Energy agriculture - food versus fuel
by Don Hofstrand, value-added agriculture specialist, co-director AgMRC, Iowa State University Extension, 641-423-0844, dhof@iastate.edu

Much controversy has centered around the “food versus fuel” issue. Proponents of the new dual focus believe that production agriculture can meet the needs of both masters. Opponents disagree. They assert that channeling a portion of agriculture’s production capacity to energy production will result in substantially higher food prices and possibly food shortages.

While there is little doubt that agriculture commodity prices are rising due to the bio-fuels industry, the magnitude of the impact on food prices and the consumer’s pocketbook may differ from what you expect. Here are some perspectives to keep in mind.

Share of disposable income that goes to food purchases
The United States is very blessed that only a small portion of the consumer’s disposable income goes for food and beverage purchases. As shown in Figure 1, the portion of disposable income that goes for food and beverages declined from 18 percent in 1961 to 10 percent in 2006.

At 2006 levels, the impact of a ten percent increase in food expenditures due to high food prices will require only one percent of disposable income.

Share of the food dollar that goes to production agriculture
The share of the food dollar that goes to farmers has decreased from 37 percent to 20 percent in the last 50 years as shown in Figure 2.

Handbook updates
For those of you subscribing to the handbook, the following updates are included.
Corn Price Basis – A2-41 (11 pages)
Soybean Price Basis – A2-42 (11 pages)
Farmland Values Survey (Realtors Land Institute) – C2-75 (2 pages)
Please add these files to your handbook and remove the out-of-date material.
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Figure 2. The large increase in ready-to-eat food is an indication of the increase in the non-farm share of the food dollar. However, even with these increased costs, the portion of consumer's disposable income that goes for food purchases continues to decline as shown in Figure 1.

If 10 percent of consumer's disposable income goes for food purchases, and 20 percent of the money for the purchases go to farmers, then farmers receive only two percent of consumer's disposable income. So, as an example, a 50 percent increase in farm commodity prices will only increase food prices by 10 percent, and will only require an additional one percent of consumer's disposable income.

The farmer's portion of the food dollar varies greatly depending on the food item. As shown in Table 1, only two percent of the sale price of potato chips and cereal goes to farmers while 45 percent of the sale price of milk goes to farmers. Bacon and eggs are 16 and 30 percent respectively, if you prepare them at home. If you eat at a restaurant, it will cost you more and the percentages will be lower.

Food waste
The amount of food that is produced but never consumed is surprisingly high. Some research indicates that slightly over 25 percent of our food supply is not consumed and disposed of somewhere along the food supply chain. Other estimates are higher. Table 2 shows the estimated...
Food loss at the retail, food service and consumer levels for different food categories. Several of them are over 30 percent.

Food waste examples can easily be observed in the typical home and at restaurants and buffets. Because food is so cheap for the typical consumer, it is often easier to dispose of excess food than keep it for later. Also, food portion sizes in restaurants have increased substantially over recent decades. Because food is cheap, increasing portion sizes is an inexpensive way to attract customers, but causes greater food loss.

Not a zero-sum game
Agricultural production used for energy does not necessarily result in an equal loss of agricultural production for food. Agriculture has a long history of surplus production capacity. Government programs have been used to restrict production capacity and prop up prices. More recently, programs have focused on supporting farm prices while letting surplus production clear the market at depressed prices. This environment has not been conducive to stimulating investment in research and technology to expand production capacity.

With the emerging energy demand, agriculture enters a period which taxes its production capacity. Higher commodity prices are providing the incentive for making investments to expand production capacity.

Table 1. Farmers Share of Food Dollar for Specific Food Products, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Product</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Farm Share</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bread (1 lb. loaf)</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>$.11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon (lb)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato Chips (13.5 oz.)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk (gallon)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal (18 oz. box)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Sirloin Steak</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Carrots (2 lb.)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs (dozen)</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettuce (head)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USDA, NASS, Agricultural Prices, 2006

Table 2. Food Losses at the Retail, Foodservice and Consumer Levels, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Edible Food Supply* (million pounds)</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain Products</td>
<td>45,606</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>48,338</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>63,077</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Products</td>
<td>76,276</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat, poultry &amp; fish</td>
<td>51,466</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>7,918</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caloric Sweeteners</td>
<td>38,827</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24,374</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355,883</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes non-edible food parts.
Source: Economic Research Service, USDA

Figure 3. Annual Crude Oil Price and Iowa Corn Price

Source: US DOE, USDA
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Livestock risk protection now available for lambs

by William Edwards, extension economist, 515-294-6161, wedwards@iastate.edu

Lamb producers and feeders in Iowa and 26 other states can now manage the risk of declining prices for fed lambs with an insurance product known as Livestock Risk Protection (LRP).

LRP has been available for cattle and hog producers for several years. Lamb-LRP is very similar to the cattle and hog programs. An application can be filed with any crop insurance agent authorized to sell LRP coverage. This allows lamb feeders to purchase a “specific coverage endorsement” any time they have a group of lambs that will go to market. Coverage can be purchased for projected marketing dates 13, 26 or 39 weeks in the future.

Each Friday a projected market price, called the “expected ending value” is posted on the Risk Management Agency (RMA) Website (http://www.rma.usda.gov/livestock/ under Coverage Prices, Rates and Actual Ending Values) for each feeding period. Coverage can be purchased for a price equal to 80, 85, 90 or 95 percent of the expected ending value, for any number of lambs (up to 7,000 head) and target selling weight. Premiums are listed on the RMA Website, and are subsidized 13 percent by the USDA. Coverage can be purchased Monday mornings from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Central time.

At the end of the coverage period the actual ending value of the lambs is calculated based on the insured number and weight, and the current price of slaughter lambs as reported by the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) of the USDA. If the ending value of the lambs is less than the revenue guarantee that was purchased, the policy holder will be paid an indemnity equal to the difference.

More detailed explanations of Lamb-LRP, with examples, are available in Briefing Paper No. 83 from the Agricultural Marketing Center at Montana State University, can be found at: http://www.ampc.montana.edu/briefings/briefing83.pdf, or Ag Decision Maker File B1-52, Risk Management Tool for Sheep Producers available at http://www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm/livestock/html/b1-52.html.
An Iowa cattle grazing survey conducted among agricultural producers and landowners indicates several trends among grazing rental rates and management practices in the state.

The 2006 survey, conducted by the Iowa Beef Center, the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Iowa Forage and Grassland Council, surveyed 448 agricultural producers in Iowa. Results were released this past month.

Some of the key findings include:
Kossuth, Pocahontas, Humboldt, Wright, Webster, Hamilton and Calhoun counties had the lowest annual average rent per acre at $24.50. Delaware, Dubuque, Jones, Jackson, Clinton, Cedar, Scott and Muscaline counties had the highest annual average rent per acre at about $45. The average rent per acre statewide was nearly $38.

The rent per acre was highest on lands that had the greatest productivity, which were lands with alfalfa and tall cool season grasses. Rates for lands with alfalfa were as much as $64 per acre and lands with tall cool season grasses were as much as $59 per acre.

Custom grazing fees on average per day were highest in the summer for a cow-calf pair, at 91 cents, and lowest for yearling cattle, at 78 cents. During the winter months, the highest daily fees were for developing heifers, at $1.14, and lowest for yearling cattle, at 65 cents.

The majority of custom grazers provided labor during both winter and summer months as part of their agreements with the cattle owners, but most owners still covered the cost of animal healthcare. Shane Ellis, Iowa State University Extension program specialist with the Iowa Beef Center, said the survey focused on a key group of producers affiliated with cattle grazing, and it provides additional details not found in the Cash Rental Rates for Iowa Survey published annually by Iowa State University Extension.

“Results from this survey will help landowners and tenants gauge the rental rate they are charging or paying,” Ellis said. “People can use it as a source for what is going on in their area.”

For the complete survey results, visit www.iowabeefcenter.org.
Insuring Iowa’s agriculture workshop offered

Are you wondering how the farm bill debate will affect the crop insurance industry and how it serves farmers? Would you like to know more about managing risk when marketing grain? Will climate change affect crop production in Iowa? These and other topics will be explored in “Insuring Iowa’s Agriculture,” a workshop to be held at Iowa State University on Tuesday, November 6. This event has been approved for 6 hours of continuing education credit by the Iowa Insurance Division. For more program details and online registration, visit http://www.ucs.iastate.edu/mnet/insuringiowasag/home.html

Internet Updates
The following updates have been added to www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm.

Risk Management Tool for Sheep Producers – B1-52
Organic Dairy Production Planning Concepts – B1-24

Decision Tools
The following decision tool has been added to www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm.

Organic Dairy Production – Use this Decision Tool to project the profitability of organic dairy production.