



# ERS Information

News on agriculture, food, the environment, and rural America

U.S. Department of Agriculture

March/April 2002

Economic Research Service

## How Will the Phaseout of Federal Estate Taxes Affect Farmers?

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aib751/aib751-02/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aib751/aib751-02/)

Ron L. Durst; (202) 694-5347; rdurst@ers.usda.gov

Concern among policymakers that the Federal estate tax might force the liquidation of some family farms has resulted in the enactment of a variety of special provisions over the years.

Providing relief to farmers and other small business owners was the primary impetus for the 1997 changes to Federal estate and gift tax policies and a major objective of the 2001 law that will phase out and eventually repeal the Federal estate tax. While only about 4 percent of all farm estates owe Federal estate taxes, a much larger percentage of farm estates must file an estate tax return, make use of special farm provisions, alter their business practices, or engage in costly estate planning in order to reduce the impact of the estate tax on their farm business. Thus, the phaseout and repeal of the Federal estate tax will affect a much broader group of farmers than just those who owe tax.

### Inside

<b>Agricultural Outlook</b> looks at	
• USDA's 10-year baseline projections	
• American consumption of imported foods	
• Exchange rates' impact on a country's economy	3
<b>Characteristics and Production Costs of U.S. Soybean Farms</b> explores how soybean production costs vary among different segments of the farm population.	4
<b>China's Food and Agriculture: Issues for the 21st Century</b> assesses the issues that will affect China's future trends in consumption, production, import, and export of food and agricultural commodities.	4
<b>Changes in Agricultural Markets in Transition Economies</b> examines economic reform in the transition economies of Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States of the former USSR.	5
<b>Reimbursement Tiering in the CACFP: Summary Report to Congress on the Family Child Care Homes Legislative Changes Study</b> summarizes the effects the tiered reimbursement rates in the Child and Adult Care Food Program on program participation and on meals offered to children.	5
<b>Livestock Sectors in the Economies of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Transition from Plan to Market and the Road Ahead</b> examines the barriers that prevent the full restructuring of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union's livestock sector.	6
<b>Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators, 2000</b> provides detailed data and analysis on biological resources, livestock and manure management, farm business management, agricultural productivity, sustainable resources use, and global climate change.	6
<b>Also Off Press</b> highlights 13 new reports.	7
<b>ERSnippets</b>	7

## Household Food Security in the United States, 2000

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr21/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr21/)

Mark Nord; (202) 694-5433; marknord@ers.usda.gov

Food security—access by all people at all times to enough food for an active healthy life—improved significantly in the United States from 1998 to 2000. The prevalence of food insecurity fell by 11.3 percent and the prevalence of hunger fell by 15.6 percent, adjusted for population growth during the period. The improvement in food security was general and widespread in all regions of the country and for all household types.

Food security is one of several necessary conditions for a population to be healthy and well nourished. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) monitors food security in the Nation's households through an annual survey of some 40,000 households conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The most recent food security survey reveals that in 2000, 89.5 percent of U.S. households were food secure throughout the year. "Food secure" means they had access, at all times, to enough food for an active, healthy life for all household members. The remaining 10.5 percent of U.S. households (11 million) were food insecure.

At some time during the previous year, these households were uncertain of having, or unable to acquire, enough food to meet basic needs of all their members because they had insufficient money or other resources. About one-third of food-insecure households (3.3 million, or 3.1 percent of all U.S. households) were food insecure to the extent that one or more household members were hungry, at least some time during the year, because they could not afford enough food. The other two-thirds of food-insecure households obtained enough food to avoid hunger, using a variety of coping strategies such as eating less varied diets, participating in Federal food assistance programs, or

*continued on page 2*

# Food Security

*continued from page 1*

getting emergency food from community food pantries.

The amount households spend for food is an indicator of how adequately they are meeting their food needs. In 2000, the typical (median) U.S. household spent \$37.50 per person for food each week. Weekly food spending by the typical household was about 36 percent higher than the cost of USDA's Thrifty Food Plan—a low-cost food "market basket" that meets dietary standards—taking into account household size and the age and gender of household members. The typical food-secure household spent 41 percent more than the cost of

the Thrifty Food Plan. In contrast, the typical food-insecure household spent 4 percent more than the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan, and the typical household classified as food insecure with hunger spent 2 percent less.

Some households participate in Federal food assistance programs or turn to community resources such as food pantries and emergency kitchens for help when they lack money to buy food. Among all food-insecure households:

- 50.4 percent had help from at least one of the three largest Federal food assistance programs—food stamps, free or reduced-price school lunches, or the Special

Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children—in the month before the survey;

- 16.7 percent obtained emergency food from a food pantry, church, or food bank during the 12 months before the survey; and

- 2.5 percent had members who ate at an emergency kitchen sometime during the 12 months before the survey.

Some 2.5 million households, 2.4 percent of all U.S. households, reported getting emergency food from food pantries, churches, or food banks at least once during the year.

## The ERS Mission

The mission of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (ERS) is to provide public and private decisionmakers with economic and related social science information and analysis that helps them achieve five key goals:

- a globally competitive agricultural production system
- a safe and secure food production system
- a healthy and well-nourished public
- harmony between agriculture and the environment
- enhanced economic opportunity and quality of life for rural Americans

The ultimate beneficiaries of ERS programs are the American people, whose well-being is improved by informed public and private decisionmaking.

**The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).**

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

## How to Obtain a Report

### WWW

ERS reports and periodicals can be found at our Website—[www.ers.usda.gov](http://www.ers.usda.gov)—by typing the publication url we've provided into your browser's address line or by typing the first four or five words of the report title into Search on our front page.

### Phone/E-mail

The ERS Media Team responds to requests for information and media questions. To reach a Media Team member, call (202) 694-5139 or e-mail [ERSINFO@ers.usda.gov](mailto:ERSINFO@ers.usda.gov).

### Fax/Mail

Write the titles below and either fax to the Media Team at (202) 694-5638 or attach your mailing label, and mail to: Media Services, ERS, Room S-2015, 1800 M Street NW, Washington, DC 20036-5831.

Report Titles:

---

---

---

---

Attach mailing label here

---

# Agricultural Outlook *April 2002*

AO emphasizes the short-term outlook for all major areas of the agricultural economy. It also presents long-term analyses of such issues as U.S. agricultural policy, trade forecasts and export-market development, food safety, the environment, and farm financial institutions.

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/AgOutlook/April2002/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/AgOutlook/April2002/)

## **USDA Longrun Projections to 2011: Global Developments Play Key Role**

In USDA's new longrun, 10-year baseline projections, recovery in global economic growth leads to stronger U.S. exports, gains in agricultural commodity prices, and rising farm incomes over the next decade. Slow U.S. and global economic growth in 2001-02 and a strong U.S. dollar provide a weak setting in the near term for the agricultural sector. But in the longer run, projected improvement in world economic growth provides a foundation for gains in U.S. agricultural exports. *Paul Westcott; (202) 694-5335; westcott@ers.usda.gov*

## **Imports Increase as Share of U.S. Food Consumption**

In the second half of the 1990s, Americans increased the proportion of imported foods they consumed. The rise is due partly to greater demand for high-value agricultural products that other countries offer, and partly to the higher exchange rate of the U.S. dollar, which increases its purchasing power. Increasing ethnic diversity of the U.S. population, rising consumer incomes, and more open trade agreements induce lower cost foreign producers to supply the large U.S. market. *Alberto Jerardo; (202) 694-5266; ajerardo@ers.usda.gov*

## **U.S. Cotton & the Appreciation of the Dollar**

The dollar's strength has exacerbated the difficulties facing the U.S. textile industry during the recent slowdown in U.S. and world economic growth. It has also been a factor in lowering cotton prices. Unlike textiles, cotton production in the U.S. accounts for about the same proportion of world production as in 1995, and its share

of world trade has surged. However, the dollar-denominated world price of cotton fell by an inflation-adjusted 56 percent between marketing year 1990 and February 2002. *Stephen MacDonald; (202) 694-5305; stephenm@ers.usda.gov*

## **Imports & Lackluster Demand Pressure Catfish Prices**

In the last 2 years, catfish imports have increased dramatically, in contrast to the 1990s when U.S. catfish production was a domestically focused industry. This rise in imports, combined with relatively flat per capita seafood consumption and increased inventories of catfish products, has put downward pressure on domestic catfish prices. Nevertheless, producers whose feeds are primarily grain-based should be able to take advantage of expected relatively low grain prices. *David Harvey; (202) 694-5177; djharvey@ers.usda.gov*

## **Calculating Damages in WTO Trade Disputes**

Since its inception in 1995, the World Trade Organization dispute settlement system has received over 200 notifications of trade disputes. While most have been settled, in only three cases has the Dispute Settlement Board had to approve damage awards. The system is designed to encourage the parties to settle disputes bilaterally. These three cases suggest the Dispute Settlement Board measures damages simply and transparently and in a way that minimizes incentives for member countries to violate agreements. *Jason Bernstein; (202) 694-5165; jasonb@ers.usda.gov*

## **WTO Accession Will Increase China's Agricultural Imports**

China's accession to the WTO is expected to lead to a wealthier and more stable international food system. Under terms of accession, China's agricultural trade regime will be more open and responsive

to international markets. WTO accession is part of a process of liberalization of China's economy that will also benefit U.S. agricultural exports. A modest increase in China's imports of key bulk commodities in the next few years should result from accession, but most benefits to U.S. farmers will occur several years down the road. *Bryan Lohmar; (202) 694-5226; blohmar@ers.usda.gov*

## **Proposed Requirements for Manure Nutrient Management: Potential Sector Impacts**

When manure from animal feeding operations (AFOs) exceeds land application needs for crop production, the runoff can enter waterways and impair water quality. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has proposed bringing additional AFOs under regulation and requiring implementation of nutrient management plans by all regulated AFOs, with a decision expected by December 2002. USDA's Economic Research Service estimated the potential national/regional impacts of the proposed nutrient management plans on all regulated AFOs. *Jonathan Kaplan; (202) 694-5494; jkaplan@ers.usda.gov*

## **Farm Families' Savings: Findings from the ARMS Survey**

Savings play a role in helping to maintain farm households' standard of living as well as complementing other risk management strategies. If farmers save during "good times," there might be less perceived need for large government outlays for disaster assistance and other unearned compensation to decrease income variability. Using data from the Agricultural Resources Management Study survey, USDA's Economic Research Service examined the influence of a range of factors on the types and level of farm household savings. *Ashok Mishra; (202) 694-5580; amishra@ers.usda.gov*

---

# Characteristics and Production Costs of U.S. Soybean Farms

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/sb974/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/sb974/)

Linda Foreman; (202) 694-5566;  
lfarmer@ers.usda.gov

Soybeans were the second leading U.S. crop in terms of harvested acreage (69 million acres) and production value (\$17.4 billion) in 1997. U.S. farmers planted 70 million acres of soybeans that year, about 6 million more acres than in 1996.

Several factors led to this surge in soybean acreage, including strong soybean prices, the absence of acreage set-aside programs, increased crop rotations with soybeans, and optimum soybean planting conditions. In addition, nearly all supply controls on U.S. field crop production (which were tied to deficiency payments) were eliminated by the 1996 Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act (FAIR). As a result, farmers could increase soybean plantings when market conditions were favorable, since they no longer risked losing future government payments on program crops (such as corn and wheat).

Soybean acreage also increased sharply between 1996 and 2001 due partly to low production costs per bushel. Widespread adoption of herbicide-tolerant varieties and low-till production practices helped keep soybean production costs low. Even falling market prices did not halt the rise in soybean acreage, since farmers were insulated from declining market prices by loan deficiency payments.

In 1997, the production costs for soybeans ranged from an average of \$2.13 per planted bushel for the 25 percent of the growers with the lowest costs to an average of \$6.00 per planted bushel for the 25 percent of the growers with the highest costs. Favorable weather conditions resulted in a near-record average yield of 39 bushels per acre, reducing the production costs per bushel. U.S. soybean farmers produced 97 percent of the Nation's soybeans for less than the 1997 season-average price of \$6.47 per bushel. Soybean production costs per acre totaled \$137.77 in 1997. The gross production value of soybeans was \$278.77 per acre.

This report presents the costs of producing U.S. soybeans and examines how these costs vary among different segments of the farm population. Soybean producers, agricultural producers with at least one acre of planted soybeans, are ranked by their production costs per bushel to analyze factors associated with low and high production costs. In addition, producers in different regions are compared to gain insights into regional variations in production costs. Farm typology is used to examine the relationship between farm sizes and soybean production costs. Characteristics and soybean production costs are compared among farms with varying amounts of soybean acreage.

Data in this report are derived from a special soybean cost-of-production survey undertaken as part of the 1997 Agricultural Resource Management Survey. This was the latest survey to collect data on farmers' costs for soybean production.

---

## China's Food and Agriculture: Issues for the 21st Century

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aib775/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aib775/)

Fred Gale; (202) 694 5215; fgale@ers.usda.gov

As the 21st century opens, China stands ready to assert itself as a major player in global markets. Its accession to the World Trade Organization is the latest step in China's incremental journey from an economy characterized by planning and self-sufficiency to one that is market driven and globally integrated. How will China's role in world agricultural trade evolve in coming years? Will it continue to integrate its economy with world markets? Will it import products that can be grown more efficiently in countries with more abundant land and water resources? Or will China maintain its past commitments to self-sufficiency in grains? Will the government allow markets to play a

greater role in agriculture or will central planning and government-supported monopolies continue to play dominant roles?

China is one of the world's largest and most volatile customers for agricultural products. Yet, for a country of its size and limited resource endowment, its level of agricultural imports is modest. China tends to import bulk commodities and items used as intermediate inputs in labor-intensive manufacturing. China is a major exporter of high-value, labor-intensive food products, such as manufactured foods, animal products, fish, vegetables, and fruits. China's agricultural exports go largely to other Asian markets. Although per capita incomes and food expenditures in China are still low, food security is not a problem for most of the country's population. Food-consumption levels have

grown and will continue to grow as the country grows richer, but this effect will further strain China's limited land and water resources.

Reliable statistical information is needed to accurately assess China's development and for markets to work efficiently. Many market analysts distrust China's official statistics, many of which rely on a bureaucratic bottom-up reporting system set up for a centrally planned economy. Improvements in China's statistical system, including implementation of modern survey methods and reconciliation of duplicative statistics produced by multiple agencies, will improve the functioning of markets. It will be equally important for China to increase transparency by publishing important numbers, such as grain and cotton stocks, which are now considered state secrets.

---

# Changes in Agricultural Markets in Transition Economies

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aer806/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aer806/)

William Liefert; (202) 694-5156;  
wliefert@ers.usda.gov

Economic reform in the transition economies of Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former USSR has transformed the volume and mix of these countries' agricultural production, consumption, and trade. The main development has been the drop in output, ranging in most countries from 25 to 50 percent, the livestock sector being hit particularly hard.

The fall in agricultural production, along with the accompanying decline in food consumption, affects U.S. agricultural and policy interests vis-à-vis the transition economies in three areas: policy-advising/technical assistance, food security and aid, and agricultural trade. A conceptual framework based on supply and demand analysis is used to examine how reform has changed agricultural production, consumption, and trade in the transition economies, with an emphasis on explaining the decline in output. Conclusions are then drawn concerning the above areas of U.S. policy interest. Key findings include:

*The drop in agricultural production has been an inevitable part of market reform.* Most government officials and agricultural interests in the transition region argue that the downsizing of agriculture during reform has had a devastating effect on the region.

They contend that the main goal of government policy and Western technical assistance in agriculture should be to revive production. Western press accounts also tend to assess the reform-driven drop in output in negative terms. This report shows that large direct and indirect subsidies in the pre-reform period helped to maintain artificially high levels of production and consumption. Reduction of the subsidies inevitably reduced these bloated volumes.

*The absence of a decline in output in a country more likely reflects failure to reform, rather than reform success.* The countries that have experienced the lowest declines in agricultural output, such as Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, have also been the least reformist.

*The food security problem in transition economies is not inadequate availability of food supplies, but insufficient access to food by segments of the population and regions within countries.* Before reform, the transition economies had high per capita levels of consumption of most foodstuffs, compared even with wealthy Western countries. Although consumption of high-value livestock products has fallen during reform, consumption of staple foods, such as bread and potatoes, has remained steady or even increased. This shows that overall food supplies have been adequate. Food insecurity has increased because the growth in poverty during transition has expanded the size of the population that cannot afford a healthy diet, and because impediments to the

internal flow of foodstuffs within certain countries have prevented deficit-producing regions from obtaining food supplies.

*The main goal of agricultural reform should not be to increase output but rather to raise productivity and reduce production costs.* By lowering production costs, productivity growth will make domestic output more price competitive on the world market. Productivity growth not only raises a country's productive capacity, but also provides flexibility as to how the country uses the increased capacity. In many transition economies, productivity growth in agriculture will benefit the economy most not by expanding the output of agricultural goods, but rather by allowing resources to be shifted to producing other goods that either are more desired by consumers or are more competitive on the world market.

*The loss of the former USSR as a large market for U.S. animal feed is a permanent consequence of reform.* The contraction of the region's livestock sector has eliminated the need for large imports of feed grain, soybeans, and soybean meal from the United States and other Western countries. On the other hand, the NIS region has become a big importer of meat, particularly poultry from the United States. The shift from importing animal feed to maintain a large livestock sector to importing meat and other livestock products is consistent with the region's comparative advantage in agricultural goods—that is, the region produces livestock goods at a relatively higher cost than it produces animal feed.

---

## Reimbursement Tiering in the CACFP: Summary Report to Congress on the Family Child Care Homes Legislative Changes Study

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr22/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr22/)

Linda Ghelfi; (202) 694-5437; lghelfi@ers.usda.gov

The introduction of tiered reimbursement rates in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) concentrated program benefits more intensely on low-income

children, as intended. Tiering reduced the number of family child care homes participating in the program, but did not alter the number or nutritional quality of meals offered by participating providers. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 mandated the tiered reimbursement structure and called for a study of its effects on

program participation and on meals offered to children. Data were collected during the spring and summer of 1999 from nationally representative samples of participating family child care homes, their sponsors, and the parents of the children they served. This report summarizes the results of the study.

---

# Livestock Sectors in the Economies of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union: Transition from Plan to Market and the Road Ahead

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aer798/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aer798/)

Nancy Cochrane; (202) 694-5143;  
Cochrane@ers.usda.gov

Ten years after the end of Communism, Poland and Hungary had emerged as the most successful reformers of the five transition economies of Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union—Russia, Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, and Romania. But even in these countries, barriers remain that prevent the full restructuring of their livestock sectors. These barriers are much more serious in Russia, Ukraine, and Romania. Using general equilibrium models, we examine the potential effect of removing these barriers.

This study is a comparative analysis of the restructuring of the livestock sectors in the five transition economies of Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union.

All five countries experienced a sharp decline in both animal inventories and meat output during the early years of the transition. These declines were in response to multiple economic shocks in both demand and supply. Producers were hit simultaneously by the reduction or elimination of government subsidies and sharp rises in feed prices. At the same time, demand for livestock products fell as real income declined.

There has been considerable divergence in the experience of these five

countries since the early years of the transition. Animal numbers and meat output began to flatten out in Russia in 2000, but are still declining in Ukraine. In Poland and Hungary, the downward trend in cattle numbers has flattened out, and hog and poultry sectors are beginning to grow. Poultry output in Poland has rebounded significantly. The Romanian livestock sector saw a brief period of stability in the mid-1990s, but this was the result of heavy government support for the sector, and inventories and production resumed their downward trend after subsidies were withdrawn in 1997.

---

## Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators, 2000

---

[www.ers.usda.gov/Emphases/Harmony/issues/arei2000/](http://www.ers.usda.gov/Emphases/Harmony/issues/arei2000/)

The Agricultural Resources and Environmental Indicators (AREI) take stock of how natural resources (land and water) and commercial inputs (energy, nutrients, pesticides, and machinery) are used in the agricultural sector; shows how they contribute to environmental quality; and links use and quality to technological change, production management practices, and farm programs.

This 2000 electronic edition of AREI updates information provided in the first two hard-copy editions published in July 1997 and December 1994, includes more detailed data and analysis on biological resources, livestock and manure management, farm business management, agricultural productivity, sustainable resources use, and global climate change.

The following chapters have been recently updated:

### **Water Use and Pricing in Agriculture, AREI Chapter 2.1**

Irrigated agriculture remains the dominant use of freshwater in the United States, although irrigation's share of total consumptive use is declining. National irrigated cropland area has expanded over 40 percent since 1969, while field water application rates have declined about 20 percent. The total quantity of irrigation water applied increased about 15 percent since 1969. Nationally, variable irrigation water costs for ground water averaged \$32 per acre and off-farm surface water about \$41 per acre. Neither reflects the full costs of water; onfarm well and equipment costs can be substantial for groundwater access, while infrastructure costs are often subsidized for publicly developed, off-farm surface water.

### **Soil Management and Conservation, AREI Chapter 4.2**

Crop production depends largely on soil and is affected greatly by the quality of that soil. Soil quality also plays a role in the environmental effects of crop produc-

tion. Traditional measures of soil quality include land capability and suitability, prime land, productivity, erodibility, and vulnerability to leach pesticides and nitrates. More comprehensive measures are needed that consider physical, chemical, and biological properties, and also economic factors. Soil management involves actions by land managers that affect soil quality and productivity and alter soil's effects on environmental quality.

### **Agricultural Research and Development, AREI Chapter 5.2**

Public and private efforts in research and technology development have been the foundation of impressive productivity gains in the agricultural sector. Over the past few decades, there have been many changes affecting the research system. Advances in the biological sciences, such as recombinant DNA technology, have expanded the opportunities to develop new technology for both the public and private sectors.

## Also Off Press

Find the latest ERS outlook reports on the web at:  
[www.ers.usda.gov/publications/outlookreports.htm](http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/outlookreports.htm)

In addition to the reports fully summarized in this issue of *ERS Information*, the following reports were recently released.

### **Wheat Yearbook\*** (3/26)

The Wheat Yearbook presents preliminary projections for 2002/03 that were released at the 2002 Agricultural Outlook Forum on Feb. 22, 2002. U.S. wheat supplies for 2001/02 are expected to drop 343 million bushels from a year ago to 2,929 million bushels.

### **Fruit and Tree Nuts Outlook** (3/21)

Prices received by fruit growers have averaged higher during the first 2 months of 2001 over 2000. Consumer expenses for fresh fruit increased 6 percent this January over a year ago. Retail prices were higher for all major fruit and fruit products.

### **U.S. Agricultural Trade Update** (3/20)

In the first 4 months of fiscal 2002, U.S. agricultural exports equal \$19.9 billion, exceeding 2001 by \$1.3 billion, a 7-percent gain. Cumulative U.S. agricultural imports of \$13.4 billion are 2.5 percent above 2001. The export surplus is boosted to \$6.5 billion, compared with \$5.5 billion in the same period last season.

### **Macroeconomic Factors Behind the Fall in Farm Interest Rates (Agricultural Income and Finance Situation and Outlook)** (3/15)

Farm interest rates are likely to move downward in the first half of 2002. In addition, farm interest rates will be under downward pressure from the large fall in bank fund costs in 2001. Farm interest rates are expected to rise slightly in the second half of 2002.

### **Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Situation and Outlook** (3/13)

Red meat and poultry exports are expected to total about 10.7 billion pounds this year, unchanged from 2001. The increase in poultry exports will offset the decline in red meats.

### **Feed Outlook** (3/12)

The only change made to the feed grains balance sheet was a 1.3-million-ton reduction in exports, caused entirely by corn.

The drop in exports lowered total use fractionally to 272.3 million tons.

Changes in this month's U.S. coarse grain forecasts caused a 10-cent-per-bushel drop in the high end of projected 2001/02 corn and sorghum average farm prices.

### **Cotton and Wool Outlook** (3/1)

The latest USDA cotton forecast for 2001/02 indicates a decline in U.S. stocks from last month as a result of increased export expectations. U.S. cotton exports are projected at 10.3 million bales, the highest since 1926/27. Over the last several seasons as U.S. mill consumption has declined, exports have accounted for a larger share of U.S. cotton demand.

### **Rice Outlook** (3/11)

The 2001/02 U.S. import forecast was raised 1 million hundredweight (cwt) to a record 13.5 million (rough basis). All of the increase was for combined medium/short grain rice. The higher import forecast boosted total supplies to a record 255 million cwt. On the use side, a million-cwt increase in rough rice exports to a near-record 26 million cwt was offset by a cut in milled rice exports to 62 million.

### **Oil Crops Outlook** (3/11)

USDA estimated 2001/02 U.S. soybean exports at 1,020 million bushels, unchanged from last month's forecast. The seasonal decline in U.S. exports has started and should be steeper compared with recent years because of foreign producers' larger crops and an improving efficiency of transportation.

### **Aquaculture Outlook** (3/6)

Per capita seafood consumption in the U.S. varied within a 1-pound range, from 14.6 pounds to 15.6 pounds between 1990 and 2000, (2000 is the last year data are available for per capita consumption). So while seafood supplies were able to keep pace with population growth, there was basically no growth in seafood consumption over this time period.

### **Outlook for U.S. Agricultural Trade** (3/21)

Fiscal 2002 U.S. agricultural exports are

forecast at \$54.5 billion, unchanged from November projections, but \$1.7 billion over fiscal 2001 reflecting year-to-year volume increases for many commodities. Since the November estimate, prospective U.S. soybean exports have risen, but those increases are offset by reductions in exports of wheat and corn.

### **Vegetables and Melons Outlook** (3/20)

Although cool temperatures in California, Arizona, Mexico, and Florida have done little damage to vegetables this winter, the resulting erratic plant growth rates have caused havoc with vegetable harvest and shipping schedules. Crop growth was sluggish for several weeks in January and February with market volume reduced.

### **Wheat Outlook** (2/12)

U.S. 2001/02 supply, use, and stocks projections are unchanged from last month. Also, the projected price range is unchanged at \$2.75 to \$2.85 per bushel. World wheat supply and demand forecasts for 2001/02 highlight a small reduction in production, a slight increase in global consumption and trade, and a modest drop in projected ending stocks.

\* Available in both electronic and paper copies. All others available electronically only.

## ERSnippets

The 2002 "Food Assistance Research Conference: Recent Findings and Emerging Issues" will take place May 16-17 at the Economic Research Service in Washington, DC. The first day of the conference will be devoted to issues related to the Food Stamp Program, while the second day will cover issues related to WIC and Child Nutrition Programs. An agenda is available. Attendance is free but registration is required due to space considerations.

To register, please contact Tina Terry-Eley by e-mail at [fanrp@ers.usda.gov](mailto:fanrp@ers.usda.gov), or by phone to (202) 694-5270.

**U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Economic Research Service**  
1800 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5831

FIRST CLASS  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
USDA  
PERMIT NO. G-145

**Moving?** To change your address, send this sheet with label intact, showing new address to USDA/ERS, Room S-2015, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036-5831.

### How can we make *ERS Information* more useful to you?

Please respond to the following questions to help us improve the content and delivery of *ERS Information*.

Do you want to keep receiving a **PRINTED** copy of *ERS Information*? \_\_\_\_\_

*ERS Information* is posted on the web each month. Do you want to receive e-mail notices announcing the web publication of *ERS Information*? \_\_\_\_\_

My e-mail address is \_\_\_\_\_

I am particularly interested in news about:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Crops                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Farm policy               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food assistance and nutrition | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental issues      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Livestock/dairy/poultry       | <input type="checkbox"/> Farm structure/income     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food safety                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rural development         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food prices and markets       | <input type="checkbox"/> Trade                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biotechnology                 | <input type="checkbox"/> International agriculture |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural chemicals        |  |

*ERS Information* would be more useful to me if it \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please **FAX** your responses to (202) 694-5638, **E-MAIL** them to [ERSINFO@ers.usda.gov](mailto:ERSINFO@ers.usda.gov), or **MAIL** to:  
Economic Research Service  
1800 M St., NW, Rm. S2015  
Washington, DC 20036