The much anticipated U.S. Prospective Plantings report was released on March 31, 2015. The USDA summary stated:

“Corn planted area for all purposes in 2015 is estimated at 89.2 million acres, down 2 percent from last year. If realized, this will be the third consecutive year of an acreage decline and would be the lowest planted acreage in the United States since 2010.

Soybeans planted area for 2015 is estimated at a record high 84.6 million acres, up 1 percent from last year. Compared with 2014, planted acreage intentions are up or unchanged in 21 of the 31 major producing States.

All wheat planted area for 2015 is estimated at 55.4 million acres, down 3 percent from last year. The 2015 winter wheat planted area, at 40.8 million acres, is down 4 percent from 2014, but up less than 1 percent from the previous estimate.”

Survey procedures
The March Prospective Plantings report was compiled by the USDA National Ag Statistics Service (NASS). This report does not equate to the exact number on the June planted acreage report to be released on June 30, 2015 or the final planted acreage report released in early January 2016. It should serve as an intentions of farm operators.

The acreage estimates for this report were based primarily on surveys conducted during the first two weeks of March 2015.
The March Agricultural Survey is a probability survey that includes a sample of over 84,000 farm operators selected from a list of producers. The selection process ensures all operations in the United States have a chance to be asked to the survey.

These farm operators were contacted by mail, Internet, telephone, or personal interview to obtain information on crop acreage planned for the 2015 crop year. This includes over 2,900 operators in Iowa.

**Estimating procedures**

The national, regional and state reported data from operators were reviewed by NASS for reasonableness and consistency with historical estimates. Each NASS regional field office submits its analysis of the current situation to the Agricultural Statistics Board (ASB). Survey data are compiled at the national level and reviewed at this level independently of each state’s review. Acreage estimates were then based on survey data and the historical relationship of official estimates to the survey data compiled for release on March 31.

**Reliability of the report**

NASS self-reports the 20-year accuracy of its report estimates (page 34 of the *Prospective Plantings* report). For corn, the root mean square error for this 2015 report vs. final planted acreage is 1.9 percent, with a 90 percent confidence level at a 3.3 percent margin of error. That means, on average, the March report may be 1.174 million acres “off” from what operators end up actually planting; final planted acres could be above or below the estimated 89.2 million acres.

Over the past 20 years, the March Prospective Plantings report compared to the actual plantings for corn has been too low in seven years and too high on 13 occasions when compared to the final January acreage planted total.

For soybeans, the root mean square error for the 2015 report vs. final planted acreage is 2.1 percent, with a 90 percent confidence level at 3.6 percent margin of error. This means on average this March report may be 1.264 million acres “off” from what U.S. operators end up actually planting; soybean acres could be that many planted acres above or below the estimated 84.6 million acres.

**Reliability of Prospective Plantings Planted Acreage Estimates**

[Based on data for the past 20 years]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Root mean square error</th>
<th>90 percent confidence interval</th>
<th>Difference between forecast and final estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(percent)</td>
<td>(percent)</td>
<td>Thousand acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley .................</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn for grain .......</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats ..................</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum for grain ......</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans for beans ....</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland cotton ........</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter wheat ..........</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durum wheat ...........</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other spring ..........</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: USDA NASS, Prospective Plantings Report, March 2015*
Over the past 20 years, the March Prospective Plantings report compared to the actual plantings for soybeans has been too low in 11 years and too high on nine occasions when compared to the January final acreage plantings.

**Conclusion**

This March 31 Prospective Plantings report does not equate to the exact June Planted Acreage report to be released on June 30 or to the final planted acreage report in early January 2016.

A major reason for having this annual Prospective Planting report is to let operators and agribusiness know what plans are for planting major crops nationwide. The futures markets adjust quickly to these acreage estimates and a great deal of price volatility can be expected this spring, likely influenced by planting conditions and weather forecasts.

Operators reported intentions to plant 89.2 million acres of corn and 84.6 million acres of soybeans. That’s 1.4 million less corn acres than was planted last year, but about 470,000 more than the average trade guess prior to the report’s release. The decline in corn acres is mostly offset by increased planting intentions for other feed grains (barley, wheat, grain sorghum).

Soybean planted acres in 2015 would be 934,000 more acres than were planted in 2014, yet nearly 1.3 million less than the average trade guess. Planting intentions for other oilseed crops (canola, peanuts, and sunflowers) exceed last year’s plantings by about 190,000 acres.

Attention will now turn to spring weather and planting progress. Excellent planting weather conditions in April and May can result in roughly up to 1 million acre swings from corn and soybean intentions. Wet and cold weather conditions can delay plantings far enough past the optimal corn planting date that some acreage may be switched to soybeans or another later planted crop.

---

**Acreage Living newsletter addresses April showers, May flowers and other spring issues**

By Christa Hartsook, Value Added Agriculture, Small Farms Program, 515-294-4430, hartc@iastate.edu; Linda Naeve, Value Added Agriculture, 515-294-8946, lnaeve@iastate.edu

April showers bring May flowers—along with yard work, weeds and excess rainwater. Acreage owners can be proactive about managing all these spring tasks by subscribing to the electronic Acreage Living newsletter, offered free from Iowa State University Extension and Outreach Small Farm Sustainability Program. The recently published Spring 2015 e-newsletter provides readers with resources and information to manage spring home and landscaping projects.

Excess rainwater is inevitable in the spring, but can it be contained and reused?

---

Plan ahead to capture rain for dry summer season

“Harvesting rainwater has gained attention in recent years, especially after the Midwest experienced a couple seasons of wet springs followed by several dry weeks during the growing season,” said Linda Naeve, value added agriculture specialist with Iowa State University Extension and Outreach.

In the wet season, runoff from roofs and drain pipes can create riverlets and trenches across a
Value of the dollar and exports of major agricultural crops

By Daryll E. Ray, Blasingame chair, Excellence in Agricultural Policy, Institute of Agriculture, University of Tennessee, and director, UT Agricultural Policy Analysis Center (APAC), (865) 974-7407, dray@utk.edu; and Harwood D. Schaffer, research assistant professor, APAC, hdschaffer@utk.edu, www.agpolicy.org

Over the last year, the U.S. dollar has appreciated by 27 percent against the euro. For U.S. residents, this strengthening of the dollar has made traveling to European countries that use the euro a bargain. At the same time it has made imports from the Eurozone cheaper and U.S. exports more expensive.

Not only has the dollar strengthened against the euro, it has strengthened against currencies in general, making U.S. goods more expensive in most markets and imports cheaper. One important exception to this trend is the Chinese renminbi which is on a par with the U.S. dollar from a year ago. That would indicate that other things being equal, the manufacturing jobs that have returned to the U.S. from China are under no threat based on exchange rates.

But what does this mean for U.S. agricultural exports? Many agricultural economists have long argued that a strong dollar has a negative impact on exports. So what can we expect this time around?

Let’s start with a discussion of the major exportable bulk commodities, corn, soybeans, wheat, and rice and the dynamics of those markets. To start, soybeans are in a class by themselves. The major growth in world soybean exports over the last decade has come from one customer: China.
In 1994, China imported just under 6 million bushels of soybeans. Twenty years later China is projected to import 2.7 billion bushels, an average increase of 136 million bushels a year. The rest of the world has increased soybean imports by 556 million bushels or 28 million bushels a year, so China is responsible for the lion’s share (83 percent) of the growth in this important export market for the U.S., Brazil, and Argentina.

With the U.S. dollar and the Chinese renminbi on a par with each other over the last year, the strengthening of the U.S. dollar is likely to have little impact on total U.S. soybean exports to China. Normally, Argentina and Brazil tend to float exportable soybean surplus out their ports rather use storage, even if they have to discount their prices to do so. (As noted below, this year the farmer strikes in Argentina are disrupting the Argentine export pattern, which in turn affects the intra-year price pattern and intra-year timing of exports by U.S. and other soybean exporters.)

In addition, to the extent that farmers in Argentina and Brazil have to purchase their inputs denominated in U.S. dollars, they are affected by the stronger U.S. dollar in the same way as U.S. farmers.

For soybeans, U.S. farmers face a greater risk than a strong dollar. And that risk is a decision by Chinese officials to level off on their imports of soybeans. They do not even have to reduce their imports to cause havoc for soybean producers worldwide. Without the average increase of 136 million bushels a year from China, producers will face a glut of soybeans on the world market and the strong U.S. dollar will have little to do with that.

And sooner or later there will be a price-hiccup in world soybean markets when Argentine farmers and their government come to an agreement over export taxes on soybeans. The USDA projects that at the end of the 2014 marketing year, Argentina will have a carryover 685 million bushels of soybeans, compared to a more normal 150 to 200 million bushels, as farmers hold soybeans off the market as a part of their tax protest. Those 400 to 500 million extra bushels of carry-over will be a headache for everyone once they come on the market and again a strong U.S. dollar will have little to nothing to do with that problem.

Looking at the three grains—corn, wheat, and rice—the U.S. is the residual supplier of these crops, with the trend over the last 20 years being flat to down. Most countries generally only import the difference between what they need and what they produce. If production is up elsewhere, imports are down no matter what the price. If production is up among our export competitors, our exports are down and vice versa.

The value of the dollar may speed up the exports of a given year’s exportable surplus but it does not have that much effect on short-term total exports because most of our grain export competitors do not want to carry much stock from year to year. Over time, the exchange rate could/would affect the amount that is produced in competitor countries; that is, it could/would change the amount of exportable surplus in a given competitor country in the future moderately reducing production when the value of the dollar is down and increasing production when the value of the dollar is high and the reverse for the U.S.

But even then, it must be remembered that additional acreage comes into production much faster than those same acres leave production. And the addition of acres happened most quickly in response to a strong price increase. With prices down significantly this year, the impact of the strong dollar is unlikely to be enough to pull additional acreage into production in the U.S. or elsewhere.

For U.S. farmers a product likely to be significantly affected by the strong dollar is beef exports. People do move away from beef when the price is high and go to lower priced protein...
Value of the dollar and exports of major agricultural crops, continued from page 5

... sources. That is to say, if the demand is highly influenced by price, the value of the dollar is very important because it affects the price (the foreign) customer sees and pays. The current cyclical increase in beef production, along with reduced exports due to the strong U.S. dollar, could put a downward pressure on cattle prices.

So what does that mean for U.S. crop farmers? The greatest worry should be the political decisions that are made in China with regard to soybean imports; the strong U.S. dollar pales in comparison because in the case of a leveling off of Chinese soybean imports some of those soybean acres will be shifted to other crops, negatively affecting all crops. For cattle producers there will certainly be some impact as the result of the strong U.S. dollar.

Updates, continued from page 1

Internet Updates
The following Decision Tools have been updated on www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm.

Farm Machinery Selection – A3-28 (8 pages)
Estimating the Number of Field Days Required – A3-28 (Decision Tool)
How Often Can Cattle Feeders Hedge a Profit with Futures? – B2-54 (4 pages)

Current Profitability
The following tools have been updated on www.extension.iastate.edu/agdm/info/outlook.html.

Corn Profitability – A1-85
Soybean Profitability – A1-86
Iowa Cash Corn and Soybean Prices – A2-11
Season Average Price Calculator – A2-15
Ethanol Profitability – D1-10
Biodiesel Profitability – D1-15

... and justice for all

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Many materials can be made available in alternative formats for ADA clients. To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964.
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