrogen release (ENR) from soil organic matter ..... | 28        |
| c. Previous crop residue nitrogen .....                            | 29        |
| d. Manure nitrogen .....   | 29        |
| e. Fertilizer nitrogen .....                                       | 29        |
| 3. Water supply (Ws) .....   | 29        |
| a. Spring soil moisture.....                                       | 30        |
| b. Growing season precipitation.....                               | 30        |
| c. Irrigation.....   | 30        |
| 4. Further crop response adjustments.....                          | 30        |
| a. Soil pH.....  | 30        |
| b. Soil salinity .....   | 30        |
| <b>Nitrogen economic analysis module calculations .....</b>        | <b>30</b> |
| <b>Farm optimization module calculations .....</b>                 | <b>32</b> |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Acknowledgements .....</b>   | <b>41</b> |
| <b>References .....</b>   | <b>42</b> |
| <b>Frequently Asked Questions about AFFIRM v3.0 .....</b>   | <b>43</b> |
| 1. Why use AFFIRM v3? .....   | 43        |
| 2. What are the information requirements to use AFFIRM v3.0? ..                                     | 43        |
| 3. How is AFFIRM v3.0 different from AFFIRM v2? .....   | 44        |
| 4. What operating system does AFFIRM v3.0 require to run? .....                                     | 44        |
| 5. What is the layout/design of AFFIRM v3.0? .....  | 44        |
| 6. How does AFFIRM v3.0 manage the screen presentation? .....                                       | 44        |
| 7. What types of devices can utilize AFFIRM v3.0? .....   | 45        |
| 8. How is my information saved and stored in AFFIRM v3.0 and is it secure? .....                    | 45        |
| 9. Are there examples and supporting documentation that comes with AFFIRM v3.0? .....               | 45        |
| 10. Can other software use AFFIRM v3.0? .....   | 45        |
| 11. Is AFFIRM v3.0 a record-keeping program? .....  | 45        |
| 12. If I am a consultant, how do I use AFFIRM v3.0 for multiple clients? .....                      | 45        |
| 13. Is AFFIRM v3.0 only suitable for Alberta conditions? .....                                      | 45        |
| 14. Can AFFIRM v3.0 import information (i.e., AFFIRM v2 or laboratory results)? .....               | 46        |
| 15. How do I enter my historic information? .....   | 46        |
| 16. Can I export information and recommendations from AFFIRM v3.0? ..                               | 46        |
| 17. How do I remove my information from AFFIRM v3.0? .....  | 46        |
| 18. Why is soil sampling and soil test results important? .....                                     | 46        |
| 19. What is the Estimated Nitrogen Release (ENR)? .....   | 46        |
| 20. How does AFFIRM v3.0 consider the previous crop residue nitrogen? .....                         | 47        |
| 21. How does AFFIRM v3.0 manage and estimate nutrients from manure? .....                           | 47        |
| 22. What is the difference between laboratory manure analyses and book values? .....                | 47        |
| 23. How does AFFIRM v3.0 manage nutrient stewardship? .....   | 47        |
| 24. Are AFFIRM v3.0 fertilizer recommendations based on target yields? .....                        | 47        |
| 25. Why don't some crops have an economic analysis? .....   | 48        |
| 26. How is the individual field economic analysis different from the whole farm optimization? ..... | 48        |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 27. Why can't alterations occur to P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> , K <sub>2</sub> O, S and micronutrient recommendations in the farm optimization? ..... | 48 |
| 28. Why does not AFFIRM v3.0 give the same recommendations as my laboratory report? .....  | 48 |

## Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1. Soil test laboratories and associated soil test methods.   | 11 |
| Table 2. Determining soil texture group from soil textural class.   | 15 |
| Table 3. Estimating plant available soil moisture based on depth of moist soil.   | 17 |
| Table 4. Crop tolerance to acid soils.  | 19 |
| Table 5. Effect of slat concentration on crop growth.   | 19 |
| Table 6. Salt tolerance of common crops grown in Alberta.   | 20 |
| Table 7. Typical soil organic matter levels for soil zones in Alberta.  | 21 |
| Table 8. Typical estimated nitrogen release (ENR) values (lb/ac) for cultivated Alberta soils.  | 22 |
| Table 9. Manure ammonia nitrogen retention factors.   | 23 |
| Table 10. Relative effectiveness of nitrogen fertilizer application for increasing crop yield.  | 24 |
| Table 11. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) values for soil textures.  | 26 |
| Table 12. N fertilizer economic analysis for Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR), Dark Brown (NE) soil group, intermediate moisture conditions. | 31 |
| Table 13. Fertilizer nutrient costs.  | 32 |
| Table 14. Field and crop information.   | 33 |
| Table 15. Fertilizer and nutrient costs to meet AFFIRM v3.0 recommendations.  | 33 |
| Table 16. Economic analysis for Canola for field A3.  | 35 |
| Table 17. Economic analysis for Malt barley for field A4.   | 36 |
| Table 18. Economic analysis for Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR) for field A5.   | 37 |
| Table 19. Economic analysis for Wheat - Western Amber Durum (WAD) for field A6.   | 38 |
| Table 20. Farm optimization - Allocation of 10 lb increments of fertilizer N for fields A3, A4, A5, and A6.                                 | 39 |
| Table 21. Adjusted fertilizer nutrient recommendation.  | 41 |

# Figures

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 1. Schematic of the nutrient recommendation module of AFFIRM v3.0   | 6  |
| Figure 2. Schematic of the crop response module for AFFIRM v3.0.   | 7  |
| Figure 3. Schematic of the nitrogen economic analysis module for AFFIRM v3.0.  | 8  |
| Figure 4. Schematic of the farm optimization module for AFFIRM v3.0.   | 9  |
| Figure 5. Soil test zones for Alberta.   | 13 |
| Figure 6. Determining soil texture by hand.  | 14 |
| Figure 7. Soil textural classes.   | 15 |
| Figure 8. Relationship of soil texture and soil moisture.  | 16 |
| Figure 9. Soil sampler and Brown soil moisture probe.  | 17 |
| Figure 10. Growing season precipitation probabilities for Alberta. (a) Optimum (10%), (b) Intermediate (50%), and (c) Low (90%). | 18 |
| Figure 11. Harmsen-Mitscherlich equation yield response curves.  | 28 |

# What is AFFIRM v3.0?

## 1. Introduction

AFFIRM v3.0 is a decision support application designed to assist the user in evaluating nutrient management options for fertilizers and livestock manure for crop production and making nutrient management decisions. Crop nutrient requirements are dependent upon various nutrient sources such as soil nutrient levels, previous crop residue management, manure, biosolids and fertilizer, plus agro-climatic variables such as spring soil moisture status, anticipated growing season precipitation or irrigation management and any crop growth soil limiting factors. Determining the appropriate rate of fertilizer nutrients aimed at optimizing crop production is dependent upon on the principles of limiting factor identification and diminishing economic returns based on crop price, fertilizer nutrient costs and the farm fertilizer budget. AFFIRM v3.0 will assist in understanding the factors that influence crop requirements and in formulating a fertilizer program that fits within the farm budget. AFFIRM v3.0 allows the user to compare nutrient management options based on nutrient stewardship decisions for nutrient source, time of application, placement, and rate. AFFIRM v3.0 is based on Alberta research. It can recommend fertilizer rates for over 160 different cereal, oilseed, pulse, forage, and specialty crops grown on either dryland or irrigation within the province.

AFFIRM v3.0 requires agronomic and economic information for the farm. Various cropping, nutrient management, moisture, and economic scenarios may evaluation are possible to optimize management decisions. The effects of spring soil moisture and anticipated growing season precipitation or irrigation has a significant impact for managing crop nutrient requirements. Crop price, fertilizer cost and the farm fertilizer budget provide AFFIRM v3.0 with the necessary information to conduct an economic analysis to determine the economic optimum rate of nitrogen fertilizer. With high fertilizer costs and variable soil moisture conditions, AFFIRM v3.0 is a tool to make informed nutrient management decisions that will enhance crop production efficiency and sustainability.

This user manual explains the four modules making up AFFIRM v3.0. The manual also explains each module variable and measurement technique. Schematic diagrams representing each module give a general understanding of the flow of calculations involved. The manual also provides equations and examples for economic calculations. The software supplies current references for further information on the factors that impact crop nutrient requirements.

## 2. Required information

AFFIRM v3.0 requires the following information to generate recommendations and record keeping:

Field legal land location or  
soil group

Previous crop grown (yield, residue management, soil and growing season or irrigation moisture, fertilizers type  
and fertilizer rates, time of application and placement)

Current crop grown.

Irrigation (if applicable).

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide**

Soil test results and sampling technique (time and depths).  
Soil test laboratory used for soil analyses.  
Manure test results or selected book values for each source of manure.  
Manure management (rate, time, and placement of manure application; weather conditions)  
Spring soil moisture conditions.  
Fertilizer products (for N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrients) for crop grown.  
N fertilizer time of application and placement (method of application)  
Fertilizer nutrient costs  
Expected crop price.  
Farm fertilizer budget

## What is new for version 3?

### 1. User access

AFFIRM v3.0 is now available as a web-based application which has allowed for the development of a stable application, compatible with current computer and tablet web browsers. The re-design of the software layout facilitates easy navigation, with functions for faster data input. Many of the features from the previous version has been maintained or enhanced.

### 2. Alberta.ca account

AFFIRM v3.0 is now a web-based application accessed by a sign in to an Alberta.ca [account](#). Creating an Alberta.ca Account allows you to securely access a variety of Alberta government online services—without needing to submit paper forms or appear in person. There is no cost to set up an Alberta.ca Account. Your account includes only the basic information required to establish it. When you use another participating government service, only the information necessary to provide that service is shared, ensuring your privacy and information is protected.

### 3. User menu

The creators have redesigned the user menu to incorporate new features and a web-based format. The Help menu item provides access to the User Guide.

### 4. Supporting documents

Updates to the User Guide, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and Tutorial Guide support the latest version of AFFIRM v3.0. The User Guide provides background information about AFFIRM v3.0 and how it generates nutrient management recommendations. The FAQs provides information on commonly asked questions. The Tutorial Guide provides instructions and examples that will lead the user through the program.

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide**

## 5. Interpretation of results

Enhanced alert messages provide information and interpretation of the entered information, corrective actions, and generated recommendations. Alert messages highlight key details that the user should consider when making fertilizer decisions.

## 6. Agronomic information

New agronomic nutrient management knowledge has become available. This knowledge and is now part of the AFFIRM v3.0 recommendation process. This includes nutrients from the soil, crop residues, manures, and fertilizers. The crop selection list has been expanded to include new alternative crops and traditional crops that were previously not included in the previous version.

## 7. Laboratory information

Updates to the list of soil test laboratories now contains current names, addition of new laboratories and removal of non-existent laboratories. Soil test calibrations for each laboratory method now link through the specific laboratory used for soil analyses. Laboratories may use more than one method to determine a nutrient concentration (particularly phosphorus). If this occurs, the recommendation is to use the method that is most appropriate test for Alberta conditions (Table 1).

## 8. Nutrient sources

### a. Soil nitrogen release estimates

The Estimated Nitrogen Release (ENR) provides an indication of the soil to mineralize (release) nitrogen over the growing season. The ENR is related to the soil organic matter level, and influenced by soil moisture and soil temperature, residue management and landscape position. As a first approximation, the ENR calculator uses the legal location and soil test area organic matter levels to predict the nitrogen release. With specific soil organic matter tests or ENR soil tests, better predictions of ENR are possible. There are several laboratory soil tests to measure the ENR. These tests will provide field specific estimates of nitrogen release that are more precise than estimates based on regional soil organic matter levels. The calibration for the nitrogen recommendation and or yield response to applied nitrogen fertilizer in AFFIRM v3.0 is based on soil groups and the typical ENR for cultivated soils in Alberta. Fields or sub-fields within soil zones may have higher ENR due to higher organic matter levels or the result of management practices such as manure applications. Soil group estimates supplied in the user guide will allow you to compare these averages with your field estimates. ENR values provide a basis to

adjust nitrogen fertilizer applications and the crop yield response to nitrogen fertilizer. More current research now updates ENR calculation, and integration into the AFFIRM v3.0 nitrogen fertilizer recommendation and crop yield response model.

## **b. Previous crop residue nitrogen credit**

Above and below ground residues from previous crop in rotation can provide a source of N to the crop grown in the current cropping year. If the above ground crop residue remains on the field and mixes into the soil, then the nitrogen mineralized from the above and below ground residue must occur to adjust fertilizer nitrogen requirements. If removal of the above ground crop residue occurs, then only the mineralized nitrogen from the below ground crop residue is account for to adjust fertilizer nitrogen requirements.

## **c. Manure nutrients**

AFFIRM v3.0 calculates the nutrients available from manure application as a contributing source for crop production and determining fertilizer requirements. AFFIRM v3.0 can utilize specific laboratory manure analysis or book values for manure sources, combined with how to apply the manure, the weather conditions at the time of manure application and the rate of manure application to calculate the quantity nutrients available from manure sources for crop production. AFFIRM v3.0 also factors in the previous 2 years application of manure to gauge the nutrients available for crop production.

## **d. Fertilizer sources**

The range of fertilizer producers has expanded for all nutrients. Availability of these products will vary among fertilizer dealers. There are new products called enhanced efficiency fertilizers. These products aim to reduce nutrient losses with the hope of better synchronizing nutrient uptake with crop nutrient demand. In 2022, further research studies on these products became available, in 2023 internal developers added this additional information to AFFIRM v3.0.

# **9. Nutrient stewardship**

Nutrient stewardship requires the implementation of nutrient beneficial management practices (BMPs) that optimize the efficiency of nutrient use. The goal of nutrient BMPs is to optimize crop productivity by matching nutrient supply with crop requirements and to minimize nutrient losses. Selection of BMPs varies by location, and those chosen for a given farm are dependent on local soil and climatic conditions, crop choice, management decisions and other site-specific factors. The nutrient stewardship factors that influence of 1) nutrient source; 2) time of nutrient application; 3) placement of nutrient application; and 4) rate of nutrient application, for making nutrient management decisions.

AFFIRM v3.0 allows the user to select nutrient stewardship options that includes:

Nutrient source – fertilizer products

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager** | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide

Classification: Public

Time of application – fall, spring, in-season

Nutrient placement – method of application (i.e., broadcast, seed-placed, banding, injection)

Fertilizer economics – nutrient costs, crop prices, economic return, and fertilizer budget. AFFIRM v3.0 uses these factors in conjunction with soil test nutrient levels, soil mineralization, crop residue, manure applied nutrients to determine the rate of nutrient application.

## 10. Crop yield response

AFFIRM v3.0 now utilizes the Harmsen-Mitscherlich equation (Harmsen, 2000a, b; Maaz et al., 2016; Pan et al., 2016) to predict crop yield response where research is available. This equation that combines nitrogen supply with water supply to predicted crop yield response. This equation utilizes the principle of diminishing returns for nitrogen supply. Updated yield response functions based on:

**Water Supply** that includes spring soil moisture, growing season precipitation based on long term probabilities, and irrigation level.

**Nitrogen Supply** that includes soil test nitrate, estimated nitrogen release from soil organic matter, nitrogen from previous crop residue, manure nitrogen and fertilizer nitrogen.

## 11. Whole farm optimization

The developers have enhanced the whole farm optimization to include Nutrient Stewardship options for fertilizer product, timing, and placement, along with fertilizer economics, to recommend nutrient application for all fields included in the analysis.

## Components of AFFIRM v3.0

AFFIRM v3.0 is comprised of four separate but connected modules to identify crop nutrient deficiencies and generate corrective nutrient recommendations. A module is a set of mathematical equations that describe the relationship between variables (e.g., crop available moisture and nutrient supply) that determine an outcome (e.g., crop yield and fertilizer requirements).

### 1. Nutrient recommendation module

AFFIRM v3.0 is a full spectrum recommendation system for macronutrients (N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O and S) and micronutrients (B, Cu, Fe, Mn, Zn and Cl). This module provides fertilizer recommendations for nutrient deficiency corrections for only those nutrients that are limiting crop production and other soil limitations (moisture, soil texture and/or soil chemistry).

Formulation of fertilizer recommendations occurred using crop specific nutrient calibration curves, combined with field information and laboratory soil test data. AFFIRM v3.0 utilizes a series of adjustments specific to crop, field,

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager** | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide

and nutrient (Figure 1). Field information, laboratory soil test data, and sampling information, combine to formulate a basic recommendation. Building on this basic recommendation by adjusting for location, soil characteristics, fertilizer and/or manure management options and moisture conditions a final recommendation for N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrients takes shape.




Figure 1. Schematic of the nutrient recommendation module of AFFIRM v3.0

For those crops with yield response equations, AFFIRM v3.0 utilizes an economic analysis to determine a rate of N associated with economic optimization.

## 2. Crop yield response module

Crop yield response equations describe the relationship between nitrogen supply and available water to produce crop yield. Understanding this relationship requires intensive and extensive field research and advanced statistical analysis. The ability to predict yield from N supply allows one to calculate the total revenue produced (yield) from a quantity of fertilizer applied.

The crop yield response model for AFFIRM v3.0 (Figure 2) predicts crop yield response based on nitrogen supply (Ns) and water supply (Ws).

The nitrogen supply includes:

- soil test nitrate to a depth of 60 cm (24 inches),
- estimated nitrogen release from soil organic matter,
- previous crop residue nitrogen,
- manure nitrogen (current and past application),
- fertilizer nitrogen (source, time, and placement)

The water supply includes:

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide**

spring soil moisture level,  
growing season precipitation level,  
irrigation level.

Using the nitrogen supplied by the soil, crop residue, and manure with expected spring soil moisture conditions, the crop yield response model predicts crop yield at increasing levels of nitrogen fertilizer for low, intermediate, and optimum levels of anticipated precipitation or irrigation. Yield increases with additional N fertilizer application. However, there is a point when additional application of N fertilizer results in smaller and smaller crop yield increase. This is the principle known as diminishing returns. The model stops when added yield increases are below a significant research level (i.e., less than one bushel). Model equations are regression-based, non-linear, functions. Yield prediction occurs at units of ten-pound (lb) increments of nitrogen.

Crop yield response equations are specific to the crop, soil group and fertilizer management (product, time, and placement). Model equations are available for those annual crops with yield response data. The module assumes P, K, S, and micronutrients are in adequate supply.




Figure 2. Schematic of the crop response module for AFFIRM v3.0.

### 3. Nitrogen economic analysis module

The goal to achieve the potential maximum yield may not always be economic (i.e., the dollar spent for extra fertilizer returns less than a dollar revenue from extra yield). Rather, producers should aim at those yields that will optimize economic returns. For crops with yield response equations, AFFIRM v3.0 formulates N recommendations on a marginal economic analysis (see Figure 3). The incorporation of crop price, N fertilizer cost and yield response data allows AFFIRM v3.0 to analyze how increasing the rate of N will influence yields, costs, and economic returns. Derived from the yield response equations, increasing N supply will increase yield, but eventually at a decreasing rate. Following the principle of diminishing returns, AFFIRM v3.0 expresses this concept in the economic analysis as a ratio called the investment ratio:

Investment ratio (IR) = Marginal return (MR) / Marginal cost (MC) Where:  
 Marginal return = expected yield increase (bu/10 lb N) X crop price (\$/bu) = (\$/10 lb N)  
 Marginal cost = fertilizer nitrogen cost (\$/10 lb N)

An IR greater than one indicates an economic return greater than zero (i.e., the additional yield produced from the extra fertilizer applied was greater than the extra fertilizer cost). An IR less than 1 indicates an economic loss and although it may increase yield, it is not enough to cover the cost of the extra fertilizer. Achievement of maximum economic return happens when MR equal MC.

The AFFIRM v3.0 nitrogen economic analysis module compares the incremental cost (10 lbs) of N fertilizer with added return of the extra crop yield produced from the additional 10 lbs of N fertilizer. In a perfect world, it would make economic sense to keep applying fertilizer until the yield would just cover the fertilizer cost (i.e., IR = 1). However, in the uncertain world of crop production (weather and crop prices), a default IR of 2 is the chosen starting point (i.e., additional revenue should be double the additional cost). The user can override this default and set the IR to reflect the user’s comfort level of risk.

Based on estimated yield data from the crop response module (Figure 2), the nitrogen economic module (Figure 3) initiates by determining the additional yield gained (i.e., yield increase) from an additional 10 lbs of N (AFFIRM v3.0 stops calculating when yield increase is less than 1 bushel). Comparison of marginal returns to marginal costs determines the investment ratio. The economic rate of N reported reflects the set target investment ratio. Inclusion of a sample calculation of the model is available in the nitrogen economic analysis calculations section of this manual. For those crops without a yield response equation, the model reports the basic recommendation. The system cannot conduct a nitrogen economic analysis.




Figure 3. Schematic of the nitrogen economic analysis module for AFFIRM v3.0.

## 4. Farm optimization module

The farm optimization module will optimize the allocation of a fertilizer budget to those fields analyzed individually by AFFIRM v3.0 and provide a summarization of fertilizer requirements for the farm. Based on the available fertilizer budget, the optimization module integrates the resources of yield response data and economic analysis to allocate the budget to optimize economic return. Like the nitrogen economic analysis of individual fields, the farm optimization analysis is specific to the anticipated growing season precipitation or irrigation level (low, intermediate, and optimum).

The farm optimization module (Figure 4) accesses the recommendation and economic analysis information from all analyzed fields. Before running the optimization analysis, the fertilizer budget receives a debit to fulfill the P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrients recommendations of all fields and N recommendations of those fields without yield response equations. The remaining portion of the budget is then available to optimize N requirements of those fields with yield response equations.

Based on the target investment ratios, the optimization module systematically allocates N fertilizer (in 10 lb increments) to those fields that will provide the highest economic return as measured by the investment ratio (IR). The system will continue distributing N fertilizer until it achieves all target investment ratios or exhausts the budget. AFFIRM v3.0 indicates the IR it achieved when it exhausts the budget. The farm optimization module includes sample calculations of the model in its calculation section.

This optimization component is particularly useful if the farm budget does not meet the individual field recommendations made by AFFIRM v3.0. This module will assist deciding where best to allocate limited fertilizer budget among all fields for the highest economic return. As well, it is an excellent summary tool to calculate total fertilizer costs and view recommendations for each field on the farm.




Figure 4. Schematic of the farm optimization module for AFFIRM v3.0.

## Limitations of AFFIRM v3.0

### 1. Current field research

This version of AFFIRM v3.0 is based on research conducted within the last 10 years. Agronomic practices are constantly evolving that includes new crops, new varieties, new fertilizers, and new management options. Tillage, crop residue management and manure management can have a profound effect on crop nutrient requirements. The creators designed AFFIRM v3.0 to incorporate new research as it becomes available.

## 2. Crop yield response model

To determine the yield increases from additional fertilizer, AFFIRM v3.0 has crop response equations specific to each crop, soil group and fertilizer management (source, time, placement) that incorporates nitrogen supply and available moisture. Due to the extensive research required, yield response equations are available for fourteen (14) of the 160 crops within AFFIRM v3.0. Crops such as forages, pulses and specialty crops are not available in the economic analysis. Within the optimization module, all nutrient recommendations are static for these crops.

## 3. Farm optimization

Due to limited research data, the marginal analysis is currently restricted to nitrogen. Nitrogen yield response equations assume that all other nutrients are in adequate supply and therefore,  $P_2O_5$ ,  $K_2O$ , S and micronutrient costs become fixed cost, removing them from the budget in the first step of the module. This partial budget approach focuses on the nitrogen fertilizer requirements. These nutrient recommendations and incurred costs do not change. AFFIRM v3.0, however, assumes the base yield produced without any nitrogen applied should be adequate to cover the costs of these nutrients.

## Nutrient recommendation modules

From Alberta field and laboratory research data, the nutrient recommendation module utilizes a series of coefficients based on the information entered and a series of adjustments to formulate fertilizer requirements (Figure 1). To determine the nitrogen requirement, AFFIRM v3.0 will utilize the crop response module (Figure 2) and economic analysis module (Figure 3) to formulate an economic optimum nitrogen rate for each field. Once data input for all fields is complete, the user can proceed to the farm optimization module (Figure 4) to summarize nutrient recommendations and fertilizer costs and/or determine where best to allocate resources for N application amongst the fields to optimize economic returns with a limited budget.

## 1. Fertilizer recommendations

AFFIRM v3.0 formulates nutrient recommendations based on soil test results and numerous factors that will influence nutrient availability and crop yield potential (Figure 1).

### a. Soil sample depth

Field research data indicates that half of the available nitrogen and sulfur are present below 15 cm (6 inches). If only surface samples (0-6 or 0-12 inch) are present to measure nitrate-N and sulfate-S, then AFFIRM v3.0 will estimate the sub-soil nitrate-N and sulfate-S to 60 cm (24 inches). Irrigation status and the previous crop grown—or whether the farmer left the field fallow—determine the estimates.

Recommendations for phosphate, potash, and micronutrients (boron, copper, iron, manganese, and zinc) are based on soil test results from 0-15 cm (0-6 inches). Recommendations for chloride are based on soil test results for soil samples to a depth of 60 cm (24 inches).

## b. Soil sampling time

Basic fertilizer recommendations are based on spring soil sampling. For those samples not taken in the fall, AFFIRM v3.0 adjusts the soil test nitrogen to account for the mineralization (i.e.

conversion of nitrogen to a plant available form) that would have occurred between the time of sampling and spring seeding. Adjustments are dependent upon the soil group of the field.

## c. Soil test laboratory

Each soil test laboratory has specific set of techniques and methods to determine plant available nutrients. Based on the soil test laboratory selected, AFFIRM v3.0 will utilize a nutrient calibration appropriate for the laboratory method associated with the specific laboratory. Occasionally, a laboratory may use more than one method to determine a nutrient soil test (such as soil test P). Please use Table 1 below for most appropriate for Alberta conditions.

Table 1. Soil test laboratories and associated soil test methods.

| Laboratory    | Laboratory Extraction or Procedure |                              |                     |                     |                |                |                       |                                   |           |           |           |           |
|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|               | NO <sub>3</sub> -N                 | P                            | K                   | SO <sub>4</sub> -S  | pH             | Salinity       | B                     | Cl                                | Cu        | Mn        | Fe        | Zn        |
| A & L         | K <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>     | Mehlich 3                    | Mehlich 3           | Mehlich 3           | 1:1 Soil:Water | 1:2 Soil:Water | Mehlich 3             | K <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>    | Mehlich 3 | Mehlich 3 | Mehlich 3 | Mehlich 3 |
| AGAT          | Mod Bray 1<br>Miller & Axley       | Mod Bray 1<br>Miller & Axley | Ammonium<br>Acetate | CaCl <sub>2</sub>   | 1:2 Soil:Water | 1:2 Soil:Water | Hot CaCl <sub>2</sub> | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      |
| AGVISE        | KCl                                | Olsen                        | Ammonium<br>Acetate | KCl                 | 1:1 Soil:Water | 1:1 Soil:Water | DTPA                  | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      |
| ALS           | CaCl <sub>2</sub>                  | Mod Kelowna (SK)             | Mod Kelowna (SK)    | CaCl <sub>2</sub>   | 1:2 Soil:Water | 1:2 Soil:Water | Hot Water             | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      |
| Down to Earth | CaCl <sub>2</sub>                  | Mod Kelowna (SK)             | Ammonium<br>Acetate | CaCl <sub>2</sub>   | 1:1 Soil:Water | 1:1 Soil:Water | Hot Water             | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      |
| Exova/Element | Mod Kelowna (NW)                   | Mod Kelowna (NW)             | Mod Kelowna (NW)    | CaCl <sub>2</sub>   | 1:2 Soil:Water | 1:2 Soil:Water | Hot Water             | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA-TEA  | DTPA-TEA  | DTPA-TEA  | DTPA-TEA  |
| Farmer's Edge | CaCl <sub>2</sub>                  | Mod Kelowna (NW)             | Mod Kelowna (NW)    | CaCl <sub>2</sub>   | 1:2 Soil:Water | 1:2 Soil:Water | DTPA                  | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      |
| Midwest       | CaCl <sub>2</sub>                  | Bray 1                       | Ammonium<br>Acetate | Ammonium<br>Acetate | 1:1 Soil:Water | 1:1 Soil:Water | Hot Water             | Ca(NO <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      | DTPA      |

## d. Current crop and nutrient requirements

Crops vary in their nutrient requirements and tolerance to soil and environmental stresses. Fertilizer recommendations are dependent upon the crop choice for the year. Growing conditions and crop type will result in different nutrient removal rates and therefore different nutrient requirements. If a choice to grow a pure legume crop or legume with a non-legume crop mix occurs, then AFFIRM v3.0 factors in the microbial symbiotic nitrogen

fixation to reduce fertilizer nitrogen requirements. Under seeding a perennial legume crop in an annual grain crop, will alter fertilizer recommendation given for the annual grain crop. As the percent legume increases in the under seeded crop, the rate of nitrogen fertilizer can decrease while the rate of phosphate, potash and sulfur should increase to insure a healthy establishment.

## 2. Fertilizer recommendation adjustments

### a. Soil test regions

Soil test regions within Alberta are reflective of the climatic differences (growing season precipitation and evapotranspiration) within the province, which influences crop yield potential. Alberta has eight different soil test regions of agricultural importance (Figure 5). AFFIRM v3.0 uses soil regions information to determine precipitation probabilities and will adjust all macronutrient recommendations accordingly, with the greatest reduction made in those portions of the province with the greatest potential moisture deficit (i.e., brown, and dark brown soil groups). The definition of soil test regions is by ecoregions, which are distinctive ecological groupings formed in response to climate. Within each ecoregion, there are ecodistricts, which are distinctive relief assemblages (drainage), geology, landforms, soils, vegetation, water, and fauna.




Figure 5. Soil test zones for Alberta.

## b. Soil texture

Soil texture is the relative proportions of sand, silt, and clay in soil. Texture affects the water holding capacity and nutrient availability of the soil. Sandy textured soils have a lower water and nutrient retention capability than silt or clay, which can limit crop growth potential. As a result, AFFIRM v3.0 reduces nitrogen recommendations for those very coarse, and coarse textured soils under irrigation. In organic soil conditions, P recommendations increase for irrigated crops due to the limited supply of plant available P and larger yield potential.

### Method to determine soil texture by hand

To determine soil texture, follow the hand method outlined in Figure 6. By feeling, squeezing, and observing a handful of soil, the texture of the soil can be determined. If the relative proportions of sand and clay from

laboratory analysis, then use Figure 7. Once the texture is determined, identification of a soil texture group follows from Table 2. AFFIRM v3.0 requires a soil texture group when entering soil information.




Figure 6. Determining soil texture by hand.

Source: Lavery, D.H. and A. Bollo Kamara, 1988.




Figure 7. Soil textural classes.

Source: Canada Department of Agriculture, revised 1976.

Table 2. Determining soil texture group from soil textural class.

| Soil Texture Group | Soil Texture Classes and Description         |
|--------------------|--|
| Very Coarse        | Sand, Loamy Sand                             |
| Coarse             | Sandy Loam, Fine Sandy Loam                  |
| Medium             | Loam, Sandy Clay Loam, Sandy Clay, Clay Loam |
| Fine               | Silt Loam, Silty Clay Loam, Silt             |
| Very Fine          | Clay, Silty Clay, Heavy Clay                 |
| Muck               | 30 – 45% Organic Matter                      |
| Peaty Muck         | 45 – 65% Organic Matter                      |
| Mucky Peat         | 65 – 85% Organic Matter                      |
| Peat               | 85 – 100% Organic Matter                     |

Source: Kryzanowski, L., et al.1988.

### c. Spring soil moisture

Spring soil moisture will affect nutrient availability and early plant growth potential. In combination with anticipated growing season precipitation, spring soil moisture plays an important in determining estimated yield response for **Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager** | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide

the economic analysis. AFFIRM v3.0 will adjust crop requirements according to the amount of available moisture present early in the growing season. Soil moisture is highly dependent upon soil texture (Figure 8).




Figure 8. Relationship of soil texture and soil moisture.

Source: Buckman and Brady, 1969.

### Method to determine available soil moisture

Based on the soil texture and depth of moist soil, the soil moisture status is simple to determine. The Brown Soil Probe (Figure 9) is an effective tool for determining the depth of moist soil (manufacture of a soil moisture probe involves welding a two cm steel ball on one end of a one meter long 1.25 cm rod and welding a handle on the other end). By vigorously pushing the probe into the soil in one motion, without turning, the probe will penetrate the soil and will stop when the probe reaches dry soil. Stones and frozen soil may stop the probe as well, detection of these is easy. The Brown Soil Probe has a short section of a wood bit welded to the end of the probe so that withdrawal of a sample of soil happens with a clockwise twist of the probe. This soil sample is useful in determining texture class and moisture by feel.



Figure 9. Soil sampler and Brown soil moisture probe.

Here are four tips when using the soil moisture probe to determine stored soil water content:

Select a representative area of the field. Avoid saline areas, potholes, and other problem areas. Depression areas, slopes, and measure knolls separately for site-specific crop planning.

Sample each field separately. Rainfall amounts can vary over short distances, crops and varieties differ in water use and crops mature at different times due to varying seeding dates and days to maturity, and other climate conditions, crop requirements that affect crop growth patterns.

Sample a minimum of 15 to 20 sites per field and record the average depth of moist soil. Spring sampling may require more sites within a field because of increased variability caused by snow trapping, snow drifting, water runoff, moisture migration within the soil and variations in ground frost, and other moisture dynamics in freeze thaw conditions.

With the soil texture and depth of moist soil, use Table 3 to determine the spring soil moisture level (low, intermediate, or optimum). Assume a spring soil moisture level of optimum with irrigated crops.

Table 3. Estimating plant available soil moisture based on depth of moist soil.

| Texture Group    | Plant available soil moisture (cm/m) | Depth of moist soil (cm) |              |         |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------|
|                  |                                      | Low                      | Intermediate | Optimum |
| Very Coarse      | 7-8                                  | 30-60                    | 60-120       | 120 +   |
| Coarse           | 10-14                                | 30-50                    | 50-100       | 100 +   |
| Medium           | 15-18                                | 15-30                    | 30-60        | 60 +    |
| Fine & Very Fine | 16-19                                | 15-30                    | 30-60        | 60 +    |

Source: Derived from Buckman and Brady, 1969.

## d. Growing season precipitation

Growing season precipitation (May-August) represents the significant moisture for rain-fed crop production. In combination with spring soil moisture, the anticipated growing season precipitation plays an important role in determining estimated yield response for the economic analysis. AFFIRM v3.0 will adjust crop nutrient requirements according to the amount of growing season precipitation. Historical growing season precipitation for Alberta, is the source for generating expected growing season precipitation probabilities for Alberta at the township level.




Figure 10. Growing season precipitation probabilities for Alberta. (a) Optimum (10%), (b) Intermediate (50%), and (c) Low (90%).

## e. Irrigation levels

For irrigated crops, AFFIRM v3.0 assigns total growing season moisture levels for Low, Intermediate and Optimum conditions based on crop evapotranspiration Alberta research (Bennett and Harms, 2011; Bennett, et al, 2014).

## f. Soil pH

Soil pH or soil reaction indicates acidity or alkalinity of the soil. AFFIRM v3.0 considers a soil pH below 6.5 as acidic and a soil pH above 7.5 as alkaline. A soil pH of 7.0 is neutral. Soil pH will physically, chemically, and biologically affect the availability of nutrients. Nutrients can be physically unavailable, tightly bound to soil colloids. Chemical structures of nutrients, particularly P, can change under low pH, making them unavailable for plant uptake. pH affects microbial survival and growth, which in its turn influences N fixation, mineralization, and the release of plant available nutrients.

Crops vary in their acidity tolerance (Table 4). Crop production in soils more acidic than the tolerance level of a crop will result in reduced yields. Under acidic conditions, AFFIRM v3.0 will adjust recommendations based on crop type and pH level for anticipated reduced yield potential. To contend with soil acidity, growing a crop that is more acid tolerant or liming the soil to correct the acid condition are options. However, before making a substantial investment to lime, marl, or wood ash, consider the area of application and application rate. Also requesting a specific lime requirement test from the laboratory would be prudent.

Table 4. Crop tolerance to acid soils.

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Non-tolerant Crops:</b><br>Alfalfa, sweet clover                                  | Tolerate pH 5.5 to 6.0 |
| <b>Moderately Tolerant Crops:</b> Barley, wheat, canola, alsike, red clover, trefoil | Tolerate pH 5.0 to 5.5 |
| <b>Tolerant Crops:</b><br>Brome, timothy, creeping red fescue, flax, oats            | Tolerate pH 4.5 to 5.0 |

Source: Alberta Agriculture, 2004

### e. Soil salinity

Electrical conductivity (EC) is a measure of the total soluble salt concentration in a soil (i.e., salinity). Soluble salts are always present in soils, however, when the concentration of salts is high, the soil is “saline” and crop growth decreases (Table 5). Yield reduction is dependent upon the crop species and their level of salinity tolerance (Table 6). Grass forages tend to have higher salinity tolerance than field crops. AFFIRM v3.0 will adjust recommendations according to the crop type and salt concentration.

Table 5. Effect of salt concentration on crop growth.

| EC (dS/m) | Description  |
|-----------|--|
| 0-2.5     | Negligible salt effects  |
| 2.5-4.9   | Very sensitive crops affected                                      |
| 5.0-8.0   | Yield of most crops decreases                                      |
| 8.0+      | Salinity level is very high and a serious limitation to most crops |

Source: Kryzanowski, L. et al. 1988.

Table 6. Salt tolerance of common crops grown in Alberta.

| Salt tolerance | EC (dS/m) | Field crops   | Forages   |
|----------------|-----------|---|---|
| Low            | 0-4       | Field beans<br>Peas   | Timothy<br>White Dutch clover<br>Alsike clover<br>Red clover  |
| Moderate       | 4-8       | Corn<br>Potatoes<br>Canola<br>Flax<br>Yellow mustard<br>Oats  | Meadow fescue<br>Reed canary grass<br>Intermediate wheatgrass<br>Crested wheatgrass   |
| High           | 8-16      | Spring wheat<br>Winter wheat<br>Fall rye<br>2-row barley<br>Sunflower<br>Safflower<br>6-row barley<br>Sugar beets | Brome grass<br>Alfalfa<br>Sweet clover<br>Birds foot trefoil<br>Slender wheatgrass<br>Russian wild rye<br>Tall wheatgrass<br>Altai wild rye |
| Very high      | >20       |   | Alkali succatan<br>Levonns alkali grass<br>Beardless wild rye   |

Source: Alberta Agriculture, 2001.

### 3. Additional considerations

There are seven other factors that can affect the level of nutrients available to the crop. Below is a list of the factors considered when making fertilizer decisions.

## a. Soil organic matter (SOM)

Soil organic matter measured as percent organic matter is the amount of plant and animal residue in the soil. Soil organic matter can range from recent crop residue to highly decomposed organic residues. The color of the soil is usually closely related to its organic matter content, with darker soils being higher in organic matter, while light colored soils (brown or grey) have lower soil organic matter levels. Organic matter content of the soil will influence the water holding capacity and nutrient availability of the soil. Typical levels of Alberta soil group SOM (for cultivated soils) range from 2 – 10% (Table 7). Specific soil organic matter levels may vary based on management history (tillage, crop residue, native vegetation) and landscape position.

Table 7. Typical soil organic matter levels for soil zones in Alberta.

| Soil Zone          | Cultivated Soil |           | Native Soils |            |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|------------|
|                    | Mean            | Range     | Mean         | Range      |
| Brown Soil         | 2.4             | 1.9 – 2.9 | 5.0          | 3.1 – 6.9  |
| Dark Brown         | 4.6             | 3.3 – 6.0 | 8.1          | 6.4 – 9.8  |
| Black              | 7.2             | 4.8 – 9.6 | 12.0         | 7.4 – 16.7 |
| Dark Grey (NE, SW) | 5.7             | 5.3 – 6.0 | 6.5          | 5.3 – 7.7  |
| Dark Grey (Peace)  | 5.2             | 3.4 – 6.9 | 14.3         | 4.8 – 23.7 |

Source: Adapted from Reinl, E. 1984.

## b. Estimated nitrogen release (ENR) from soil organic matter

The organic matter serves as a reserve for essential nutrients, especially nitrogen. Bacterial activity will release a portion of this reserve nitrogen, making it available for crop growth (a process known as mineralization). The ENR is an estimate of the amount of nitrogen released over the growing season and is related to the soil organic matter level, plus soil moisture and temperature.

ENR provides valuable information about the soils ability to mineralize soil organic nitrogen. The nitrogen recommendation module and the crop yield response to nitrogen module of AFFIRM v3.0 both account for the average nitrogen release over the growing season (Table 8), based on average soil organic matter of each soil group. However, nitrogen release in a field may deviate from this average due to variation in soil organic matter levels, soil moisture and soil temperature during the growing season, residue management and landscape position. For example, soils with higher organic matter levels than the typical average for a particular soil group (Table 8) may have greater nitrogen release potential. Elevated measured ENR values would indicate greater than expected nitrogen from the soil for crop growth.

ENR can be determined from soil organic matter or specific laboratory tests. Lab calculated ENR values provide field specific estimates of nitrogen release that are more precise than AFFIRM v3.0 calculated ENR estimates, based on regional soil organic matter levels (Table 8). Potential nitrogen release (PNR) test determines the readily mineralizable organic N present in the soil. Laboratories will typically use either a hot KCl or phosphate-borate test to determine the PNR. Once the concentration of the mineralizable organic N pool is determined (i.e. PNR), ENR is calculated through a series of equations that factor in the effects of soil temperature and moisture over the growing season. There is a strong correlation between soil organic matter level and ENR.

Table 8. Typical estimated nitrogen release (ENR) values (lb/ac) for cultivated Alberta soils.

|                     | Dryland Soil |          | Irrigated Soils |           |
|---------------------|--------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Soil Zone           | Mean         | Range    | Mean            | Range     |
| Brown Soil          | 48           | 41 - 54  | 65              | 59 - 72   |
| Dark Brown (NE, SW) | 76           | 59 - 95  | 94              | 77 - 113  |
| Black (NE, SW)      | 111          | 79 - 146 | 129             | 96 - 164  |
| Dark Grey (NE, SW)  | 91           | 85 - 95  | 109             | 103 - 113 |
| Dark Grey (Peace)   | 84           | 60 - 72  | 102             | 78 - 125  |

Source: Mezbahuddin et al. 2018; Derived from Campbell, C. A., et al. 1984, 1997 and Jalil, A., et al., 1996.

AFFIRM v3.0 takes this source of nitrogen into account when calculating N fertilizer requirements for the crop production. Consideration should be given to the difference between regional and field specific ENR values when making N fertilizer decisions.

### c. Previous crop residue management

Above and below ground residues from previous crop in rotation can provide a source of N to the growth of the current crop in the current cropping year. N mineralization from previous crop residues depends upon various factors like quantity of residues, microbial degradability of the residue (quality of residue), and soil and environmental conditions. Residues from field crops are usually very high in their C to N ratios. Therefore, addition of residues from a previous field crop would immediately hasten immobilization of available soil N. But with subsequent microbial decomposition, N from these residues would eventually be re-mineralized. In contrast, residues from a previous pulse (legume) crop would contribute to larger N mineralization and hence higher N supply to the current crop for a given substrate quantity and soil and environmental condition (Miller et al., 2003; Przednowek et al., 2004; St. Luce, 2015). Again, N contribution of pulses may vary depending upon soil and environmental conditions, which affect the degree of biological N<sub>2</sub> fixation, legume grain yields, and the quantity and quality of crop residues (St. Luce, 2015). Plowing down a forage crop can increase plant available nitrogen in the soil for subsequent crop use. To determine the potential amount of nitrogen currently available to the crop, consider:

- The type of forage stand (percent legume)
- The time of year when plow down of the crop happens, and
- Whether the farmer harvested the crop before plow down.

If harvest of a stand occurs prior to plow down or the stand has as low percentage of legume, less nutrients will be available to the crop compared to an unharvested stand or a high legume content crop. The longer the period between plow down and subsequent cropping the longer the time for mineralization to occur and release useable forms of nutrients into the soil.

AFFIRM v3.0 uses the crop yield from the previous year and the residue management to calculate the nitrogen from the previous crop that would be available for the next crop.

## d. Manure application

Manure is a valuable resource and a significant source of nutrients. One of the most critical tasks in manure nutrient management planning is determining the appropriate manure application rates to get the desired crop productivity. Manure nutrient content is highly variable and can vary depending upon livestock source and method of storage and handling. It is also necessary in certain scenarios to determine fertilizer application rates to meet any nutrient requirements not met through manure application. These activities involve using information including available land base; soil nutrient profile; crop nutrient requirements; nutrient content of manure; application method and time, and soil and weather conditions.

Table 9. Manure ammonia nitrogen retention factors.

| Application Strategy                       | Weather Conditions |          |          |          |          |
|--|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | Average            | Cool-Wet | Cool-Dry | Warm-Wet | Warm-Dry |
| Surface applied, incorporated within 1 day | 0.75               | 0.90     | 0.85     | 0.75     | 0.50     |
| Surface applied, incorporated within 1 day | 0.70               | 0.87     | 0.81     | 0.69     | 0.43     |
| Surface applied, incorporated within 1 day | 0.65               | 0.85     | 0.78     | 0.56     | 0.35     |
| Surface applied, incorporated within 1 day | 0.60               | 0.83     | 0.70     | 0.50     | 0.28     |
| Surface applied, incorporated within 1 day | 0.55               | 0.80     | 0.70     | 0.50     | 0.20     |
| Surface applied, not incorporated          | 0.34               | 0.60     | 0.50     | 0.25     | 0.00     |
| Injected                                   | 1.00               | 1.00     | 1.00     | 1.00     | 1.00     |
| Cover crop                                 | 0.65               | 0.75     | 0.25     | 0.40     | 0.50     |

Source: Nutrient Management Planning Guide, Alberta Agriculture and Food, 2008.

The current practice in Alberta is to base manure application on crop available N, which is the first limiting nutrient in most Alberta cropping scenarios. The impact this practice has on levels of other nutrients in the soil needs consideration. By applying manure based on N, the simultaneous application rates of other nutrients including P and K will exceed crop removal. This is due to the typical nutrient content of most manure. This has three important implications:

Applying nutrients above their agronomic requirement prevents realization of the full economic value of manure. Research has clearly demonstrated that long term application of P above agronomic rates is contributing to P build-up in surface soil layers to the point that there is increased risk of runoff losses of P. Loss of P to surface water is a significant environmental concern.

High soil test levels of certain nutrients can impair the crop's ability to absorb other essential nutrients (e.g., high soil test P can impair zinc uptake).

Phosphorus-based application of manure has the advantage of avoiding nutrient accumulation. Unfortunately, a major constraint is the current application technologies are not able to consistently apply manure at rates low

enough to meet agronomic P requirements. Also, the land base necessary for acceptable phosphorus-based application rates of manure can be 3 to 6 times greater than the land base necessary for nitrogen-based manure application.

If eligible land base exceeds manure supply the issue, then becomes how to prioritize fields for application to maximize economic benefit. The basis of prioritizing fields can consider:

- distance to field from storage,
- fertility requirements (e.g., high nutrient use crops, high fertilizer recommendations),
- value of the growing crop,
- presence of degraded soils (e.g., eroded areas, low organic matter, poor tilth) that would benefit from manure application,
- desire to minimize nuisance to neighbors or environmental risk,
- accessibility or flexibility in crop management.

AFFIRM v3.0 calculates the nutrients available from manure application as a contributing source for crop production and determining fertilizer requirements. AFFIRM v3.0 utilizes specific laboratory manure analysis or book values for manure sources, combined with the method of manure application, the weather conditions at the time of manure application and the rate of manure application to calculate the quantity nutrients available from manure sources for crop production. AFFIRM v3.0 also factors in the previous 2 years application of manure to gauge the nutrients available for crop production.

**e. Fertilizer application**

Fertilizer timing (season), placement, and product type all influence the effectiveness of the fertilizer application.

Nitrogen fertilizer requirements for optimum economic returns on crops grown in Alberta cover a very wide range of application rates depending on the soil nitrogen level, soil nitrogen mineralization during the growing season, manure nitrogen, nitrogen from previous crop residue, spring soil moisture and growing season precipitation and or irrigation. Nitrogen fertilizers are very soluble and move readily in moist soil. Placement with or very near the seed is not necessary to ensure effective utilization. Seven other placement options exist which include broadcasting, pre-plant banding, side-banding or mid-row banding at planting, seed row placement, in-season broadcasting and in-season fertigation.

*Table 10. Relative effectiveness of nitrogen fertilizer application for increasing crop yield.*

|  |                          |              |         |           |
|--|--------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|
| Method and Time of Nitrogen Fertilizer Application | Soil-Climatic Categories |              |         |           |
|  | Dry                      | Intermediate | Optimum | 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 |

Source: Alberta Fertilizer Guide, 2004.

Enhanced efficiency fertilizer nitrogen (EEFN) products include fertilizer N products with nitrification inhibitors or nitrification plus urease inhibitors or controlled release N products. The purpose of these enhanced efficiency products is to control the transformation of ammonium-N to nitrate-N, the dominant nitrogen form used by crops. The potential outcome of the use of these products is to synchronize available crop N with crop demand, reduce N losses, increase N uptake by the crop, increase crop yield or reduce fertilizer N requirements to achieve similar yields with non-EEFN products. It is also possible to blend EEFN and non-EEFN products to improve synchronized fertilizer N with crop demand. There can be a significant cost difference between EEFN and non-EEFN products which will influence the economic decision for products and rates of application.

For phosphate fertilizer application, available soil test phosphorus (P) levels tend to be characteristic of individual fields or soil types and do not vary widely from year to year owing to previous management. An agronomist can determine the required phosphate fertilizer rate based on the field's soil test phosphorus level, the crop's phosphorus needs, and the expected growing conditions. Phosphate fertilizers do not move readily in soil. Placing the band of phosphate near developing seedling roots of annual crops is most effective. Placement below the depth of seeding may improve availability under dry conditions because the fertilizer is in a moist part of the root zone for a longer time than with seed row placement. Broadcast-incorporated applications are less effective than when fertilizer banding occurs with or near the seed of annual crops. Broadcast application should be two to four times the recommended rates for banding or seed row application. On established forages, response to broadcast applications may be delayed owing to the slow movement of phosphorus into the root zone. A greater response may occur in the year following application than in the year of application. On soil very deficient in phosphorus, phosphate fertilizer banding or incorporation before seeding perennial forages is the best.

Potassium (K) deficient soils are not common throughout Alberta but do occur quite frequently in certain areas and soil types. Potassium deficiencies tend to occur on sandy, calcareous soils and soils with poor subsurface drainage adjacent to and on organic soils. Soils testing low in available potassium occur most frequently in west-central, northwestern (excluding the Peace region) and northeastern Alberta. Potassium will move in the soil more readily than phosphorus, but for annual crops, potassium fertilizers are more efficient when drilled with the seed or banded. Broadcast applications of about twice the rate used for drill-in application are effective. The maximum safest amount placed when seeding of cereals is 35 lb/ac. For small-seed crops such as canola or flax, the maximum safe rate with the seed is 15 lb/ac. Broadcast or band applications are equally effective in either fall or spring.

Sulfur deficient soils include Gray Wooded and Dark Gray Wooded soils and well drained Black soils. Sulfur deficiency is not common on Brown and Dark Brown soils. Deficiencies seldom occur in crops grown on fallow, but legume crops, or cereal and oilseed crops well fertilized with nitrogen fertilizer commonly require sulfur fertilization. Sulfur requirements of canola and legumes are greater than those of cereals. Sulfur in the sulfate form moves readily in moist soils. Therefore, soluble sulfate fertilizers provide an available sulfur source either as broadcast, drill-in or band applications. Use of elemental sulfur is also possible as a sulfur fertilizer choice but is most effective as a broadcast fall application to allow for oxidation to the plant available sulfate form.

Plants require small amounts of micronutrients including boron, chloride, copper, iron, manganese, molybdenum, and zinc. For that reason, application rates of these fertilizer nutrients, if required, though very small, have lasting effects for one or more growing seasons. Broadcast and incorporation are often most effective in achieving an even distribution of the micronutrient fertilizer product.

When possible, AFFIRM v3.0 makes use of limited research to adjust fertilizer application rates based on product, time, and placement.

## f. Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC)

The cation exchange capacity (CEC) indicates the soil's capacity to hold cation nutrients expressed in mill equivalents per one hundred grams of soil (meq/100g) or centimole per kg of soil (cmol/kg). Any element with a positive charge is called a cation and, in this case, it refers to the basic cations, calcium (Ca<sup>+2</sup>), magnesium (Mg<sup>+2</sup>), potassium (K<sup>+1</sup>) and sodium (Na<sup>+1</sup>) and the acidic cations, hydrogen (H<sup>+1</sup>) and aluminum (Al<sup>+3</sup>).

CEC is a useful indicator of soil fertility, particularly the supply of three important plant nutrients: calcium, magnesium, and potassium. CEC varies according to the type of soil and is highly dependent upon the soil texture and organic matter content (Table 11). Humus, the end-product of decomposed organic matter, and clay have a great capacity to attract and hold cations due to their chemical structure. The negatively charged binding sites is often between fifty to seventy sites per particle in these colloidal structures. Sandy soils with low organic matter have less capacity to exchange cations (due to the lack of negative charge) and therefore have very low CEC values. However, further improvements are possible by increasing soil organic matter content.

Table 11. Cation exchange capacity (CEC) values for soil textures.

| Soil texture         | CEC (meq/100g soil) |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| Sands                | 3-20                |
| Loams and silt loams | 10-25               |
| Clay and clay loams  | 20-50               |
| Organic soils        | 50-100              |

Source: Mengel D.B., 1993.

CEC is also related to the age of a soil. As soils age, they become more weathered, physically, and chemically. Older soils tend to have lower CEC than younger soils. Alberta soils are young, only developing in the past 10,000 years after the last glaciation. As a result, CEC has little influence of fertilizer recommendations except for coarse textured soils high in sand content.

AFFIRM v3.0 provides fertilizer recommendations adjusted for soil texture that is based on the available water holding capacity of the soil.

## g. Soil tillage system

Soil moisture conditions and soil fertility levels differ under conventional and direct tillage. Converting to a no-till, minimum tillage or reduced tillage operation can improve spring soil moisture conditions and nitrogen supplying power of the soil. Minimizing soil disturbance improves water infiltration, maintains existing soil moisture, increases soil organic matter, and reduces the risk of erosion. These are all factors that increase yield potential.

However, switching tillage methods changes the soil ecosystem, which can result in changes in nutrient availability and nutrient stratification.

With changing soil tillage systems, there may be a transition period that limits nitrogen availability. Limited tillage and reduced incorporation of crop residues result in slower nitrogen release rates due to less contact with soil microorganisms and reduced oxygen supply. Under direct seeding systems, soil temperatures are cooler and can limit the availability for P and K, which may require additional nutrients to take advantage of the higher yield potential.

## Crop yield response to nitrogen and moisture module

Conducting nitrogen economic analysis and optimization calculations requires yield response equations. The crop yield response model within AFFIRM v3.0 incorporates available nitrogen and total plant soil moisture to predict crop yield (Figure 2). The current version of AFFIRM v3.0 has yield response equations for:

### Wheat

- Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR)
- Wheat - Western Soft White Spring (WSWS)
- Wheat - Western Amber Durum (WAD)
- Wheat - Western Extra Strong (WES)
- Wheat - Western Red Spring (WRS)

### Barley

- Barley (Feed and Food)
- Barley (Malt)
- Barley (Hulless)

### Other Cereals

- Oats (Milling)
- Triticale (Spring) Oilseeds
- Canola
- Canola (Argentine)
- Canola (Polish)
- Flax

## 1. Crop yield response model

The Harmsen-Mitscherlich equation (Harmsen, 2000a, b; Maaz et al., 2016; Pan et al., 2016) is a biologically relevant model which recognizes the principle of diminishing returns for added nutrients and assumes that crop yield is plateaued at a maximum or potential yield. Low moisture availability limits potential yield and increases linearly with increasing moisture availability. The model also assumes that crop nutrient availability increases curvilinearly with increasing moisture availability. Hence, predicted crop yields by this model are functions of yield-based water and nutrient (e.g., nitrogen) use efficiencies that are agronomically relevant and quantifiable. Once yield based water and nitrogen use efficiencies are known, prediction of crop nitrogen requirements for different

moisture and nitrogen availability is possible. The model uses two key variables, Nitrogen supply (Ns) and Water supply (Ws). Both variables are composed of additional sources of nitrogen and water as described below.

AFFIRM v3.0 utilizes a set of Harmsen-Mitscherlich yield response equations based on nitrogen fertilizer source, placement, and time of application for each crop. Development of the initial equations used research data for HRS Wheat, Barley and Canola. Then further expansion of the equations to other related crops followed utilizing regional variety testing data.




Figure 11. Harmsen-Mitscherlich equation yield response curves.

## 2. Nitrogen supply (Ns)

The total nitrogen available to the crop is the sum of the sources of nitrogen within the agriculture system and includes soil nitrogen (soil test nitrate, estimated nitrogen release) crop residue nitrogen, manure nitrogen and fertilizer nitrogen.

### a. Available soil test nitrate

Soil test nitrate measured or estimated to a depth of 60 cm (24 inches). If subsurface soil test nitrate data is unavailable, AFFIRM v3.0 will estimate total available soil test nitrate in the soil profile based on the upper soil samples. Previous crop history and irrigation factor into these estimates. These estimates may contain significant error; and so, there is a strong case for encouraging users to analyze subsoil samples for soil nitrate levels.

### b. Estimated nitrogen release (ENR) from soil organic matter

The organic matter serves as a reserve for essential nutrients, especially nitrogen. Research suggests that bacterial activity will releases between one to five percent of this reserve nitrogen annually, making it available for crop growth (a process known as mineralization). ENR estimates the amount of nitrogen release over a growing season and is related to the soil organic matter level, plus soil moisture and temperature. AFFIRM v3.0 can calculate the ENR based on regional soil organic matter levels, laboratory measured soil organic matter, or specific N mineralization soil tests.

### **c. Previous crop residue nitrogen**

Above and below ground residues from previous crop in rotation can provide a source of N for the crop growing in the current cropping year. Addition of residues from a previous field crop would immediately hasten immobilization of available soil N. But with subsequent microbial decomposition, N from these residues would eventually be re-mineralized. In contrast, residues from a previous pulse (legume) crop would contribute to larger N mineralization and hence higher N supply to the current crop for a given substrate quantity and soil and environmental condition. AFFIRM v3.0 uses the crop yield from the previous year and the residue management to estimate the nitrogen available for the next crop.

### **d. Manure nitrogen**

Manure is a valuable resource and a significant source of nutrients. One of the most critical tasks in manure nutrient management planning is determining the appropriate manure application rates to get the desired crop productivity. Manure nutrient content is highly variable and can vary depending upon livestock source and method of storage and handling. It is also necessary in certain scenarios to determine fertilizer application rates to meet any nutrient requirements not met through manure application. These activities involve using information including available land base; soil nutrient profile; crop nutrient requirements; nutrient content of manure; application method and time, and soil and weather conditions.

AFFIRM v3.0 calculates the nitrogen available from manure application towards the nitrogen supply for crop production. AFFIRM v3.0 utilizes either specific laboratory manure analysis or book values for manure sources, combined with the manure application method, the weather conditions at the time of manure application and the rate of manure application to calculate the quantity nitrogen available from manure sources towards the nitrogen supply for crop production. AFFIRM v3.0 also factors in the previous 2 years application of manure to gauge the nutrients available for crop production.

### **e. Fertilizer nitrogen**

To calculate optimum fertilizer nitrogen rates, AFFIRM v3.0 uses Nutrient Stewardship to compare nitrogen fertilizer sources, timing of fertilizer application, and fertilizer placement. The amount of data available from research studies limits the crop yield response equation available with AFFIRM v3.0. Augmentation of these equations will occur as more research becomes available. AFFIRM v3.0 can calculate current crop yield response using urea, ESN, and urea-ESN blend fertilizer nitrogen sources. It supports fall or spring applications and allows for banded or seed-placed fertilizer placement. Crop response equations development is based on specific combinations of source, time, and placement for different crops and soil test regions.

Future research is needed to address other fertilizer nitrogen sources including enhanced efficiency fertilizers (EEF) such as controlled release (CR) products, or products with nitrification inhibitors (NI) and/or urease inhibitors (UI), timing including fall, spring and in-season, and placement such as seed-placed, injection, banding, fertigation, broadcast, broadcast & incorporated.

## **3. Water supply (Ws)**

The available moisture is the sum of spring soil moisture plus growing season precipitation or irrigation.

### **a. Spring soil moisture**

Spring soil moisture will affect nutrient availability and early plant growth potential. Soil moisture is a function of soil texture and depth of moist soil. AFFIRM v3.0 assigns soil moisture levels for Low, Intermediate and Optimum conditions.

### **b. Growing season precipitation**

The definition of growing season precipitation is the long-term probability equations for each soil zone. AFFIRM v3.0 calculates growing season precipitation for Low, Intermediate and Optimum conditions based on these precipitation probability equations.

### **c. Irrigation**

For irrigated crops, AFFIRM v3.0 assigns irrigation levels for Low, Intermediate and Optimum irrigation conditions based on Alberta research (Bennett and Harms, 2011; Bennett, et al, 2014).

## **4. Further crop response adjustments**

### **a. Soil pH**

Crops vary in their acidity tolerance (Table 4). Production in soils more acidic than their tolerance level will result in reduced yields. Under acidic conditions, AFFIRM v3.0 will adjust the yield response to nitrogen based on pH level.

### **b. Soil salinity**

Electrical conductivity (EC) is a measure of the total soluble salt concentration in a soil. Soluble salts are always present in soils, however, when the concentration of salts is high, experts consider the soil “saline” and saline soil can reduce crop growth (Table 5). Yield reduction is dependent upon the crop species and their level of salinity tolerance (Table 6). Grass forages tend to have higher salinity tolerance than field crops. AFFIRM v3.0 will adjust yield response to nitrogen according to salt concentration.

## **Nitrogen economic analysis module calculations**

The marginal economic analysis module (Figure 3) determines the economic optimizing rate of N by comparing the added costs of N (i.e., marginal cost) with the added returns from additional crop yield increases (i.e., marginal return). It is economically beneficial to increase yields by adding N if added returns exceed added costs (i.e., investment ratio > 1). However, in the uncertain industry of crop production, AFFIRM v3.0 suggests choosing an N rate that produces twice the economic return (i.e., investment ratio = 2). Table 12 outlines the economic analysis module calculations for a field of Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR) for intermediate moisture conditions.

Table 12. N fertilizer economic analysis for Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR), Dark Brown (NE) soil group, intermediate moisture conditions.

| Fertilizer Nitrogen Added (lb/ac) | Estimated Yield (bu/ac) | Predicted Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Added Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Estimated Revenue from Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Return (\$/ac) | Total Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Gross Margin Change (\$/ac) | Investment Ratio |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 0                                 | 40.7                    | 0.0                              |                              |  |                         |   |  |                             |                  |
| 10                                | 44.1                    | 3.4                              | 3.4                          | 20.57  | 20.57                   | 5.70                                      | 5.70   | 14.87                       | 3.61             |
| 20                                | 47.0                    | 6.4                              | 3.0                          | 38.60  | 18.03                   | 11.40                                     | 5.70   | 27.20                       | 3.16             |
| 30                                | 49.6                    | 9.0                              | 2.6                          | 54.39  | 15.79                   | 17.10                                     | 5.70   | 37.29                       | 2.77             |
| 40                                | 51.9                    | 11.3                             | 2.3                          | 68.30  | 13.91                   | 22.80                                     | 5.70   | 45.50                       | 2.44             |
| 50                                | 54.0                    | 13.3                             | 2.0                          | 80.53  | 12.23                   | 28.50                                     | 5.70   | 52.03                       | 2.15             |
| 60                                | 55.7                    | 15.1                             | 1.8                          | 91.29  | 10.76                   | 34.20                                     | 5.70   | 57.09                       | 1.89             |
| 70                                | 57.3                    | 16.6                             | 1.6                          | 100.67   | 9.38                    | 39.90                                     | 5.70   | 60.77                       | 1.65             |
| 80                                | 58.7                    | 18.0                             | 1.4                          | 108.96   | 8.29                    | 45.60                                     | 5.70   | 63.36                       | 1.45             |
| 90                                | 59.9                    | 19.2                             | 1.2                          | 116.22   | 7.26                    | 51.30                                     | 5.70   | 64.92                       | 1.27             |
| 100                               | 60.9                    | 20.3                             | 1.1                          | 122.63   | 6.41                    | 57.00                                     | 5.70   | 65.63                       | 1.12             |
| 110                               | 61.9                    | 21.2                             | 0.9                          | 128.26   | 5.63                    | 62.70                                     | 5.70   | 65.56                       | 0.99             |

N fertilizer cost = \$0.57/lb N Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR) price = \$6.05/bu.

Example calculations for 60 lbs of N applied:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Marginal Cost} &= \text{N fertilizer cost (\$/lb)} \times 10 \text{ lbs} \\ &= \$0.57 \times 10 \\ &= \$5.70 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Added Yield Increase} &= (\text{Predicted Yield Increase @ 60 lbs N}) - (\text{Predicted Yield Increase @ 50 lbs N}) \\ &= 15.1 \text{ bu} - 13.3 \text{ bu} \\ &= 1.8 \text{ bu}^* \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Marginal Return} = \text{yield increase} \times \text{crop price}$$

$$= 1.8 \text{ bu} \times \$6.05/\text{bu}$$

$$= \$10.76$$

Investment Ratio = marginal return/marginal cost

$$= \$10.76/\$5.70$$

$$= 1.89$$

\* AFFIRM v3.0 rounds the estimated yield values; therefore, your own calculations may not be same as the table.

## Farm optimization module calculations

When farmers make fertilizer decisions, there is a need to consider the fertilizer requirements for the entire farm, rather than on an individual field basis. This module provides a summarization tool that will assist in allocating the farm fertilizer budget to optimize economic returns. Incorporating the cost of all recommended nutrients for the farm provides a more realistic assessment of the total fertilizer economics of the farm operation, rather than just nitrogen on an individual field basis. Using the optimization module, AFFIRM v3.0 will summarize farm fertilizer recommendations and assist in the economic decisions for the entire farm. AFFIRM v3.0 will determine how to best allocate funds to best fit a farm budget that is limiting. Due to the tremendous amount of data required for this module, AFFIRM v3.0 can only assess the N requirements of those crops that have yield response equations available.

The example below illustrates the steps involved in the optimization module. The location of the fields in this example are in the Black (Southwest) soil region. The yield response is for an Intermediate moisture condition and AFFIRM v3.0 assumes a target investment ratio of two for all fields. The fertilizer nitrogen used in this example is urea, applied in the spring banded.

Tables 13 and 14 outline the information required to make the calculations.

*Table 13. Fertilizer nutrient costs.*

| Fertilizer cost (\$/lb) |                               |                  |      |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------|
| N                       | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | K <sub>2</sub> O | S    |
| 0.57                    | 0.40                          | 0.34             | 0.46 |

Table 14. Field and crop information.

| Field | Field size (acres) | Crop             | Crop price | Yield response equations | Recommendations (lbs/ac) (Intermediate moisture level) |                               |                  |    |
|-------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------|----|
|       |                    |                  |            |                          | N  | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | K <sub>2</sub> O | S  |
| A1    | 100                | Mustard (Yellow) | \$17.00/bu | Not available            | 50   | 10                            | 0                | 5  |
| A2    | 150                | Peas (Feed)      | \$5.14/bu  | Not available            | 0  | 20                            | 0                | 0  |
| A3    | 120                | Canola           | \$10.45/bu | Available                | 100  | 15                            | 0                | 10 |
| A4    | 140                | Malt Barley      | \$4.35/bu  | Available                | 40   | 10                            | 0                | 0  |
| A5    | 100                | Wheat - NHR      | \$6.05/bu  | Available                | 40   | 15                            | 0                | 0  |
| A6    | 150                | Wheat - WAD      | \$7.59/bu  | Available                | 90   | 10                            | 0                | 5  |

In this example, the total cost required to fulfill the recommendations of each field calculated (Table 15).

Table 15. Fertilizer and nutrient costs to meet AFFIRM v3.0 recommendations.

| Field        | Crop             | Fertilizer Nutrient Requirements (lbs) |                               |                  |              | Fertilizer Nutrient Costs (\$) |                               |                  |              |
|--------------|------------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
|              |                  | N                                      | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | K <sub>2</sub> O | S            | N                              | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | K <sub>2</sub> O | S            |
| A1           | Mustard (Yellow) | 5,000                                  | 1,000                         | 0                | 500          | 2,850                          | 400                           | 0                | 506          |
| A2           | Peas (Feed)      | 0                                      | 3,000                         | 0                | 0            | 0                              | 1,200                         | 0                | 0            |
| A3           | Canola           | 12,000                                 | 1,800                         | 0                | 1200         | 6,840                          | 720                           | 0                | 552          |
| A4           | Malt Barley      | 5,600                                  | 1,400                         | 0                | 0            | 3,192                          | 560                           | 0                | 0            |
| A5           | Wheat - NHR      | 4,000                                  | 1,500                         | 0                | 0            | 2,280                          | 600                           | 0                | 0            |
| A6           | Wheat - WAD      | 13,500                                 | 1,500                         | 0                | 750          | 7,695                          | 600                           | 0                | 345          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                  | <b>40,100</b>                          | <b>10,200</b>                 | <b>0</b>         | <b>2,450</b> | <b>22,857</b>                  | <b>4,080</b>                  | <b>0</b>         | <b>1,403</b> |

Example calculations for Field 'A1': Nitrogen:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Quantity required (lbs)} &= \text{N recommendation (lbs/ac)} \times \text{field size (ac)} \\
 &= 50 \text{ lbs/ac} \times 100 \text{ ac} \\
 &= 5,000 \text{ lbs N}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dollars required (\$)} &= \text{Quantity required} \times \text{N fertilizer cost} \\ &= 5,000 \text{ lbs N} \times \$0.57/\text{lb N} \\ &= \$2,850.00 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the recommendation, the farm will require **\$28,340** for fertilizer application.

However, for this example, the farm fertilizer budget is **\$25,000**.

Therefore, removing a total of **\$3,340** will meet the budget constraint. (**\$25,000 minus \$28,340 equals \$3,340**)

*Where can reduction in costs occur to meet the budget?*

Based on the recommendations, \$ needed for PKS for all fields is **\$5,483**.

The \$ needed for N for those fields with crops without Yield Response data (fields A1 and A2) is **\$2,850**.

This becomes a fixed cost of **\$5,483 plus \$2,850 equals \$8,333**.

The optimization module allows for the opportunity to alter the N application for fields A3, A4, A5 and A6 to meet the budget using yield response to nitrogen fertilizer data.

Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19 provide the economic analysis for the four fields.

Table 16. Economic analysis for Canola for field A3.

| Fertilizer Nitrogen Added (lb/ac) | Estimated Yield (bu/ac) | Predicted Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Added Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Estimated Revenue from Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Return (\$/ac) | Total Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Gross Margin Change (\$/ac) | Investment Ratio |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 0                                 | 37.2                    | 0.0                              |                              |  |                         |   |  |                             |                  |
| 10                                | 39.2                    | 2.1                              | 2.1                          | 21.53  | 21.53                   | 5.70                                      | 5.70   | 15.83                       | 3.78             |
| 20                                | 41.2                    | 4.0                              | 1.9                          | 41.49  | 19.96                   | 11.40                                     | 5.70   | 30.09                       | 3.50             |
| 30                                | 42.9                    | 5.8                              | 1.8                          | 60.19  | 18.70                   | 17.10                                     | 5.70   | 43.09                       | 3.28             |
| 40                                | 44.6                    | 7.4                              | 1.7                          | 77.54  | 17.35                   | 22.80                                     | 5.70   | 54.74                       | 3.04             |
| 50                                | 46.1                    | 9.0                              | 1.5                          | 93.63  | 16.09                   | 28.50                                     | 5.70   | 65.13                       | 2.82             |
| 60                                | 47.6                    | 10.4                             | 1.4                          | 108.68   | 15.05                   | 34.20                                     | 5.70   | 74.48                       | 2.64             |
| 70                                | 48.9                    | 11.7                             | 1.3                          | 122.68   | 14.00                   | 39.90                                     | 5.70   | 82.78                       | 2.46             |
| 80                                | 50.2                    | 13.0                             | 1.2                          | 135.64   | 12.96                   | 45.60                                     | 5.70   | 90.04                       | 2.27             |
| 90                                | 51.3                    | 14.1                             | 1.2                          | 147.76   | 12.12                   | 51.30                                     | 5.70   | 96.46                       | 2.13             |
| 100                               | 52.4                    | 15.2                             | 1.1                          | 159.05   | 11.29                   | 57.00                                     | 5.70   | 102.05                      | 1.98             |
| 110                               | 53.4                    | 16.2                             | 1.0                          | 169.50   | 10.45                   | 62.70                                     | 5.70   | 106.80                      | 1.83             |
| 120                               | 54.3                    | 17.2                             | 0.9                          | 179.32   | 9.82                    | 68.40                                     | 5.70   | 110.92                      | 1.72             |
| 130                               | 55.2                    | 18.0                             | 0.9                          | 188.41   | 9.09                    | 74.10                                     | 5.70   | 114.31                      | 1.59             |

Table 17. Economic analysis for Malt barley for field A4.

| Fertilizer Nitrogen Added (lb/ac) | Estimated Yield (bu/ac) | Predicted Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Added Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Estimated Revenue from Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Return (\$/ac) | Total Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Gross Margin Change (\$/ac) | Investment Ratio |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 0                                 | 83.0                    | 0.0                              |                              |  |                         |   |  |                             |                  |
| 10                                | 86.7                    | 3.7                              | 3.7                          | 15.88  | 15.88                   | 5.70                                      | 5.70   | 10.18                       | 2.79             |
| 20                                | 89.9                    | 6.9                              | 3.2                          | 29.84  | 13.96                   | 11.40                                     | 5.70   | 18.44                       | 2.45             |
| 30                                | 92.7                    | 9.7                              | 2.8                          | 42.20  | 12.36                   | 17.10                                     | 5.70   | 25.10                       | 2.17             |
| 40                                | 95.2                    | 12.2                             | 2.5                          | 53.07  | 10.87                   | 22.80                                     | 5.70   | 30.27                       | 1.91             |
| 50                                | 97.4                    | 14.4                             | 2.2                          | 62.68  | 9.61                    | 28.50                                     | 5.70   | 34.18                       | 1.69             |
| 60                                | 99.4                    | 16.4                             | 2.0                          | 71.17  | 8.49                    | 34.20                                     | 5.70   | 36.97                       | 1.49             |
| 70                                | 101.1                   | 18.1                             | 1.7                          | 78.60  | 7.43                    | 39.90                                     | 5.70   | 38.70                       | 1.30             |
| 80                                | 102.6                   | 19.6                             | 1.5                          | 85.22  | 6.62                    | 45.60                                     | 5.70   | 39.62                       | 1.16             |
| 90                                | 104.0                   | 20.9                             | 1.3                          | 91.00  | 5.78                    | 51.30                                     | 5.70   | 39.70                       | 1.01             |
| 100                               | 105.1                   | 22.1                             | 1.2                          | 96.14  | 5.14                    | 57.00                                     | 5.70   | 39.14                       | 0.90             |
| 110                               | 106.2                   | 23.1                             | 1.0                          | 100.66   | 4.52                    | 62.70                                     | 5.70   | 37.96                       | 0.79             |

Table 18. Economic analysis for Wheat - Northern Hard Red (NHR) for field A5.

| Fertilizer Nitrogen Added (lb/ac) | Estimated Yield (bu/ac) | Predicted Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Added Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Estimated Revenue from Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Return (\$/ac) | Total Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Gross Margin Change (\$/ac) | Investment Ratio |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 0                                 | 52.2                    | 0.0                              |                              |  |                         |   |  |                             |                  |
| 10                                | 54.7                    | 2.5                              | 2.5                          | 15.19  | 15.19                   | 5.70                                      | 5.70   | 9.49                        | 2.66             |
| 20                                | 56.9                    | 4.8                              | 2.2                          | 28.74  | 13.55                   | 11.40                                     | 5.70   | 17.34                       | 2.38             |
| 30                                | 59.0                    | 6.8                              | 2.0                          | 40.90  | 12.16                   | 17.10                                     | 5.70   | 23.80                       | 2.13             |
| 40                                | 60.7                    | 8.6                              | 1.8                          | 51.73  | 10.83                   | 22.80                                     | 5.70   | 28.93                       | 1.90             |
| 50                                | 62.4                    | 10.2                             | 1.6                          | 61.47  | 9.74                    | 28.50                                     | 5.70   | 32.97                       | 1.71             |
| 60                                | 63.8                    | 11.6                             | 1.4                          | 70.12  | 8.65                    | 34.20                                     | 5.70   | 35.92                       | 1.52             |
| 70                                | 65.1                    | 12.9                             | 1.3                          | 77.86  | 7.74                    | 39.90                                     | 5.70   | 37.96                       | 1.36             |
| 80                                | 66.2                    | 14.0                             | 1.1                          | 84.82  | 6.96                    | 45.60                                     | 5.70   | 39.22                       | 1.22             |
| 90                                | 67.2                    | 15.0                             | 1.0                          | 90.99  | 6.17                    | 51.30                                     | 5.70   | 39.69                       | 1.08             |

Table 19. Economic analysis for Wheat - Western Amber Durum (WAD) for field A6.

| Fertilizer Nitrogen Added (lb/ac) | Estimated Yield (bu/ac) | Predicted Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Added Yield Increase (bu/ac) | Estimated Revenue from Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Return (\$/ac) | Total Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Marginal Cost of Fertilizer Nitrogen (\$/ac) | Gross Margin Change (\$/ac) | Investment Ratio |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 0                                 | 56.7                    | 0.0                              |                              |  |                         |   |  |                             |                  |
| 10                                | 59.8                    | 3.1                              | 3.1                          | 23.53  | 23.53                   | 5.70                                      | 5.70   | 17.83                       | 4.13             |
| 20                                | 62.7                    | 5.9                              | 2.8                          | 45.01  | 21.48                   | 11.40                                     | 5.70   | 33.61                       | 3.77             |
| 30                                | 65.2                    | 8.5                              | 2.6                          | 64.51  | 19.50                   | 17.10                                     | 5.70   | 47.41                       | 3.42             |
| 40                                | 67.6                    | 10.9                             | 2.4                          | 82.35  | 17.84                   | 22.80                                     | 5.70   | 59.55                       | 3.13             |
| 50                                | 69.7                    | 13.0                             | 2.1                          | 98.67  | 16.32                   | 28.50                                     | 5.70   | 70.17                       | 2.86             |
| 60                                | 71.7                    | 15.0                             | 2.0                          | 113.47   | 14.80                   | 34.20                                     | 5.70   | 79.27                       | 2.60             |
| 70                                | 73.5                    | 16.7                             | 1.8                          | 126.98   | 13.51                   | 39.90                                     | 5.70   | 87.08                       | 2.37             |
| 80                                | 75.1                    | 18.4                             | 1.6                          | 139.28   | 12.30                   | 45.60                                     | 5.70   | 93.68                       | 2.16             |
| 90                                | 76.6                    | 19.8                             | 1.5                          | 150.51   | 11.23                   | 51.30                                     | 5.70   | 99.21                       | 1.97             |
| 100                               | 77.9                    | 21.2                             | 1.4                          | 160.76   | 10.25                   | 57.00                                     | 5.70   | 103.76                      | 1.80             |
| 110                               | 79.2                    | 22.4                             | 1.2                          | 170.09   | 9.33                    | 62.70                                     | 5.70   | 107.39                      | 1.64             |
| 120                               | 80.3                    | 23.5                             | 1.1                          | 178.59   | 8.50                    | 68.40                                     | 5.70   | 110.19                      | 1.49             |
| 130                               | 81.3                    | 24.6                             | 1.0                          | 186.33   | 7.74                    | 74.10                                     | 5.70   | 112.23                      | 1.36             |

Following the principles of economic optimization, AFFIRM v3.0 deducts the P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S, and micronutrient requirements of all fields and the N requirements of those crop without yield response equations from the budget. In this example, the farm budget available for allocation of nitrogen fertilizer for crops on fields A3, A4, A5 and A6 (crops with Yield Response data) is **\$25,000** minus **\$8,333** equals **\$16,667**.

AFFIRM v3.0 will allocate the 35,100 lbs of available N fertilizer in 10 lbs/ac increments. Since each field a different size, the following outlines fertilizer requirements for each 10 lb application to each field:

- A3 - 1,200 lbs
- A4 - 1,400 lbs
- A5 - 1,000 lbs
- A6 - 1,500 lbs

Following the principle of allocating resources to optimize economic return (i.e., highest investment ratio), AFFIRM v3.0 will allocate N in the sequence displayed in Table 20 until budget depletion or achievement of target investment ratios.

Table 20. Farm optimization - Allocation of 10 lb increments of fertilizer N for fields A3, A4, A5, and A6.

| Field | Crop        | Field Size (ac) | Fertilizer Nitrogen Added (lb/ac) | Marginal Return (\$/ac) | Investment Ratio | Fertilizer Nitrogen Allocated for this step (lb) | Cumulative Fertilizer Nitrogen Allocated (lb) | Total Budget Required (\$) |
|-------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 10                                | 23.53                   | 4.13             | 1,500  | 1,500   | 855                        |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 10                                | 21.53                   | 3.78             | 1,200  | 2,700   | 1,539                      |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 20                                | 21.48                   | 3.77             | 1,500  | 4,200   | 2,394                      |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 20                                | 19.96                   | 3.50             | 1,200  | 5,400   | 3,078                      |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 30                                | 19.50                   | 3.42             | 1,500  | 6,900   | 3,933                      |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 30                                | 18.70                   | 3.28             | 1,200  | 8,100   | 4,617                      |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 40                                | 17.84                   | 3.13             | 1,500  | 9,600   | 5,472                      |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 40                                | 17.35                   | 3.04             | 1,200  | 10,800  | 6,156                      |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 50                                | 16.32                   | 2.86             | 1,500  | 12,300  | 7,011                      |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 50                                | 16.09                   | 2.82             | 1,200  | 13,500  | 7,695                      |
| A4    | Malt Barley | 140             | 10                                | 15.88                   | 2.79             | 1,400  | 14,900  | 8,493                      |
| A5    | Wheat - NHR | 100             | 10                                | 15.19                   | 2.66             | 1,000  | 15,900  | 9,063                      |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 60                                | 15.05                   | 2.64             | 1,200  | 17,100  | 9,747                      |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 60                                | 14.80                   | 2.60             | 1,500  | 18,600  | 10,602                     |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 70                                | 14.00                   | 2.46             | 1,200  | 19,800  | 11,286                     |
| A4    | Malt Barley | 140             | 20                                | 13.96                   | 2.45             | 1,400  | 21,200  | 12,084                     |
| A5    | Wheat - NHR | 100             | 20                                | 13.55                   | 2.38             | 1,000  | 22,200  | 12,654                     |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 70                                | 13.51                   | 2.37             | 1,500  | 23,700  | 13,509                     |
| A3    | Canola      | 120             | 80                                | 12.96                   | 2.27             | 1,200  | 24,900  | 14,193                     |
| A4    | Malt Barley | 140             | 30                                | 12.36                   | 2.17             | 1,400  | 26,300  | 14,991                     |
| A6    | Wheat - WAD | 150             | 80                                | 12.30                   | 2.16             | 1,500  | 27,800  | 15,846                     |

|    |             |     |     |       |      |       |        |        |
|----|-------------|-----|-----|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| A3 | Canola      | 120 | 90  | 12.12 | 2.13 | 1,200 | 29,000 | 16,530 |
| A5 | Wheat - NHR | 100 | 30  | 12.16 | 2.13 | 1,000 | 30,000 | 17,100 |
| A3 | Canola      | 120 | 100 | 11.29 | 1.98 | 1,200 | 31,200 | 17,784 |
| A6 | Wheat - WAD | 150 | 90  | 11.23 | 1.97 | 1,500 | 32,700 | 18,639 |
| A4 | Malt Barley | 140 | 40  | 10.87 | 1.91 | 1,400 | 34,100 | 19,437 |
| A5 | Wheat - NHR | 100 | 40  | 10.83 | 1.90 | 1,000 | 35,100 | 20,007 |

In this example, the budget is not enough to meet the target investment ratio of 2 and AFFIRM v3.0 stops allocating fertilizer when the total capital required = **\$16,530**. The total amount of Nitrogen fertilizer allocated to each field is:

Field A3          Canola          = 90 lbs/ac

Field A4          Malt Barley      = 30 lbs/ac

Field A5          Wheat - NHR      = 20 lbs/ac

Field A6          Wheat - WAD      = 80 lbs/ac

The investment ratios reached in this example were:

Field A3          Canola          = 2.13

Field A4          Malt Barley      = 2.17

Field A5          Wheat - NHR      = 2.38

Field A6          Wheat - WAD      = 2.16

Presentation of the final fertilizer nutrient requirements for this example are in Table 21. Note the reduction of the final recommendations of nitrogen for fields A4, A5 and A6 compared to Table 14.

Table 21. Adjusted fertilizer nutrient recommendation.

| Field | Field size (acres) | Crop             | Recommendations (lbs/ac)<br>(Intermediate moisture level) |                               |                  |    |
|-------|--------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|----|
|       |                    |                  | N   | P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> | K <sub>2</sub> O | S  |
| A1    | 100                | Mustard (Yellow) | 50  | 10                            | 0                | 5  |
| A2    | 150                | Peas (Feed)      | 0   | 20                            | 0                | 0  |
| A3    | 120                | Canola           | 90  | 15                            | 0                | 10 |
| A4    | 140                | Malt Barley      | 30  | 10                            | 0                | 0  |
| A5    | 100                | Wheat - NHR      | 20  | 15                            | 0                | 0  |
| A6    | 150                | Wheat - WAD      | 80  | 10                            | 0                | 5  |

To achieve the target IR of 2, the \$ required for N to crops with yield response data (i.e., A3, A4, A5 and A6) is **\$20,044**. This would require an increase in the fertilizer budget to **\$28,340**. This would allow for the full allocation of **35,165 lbs** of N.

## Acknowledgements

Development Team:

Len Kryzanowski, P.Ag., Director, Environmental Strategy and Research

Symon Mezbahuddin, Ph.D., Geomatics and Modelling Specialist

Trevor Wallace, P.Ag., Nutrient Management Specialist

Ann-Marie Gramlich, Financial Administrator

Information Technology support from Karla Doherty (Senior Project Manager), JohnMark Mikhail (Senior Solutions Architect) and Krystyna Cynar (Director, Strategic Services),

Application development by Fujitsu Consulting (Canada): Harold Peske (Project Manager/Business Analyst), Darren Caharel (Service Delivery Manager),

Ken Schwartz, Tiger Lu, James Hogan, Kelly Rosborough, Alex Yushko, Leo Yu, Bob Bryenton, John Mommersteeg and Tracy Dean.

Environmental Stewardship Branch of Alberta Agriculture and Forestry, in cooperation with Crops Research and Extension Branch developed AFFIRM v3.0. We very much appreciate the funding and in-kind support we received from our partners:

Government of Alberta Information Management Technology (IMT) Fund

Growing Forward 2 Research Innovations and Opportunities (ROI) Fund

Alberta Crop Industry Development Fund (ACIDF)

Alberta Agriculture and Forestry (AAF) Capital Fund

Environmental Stewardship Branch

This project would not be possible without the extensive field and laboratory research conducted by provincial, federal, university and industry agronomic researchers in Alberta and western Canada.

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager** | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide

Classification: Public

## References

Alberta Agriculture, 2004, Beneficial Management Practices: Environmental Manual for Crop Producers in Alberta - Soil pH, Agdex 100/25-1

Alberta Agriculture, 2001, Salt Tolerance of Plants, Agdex 518-17

Alberta Agriculture and Food, 2008, Nutrient Management Planning Guide

Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, 2004, Alberta Fertilizer Guide. Agdex 541-1

Bennett, D. R., and T. E. Harms. 2011. Crop yield and water requirement relationships for major irrigated crops in southern Alberta. *Canadian Water Resources Journal* 36 (2): 159-170.

Bennett, D. R., T. E. Harms and T. Entz, 2014. Net irrigation water requirements for major irrigated crops with variation in evaporative demand and precipitation in southern Alberta. *Canadian Water Resources Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 63–72.

Buckman and Brady, 1969. The nature and properties of soils.

Canada Department of Agriculture, Glossary of Terms in Soil Science, Research Branch, revised 1976., Ottawa. Publication 1459, 44 pp.

Campbell, C.A., Jame, Y.W. and Winkleman, G.E. 1984. Mineralization rate constants and their use for estimating nitrogen mineralization in some Canadian prairie soils. *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 64: 333-343.

Campbell, C.A., Jame Y.W., Jalil, A. and Schoenau, J. 1997. Use of hot KCl-NH<sub>4</sub>-N to estimate N requirements. *Can J. Soil Sci.* 77:161-166.

Harmsen, K. 2000a. A modified Mitscherlich equation for rainfed crop production in semi-arid areas: Theory. *NJAS-Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences*, 48(3), 237-250.

Harmsen, K. 2000b. A modified Mitscherlich equation for rainfed crop production in semi-arid areas: Case study of cereals in Syria. *NJAS-Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences*, 48(3), 251-272.

Jalil, A., Campbell, C.A., Schoenau, J., Henry, J.L., Jame, W. and Lafond, G.P. 1996. Assessment of two chemical extraction methods as indices of available N. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 60: 1954-1960.

Kryzanowski, L., Lavery, D.H., Ashworth, J., Nyborg, M., Harapiak, J., Kucey, R., 1988, Soil Test Recommendations for Alberta: Technical Manual. Alberta Agriculture, Food & Rural Development

Lavery, D.H. and Bollo-Kamara, A. 1988. Recommended Methods of Soil Analysis for Canadian Prairie Agricultural Soils. Alberta Agriculture, Food & Rural Development.

Maaz, T., Pan, W., and Hammac, W. 2016. Influence of Soil Nitrogen and Water Supply on Canola Nitrogen Use Efficiency. *Agronomy Journal*, 108(5), 2099-2109.

Mengel, D. B., 1993, Fundamentals of Soil Cation Exchange Capacity (CEC), Department of Agronomy, Purdue University. <https://www.extension.purdue.edu/extmedia/AY/AY-238.html>

Mezbahuddin, S., Kryzanowski, L.M., McKenzie, R., Akbar, A., Sprout, C., Lohstraeter, G., Powers, L., and O'Donovan, J. 2018. Estimating Nitrogen Mineralization for Improved Fertilizer Recommendations in Alberta. Alberta Soil Science Workshop, Edmonton, AB.

Miller, P. R., Gan, Y., McConkey, B. G. and McDonald, C. L. 2003, Pulse Crops for the Northern Great Plains: II. Cropping Sequence Effects on Cereal, Oilseed, and Pulse Crops. *Agron. J.* 95:980– 986 (2003).

Pan, W. L., McClellan Maaz, T., Hammac, W. A., McCracken, V. A., and Koenig, R. T. 2016. Mitscherlich-modeled, semi-arid canola nitrogen requirements influenced by soil nitrogen and water. *Agronomy Journal*, 108(2), 884-894.

Przednowek, D. W. A., Entz, M. H., Irvine, B., Flaten, D. N. and Thiessen Martens, J. R. 2004. Rotational yield and apparent N benefits of grain legumes in southern Manitoba. *Can. J. Plant Sci.* 84: 1093–1096.

Reinl, E. 1984. Changes in soil organic carbon due to agricultural land use in Alberta. M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Soil Science, University of Alberta.

St. Luce, M., Grant, C.A., Zebarth, B.J., Ziadi, N., O'Donovan, J. T., Blackshaw, R.E., Harker, K. N., Johnson, E.N., Gan, Y., Lafond, G.P., May, W.E., Khakbazan, M., Smith, E.G., and Malhi, S.S., 2015. Legumes can reduce economic optimum nitrogen rates and increase yields in a wheat–canola cropping sequence in western Canada, *Field Crops Research* 179 (2015) 12–25.

## Frequently Asked Questions about AFFIRM v3.0

### 1. Why use AFFIRM v3?

There are numerous factors that need consideration when making fertilizer decisions. AFFIRM v3.0 is a full spectrum nutrient recommendation software that incorporates a marginal economic analysis into the recommendation process. Based on the principles of limiting factor identification and diminishing returns, this interactive decision support tool will assist you in determining where best to allocate your resources to optimize the earning potential of your farm. The ability to run different scenarios will allow you to understand and quantify many factors involved in determining your crop nutrient requirements.

### 2. What are the information requirements to use AFFIRM v3.0?

Checklist - Required field and farm information to use AFFIRM v3.0:

Field legal land location

Previous crop grown (yield, residue management, soil and growing season or irrigation moisture, fertilizers used which includes rates, time of application and placement)

Current crop grown

Irrigation (if applicable)

Soil test results and sampling technique (time and depths)

Soil test methods used for soil analyses based on the laboratory used

Manure test results or selected book values for each source of manure

Manure management (rate, time, and placement of manure application; weather conditions)

Spring soil moisture conditions

Fertilizer products (N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrients) for growing the intended crop

N fertilizer time of application and placement (method of application)

Fertilizer nutrient costs

Expected crop price

Farm fertilizer budget

### 3. How is AFFIRM v3.0 different from AFFIRM v2?

If you previously used AFFIRM v2, the first difference you will notice is the means of access. New computer programming techniques allowed for re-design of this decision support tool.

AFFIRM v3.0 is now available as a web-based application accessible through an Alberta.ca Account. Creating an Alberta.ca Account allows you to securely access a variety of Alberta government online services—without needing to submit paper forms or appear in person. There is no cost to set up an Alberta.ca Account. Your account includes only the basic information required to establish it. When you use another participating government service, only the information necessary to provide that service is shared, ensuring your privacy and information is protected.

Other enhancements include:

Update of the AFFIRM v3.0 adjustment coefficients to reflect new agronomic management research and knowledge.

Update of the list of soil test laboratories to reflect the current laboratories conducting soil analyses in the province.

The expanded list of crops that represent cereals, oilseeds, pulse, forage, and specialty crops grown on either dryland or irrigation within the province.

Expansion of the nutrient sources impacting recommendations to include estimated nitrogen release from soil organic matter (soil mineralizable nitrogen), nitrogen from previous crop residue, manure nutrients and fertilizer products.

Nutrients available from manure sources are affected by manure analysis (laboratory or book values) timing of application, placement, rate, and weather conditions.

The expanded fertilizer products list to include new fertilizer products such enhanced efficiency nitrogen fertilizers. Nutrient stewardship of fertilizers and manures reflect the nutrient availability of the fertilizer and manure sources, timing of application and placement.

Update to the yield response equations used for economic analysis and nitrogen fertilizer recommendations using new field research based on:

**Water Supply** that includes spring soil moisture, growing season precipitation based on long term probabilities, and irrigation level.

**Nitrogen Supply** that includes soil test nitrate, estimated nitrogen release from soil organic matter, nitrogen from previous crop residue, manure nitrogen and fertilizer nitrogen.

### 4. What operating system does AFFIRM v3.0 require to run?

AFFIRM v3.0 is web-based application. Requiring a web browser to utilize AFFIRM v3.0. This means that use of AFFIRM v3.0 can occur on Windows and Apple computers and tablets that have a web-based browser. Note that the use of Microsoft Internet Explorer has resulted in some difficulties when printing recommendation reports.

### 5. What is the layout/design of AFFIRM v3.0?

The format of AFFIRM v3.0 focuses on the farm level with individual fields or sub-fields recommendations and whole farm optimization. AFFIRM v3.0 is composed of sequentially ordered screens to enter information about the farm and individual fields or sub-fields, fertilizer and manure nutrient sources, and economic factors (fertilizer costs and expected crop prices).

### 6. How does AFFIRM v3.0 manage the screen presentation?

The design of AFFIRM v3.0 can adjust for various screen sizes to best fit the information that is on the screen.

**Alberta Farm Fertilizer Information and Recommendation Manager | AFFIRM Version 3 User Guide**

## **7. What types of devices can utilize AFFIRM v3.0?**

Any device that has internet access and use of a web browser can use AFFIRM v3.0. That would include desktop computer, laptops, and tablets. It is possible to use a smart phone, but the amount of information of the various screens may make it difficult to utilize.

## **8. How is my information saved and stored in AFFIRM v3.0 and is it secure?**

AFFIRM v3.0 saves your entered information in an online secure database within the Government of Alberta that is only accessible to the owner or individual who created the farm in AFFIRM through an Alberta.ca account. AFFIRM v3.0 does not save the results of the recommendation process.

## **9. Are there examples and supporting documentation that comes with AFFIRM v3.0?**

The tutorial provides tips throughout, and print screens help you follow along step-by-step.

The **User Manual** provides detailed information on each of the four modules included in AFFIRM v3.0 (including an example of the economic calculations) and identifies the limitations that exist. Current Alberta Agriculture and Irrigation references list additional information on those factors impacting crop nutrient requirements.

A **Help** icon within the menu bar of AFFIRM v3.0 provides access to the **User Manual** and the **Tutorial Guide** within AFFIRM.

## **10. Can other software use AFFIRM v3.0?**

The new version of AFFIRM v3.0 is a stand-alone application and other decision support software or applications cannot be use AFFIRM v3.0.

## **11. Is AFFIRM v3.0 a record-keeping program?**

Yes, AFFIRM v3.0 may prove to be a very useful record-keeping tool for you. You can store crop management information such crop variety and yield, moisture conditions, fertilizer application, manure management, and crop residue management. Users can track soil fertility trends using stored soil test information, while documenting details in the comment section helps answer questions in future years. As well, AFFIRM v3.0 will record fertilizer costs and crop prices each year so that their use to track production economics over time is possible.

## **12. If I am a consultant, how do I use AFFIRM v3.0 for multiple clients?**

AFFIRM v3.0 allows to you have multiple farms that represent various clients for your consultation. In addition, AFFIRM v3.0 provides the user with the capability to invite another user to view and/or edit an owner's farm information.

## **13. Is AFFIRM v3.0 only suitable for Alberta conditions?**

Use of research data from Alberta with Alberta soil and climate conditions went into the development of AFFIRM v3.0. It is possible to use AFFIRM v3.0 outside of Alberta, but the user must be careful that the precipitation probabilities and soil types (organic matter, texture, and inputs.) are similar and the soil laboratory are the same or use the same analytical procedures.

## **14. Can AFFIRM v3.0 import information (i.e., AFFIRM v2 or laboratory results)?**

Presently, AFFIRM v3.0 does not have the capability to import information from older versions of AFFIRM. Differences in laboratory report formats creates difficulty for importing the laboratory information. The potential for this option will be re-evaluated when developing the next version.

## **15. How do I enter my historic information?**

The design of AFFIRM v3.0 stores field data on a yearly basis. When creating a new farm, AFFIRM v3.0 will request you to enter the first year that you will be analyzing data for nutrient management. Once you have set this year, additional fertilizer costs will continue to the next year. It is important to set the appropriate year, as you cannot enter data preceding this entered year.

## **16. Can I export information and recommendations from AFFIRM v3.0?**

No, AFFIRM v3.0 has no export function to transfer information.

## **17. How do I remove my information from AFFIRM v3.0?**

Deleting individual fields or the entire farm will remove your information stored in AFFIRM v3.0.

## **18. Why is soil sampling and soil test results important?**

Soil sampling and soil testing is essential to measure soil nutrient levels and other chemical and physical soil properties that will influence crop growth. It provides a snapshot of the soil at the time of sampling. Over time, soil test results vary or change, some more quickly than others depending on the management of soil, nutrients and crops, and climate. Soil properties such as particle size or soil texture will not change over time, but may vary spatially, so where you soil sample is very important. Soil texture has a significant influence on moisture retention, the ability of crops to tolerant drought conditions, crop growth and subsequent fertilizer requirements. Soil nutrient levels may vary annually such as nitrate nitrogen. Most soil test will vary by depth. For soil nitrate and sulfate levels, sampling depth is very critical and sampling depths to 60 cm (2 ft) in 15 cm (6 in) increments is the most dependable for making fertilizer nitrogen and sulfur recommendations. Whereas use of the surface 15 cm (6 in) is the norm for phosphate, potash, and most micronutrient fertilizer recommendations. If you only have a surface sample for all nutrients, AFFIRM v3.0 will estimate the subsurface levels for nitrate and sulfate which can affect nitrogen and sulfur recommendations. Soil pH and soil salinity will also affect crop growth. Crops vary in their ability to tolerate salinity, or acid soil conditions and affects fertilizer recommendations.

## **19. What is the Estimated Nitrogen Release (ENR)?**

The Estimated Nitrogen Release (ENR) provides an indication of the mineralizable (release) nitrogen of the soil over the growing season. The ENR is related to the soil organic matter level, and influenced by soil moisture and soil temperature, residue management and landscape position. As a first approximation, the ENR calculator uses the legal location and soil test area soil organic matter levels to estimate the ENR. Calculations with specific soil organic matter tests or ENR soil tests, offer better predictions of ENR. There are specific laboratory soil tests to measure ENR. These tests will provide field specific estimates of nitrogen release that are more precise than estimates based on regional soil organic matter levels. The calibration for the nitrogen recommendation and or yield response to applied nitrogen fertilizer in AFFIRM v3.0 is based on soil groups and the typical ENR for cultivated soils in Alberta. Fields or sub-fields within soil zones may have higher ENR due to higher organic matter levels or the result of management practices such as manure applications. Adjustments to nitrogen fertilizer applications and the crop yield response to nitrogen fertilizer can use ENR values.

## **20. How does AFFIRM v3.0 consider the previous crop residue nitrogen?**

Above and below ground residues from previous crop in rotation can provide a source of N for growing the crop in the current cropping year. If the above ground crop residue remains on the field and incorporated into the soil, then consideration of the nitrogen mineralized from the above and below ground residue occurs to adjust fertilizer nitrogen requirements. If removal of the above ground crop residue occurs, then consideration of only the mineralized nitrogen from the below ground crop residue occurs to adjust fertilizer nitrogen requirements.

## **21. How does AFFIRM v3.0 manage and estimate nutrients from manure?**

AFFIRM v3.0 calculates the nutrients available from manure application as a contributing source for crop production and determining fertilizer requirements. AFFIRM v3.0 can utilize specific laboratory manure analysis or book values for manure sources, combined with the manure application method, the weather conditions at the time of manure application and the rate of manure application to calculate the quantity nutrients available from manure sources for crop production. AFFIRM v3.0 also factors in the previous two years application of manure to gauge the nutrients available for crop production.

## **22. What is the difference between laboratory manure analyses and book values?**

AFFIRM v3.0 has the option of using a manure analysis specific to a manure source or book values which provides an estimate of nutrient content of the manure based on manure type (livestock, solid or liquid). The laboratory analysis is the most accurate reflection of the nutrient content of the manure, while the book values may not provide a reliable estimate for the manure.

## **23. How does AFFIRM v3.0 manage nutrient stewardship?**

Nutrient stewardship requires the implementation of nutrient beneficial management practices (BMPs) that optimize the efficiency of nutrient use. The goal of nutrient BMPs is to optimize crop productivity by matching nutrient supply with crop requirements and to minimize nutrient losses. Selection of BMPs varies by location, and those chosen for a given farm are dependent on local soil and climatic conditions, crop choice, management decisions and other site-specific factors. The nutrient stewardship concept applies globally but varies depending on field and site-specific characteristics such as soil, cropping system, management techniques, climate, and equipment. The four factors that influence all nutrient decisions include 1) nutrient source; 2) time of nutrient application; 3) placement of nutrient application; and 4) rate of nutrient application.

AFFIRM v3.0 allows the user to select nutrient stewardship options that includes:

Nutrient source – soil tests, soil mineralization, crop residue, manure, and fertilizer products • Time of application – fall, spring, in-season

Nutrient placement – method of application (i.e., broadcast, seed-placed, banding, injection)

Fertilizer economics – nutrient costs, crop prices, economic return, and fertilizer budget. AFFIRM v3.0 uses these factors to determine the rate of nutrient application.

## **24. Are AFFIRM v3.0 fertilizer recommendations based on target yields?**

Fertilizer recommendations generated by AFFIRM v3.0 is not based on target crop yields. AFFIRM v3.0 identifies soil factors (nutrient levels, pH, salinity, and soil moisture) that may limit crop growth and generates fertilizer recommendations to correct nutrient deficiencies and adjust for soil limiting factors. AFFIRM v3.0 generates a crop yield response to fertilizer nitrogen and moisture conditions and identifies appropriate fertilizer nitrogen rate based on economic analysis to optimize economic returns. Unfortunately, available research data limits yield

response equations development. As a result, AFFIRM provides crop yield response to major crops only. A “YR” after the crop name identifies these major crop yield response equations.

## **25. Why don't some crops have an economic analysis?**

To conduct an economic analysis, AFFIRM v3.0 needs to predict a yield response for added fertilizer nitrogen at a specific moisture level for a crop with non-linear regression equations. The development of such equations requires extensive and intensive field research to collect the required data (i.e., yield, soil nitrogen level, fertilizer nitrogen rates, spring soil moisture conditions, growing season precipitation or irrigation levels). There is limited research information to develop yield response equations. The yield response equations developed represent a small number, but significant portion of annual crops grown in Alberta and nitrogen fertilizer products. There is a vital need for field research to maintain or increase the number of crops with this information. Crops without yield response will still receive a fertilizer recommendation based on the research information available.

## **26. How is the individual field economic analysis different from the whole farm optimization?**

The economic analysis involves the analysis of added returns to added costs of additional applications of fertilizer to an individual field. Based on your risk level and profit margin, the economic analysis determines the recommended N rate for that field. The whole farm optimization module then incorporates the P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrient costs of all fields, and based on a set budget, will determine how the available dollars for N application should be allocated by field and crop. According to the results of the economic analysis, AFFIRM v3.0 will optimize your investment by allocating N fertilizer (in 10lb increments) to those fields with the highest economic return potential until achievement of a target investment ratio or the depletion of available dollars.

## **27. Why can't alterations occur to P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrient recommendations in the farm optimization?**

The optimization of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrients occurs at the field level based on soil test levels, crop selection, soil test zone, and moisture level prior to the whole farm optimization. The farm optimization process focuses on allocating the dollars for nitrogen to maximize production and returns after covering the cost of the P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and micronutrients. This is not the best way, but given the limitation of our data, it is the best we can do. If we had research data for crop response to all nutrients, then a multi-nutrient optimization would be possible. The experimental design would require a huge number and level of interactions to get all combinations of nutrients and fertilizer rates.

## **28. Why does not AFFIRM v3.0 give the same recommendations as my laboratory report?**

The intent of AFFIRM v3.0 is not to reproduce fertilizer recommendations and target yield predictions made by various private laboratories. Rather, AFFIRM v3.0 makes use of the recommendations outlined in the Soil Test Recommendations for Alberta: Technical Manual, soil test calibration research and the yield response equations developed by Alberta Agriculture and Forestry and when necessary, soil and fertilizer research from western Canada. Soil test laboratories have various mechanisms for developing fertilizer recommendations that may or may not include research from Alberta Agriculture and Irrigation.