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## 2009 Meat Animal Production and Value

Iowa: The 2009 gross income from cattle and calves, hogs and pigs, and sheep and lambs for Iowa totaled $\$ 6.93$ billion, down from $\$ 7.68$ billion in 2008. Gross income decreased 14.3 percent for cattle and calves, 6.95 percent for hogs and pigs, and 22.4 percent for sheep and lambs.

United States: The 2009 gross income from cattle and calves, hogs and pigs, and sheep and lambs for the U.S. totaled $\$ 59.0$ billion, down 10 percent from 2008. Gross income decreased for cattle and calves, hogs and pigs, and sheep and lambs. Cattle and calves decreased 10 percent, hogs and pigs also decreased 10 percent, while sheep and lambs decreased 3 percent.

Total 2009 cash receipts from marketings of meat animals decreased 10 percent to $\$ 58.6$ billion. Cattle and calves accounted for 75 percent of this
total, hogs and pigs 24 percent, and sheep and lambs 1 percent. Production decreased for all cattle and calves, hogs and pigs, and sheep and lambs.

Cattle and Calves: Cash receipts from marketings of cattle and calves decreased 10 percent from $\$ 48.5$ billion in 2008 to $\$ 43.8$ in 2009. All cattle and calf marketings totaled 54.1 billion pounds in 2009, down 1 percent from 2008.

Hogs and Pigs: Cash receipts from hogs and pigs totaled $\$ 14.4$ billion during 2009, down 10 percent from 2008. Marketings totaled 32.7 billion pounds in 2009, up slightly from 2008.

Sheep and Lambs: Cash receipts from marketings of sheep and lambs in 2009 were $\$ 436$ million, down 3 percent from 2008. Marketings decreased 6 percent to 494 million pounds.

## 2009 Meat Animals Production and Value

|  | Cattle and Calves |  |  | Hogs and Pigs |  |  | Sheep and Lambs |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Production | Value per Head | Value of Production | Production | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Value } \\ \text { per Head } \end{gathered}$ | Value of Production | Production | $\begin{gathered} \text { Value } \\ \text { per Head } \end{gathered}$ | Value of Production |
|  | 1,000 lbs. | Dollars | \$1,000 | 1,000 lbs. | Dollars | \$1,000 | 1,000 lbs. | Dollars | \$1,000 |
| California | 1,919,081 | 930 | 1,111,796 | 53,886 | 110 | 18,979 | 36,334 | 134 | 29,162 |
| Colorado | 1,803,820 | 880 | 1,586,292 | 268,688 | 88 | 129,681 | 62,387 | 128 | 47,480 |
| Illinois | 501,470 | 880 | 421,593 | 1,840,656 | 83 | 908,335 | 3,887 | 212 | 3,013 |
| lowa | 1,786,596 | 860 | 1,436,961 | 9,623,124 | 86 | 3,585,441 | 23,048 | 142 | 21,296 |
| Kansas | 3,915,772 | 800 | 2,964,814 | 915,237 | 75 | 326,925 | 6,258 | 131 | 5,363 |
| Minnesota | 1,108,160 | 1,020 | 800,217 | 3,476,675 | 97 | 1,420,587 | 14,527 | 128 | 13,729 |
| Nebraska | 4,597,667 | 870 | 3,733,330 | 1,368,535 | 89 | 629,840 | 7,823 | 132 | 7,046 |
| North Carolina | 312,124 | 720 | 205,617 | 4,099,445 | 70 | 1,836,124 | 1,170 | 159 | 936 |
| Oklahoma | 1,983,903 | 750 | 1,746,563 | 1,265,851 | 79 | 473,680 | 3,731 | 156 | 2,975 |
| Texas | 6,923,911 | 770 | 5,481,429 | 303,688 | 69 | 115,156 | 34,673 | 101 | 31,992 |
| Wyoming | 467,134 | 910 | 399,522 | 122,787 | 93 | 50,231 | 36,681 | 130 | 32,119 |
| United States | 40,919,268 | 872 | 31,769,067 | 31,131,408 | 83 | 12,762,128 | 413,106 | 133 | 356,660 |

Iowa: Milk production totaled 4.38 billion pounds for 2009, up from 4.32 in 2008. The average number of milk cows was 215,000 head, down one thousand head from a year earlier. Production per cow was 20,367 pounds, up 372 pounds from 2008. The value of milk produced decreased to $\$ 578$ million from the 2008 value of $\$ 799$ million.

United States: Milk production decreased 0.3 percent in 2009 to 189 billion pounds. The rate per cow, at 20,576 pounds, was 181 pounds above 2008. The annual average number of milk cows on farms was 9.20 million head, down 114,000 head from 2008.

Cash receipts from marketings of milk during 2009 totaled $\$ 24.3$ billion, 30.1 percent lower than 2008. Producer returns averaged $\$ 12.93$ per hundredweight, 29.9 percent below 2008. Marketings totaled 188 billion pounds, 0.3 percent below 2008. Marketings include whole milk sold to plants and dealers and milk sold directly to consumers.

An estimated 1.01 billion pounds of milk were used on farms where produced, 5.1 percent less than 2008. Calves were fed 89 percent of this milk, with the remainder consumed in producer households.

## Milk Cows, Production, and Value of Production, 2008-2009

[2008 numbers are revised]

| State | Milk Cows ${ }^{1}$ |  | Milk Per Cow ${ }^{2}$ |  | Milk Production ${ }^{2}$ |  | Value of Milk Produced ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2008 | 2009 | 2008 | 2009 | 2008 | 2009 |
|  | Thousands | Thousands | Pounds | Pounds | Million Pounds | Million Pounds | 1,000 Dollars | 1,000 Dollars |
| California | 1,844 | 1,796 | 22,344 | 22,000 | 41,203 | 39,512 | 6,930,345 | 4,539,929 |
| Idaho | 549 | 550 | 22,432 | 22,091 | 12,315 | 12,150 | 2,105,865 | 1,433,700 |
| lowa | 216 | 215 | 19,995 | 20,367 | 4,319 | 4,379 | 799,015 | 578,028 |
| Michigan | 350 | 355 | 22,180 | 22,445 | 7,763 | 7,968 | 1,490,496 | 1,067,712 |
| Minnesota | 464 | 469 | 18,927 | 19,230 | 8,782 | 9,019 | 1,677,362 | 1,208,546 |
| New Mexico | 338 | 325 | 23,269 | 24,320 | 7,865 | 7,904 | 1,376,375 | 956,384 |
| New York | 626 | 619 | 19,859 | 20,071 | 12,432 | 12,424 | 2,386,944 | 1,689,664 |
| Ohio | 280 | 277 | 18,321 | 18,744 | 5,130 | 5,192 | 1,010,610 | 1,519,344 |
| Pennsylvania | 549 | 545 | 19,262 | 19,360 | 10,575 | 10,551 | 2,115,000 | 732,072 |
| Texas | 418 | 423 | 20,134 | 20,898 | 8,416 | 8,840 | 1,573,792 | 1,175,720 |
| Washington | 244 | 240 | 23,344 | 23,171 | 5,696 | 5,561 | 1,002,496 | 684,003 |
| Wisconsin | 1,252 | 1,257 | 19,546 | 18,811 | 24,472 | 25,239 | 4,625,208 | 3,306,309 |
| United States | 9,315 | 9,201 | 20,395 | 20,576 | 189,982 | 189,320 | 35,050,757 | 24,477,390 |

${ }^{1}$ Average number during year. Excludes heifers not yet fresh. ${ }^{2}$ Excludes milk sucked by calves. ${ }^{3}$ Value at average returns per 100 pounds of milk in combined marketings of milk and cream. ${ }^{4}$ Includes value of milk fed to calves.


Chickens: Production and Income, Iowa

| Year | Pounds <br> Sold | Price per <br> Pound | Value Of <br> Sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,000 pounds |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 38,729 | Dollars | 1,000 dollars |
| 2005 | 34,112 | 0.011 | 426 |
| 2006 | 32,708 | 0.003 | 102 |
| 2007 | 18,594 | 0.003 | 98 |
| 2008 | 21,457 | 0.005 | 93 |
| 2009 | 22,515 | 0.005 | 107 |

Eggs: Production and Income, lowa

| Year | Eggs <br> Produced | Price per <br> Dozen | Value of <br> Sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Million eggs |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 6,942 | Cents | 1,000 dollars |
| 2005 | 12,978 | 38.0 | 219,393 |
| 2006 | 13,811 | 31.0 | 335,318 |
| 2007 | 13,868 | 35.4 | 406,865 |
| 2008 | 14,407 | 71.4 | 824,806 |
| 2009 | 14,475 | 93.1 | $1,117,850$ |

Dairy Products: Quantity Manufactured by Month, Iowa

| Year | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sep. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | ----------- | --- 1, | O0 pound | ------ | ------ |  |  |  |  |
| Total Cheese (Excluding Cottage Cheese) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 20,904 | 20,009 | 23,852 | 22,654 | 21,355 | 22,458 | 21,032 | 20,586 | 21,605 | 22,342 | 22,048 | 20,876 | 259,721 |
| 2005 | 12,812 | 11,826 | 13,236 | 13,018 | 13,581 | 12,890 | 12,285 | 12,813 | 11,979 | 12,113 | 12,654 | 13,420 | 152,627 |
| 2006 | 13,312 | 12,454 | 13,542 | 13,148 | 13,841 | 13,043 | 12,348 | 11,622 | 10,778 | 11,401 | 10,808 | 11,843 | 148,140 |
| 2007 | 12,193 | 11,348 | 12,342 | 11,723 | 12,204 | 11,349 | 11,753 | 12,175 | 12,208 | 13,039 | 13,357 | 13,550 | 147,241 |
| 2008 | 14,217 | 13,561 | 14,142 | 13,660 | 14,234 | 13,397 | 13,859 | 13,446 | 13,224 | 13,628 | 14,240 | 15,843 | 167,451 |
| 2009 | 15,758 | 14,607 | 17,119 | 18,965 | 18,803 | 19,123 | 18,414 | 17,844 | 18,675 | 20,246 | 19,361 | 20,998 | 219,913 |
| Cottage Cheese Curd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 906 | 992 | 1,100 | 1,129 | 1,154 | 1,137 | 1,305 | 1,506 | 1,318 | 1,291 | 1,362 | 1,214 | 14,414 |
| 2005 | 1,917 | 1,663 | 1,823 | 1,784 | 1,947 | 2,016 | 2,144 | 2,020 | 2,286 | 1,896 | 1,832 | 1,925 | 23,253 |
| 2006 | 2,122 | 1,961 | 2,413 | 2,069 | 2,363 | 2,375 | 2,185 | 2,576 | 2,248 | 2,252 | 2,264 | 1,968 | 26,796 |
| 2007 | 2,250 | 2,252 | 2,389 | 2,442 | 2,553 | 2,515 | 2,299 | 2,222 | 2,992 | 1,843 | 1,853 | 1,855 | 27,465 |
| 2008 | 1,992 | 1,882 | 2,336 | 2,080 | 2,125 | 1,358 | 1,174 | 1,076 | 1,335 | 1,166 | 1,023 | 1,080 | 18,627 |
| $2009{ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total American-Type Cheese |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 10,190 | 9,670 | 10,939 | 10,454 | 10,439 | 10,250 | 9,530 | 9,778 | 10,115 | 10,172 | 9,831 | 11,058 | 122,466 |
| $2005{ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2006{ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 9,708 | 8,992 | 9,689 | 9,041 | 9,755 | 9,186 | 10,049 | 10,240 | 9,929 | 10,665 | 10,799 | 11,139 | 119,192 |
| 2008 | 11,447 | 11,023 | 11,320 | 11,052 | 11,624 | 10,862 | 11,472 | 10,944 | 11,129 | 11,281 | 11,638 | 12,949 | 136,741 |
| 2009 | 12,926 | 11,655 | 13,339 | 14,359 | 14,461 | 15,011 | 14,713 | 13,814 | 14,357 | 16,449 | 15,348 | 16,306 | 172,738 |
| Creamed Cottage Cheese |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 822 | 934 | 1,013 | 1,050 | 1,059 | 1,080 | 1,268 | 1,369 | 1,264 | 1,229 | 1,260 | 1,106 | 13,424 |
| 2005 | 1,442 | 1,375 | 1,549 | 1,467 | 1,689 | 1,644 | 1,667 | 1,601 | 1,829 | 1,582 | 1,523 | 1,500 | 18,868 |
| 2006 | 1,636 | 1,505 | 1,909 | 1,583 | 1,918 | 1,849 | 1,658 | 1,963 | 1,708 | 1,674 | 1,754 | 1,523 | 20,680 |
| 2007 | 1,632 | 1,643 | 1,740 | 1,841 | 1,902 | 1,852 | 1,815 | 1,206 | 1,571 | 823 | 852 | 957 | 17,834 |
| $2008{ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2009{ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
## May Econ Corner

## Shane Ellis, ISU Extension Livestock Economist \& Chad Hart, ISU Extension Grain Marketing Specialist

In April, fed cattle prices passed the $\$ 100 /$ cwt for the first time since July 2008. Since that time prices have remained in the upper $\$ 90$ 's/cwt. Stronger beef demand and tighter cattle supplies have given cattle feeders their first significant profits in nearly five years. Based on the ISU Estimated Returns March was the first month cattle were sold for a profit (\$77/hd) since July of 2009. April profits are estimated to be $\$ 159 /$ hd, the first triple digit profits since mid-2004. Profitability continues to look good for May and June. Although fed cattle prices are expected to remain in the mid to upper $\$ 90 /$ cwt for the duration of the year, profitability in the feeding sector will be diminished somewhat as the price of feeder cattle has increased along with fed cattle prices. There are fewer feeder animals available and with a return to profitability, competition to acquire those cattle has driven prices higher. The spread between recent fed and feeder cattle prices has remained very consistent with the spread of the last year, but tighter than the five year average.

Iowa hog prices have been on a steady increase for the past month reaching a peak of $\$ 88 / \mathrm{cwt}$ average weight hog price in the last week of April. If the seasonal trend holds true, lean hog prices will remain near or above $\$ 80 /$ cwt for most of the summer. The ISU Estimated Returns suggest hogs marketed in April netted \$29 profit, the most profitable month since September 2006. Based on current profit projection, hog producer will continue to enjoy profitability for the rest of the year. If current futures prices for corn, SBM, and hogs are correct the projected profits for 2010 could offset 80 percent of the losses sustained in 2009. The drawback of such a rapid return to profitability is the temptation to ramp up production. Again, the excellent prices we are now seeing is a result of tight supplies, steady domestic demand and robust exports. The time to utilize vacant production capacity will come, but hopefully the industry can continue to withhold.

Mother Nature has provided quite a reversal in fortunes. A couple of months ago there were serious concerns about soggy conditions limiting planting opportunities. Now we're staring at record progress in corn planting. Nationally, half of the corn crop is planted, which is 30 percent ahead of last year at this time and 28 percent ahead of the 5year average. Iowa is at 68 percent, 27 percentage points ahead of last year and 45 percentage points ahead of the 5 -year average. Illinois is at 73 percent, Indiana is at 56 , and Minnesota is at 63 percent. Soybean planting is also getting a jump start. While USDA hasn't released any national numbers, several states have started reporting on soybeans. As with corn, most states are proceeding with planting as a pace faster than the 5 -year average. Iowa has 4 percent of its soybeans planted. Illinois is at 5 percent. Indiana is already at 12 percent. North Dakota is reporting that 2 percent of its soybean area is planted as well. Only Louisiana is behind the 5 -year average. The rapid planting progress, in combination with the projected increases in corn and soybean acres, has been weighing down on the markets over the past month as traders expect larger supplies come this fall.

With the current outlook of another large set of corn and soybean crops, focus is shifting back to the demand side of the equation. Corn demand through ethanol continues to grow, but the pace is expected to slow. Ethanol production surged over the winter and ethanol stocks have built up. These stocks have pressured ethanol prices lower, even as gasoline prices have increased over the last couple of months. Estimates as of mid-April had corn feed demand running 200 million bushels above last year, at 5.45 billion bushels. This slippage in corn feed demand over the last couple of years, is due to a combination of lower livestock numbers and higher usage of distillers grains in feed rations. As distillers grains have grown in importance as both a feed source for livestock and a revenue stream for ethanol plants, interest has grown in risk management tools for distillers grains such as the new CME Group distillers grains futures contracts.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data not published to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

