



Is Local Beef More Sustainable?

Ashley Broocks
Graduate Student

Emily Andreini
Graduate Student

Megan Rolf
Assistant Professor

Sara Place
Assistant Professor, Sustainable Beef Cattle Systems

Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Fact Sheets are also available on our website at: <http://osufacts.okstate.edu>

Consumer interest in locally produced food has increased dramatically during the past few decades. While there is no single formal definition of local food, the term local food commonly refers to food grown or raised up to 400 miles of purchase location, or simply food produced within the same state¹. However, local can mean different things to different people, considering the different size of states (for example, Rhode Island vs. Texas). It is important to note that local does not imply one production system was used over another, it simply means that the product was produced within a certain distance of where it is being sold.

From an environmental sustainability perspective, the primary difference of local versus non-local products is the type of transportation used in moving post-harvest beef from processors to consumers, as shown in Figure 1. Measuring and comparing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions due to transportation of beef from local and national locations is difficult because mode of transportation, load sizes, fuel type, distance to market and frequency of trips are rarely similar¹. However, approximately 80 percent of GHG emissions occur in the beef production chain before the animal is harvested². Approximately 1 to 3 percent of GHG emissions occur due to transportation of beef to the consumer.^{3,4} Local food, including beef, is either marketed directly to consumers, or marketed to food service (e.g., restaurants) and retailers, then purchased by consumers. The appeal of purchasing local foods is often associated with perceived reductions of GHGs because the product travels shorter distances from the producer to the consumer, thereby reducing what is known as food miles.




Figure 1. Major differences in the beef production chain between local and non-local beef are primarily due to transportation. (Photos courtesy of Oklahoma State University, USDA-ARS, USDA-NRCS and openclipart.org)

However, there is a tradeoff between the increased frequency of trips and smaller load sizes versus the distance traveled per trip in local beef systems, as compared to the mainstream beef transportation system. This is because more beef moved per trip will translate into lower fossil fuel energy use and lower GHG emissions per unit of beef transported¹. Consequently, even if transportation distances were cut significantly for local beef, the impacts on GHG emissions are likely minimal.

While the environmental benefits of local beef (strictly considering transportation differences) may be minimal, many consumers that purchase local beef and other food products do so for social reasons, such as wanting to support their local economy and wanting to know where their food is produced⁵. To consumers that weigh those factors heavily in their purchasing decisions, local beef may be viewed as their most desirable choice. However, the effects of purchasing local food, including beef, on the local economy are not clear-cut nor are any economic benefits evenly distributed across communities (e.g., if a consumer shifts from purchasing at a retailer to a farmers market, the local owner(s) and operator(s) of the retailer will likely be negatively impacted)^{1,6}.

Additionally, it is unlikely all U.S. consumers will have access to local beef if it is defined as within 400 miles of where one lives due to land use constraints. For example, in highly populous cities, it would be unlikely the land immediately surrounding the city would be able to support enough beef production to make local beef accessible to all consumers in that city. In more rural areas, rising land costs due to competition with crop production and expansion of residential housing may limit the ability to produce enough local beef to feed the population.

Regardless of where beef is produced, beef producers and researchers are continuously working toward improving the sustainability of beef production. As more of the environmental impact of beef production can be attributed to the raising of cattle and the feed fed to the cattle, focusing on improving the production efficiency of beef will have a far greater impact on environmental sustainability than reducing food miles. Sustainable beef production is not limited to a single production system, so all beef production systems (e.g., local, non-local, organic, conventional, grass-finished, grain-finished) can be

sustainable if they are committed to constant improvement in all aspects of sustainability, including environmental impact, societal acceptance and economic viability of production systems².

Summary

The term “local” simply reflects the distance a product has been transported before being marketed and does not necessarily reflect differences in production practices or sustainability. The environmental sustainability benefit of purchasing local beef products are likely minimal as:

- 1) transportation accounts for only 1 to 3 percent of GHG emissions per unit of beef, and
- 2) local beef products can decrease transportation distance, but often at the expense of increased frequency of shorter distance trips due to smaller beef delivery sizes. Therefore, GHG emissions from the burning of fossil fuels per unit of beef may not be greatly impacted.

Literature Cited

- ¹Martinez, S., M. Hand, M. Da Pra, S. Pollack, K. Ralston, T. Smith, S. Vogel, S. Clark, L. Lohr, S. Low, & C. Newman. 2010. Local food systems: concepts, impacts, and issues. USDA ERS 97: 1-87.
- ²Battagliese, T., J. Andrade, I. Schulze, B. Uhlman, C. Barcan. 2013. More sustainable beef optimization project: Phase 1 final report. BASF Corporation. Florham Park, NJ.
- ³Weber, C. and H.S. Matthews. 2008. Food miles and the relative climate impacts of food choices in the United States. *Environ. Sci. Tech.* 42: 3508-3513.
- ⁴Sanders, K.T., and M.E. Webber. 2014. A comparative analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions intensity of wheat and beef in the United States. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 9: 1-9.
- ⁵Brain, R. 2012. The local food movement: Definitions, benefits & resources. Utah State University Extension. Available at: https://extension.usu.edu/files/publications/publication/Sustainability_2012-09pr.pdf Accessed December 18, 2015.
- ⁶Born, B. and M. Purcell. 2006. Avoiding the local trap: Scale and food systems in planning research. *J. Plan. Educ. Res.* 26:195-207.

Oklahoma State University, in compliance with Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11246 as amended, and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and other federal and state laws and regulations, does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, genetic information, sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, or status as a veteran, in any of its policies, practices or procedures. This provision includes, but is not limited to admissions, employment, financial aid, and educational services. The Director of Equal Opportunity, 408 Whitehurst, OSU, Stillwater, OK 74078-1035; Phone 405-744-5371; email: eeo@okstate.edu has been designated to handle inquiries regarding non-discrimination policies: Director of Equal Opportunity. Any person (student, faculty, or staff) who believes that discriminatory practices have been engaged in based on gender may discuss his or her concerns and file informal or formal complaints of possible violations of Title IX with OSU's Title IX Coordinator 405-744-9154.

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Director of Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. This publication is printed and issued by Oklahoma State University as authorized by the Vice President for Agricultural Programs and has been prepared and distributed at a cost of 42 cents per copy.