United States Department of Agriculture

Economic Research Service

Commodity Economics Division

# The U.S. Sheep Industry

Richard Stillman Terry Crawford Lorna Aldrich

## It's Easy To Order Another Copy!

Just dial 1-800-999-6779. Toll free (in the United States and Canada). All other areas please dial 301-725-7937.

Ask for The U.S. Sheep Industry (AGES 9048).

The cost is \$8.00 per copy. For non-U.S. addresses (including Canada), add 25 percent. Charge your purchase to your VISA or MasterCard, or we can bill you. Or send a check or purchase order (made payable to ERS-NASS) to:

ERS-NASS P.O. Box 1608 Rockville, MD 20849-1608.

We'll fill your order by first-class mail.

The U.S. Sheep Industry, by Richard Stillman, Terry Crawford, and Lorna Aldrich. Commodity Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Staff Report No. AGES 9048.

#### Abstract

The U.S. sheep inventory declined from 49 million head in 1942 to 9 million in 1989. Lamb imports have also declined and, in relation to U.S. production, are not seen as a major cause of the sheep industry's problems. Production has declined despite positive returns to producers. Government payments under the wool program provide an important source of income for the sheep industry. In recent years, the industry, including the marketing sector, has stabilized. Imports have followed the downward trend in domestic production and respond counter-cyclically to domestic price fluctuations. A major challenge to the industry is to expand consumption of lamb, a relatively expensive red meat. This study, prepared in accordance with section 4508 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, focuses on production of lamb and lamb products, returns in the sheep industry, demand and marketing trends for lamb, and lamb imports, both live and product.

**Keywords:** Sheep, lamb, mutton, imports, consumption, wool, sheep, cost of production.

#### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the individuals and organizations that provided data and information for this study, especially Richard Wertheimer and the American Sheep Industry Association, Edward Martin, Edward Farrell, and the New Zealand Meat and Wool Board, Bryan Yolles, Alexander Papachristou, J.B. Penn, and the Australian Meat and Live-Stock Corporation. Without the cooperation of these individuals and their organizations much of this study would not have been possible.

Technical questions about this study should be addressed to Richard Stillman, Terry Crawford, or Lorna Aldrich. Room 808, 1301 New York Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20005-4788, or call (202) 786-1285.

1301 New York Avenue, NW. Washington, DC 20005-4788

July 1990

## Contents

,

Summary	•	•	•	•	v
Introduction	•	•	•	•	1
Sheep Production Practices	•	•	•	•	1
Stock Sheep	•	•	•	•	2 2
Regional Location	•	•	•	•	2 4
Lambs on Feed	•	•	•	•	4
Costs and Returns in Sheep Production	•	•	•	•	5
Trends in Cost of Production	•	•	•	•	5 13
	-	•	•	·	10
Lamb and Mutton Production	•	•	•	•	13
Seasonality of Lamb Production	•	•	•	•	15
Sheen and Lamb Marketing and Slaughter					ាត
Sheep and ham harkeeing and Staughter	•	•	•	•	10
Lamb Prices	•	•	•	•	20
Wholesale Prices	•	•	•	•	20
Seasonality in Prices	•	•	•	•	20
Live Lamb Prices	•	•	٠	•	20
Recent Fluctuation in Lamb Prices	•	•	•	•	23
Lamb and Mutton Consumption	•	•	•	•	23
Lamb Imports	•	•	•	•	30
Trends in Imports	•	•	•	•	30
Fresh Lamb Imports	•	•	•	•	30
Live Lamb Trade	•	•	•	•	33
Seasonality of Imports	•	•	•	•	33
Conclusions	•	•	•	•	33
References	•	•	•	•	40
Appendix AWool	•	•	•	•	44
Appendix BWorld Sheep Production	•	•	•	•	45
Appendix CAustralian and New Zealand Sheep Production	n	•	•	•	49

Summary

This report assesses the state of the U.S. sheep industry. It responds to section 4508 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress a report on the market for lamb meat products. As required by the act, this report discusses the condition of:

- o Production of lamb and lamb products.
- o Costs and returns in the sheep industry.
- o Demand and marketing trends for lamb.
- o Imports of both live lambs and lamb meat products.

Lamb prices dropped in April 1988 from the March highs, which was counter to normal seasonal patterns. The major cause of the decline in the slaughter lamb prices was an increase in domestic production in March due to increased slaughter and record heavy slaughter weights. Production in March 1988 was 34 million pounds, compared with slightly under 28 million pounds in April 1987, the comparable Easter/Passover period.

The sheep industry has developed two distinctive enterprises: stock sheep production and lamb feeding. Stock sheep producers manage grazing flocks on pasture and range forage; frequently these producers use arid land with few alternative uses. Lambs are fed grain to finish them for slaughter. Approximately 65 percent of the lambs slaughtered go through feedlots ( $\underline{2}$ ).  $\underline{1}/$ 

Inventory data on stock sheep began in 1867 when there were approximately 45 million head of sheep. The inventory peaked in 1942 at 49 million head and declined until 1979. The inventory appears to be stabilizing and re-entering a typical livestock cycle, which previously was masked by the longer term downward trend in the sheep industry. Since 1986, inventories appear to be expanding in response to increased returns. The stock sheep inventory is expected to cycle in the 8- to 10-million-head range over the next few years.

Returns to the U.S. sheep industry have consistently been better than those to the cattle industry. Part of the reason for these relatively higher returns has been a government program supporting the prices received for domestic wool production. In 1987, 17 percent of stock sheep receipts came from government payments.

Because of their high susceptibility to disease and predators, sheep require well-developed management skills. Sheep and lamb death losses are much higher than those for other livestock. Death losses of sheep and lambs in 1987 were 12 percent of beginning inventory. As a result, sheep production requires more labor per animal unit than cattle enterprises.

<sup>1/</sup> Underscored numbers in parentheses are listed in the References.

Sheep producers have historically competed with beef cattle producers for many of the same resources to operate their enterprises: grazing land, labor, water, and marketing and transportation facilities. The higher returns to sheep than cattle, while sheep numbers have declined, indicate that higher returns to management are required to retain resources in sheep production.

Lamb and mutton production has declined since 1945, following the decline in sheep numbers. Lamb production has fallen less than inventories because of a trend toward heavier slaughter weights, reflecting genetic improvements and a larger proportion marketed as fed lambs.

As the number of sheep and lambs slaughtered has declined, the infrastructure of the sheep industry has consolidated. Higher costs result if marketing activities are handled by low-volume, less cost-efficient units, or if the area of procurement and distribution covered by these units increases. Higher procurement and transportation costs are generally borne by producers as the distance between sheep-raising areas and slaughter plants increases.

Like beef and pork consumption, lamb and mutton consumption as a percentage of total meat and poultry consumption has been declining because increases in meat and poultry consumption have come from poultry. Lamb consumption has declined to less than 1 percent of red meat consumption and only 0.6 percent of total meat and poultry consumption.

The industry's challenge is to attract new consumers of a relatively expensive red meat when red meats are losing their market share to poultry due to lower relative prices. Gains for the lamb industry depend on increasing the consumer base. Even though lamb has been sold in the United States for many years, it is unfamiliar to many consumers. In a marketing context, lamb should be approached as a new or specialty product.

The United States imports both sheep meat and live animals. Live animal imports have never been large, and the United States has been a net exporter of live animals. However, the United States has been a net importer of lamb meat and mutton. Lamb and mutton imports have been declining since 1960, along with domestic production and consumption.

Consumption of lamb was 1.2 pounds per capita in 1988, less than 0.6 percent of meat consumption. Small-scale production and distribution tend to increase the costs as the infrastructure shrinks. These higher processing costs are generally borne by both consumers and producers. Imports and production of lamb have declined since 1960, indicating that the biggest problem with the domestic market is the lack of a consumer base. Producers' returns have been consistently positive in recent years, and marketing facilities and plants have been adjusted to gain scale economies for a declining industry. The sheep industry is showing signs of stabilizing or even modest growth.

## The U.S. Sheep Industry

Richard Stillman Terry Crawford Lorna Aldrich

#### Introduction

Concern arose over conditions in the U.S. sheep industry in 1988 because lamb prices were much lower during the usual late spring price peaks than in 1987. At the same time, a shipment of live lambs from New Zealand entered U.S. marketing channels. These events led to questions about the influence of imports on conditions in the U.S. sheep industry. In this report, we assess the state of the U.S. sheep industry. We respond to section 4508 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a report to Congress on the market for lamb meat products. As required by the act, we discuss the following conditions:

- o Production of lamb and lamb products.
- o Costs and returns in the sheep industry.
- o Demand and marketing trends for lamb.
- o Imports of both live lambs and lamb meat products.

We take a broad view of the sheep industry, emphasizing long-term trends, costs and receipts to stock sheep and lamb feeding enterprises, livestock cycles, and seasonal price patterns. Such a perspective helps distinguish the basic forces influencing conditions in the industry from one-time events that, while temporarily disruptive, are not likely to recur. We focus on the reasons for the decline in the sheep inventory, as opposed to the subsequent decline in slaughter facilities.

We conclude that imports have been countercyclical, but declining along with domestic inventories and production; that returns have generally been higher than in the competing cow-calf industries; and that the major challenge to the U.S. sheep industry is to expand consumption of a relatively expensive red meat. The issue of red meat consumption goes beyond lamb, as poultry is capturing market shares from all red meats through lower relative prices.

## Sheep Production Practices

The sheep industry has developed two distinctive enterprises: stock sheep production and lamb feeding. Stock sheep producers manage grazing flocks on pasture and range forage; these producers frequently use arid land with few alternative uses. Stock sheep producers sell lambs that are either slaughtered or placed in feedlots. In 1987, 31 percent of the stock sheep receipts came from slaughter lambs and 33 percent from feeder lambs. Wool, an important coproduct, accounted for 27 percent of stock sheep receipts, and cull ewes accounted for the remainder.

Feeder lambs are raised on forage until they reach around 80 pounds and then are usually placed in a dry lot for grain feeding. Feedlot-finished lambs have grown as a percentage of lambs slaughtered, due to the cost efficiency of grain feeding versus range finishing.

## Stock Sheep

Stock sheep, mature ewes and rams, and their intended replacements in the breeding flock are the productive capital of the sheep industry.

## Inventory Trends

Inventory data on stock sheep began in 1867 when there were approximately 45 million head (fig. 1). From 1867 to 1942, the number of stock sheep varied from a peak of 51 million head in 1884 to a low of 33 million in 1923. The inventory peaked a second time in 1942 at 49 million head. Producers liquidated their herds during 1942-50, and stock sheep numbers declined an unprecedented 47 percent. Inventories then remained stable during the 1950's. During a liquidation in the 1960's, inventories dropped another 40 percent, to 17 million head. The decline continued through the 1970's, reaching a low of 10.8 million head in 1979.

As the inventory now begins to stabilize, it appears to be reentering a typical livestock cycle, which had been masked by the long-term downward trend in the sheep industry. The sheep inventory began to expand after 1979 and reached a peak in 1982 of 11.4 million head (fig. 2). Then, primarily because of a drought that reduced the carrying capacity of ranges in the main producing areas during 1982-84, the inventory declined until 1986 when it reached a low of 8.5 million head. Another reversal occurred in 1986 and sheep inventories climbed to 9.2 million head by January 1, 1989. Inventories appear to be expanding in response to increased returns. The stock sheep inventory is expected to stay in the 8- to 10-million-head range over the next few years.

## Regional Location

The ability of sheep to forage in an arid environment has determined the regional distribution of sheep in the United States. Sheep production is primarily located in the 17 Western States where few or no alternative enterprises are available (fig. 3).

Figure 1 U.S. sheep inventory

Million head



Figure 2 U.S. all sheep inventory



Stock sheep, ruminants like beef cattle, are excellent foragers in an arid environment. About two-thirds of all sheep operations also raise cattle. Sheep eat a slightly different browse than cattle, but tend to compete with beef cattle production for labor and land resources. (A general way to compare the competition for range resources between sheep and cattle is a feed consuming animal unit (AU). An AU is defined as one cow or five sheep.)

In the West, many sheep operations use government grazing land, which is generally arid. About 30-40 percent of the sheep in the 17 Western States use either Bureau of Land Management or Forest Service land (<u>13</u>).

#### Production Problems

Sheep and lambs are very susceptible to disease and predators. Therefore, sheep producers have had to acquire well developed management skills. Death losses are much higher for sheep and lambs than for other livestock. Death losses of sheep and lambs in 1987 were 1.2 million head (505,000 sheep and 731,000 lambs), 12 percent of beginning inventory. For cattle enterprises, death losses were only 4.7 percent, consisting of 1.7 million cattle and 3.1 million calves. There is little information available to allocate death losses among disease, predators, and other causes. Sheep are susceptible to parasites and generally have less resistance to disease and injury than other classes of livestock As a result, sheep production requires more labor per (9). animal unit than cattle production. In the past, resident aliens as well as domestic workers have furnished labor. The ability to attract and keep skilled sheep herders at a reasonable wage is frequently mentioned as a major challenge to the sheep industry.

#### Lambs on Feed

Although the number of lambs on feed has been declining, the percentage of the sheep inventory on feed has grown. The American Sheep Producers Council estimates that 65 percent of all lambs slaughtered go through feedlots (2). The only information available on lamb feeding is a January 1 inventory number from the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). This does not reflect the volume of lambs that go through feedlots, but it gives an indication of the trends in lamb feeding.

Only 7 percent of the sheep inventory was on feed on January 1, 1989. The largest number of lambs on feed, 7 million head in 1943, was 14.4 percent of the inventory. In 1989, lambs on feed totaled 1.9 million head, accounting for 17 percent of the January 1 inventory of all sheep and lambs.

Lambs on feed are concentrated in the Great Plains and California. Costs will continue to encourage lamb feeding. In finishing animals, grain feeding generally costs less per pound of gain than range feeding.

#### Costs and Returns in Sheep Production

Sheep producers compete with beef cattle producers for resources to operate their enterprises: grazing land, labor, water, and marketing and transportation facilities. Sheep production, which generally yields higher returns than cattle production, also requires more intensive use of labor and management. Higher returns to sheep operators than to cattle operators in the face of declining sheep numbers suggests that even higher returns to management are required to retain resources in sheep production.

#### Trends in Cost of Production

Cash receipts to sheep producers per breeding ewe increased from \$26 in 1972 to \$73 in 1987 (table 1). This increase (180 percent) was slightly greater than the rate of inflation as measured by the consumer price index (172 percent). Cash receipts from beef cow-calf enterprises increased 123 percent during the same period, substantially less than the rate of inflation (table 2).

Total cash expenses increased from \$21 per ewe in 1972 to \$45 in 1987 (114 percent). Thus, cash receipts less cash expenses have increased sharply for sheep enterprises, from \$5 per ewe in 1972 to \$28 in 1987 (460 percent). Sheep enterprises have had positive receipts less cash expenses for 15 of the last 16 years (1972-87). Preliminary estimates for 1988 and forecasts for 1989 indicate that positive returns will continue. Again, sheep have done better per breeding animal than cattle, which have had positive returns in only 7 of the last 16 years (fig. 4).

Receipts for sheep enterprises come from sales of animals and wool and from government wool program payments (fig. 5). The share from each source, although varying from year to year, has on average remained the same. Receipts from animals (feeder lambs, slaughter lambs, and cull ewes) made up 72 percent of total receipts in 1972 and 73 percent in 1987. Wool sales accounted for 10 percent of receipts in both 1972 and 1987. Government payments (wool incentive and unshorn payment) dropped from 18 percent of receipts in 1972 to 17 percent in 1987. When meat prices were under pressure from drought-induced liquidation of the cattle and sheep herds in 1983, animals accounted for 66 percent of total cash receipts, wool for 14 percent, and government payments for 20 percent.

Cash expenses for sheep producers have not increased as fast as receipts because variable expenses (such as feed) have not kept pace with other costs. Feed, which was almost 40 percent of total cash expenses in 1972, dropped to 28 percent by 1987. Other variable cash expenses decreased from 40 percent in 1972 to 36 percent in 1987, while fixed cash expenses (general farm overhead, taxes, insurance, and interest) increased from 21 to 36 percent during the same period.

## Figure 3 Regional distribution of sheep inventory

## Percent



## Figure 4 Returns to U.S. sheep and cow-calf enterprises

Dollars per animal unit\*



Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
			Doll	ars		
Cash receipts:						
Slaughter lambs	9.85	12.00	13.00	14.53	15.65	17.46
Feeder lambs	6.99	8.58	8.06	9.27	11.35	12.57
Cull ewes	1.72	3.30	2.63	2.56	3.30	3.45
Wool	2.60	6.15	4.39	3.32	4.88	5.35
Wool payments 1/	3.88	0	1.35	2.86	- 66	2.83
Unshorn lamb payments	.75	Õ	.26	. 55	.13	.55
Total	25.80	30.03	29.71	33.09	35.97	42.22
Cash expenses.	20.00	50.05	23.71	55.05	55.57	10.00
Feed						
Grain	1 11	1 79	2 77	2 56	2 36	1 92
Protein sunnlements	1 76	3 82	2 8 2	2.30	2.50	2 83
Salt and minerals	13	11	2.02	2.51	10	2.03
Hay	2 24	• 14 2 55	2 00	3 74	2 00	2 2 2 2
Dacturo	1 01	2.55	2.33	J./4 2 1/	2.09	2.09
Public grading	1.01	2.07	2.14	2.14	2.19	2.10
	1 25	1 21	3 4 3	1 4 1	1 (5	70
$(AOM) \underline{Z}$	T.20	1.31	1.41	1.41	1.65	./3
Crop residues	.05	.05	.05	.05	.05	.05
Total feed costs	8.34	11./4	12.34	12.39	12.64	10.82
Voter						
vecerinary and	<b>C</b> 0	<u> </u>	50	60	50	~ ~ ~
mealcine	.60	.62	.59	.62	.59	.61
Livestock nauling	.66	.73	.66	.72	.66	.71
Marketing	.15	.16	.15	.16	.15	.16
Ram death loss	.13	.14	.15	• 17	.18	.19
Shearing and tagging	• 58	.62	.68	.75	.79	.84
Fuel, lube, and						
electricity	.50	.53	.74	.82	.87	.93
Machinery and						
building repair	2.57	2.62	2.82	2.98	2.87	1.22
Hired labor	2.72	2.98	3.41	3.67	4.15	4.32
Miscellaneous	.44	.47	.52	.57	.60	.64
Total variable						
expenses	16.71	20.61	22.07	22.84	23.49	20.44
General farm overhead	1.05	1.42	1.27	1.41	1.67	1.94
Taxes and insurance	.90	.92	.97	1.04	1.26	1.19
Interest	2.53	3.68	3.16	3.52	5.32	5.64
Total fixed expenses	4.48	6.02	5.40	5.97	8.25	8.77
Total cash						
expenses	21.18	26.63	27.47	28.81	31.74	29.21
Receipts less						
cash expenses	4.61	3.40	2.24	4.29	4.23	13.01
Capital replacement	2.19	2.32	2.52	2.75	2.90	2.84
Receipts less cash						
expenses and						
replacement	2.42	1.08	28	1.53	1.34	10.16
See footnotes at end o:	f table	•			Conti	.nued

Table	1U.	s.	sheep	production	costs	and	returns	per	ewe	
-------	-----	----	-------	------------	-------	-----	---------	-----	-----	--

÷

Item	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
	······································		Dolla	ars		
Cash receipts:						
Slaughter lambs	19.91	21.03	20.46	16.03	16.60	16.39
Feeder lambs	17.72	18.41	15.74	13.30	13.49	12.30
Cull ewes	4.70	5.52	3.55	3.43	3.05	2.17
Wool	5.54	6.42	6.55	7.45	6.28	6.72
Wool payments <u>1</u> /	3.09	3.29	3.52	4.61	6.28	7.75
Unshorn lamb payments	.66	.71	.76	.88	1.50	1.56
Total	51.62	55.37	50.58	45.70	47.20	46.89
Cash expenses:						
Feed						
Grain	1.99	2.24	2.56	2.13	2.14	2.38
Protein supplements	2.85	3.21	3.64	3.38	3.16	3,60
Salt and minerals	.23	.26	.32	.35	.37	.38
Hav	2.69	2.45	2.93	3.53	3.71	3.65
Pasture	2.41	2.70	3.05	3.19	3.11	3.16
Public grazing						
(AUM) 2/	.73	.93	1.13	1.11	.91	.70
Crop residues	.05	.04	.05	.06	.05	.06
Total feed costs	10.95	11.84	13.68	13.75	13.45	13.93
Other						
Veterinary and						
medicine	.66	.73	.83	.91	. 98	. 99
Livestock hauling	.76	.87	1.00	1.12	1,18	1.20
Marketing	.17	. 19	.22	.24	.26	.27
Ram death loss	.26	.34	. 33	.31	.29	. 28
Shearing and tagging	.90	.98	1.06	1.14	1.18	1,21
Fuel, lube, and	• • • •		1.00		1.10	<b>1</b> .01
electricity	. 98	1.28	1.75	1.98	1.93	1.82
Machinery and	• • • •	1120	1075	1.00	1.75	1.02
building repair	1.32	1.45	1.59	1.74	2.19	2.29
Hired labor	4.62	5.05	5.44	5.83	6.05	6.22
Miscellaneous	. 69	.77	. 87	.96	1.02	1 04
Total variable	• • • •	• / /	•••	• 50	1.02	1.04
expenses	21.31	23.51	26.77	27.98	28.53	29 25
General farm overhead	2.54	3.08	3.21	3.22	4 47	2 86
Taxes and insurance	1.20	1.45	1 55	1 57	1 80	1 82
Interest	6.93	8 25	8 49	2 52	13 50	Q 10
Total fixed expenses	10 67	12 79	13 25	13 31	10 86	13 78
Total cash expenses	31 98	36 30	10 02	11 20	19.00	13.70
Receipts less	51.50	30.30	40.02	41.29	40.55	43.03
cash expenses	19 64	19 07	10 56	1 11	_1 10	3 96
Capital replacement	3 89	1 90	5 12	5 60	6 50	5.00
Receipts less cash	5.09	4.50	3.12	5.09	0.00	0.90
expenses and						
replacement	15.75	14.17	5 44	-1.20	-7 77	-3 00
-		/				J. UJ

Table	1U.	s.	sheep	production	costs	and	returns	per
	ewe	e(	Contin	led				

See footnotes at end of table.

Continued--

•

I

Item	1984	1985	1986	1987
		Dolla	rs	
Cash receipts:				
Slaughter lambs	19.93	21.58	20.86	22.96
Feeder lambs	15.02	18.48	18.76	24.02
Cull ewes	3.20	6.06	5.97	6.18
Wool	8.81	6.84	7.35	7.62
Wool payments <u>1</u> /	9.47	10.99	11.78	10.48
Unshorn lamb payments	1.81	2.21	2.40	1.79
Total	58.24	66.16	67.12	73.05
Cash expenses:				
Feed				
Grain	2.52	2.01	1.60	1.19
Protein supplements	3.39	3.40	3.68	4.00
Salt and minerals	.38	.40	.40	.40
Нау	3.74	3.90	3.03	2.82
Pasture	3.43	3.31	3.47	3.41
Public grazing (AUM) <u>2</u> /	.71	.67	.68	.67
Crop residues	.06	.05	.05	.05
Total feed costs	14.23	13.74	12.91	12.54
Other				
Veterinary and medicine	1.04	1.05	1.08	1.11
Livestock hauling	1.25	1.28	1.25	1.26
Marketing	.28	.29	.29	.30
Ram death loss	.27	.27	.27	.27
Shearing and tagging	1.23	1.24	1.29	1.34
Fuel, lube, and electricity	1.49	1.53	1.14	1.25
Machinery and				
building repair	2.26	2.39	2.32	2.35
Hired labor	6.34	6.49	6.73	6.98
Miscellaneous	1.08	1.12	1.15	1.19
Total variable expenses	29.47	29.40	28.43	28.59
General farm overhead	3.74	3.25	5.03	5.50
Taxes and insurance	1.70	1.82	1.76	1.80
Interest	5.99	4.80	8.05	8.77
Total fixed expenses	11.43	9.87	14.84	16.07
Total cash expenses	40.90	39.27	43.27	44.66
Receipts less				
cash expenses	17.34	26.89	23.85	28.39
Capital replacement	7.38	7.61	7.49	7.79
Receipts less cash				
expenses and				
replacement	9.96	19.28	16.36	20.60
-				

## Table 1--U. S. sheep production costs and returns per ewe--Continued

1/ Wool payments based on previous years marketing. 2/ Animal Unit Month.

,

• •

•

-.

Item	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
			Dolla	ars		
Cash receipts:						
Steer calves	44.78	57.51	40.97	36.68	39.52	43.46
Heifer calves	26.50	34.04	24.25	21.71	23.38	25.72
Yearling steers	29.06	37.32	26.59	23.80	34.42	28.20
Yearling heifers	18.25	23.44	16.70	14.95	21.62	17.71
Cull cows	21.80	22.11	18.24	21.89	15.79	31.82
Total	140.39	174.42	126.75	119.01	34.73	146.91
Cash expenses:						
Feed						
Grain	3.44	5.56	8.59	7.94	7.32	5.97
Silage	1.34	2.16	3.34	3.09	2.85	2.32
Protein supplements	4.25	9.24	6.81	5.58	5.58	6.84
Salt and minerals	1.52	1.63	1.83	2.07	2.25	2.55
Hay	27.13	31.00	36.28	45.38	47.21	35.03
All pasture and	2,120	0100	00120			
private range	24.61	28.26	29.15	29.18	29.84	29.66
Public grazing						
(AM and AUM) 1/	.63	.73	.93	.93	1.37	1.37
Crop residue	.06	.06	.06	.06	.06	.07
Total feed costs	62.98	78.64	86.99	94.23	96.48	83.81
Other						
Veterinary and						
medicine	3.85	4.01	3.82	3.98	3.79	3.94
Livestock hauling	.95	1.04	.95	1.03	.94	1.02
Marketing	2.48	2,63	2.46	2.61	2.44	2.59
Custom feed mixing	.29	.30	.29	.30	.29	.30
Fuel, lube, and						
electricity	5.52	5.83	8.08	9.00	9.52	10.23
Machinery and	0	0.00				
building repair	9.34	9.88	12.05	13.81	12.58	13.54
Hired labor	4,99	5.46	6.26	6.73	7.62	7.92
Total variable		51.0	0.20	0070		
expenses	90.40	107.79	120.90	131.69	133.66	123.35
General farm overhead	4.10	5.55	4.96	5.53	6.54	7.59
Taxes and insurance	11.45	11.76	12.37	13.28	16.09	15.27
Interest	8 13	11.82	10.15	11.29	17.08	18.10
Total fixed	0.10	11.02	10.13	11.07	1,100	10.10
expenses	23.68	29.13	27.48	30.10	39.71	40.96
Total cash	20.00	23120	27110	50110	00011	10000
expenses	114.08	136.92	148.38	161.79	173.37	164.31
Receipts less cash		100030	110100	10100	2.0107	201002
expenses	26 31	37 50	-21 63	-42 76	-38 64	-17 40
Capital replacement	26 65	28 16	30 64	33 10	35 21	34 50
Receipts less	20.00	20.10	50.04	55.45	JJ.21	54.55
Cash expenses						
and replacement	- 31	9 31	-52 27	-76 25	-73 25	-51 00
	• • • •	2.54	56.61	10.20	13.05	51.55
See footnotes at end of	table.				Cont	inued

•

•

Item	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
			<u>Dol</u>	lars		
Cash receipts.						
Stoor galvog	77 16	102 04	00 02	71 96	71 22	71 62
Hoifor galvos	11.10	21 51	52 27	/4.00	14.22	/4.02
Vorling stoors	40.00	01.51	53.27	44.02	44.20	43.00
Yearling beiford	40.34	63.37	70.40	07.72	42.13	20 00
Cull cove	30.36	52.30	49.24	44.08	42.19	20.09
Cull cows	43.03	51.12	35.98	29.96	30.10	28.04
	244.55	352.30	306.91	260.64	255.49	247.18
Cash expenses:						
reed	c - c					
Grain	6.56	7.78	10.12	9.42	8.31	10.70
Silage	2.20	2.66	4.58	5.51	4.66	6.20
Protein supplements	9.21	12.34	17.28	18.21	17.26	18.13
Salt and minerals	2.60	2.65	2.13	2.41	2.40	2.52
Нау	33.05	29.86	32.03	40.23	41.47	38.99
All pasture and						
private range	30.84	34.15	35.81	37.40	39.02	36.45
Public grazing						
(AM and AUM) <u>1</u> /	1.12	1.08	.68	.76	.75	.65
Crop residue	.07	.06	.07	.07	.07	.08
Total feed costs	85.65	90.58	102.70	114.01	113.94	113.72
Other						
Veterinary and						
medicine	4.45	4.54	5.05	5.52	5.91	6.11
Livestock hauling	1.07	1.23	1.40	1.75	1.70	1.74
Marketing	3.01	3.58	3.81	3.86	3.90	4.00
Custom feed mixing	.34	.38	.42	. 4 4	.49	. 47
Fuel, lube, and						
electricity	10.73	14.02	19.23	21 72	21 30	19 54
Machinery and	20070	1.1.01	17.120		21.50	13.34
building repair	14.62	16 04	17 60	19 31	21 17	22 00
Hired labor	9 00	10.04	11 72	12 /1	12 02	12 10
Total variable	5.00	10.40	11.72	17.41	13.02	13.40
	128 87	140 93	161 02	100 02	101 40	101 15
Conoral farm overhead	12 52	140.05	21 04	100.02	101.43	10 20
Tayog and incurance	16 15	10 00	21.94	20.68	19.47	19.26
Interest	20.20	19.02	20.52	19.62	20.87	23.43
Interest Total fixed	30.30	48.45	47.50	44.86	45.43	44.96
		00.00	00.00	05 16	05 55	
motol coch	59.98	90.33	89.96	85.16	85.77	87.65
Total cash	100 05					
expenses	188.85	231.16	251.89	265.18	267.20	268.80
Receipts less cash						
expenses	55.70	121.14	55.02	-4.54	-11.71	-21.62
capital replacement	37.39	46.74	54.19	59.22	62.88	64.28
Receipts less cash						
expenses and						
replacement	18.31	74.40	.83	-63.76	-74.59	-85.90
See footnotes at end o	of table	э.			Contir	nued

Table 2--U.S. cow-calf production costs per cow--Continued

11

Item	1984	1985	1986	1987
		Dol	lars	
Cash receipts:				
Steer calves	76.37	77.71	78.17	86.79
Heifer calves	44.36	46.22	47.81	60.01
Yearling steers	65.89	61.52	66.70	84.11
Yearling heifers	41.47	40.30	43.96	47.72
Cull cows	30.69	28.64	28.83	34.31
Total	258.78	254.39	265.47	312.94
Cash expenses:				
Feed				
Grain	11.20	9.39	7.31	5.94
Silage	5.83	6.04	5.79	6.07
Protein supplements	18.69	16.00	16.73	17.65
Salt and minerals	2.62	2.69	2.67	2.69
Hay	43.34	42.96	34.15	35.17
All pasture and				
private range	39.30	36.44	36.23	39.78
Public grazing				
(AM and AUM) 1/	.71	.66	.74	.71
Crop residue	.08	.07	.08	.06
Total feed costs	121.77	114.25	103.70	108.07
Other				
Veterinary and				
medicine	6.31	6.38	6.56	6.69
Livestock hauling	1.80	1.85	1.88	1.98
Marketing	4.10	4.21	4.17	4.42
Custom feed mixing	.48	.49	.49	.28
Fuel, lube, and				
electricity	16.58	16.00	12.17	14.06
Machinery and				
building repair	21.58	22.51	21.92	21.96
Hired labor	13.72	13.98	14.07	15.01
Total variable expenses	186.34	179.67	164.96	172.47
General farm overhead	24.13	17.48	25.64	30.00
Taxes and insurance	19.54	19.04	10.47	9.77
Interest	46.52	44.30	37.20	43.60
Total fixed expenses	90.19	80.82	73.31	83.37
Total cash expenses	276.53	260.49	238.27	255.84
Receipts less cash expenses	-17.75	-6.10	27.20	57.10
Capital replacement	64.46	64.53	74.20	75.58
Receipts less cash expenses				
and replacement	-82.21	-70.63	-47.00	-18.48

		gov-golf	production	costs	nor	cowContinued
Table	2U.S.	cow-cali	production	COSTS	per	cowcontinuea

1/ Animal Month and Animal Unit Month.

...

Labor is an exception to the general trend for variable expenses with an increase in cost share from 13 percent in 1972 to 16 percent in 1987. Variable labor costs for cattle increased from 6 to 9 percent during 1972-87. Labor has repeatedly been cited as a special problem in sheep production, in terms of skill required, working conditions, and availability of workers. The sheep industry in the past obtained special permission to bring in workers from other countries on a temporary basis.

Feed cost is the single largest cost item for sheep production even though it is declining in relative importance. Feed costs increased only 50 percent during 1972-87, while total costs doubled. Protein supplements account for a third of the feed costs, while hay and pasture each account for a fourth. The cost for using public grazing land, an important source of feed in the West, has declined due to reductions in grazing fees since 1980.

When longer run costs, such as capital replacement costs, are considered in addition to cash expenses, returns for ewes were positive for 12 of the 16 years since 1972. The 4 years with negative returns coincide with a drought in 1982 through 1984 and the liquidation phase of the cattle cycle. Sheep returns are sensitive to changes in the cattle cycle because of the lower prices associated with increased cattle sales. Droughts often cause both cattle and sheep producers to liquidate their inventories.

## Colorado Lamb Feeding Cost

In addition to estimating long-term cost series for stock sheep, ERS also estimates a Colorado lamb feeding budget (based on a 1985 Colorado State University survey). This budget represents most of the lamb feeding in the Western States (table 3) (<u>14</u>). Over half of all lambs slaughtered are fattened in large commercial feedlots. Colorado is the leading lamb-feeding State with a fifth of all lamb feeding. Other major lamb-feeding States are California, Texas, and Wyoming.

Lambs are fed for a shorter time than cattle. Lamb purchases account for almost half of the cost, with feed cost the next largest at a fifth of total cost. Feeders adjust their bids for feeder lambs according to their cost structure and their expectations of slaughter lamb prices. Lower feed costs and smaller lamb supplies increase feeder lamb prices. Feeder lambs' cost accounted for 78 percent of total cost in 1988, compared with 76 percent in 1985. Overbidding for feeder lambs resulted in negative net margins in 1988.

#### Lamb and Mutton Production

Meat from sheep is called lamb or mutton, depending on the age of the animal. Lambs are generally slaughtered between 8 and 14 months of age. The Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS), USDA, sets grading standards for both lamb and mutton. Lamb is defined by the condition of the break-joint on the foreleg of the animal,

Item	1985	1986	1987	1988			
	Dollars per head						
Costs:							
Feeder lamb (83 lbs)	55.67	59.96	71.45	70.47			
feed	7 06	6 71	1 90	6 50			
Usy pollots (64 lbs)	7.90	0.74	4.09	3 4 3			
Ray perfecs (64 ibs)	2.04	2.03	2.70	3.42			
Food additives	2 00	1 98	1 94	1 96			
Total feed	12.76	13.40	11.77	14.97			
Labor	. 60	. 62	. 65	. 65			
Death loss	1.28	1.38	1.64	1.62			
Veterinary and medicine	.37	.37	.38	.38			
Miscellaneous and indirect							
costs	.78	.77	.77	.81			
Machine hire	1.61	1.60	1.62	1.65			
Interest on operating capital	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.45			
Total costs	73.37	78.17	88.10	90.38			
Selling price per cwt required to cover costs: Feed and feeder		<u>Dollars</u>	<u>per_cwt</u>				
costs (121 lbs)	56.56	60.63	68.78	70.61			
All costs (121 lbs)	60.64	64.60	72.81	74.69			
Feed costs per 100-lb gain	33.58	35.27	30.98	39.40			
Choice slaughter lambs,							
South St. Paul	67.22	68.04	75.19	66.24			
Net margin	6.58	3.44	2.38	-8.46			
Prices:							
Choice slaughter lambs,			_				
South St. Paul	67.22	68.04	75.19	66.24			
Feeder lamb, choice,		<b></b>					
South St. Paul	67.08	72.24	86.08	84.90			
Corn (\$/bu)	2.65	2.25	1.63	2.20			
Alfalfa pellets (\$/ton) Soybean meal	82.37	82.88	86.36	106.98			
44 percent (\$/ton)	129.25	158.93	170.35	234.85			
Annual interest rate	13.43	11.15	9.98	10.58			
		1077	100				
Index of prices.		<u>1977 =</u>	100				
Farm labor	152 60	150 25	166 00	166 00			
Drices naid by farmors	163.60	150.25	160.00	160.00			
Agricultural chemicals	128 00	126 83	101.00	125 22			
Tractors and self-propelled	120.00	120.03	124.23	TC 72			
equipment	178 30	174 33	173 33	178 50			
Other machinery	183.20	182 25	184 08	195 00			
Fuel and energy	200.20	171.25	158.25	164.00			
			100 0 20	101.00			

ź

.,

Table	3Colorado	lamb	feeding	budget,	cost	per	head
-------	-----------	------	---------	---------	------	-----	------

in addition to the color and characteristics of the rib bones (roundness for lamb and flatness for mutton), and the characteristics of the lean meat. Mutton comes from any sheep that is too old to classify as lamb. Mutton accounts for about 5 percent of sheep meat produced.

## Production Trends

Lamb and mutton production has declined since 1945, following the decline in sheep inventories. Lamb production has fallen less than inventories because of a trend toward heavier slaughter weights, reflecting genetic improvements and a larger proportion marketed as fed lambs. This trend toward heavier weights was developed to offset costs by reducing the number of breeding ewes necessary to produce a pound of lamb and to take advantage of reasonable grain prices.

Since 1979, lamb meat production has appeared to be cycling in a typical livestock cycle (fig. 6). Lamb production dropped to 275 million pounds in 1979, then recovered to 350 million pounds in 1984, and dropped again in 1987 to 303 million pounds. This reduction resulted in the lowest per capita supplies on record in the United States. Production recovered to 315 million pounds in 1988, partly because of an increase in carcass weights of 3 pounds per animal. The cyclical turning point between 1987 and 1988 created a sharp contrast between high prices in 1987.

### Seasonality of Lamb Production

Lamb production exhibits a distinct seasonal pattern with production higher in the spring and fall (fig. 7). Lamb slaughter is usually highest in March or April depending on the dates of the spring religious holidays. Mature sheep slaughter has a different pattern than that for lamb slaughter. These animals are culled after the weaning of the lambs in the early summer or in the fall.

## Sheep and Lamb Marketing and Slaughter

Of 127 firms reporting purchases of lambs for slaughter in 1988, 116 were single-plant firms and 11 were multiplant firms (<u>39</u>). Most of the sheep and lambs marketed (81.4 percent in 1987) were purchased directly through nonpublic markets, rather than terminal or auction markets (table 4). The concentration of the industry in the West, the increasing percentage of lambs in feedlots, and the distance between markets have fostered direct marketing. The areas that tend to have a large proportion of packer feeding also have the largest percentages of direct purchases (<u>39</u>).

The proportion of sheep and lambs valued on a grade and weight basis has been increasing (table 5). Payment on grade and weight basis is a method that pays the producer on the carcass weight of the animal rather than its liveweight. In 1987, 35.9 percent of

## Figure 5 U.S. stock sheep receipts, all sizes

Dollars per ewe



## Figure 6 U.S. commercial lamb production

Million pounds



ė.

State/region <u>2</u> /	Nonpublic	Terminal	Auction	Total <u>3</u> /	Nonpublic	Terminal	Auction	Total
		<u>1,000</u>	head			<u>Per</u>	<u>cent</u>	
New England	3	0	3	6	50.0	0	50.0	100.0
New York	20	0	29	48	40.8	0	59.2	100.0
New Jersey	4/	6	2	8	1.9	71.4	26.7	100.0
Pennsylvania	12	4/	64	77	16.1	0.4	83.5	100.0
North Atlantic <u>3</u> /	36	6	98	139	25.6	4.5	69.9	100.0
Ohio	3	0	5	8	33.3	0	66.7	100.0
Indiana	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	100.0	100.0
Illinois	190	105	6	301	63.1	34.9	2.0	100.0
Michigan	10	1	168	179	5.6	0.6	93.9	100.0
Wisconsin	0	1	0	0	100.0	0	0	100.0
East North Central	203	106	180	488	41.5	21.7	36.8	100.0
Minnesota	201	61	87	349	57.7	17.4	24.8	100.0
Iowa	324	49	93	463	69.9	10.0	20.0	100.0
Missouri	<u>4</u> /	2	10	12	0.4	15.6	84.1	100.0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	72	13	2	86	83.5	14.6	1.9	100.0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	360	32	0	392	91.8	8.2	0	100.0
West North Central	957	154	191	1,302	73.5	11.8	14.7	100.0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryl <b>and</b>	0	<u>4</u> /	14	14	0	1.8	98.2	100.0
Virginia	70	0	69	140	50.3	0	49.7	100.0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	43.5	0	56.5	100.0
North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	100.0	0	0	100.0
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0
South Atlantic	70	<u>4</u> /	83	153	45.8	0.2	54.0	100.0
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	0	0	<u>4</u> /	0	0	0	100.0	100.0
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	12.2	8.7	79.1	100.0
South Central	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	4/	11.8	8.4	79.7	100.0
Oklahoma	0	0	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	0	0	100.0	100.0
Texas	536	0	29	565	94.9	0	5.1	100.0
Southern Plains	536	0	29	565	94.9	0	5.1	100.0
Montana	<u>4</u> /	0	<u>4</u> /	<u>4</u> /	83.2	0	16.8	100.0
Idaho	2	0	1	3	76.1	0	23.9	100.0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	1,126	0	9	1,135	99.2	0	0.8	100.0
New Mexico	16	0	13	29	56.0	0	44.0	100.0
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Utah	13	0	<u>4</u> /	13	99.4	0	0.6	100.0
Mountain	1,157	0	23	1,180	98.1	0	1.9	100.0

## Table 4--Market outlets for sheep and lambs: Purchases by region and State of slaughter, reporting slaughter packers, 1987 $\underline{1}/$

See footnotes at end of table.

ģ

.

,

Continued--

State/region <u>2</u> /	Nonpublic	Terminal	Auction	Total <u>3</u> /	Nonpublic	Terminal	Auction	Total
		<u>1,000</u>	head			<u>Per</u>	<u>cent</u>	
Washington	150	0	4	155	97.1	0	2.9	100.0
Oregon	1	0	4/	1	93.2	0	6.8	100.0
California	829	0	24	853	97.2	0	2.8	100.0
Pacific	980	0	28	1,008	97.2	0	2.8	100.0
48 States	3,939	266	631	4,837	81.4	5.5	13.1	100.0
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United States	3,939	266	631	4,837	81.4	5.5	13.1	100.0

Table 4--Market outlets for sheep and lambs: Purchases by region and State of slaughter, reporting slaughter packers, 1987 1/--Continued

<u>1</u>/ Includes all purchases of livestock except from terminals and auctions. Nonpublic outlets are terminals that have more than one marketing agency selling on commission; auctions have only one. <u>2</u>/ Location of slaughter, but not necessarily the origin of livestock.

3/ Totals may not add due to rounding.

 $\overline{4}$  / Less than 500 head.

Source: (35).

the sheep and lambs slaughtered was purchased on a grade and weight basis.

As the number of sheep and lambs slaughtered has declined, the infrastructure of the sheep industry has consolidated. Higher marketing costs result if marketing activities are handled by low-volume, less cost-efficient units, or if the area of procurement and distribution covered by these units increases. Higher procurement and transportation costs are generally borne by producers as the distance between sheep-raising areas and slaughter plants increases. These costs have helped encourage the feeding industry to locate slaughter plants in the feeding areas.

Another effect of the reduced volume in the sheep industry is the trend toward a few large plants slaughtering most of the sheep and lambs. The percentage of sheep and lambs slaughtered in large plants has not changed significantly during the present lamb cycle. In 1987, 95 percent of the lambs were slaughtered in plants of 10,000 head or more, compared with 97 percent in 1979. However, the number of plants slaughtering 10,000 head or more has declined from 26 to 22, even though total slaughter increased slightly (table 6).

As market concentration increases, the number of bidders for lambs is reduced. The increasing concentration has raised concerns in the industry. The effect of the reduction in slaughtering plants and the control of slaughter by fewer packers is dampened by the ease of entry into this activity. The increase in the number of plants slaughtering lambs between 1979 and 1983 indicates that entry into lamb slaughter is not that difficult. However, many of the smaller plants, which can increase slaughter quickly, are not full-time lamb-slaughtering

Year	Grade and weight	Total	Grade and weight as share of total
<u> </u>	<u>1,000</u> h	ead	Percent
1974	771	8,868	8.7
1975	820	7,835	10.5
1976	623	6,795	9.2
1977	527	6,069	8.7
1978	517	5,106	10.1
1979	1,179	4,916	24.0
1980	1,542	5,452	28.3
1981	1,028	5,448	18.9
1982	1,643	5,677	28.9
1983	1.760	6.007	29.3
1984	1,377	6,482	21.2
1985	2,192	5,909	37.1
1986	2,413	5,089	47.4
1987	1,737	4,827	35.9

Table 5--Grade and weight purchases of sheep and lambs

Source: (<u>35</u>).

Table 6--Sheep and lamb slaughter by plant size

19	79	198	83	1987		
Plants	Total	Plants	Total	Plants	Total	
Number	1,000 <u>head</u>	<u>Number</u>	1,000 <u>head</u>	Number	1,000 <u>head</u>	
617 163 29 26	15.1 44.0 103.4 4,733.2	692 247 46 31	19.4 68.7 138.7 6,185.1	653 171 60 22	17.1 50.0 171.3 4,763.5	
	19 Plants <u>Number</u> 617 163 29 26 835	1979         Plants       Total         Number       1,000 head         617       15.1         163       44.0         29       103.4         26       4,733.2         835       4,895.6	1979       198         Plants       Total       Plants         Number       1,000 head       Number         617       15.1       692         163       44.0       247         29       103.4       46         26       4,733.2       31         835       4,895.6       1,016	1979       1983         Plants       Total       Plants       Total         Number       1,000 head       Number       1,000 head         617       15.1       692       19.4         163       44.0       247       68.7         29       103.4       46       138.7         26       4,733.2       31       6,185.1         835       4,895.6       1,016       6,412.0	1979         1983         19           Plants         Total         Plants         Total         Plants           Number         1,000 head         Number         1,000 head         Number         Number           617         15.1         692         19.4         653           163         44.0         247         68.7         171           29         103.4         46         138.7         60           26         4,733.2         31         6,185.1         22           835         4,895.6         1,016         6,412.0         906	

Source: (<u>32</u>).

î

plants and are likely higher cost slaughterers. As lamb slaughter declined during 1983-87, many plant operators found it unprofitable to remain in business and closed.

## Lamb Prices

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) ceased publishing lamb and veal retail prices in 1981. Lamb prices were combined with mutton, organ meats, and game and reported as "other meats." The combination of high-value products (lamb and game) with lowvalue products (organ meats, such as liver, kidneys, and tripe) hampers demand analysis for retail lamb. This development coincides with a period when lamb and mutton production and consumption have stabilized, following a long period of decline that makes results of previous demand studies questionable.

#### Wholesale Prices

The wholesale price per hundred weight (cwt) for lamb carcasses has generally been higher than for other meats (fig. 8). This reflects the increasing specialty nature of lamb. As per capita consumption declined, the wholesale price of lamb has continued to increase, both in nominal levels and relative to other meats (fig. 9).

### Seasonality in Prices

Wholesale carcass prices tend to increase during the period of peak lamb demand, which is in the winter and the early spring. Prices generally peak in May, then fall after the heavy Easter/Passover demand period and continue downward through summer and fall, bottoming in November. The cycle starts again in December, with holiday demand for lamb (fig. 10).

Wholesale cut prices exhibit a slightly different pattern, reflecting seasonal demand for leg of lamb. Wholesale leg prices peak in March, around the time of the spring religious holidays and drop off rapidly during the next several months. Leg prices also rebound during December, because of the December religious holidays. Leg prices help hold up the carcass price as production peaks in the spring. Prices of other cuts (chuck, loin, and rack) do not appear to have a significant seasonal pattern.

6

#### Live Lamb Prices

Prices of slaughter lambs reflect the final demand for the lamb product and, therefore, follow wholesale price patterns. The final demand encompasses retail and hotel, restaurant, and institutional levels.

The seasonal index for both slaughter and feeder lambs, indicates that prices peak in April (fig. 11). Slaughter prices are at their lowest in November.

Figure 7 Seasonal patterns in lamb slaughter, 1983-88



## Figure 8 Wholesale prices of lamb and major meats

3

.



## Figure 9 Wholesale lamb prices relative to selected meats





ť

47

ėŋ,





Feeder lamb prices vary with slaughter lamb prices and feed costs. Lambs usually stay on feed for 2-3 months; hence, the feeder lamb prices will lead the slaughter lamb price in seasonal peaks and troughs. Feeder lamb prices tend to peak in April and decline sharply until July; then they increase until the next April.

## Recent Fluctuation in Lamb Prices

Lamb prices dropped dramatically in April 1988 from the March highs, which was counter to normal seasonal patterns. The prices continued to decline throughout the year, reaching year-earlier levels in November. The major cause of the decline in the slaughter lamb prices was the dramatic increase in domestic production in March, which resulted from increased slaughter and record-high slaughter weights (figs. 12-14). Production reached 34 million pounds in March 1988, compared with slightly under 28 million pounds in April 1987, the comparable Easter/Passover period.

The low of the current production cycle was probably reached in May 1987 (fig. 13). Expansion in 1988, coupled with an untimely bunching of production in March, disturbed the usual seasonal price pattern. Initial prices in 1988 were above 1987, but as production increased and slaughter weights reached record highs, prices fell after March, counter to the normal seasonal pattern. Thus, April and May prices in 1988 were considerably below the same months in 1987, reflecting the cyclical upturn in production, exacerbated by heavy slaughter weights. Extended feeding times in hopes of the expected seasonal price increases resulted in very heavy lambs, and prices were further discounted due to the fatter carcasses during spring and early summer 1988.

Coinciding with this downturn in lamb prices, a shipment of 9,000 live lambs from New Zealand was released from quarantine in March 1988. These lambs were equivalent to about 1-2 percent of average monthly production in the spring period. Nearly 8,700 of these lambs went into feedlots and were likely slaughtered sometime between late April and early June. The coincident timing led to concerns that the live lamb imports rather than the cyclical upturn in production and record heavy weights depressed prices. However, the quantity of live lambs imported was insufficient to explain the large drop in prices.

#### Lamb and Mutton Consumption

Lamb and mutton consumption, like all meat consumption series published by ERS, is an estimated net disappearance series (23). Consumption is determined as production plus imports and beginning cold storage stocks, minus exports, shipments to U.S. territories, and ending cold storage stocks. Mutton consumption is a very small part of total lamb and mutton consumption. Estimates of lamb consumption have been made since 1967, based on assumptions about the relative levels of stocks and exports (table 7). Domestic lamb production, on average 10 times as large as imports, is by far the largest source of supply.

## Figure 11 Seasonal patterns in live lamb prices, 1976-88

Index



## Figure 12 Monthly commercial lamb production

Million pounds



۱

Ŷ

1

ð)

## Figure 13 Monthly slaughter lamb prices San Angelo, TX

Dollars per cwt

3 4

Ņ







Lamb and mutton consumption peaked on a per capita basis in 1945 at 7.3 pounds carcass weight (6.5 pounds retail weight). This was about 5 percent of red meat consumption. Consumption of lamb and mutton on a per capita basis reached a record low in 1987 at 1.3 pounds per person, retail weight (table 7). Lamb and mutton consumption in 1988 was estimated to have increased to 1.4 pounds, due mostly to domestic production increases.

Lamb and mutton consumption, like beef and pork consumption, as a percentage of total meat and poultry consumption has been declining, as increases in meat consumption have come from poultry (fig. 15). Lamb and mutton consumption has declined to less than 1 percent of red meat consumption and was 0.6 percent of total meat and poultry consumption in 1988 (fig. 16).

Broiler and turkey consumption has increased over time due mainly to lower relative prices, compared with beef, pork, and lamb. To a lesser extent, the gain in market share for the poultry industry has been a result of offering a perceived lower fat/cholesterol product, advertising, and development of new products. Beef, pork, and poultry industries have all been attempting to add new products that fit into modern lifestyles, such as prepared and further-processed products that can easily be used in a family where both adults work or in single-person households.

Survey data indicate that the lamb industry lacks a consumer base; only a very small percentage of consumers eat lamb (table 8). Nationwide cross-sectional consumer surveys done by USDA and reported by the National Research Council indicate the low levels of lamb consumption in the United States. The 1985 survey covered 1 day, and the 1977 survey covered a 2-week period that was sampled throughout the year. The low lamb consumption in both surveys is a reflection of how small the industry is relative to other meats.

The 1985 survey found that only 1 percent of the females (19-50 years of age) and only 0.5 percent of males (19-50) consumed lamb, veal, or game (<u>19</u>). Both of these percentages were down from the 1977 levels of 1.3 percent for females and 1.9 percent for males. Because veal and game consumption is included in the per capita basis with lamb, the true percentage of consumers eating lamb during the survey periods is probably half of the reported share. In holiday periods, consumption of lamb might be higher, but if gains are to be made in the consumer base for lamb, the industry must attract year-round consumers.

The lamb industry's challenge is to attract new consumers of relatively expensive red meat when red meats are losing their market share to poultry, due primarily to lower relative prices of poultry. Gains for the lamb industry depend on increasing the consumer base. Even though lamb has been sold in the United States for many years, its unfamiliarity makes it like a new product to most consumers.

Table 7Lamk	and	mutton	supply	and	use
-------------	-----	--------	--------	-----	-----

Ø

4

,

i

_			Supply	,					Use		
Commodity	Produc	tion	Begin-				Ship-		Co	nsumption	)
and year	Commer-	Farm	ning	Imports	Total	Exports	ments	Ending		Per c	apita
	cial		stocks	•		<u>1</u> /	<u>2</u> /	stocks	Total	Carcass	Retail
								<u></u>			
	<b>-</b> ·			!	Million p	<u>ounds</u>				<u>Po</u> u	unds
tamb and mut	tton:										
1967	636.0	10.0	17.0	121.0	784.0	6.0	0	5.0	763.0	3.84	3.42
1968	592.0	10.0	15.0	147.0	764.0	7.0	0	4.0	743.0	3.70	3.29
1969	540.0	10.0	14.0	153.0	717.0	6.0	0	6.0	695.0	3.43	3.05
1970	540.0	11.0	16.0	122.0	689.0	7.0	0	9.0	663.0	3.23	2.88
1971	545.0	11.0	19.0	103.0	678.0	8.0	0	9.0	651.0	3.13	2.79
1972	533.0	10.0	19.0	148.0	710.0	7.0	0	6.0	687.0	3.27	2.91
1973	502.0	10.0	16.0	53.0	581.0	6.0	0	5.0	560.0	2.64	2.35
1974	453.0	11.0	15.0	26.0	505.0	8.0	0	4.0	483.0	2.20	2.01
1975	400.0	11.0	14.0	27.7	452.7	8.0	U	2.0	432.0	2.00	1.78
1976	361.0	10.0	12.0	36.3	419.5	5.8	5.0	15.0	371.4	1.02	1.02
1977	340.0	10.0	15.0	22.5	38/.3	4.0 7.2	1.7	10.0	3/1.4	1.09	1 37
1970	301.0	9.0	10.0	39.3	374.3	J.2 1 /	1.5	12.0	342.0	1 48	1 32
1979	310 0	9.0	12.0	33 0	362 0	1.4	3.0	9.0	348.5	1.53	1.36
1981	328 0	10.0	9.0	31.1	378 1	2.4	2.4	11.0	362.3	1.57	1.40
1982	356.0	9.0	11.0	20.8	396.8	1.7	2.4	8.7	384.0	1.65	1.47
1983	367.0	8.0	8.7	18.1	401.7	1.4	2.2	11.0	387.1	1.65	1.47
1984	371.0	8.0	11.0	20.0	410.0	1.9	3.2	7.0	397.9	1.68	1.49
1985	352.0	7.0	7.0	36.5	402.5	1.0	2.5	13.0	386.0	1.61	1.44
1986	331.0	7.0	13.0	41.1	392.1	2.1	2.1	13.0	375.0	1.55	1.38
1987	309.0	7.0	13.0	44.0	373.0	1.5	2.4	7.9	361.2	1.48	1.32
1988	326.0	7.0	7.9	51.3	392.2	1.5	2.4	7.8	388.3	1.58	1.40
1 amb a											
1047	505 5	0 /	1/ 8	12 7	631 0	6.8	n	18	615 2	3 10	2 75
1968	556.5	9.4	14.0	22.9	600 6	5.4	õ	3.3	582.0	2.90	2.58
1969	502.9	9.3	13.3	43.6	569.2	4.6	õ	3.6	551.0	2.72	2.42
1970	504.1	10.3	13.6	43.5	571.5	5.9	0	7.7	547.9	2.67	2.38
1971	503.5	10.2	17.7	38.2	569.5	6.7	Ó	7.3	545.5	2.63	2.34
1972	498.7	9.4	17.3	37.3	562.6	5.7	0	3.9	543.0	2.59	2.30
1973	460.1	9.3	13.9	27.3	510.6	5.4	0	3.1	492.0	2.32	2.07
1974	426.3	10.4	13.1	17.8	467.6	7.5	0	3.4	446.7	2.09	1.86
1975	373.3	10.2	13.4	24.6	421.5	7.3	0	1.3	402.9	1.87	1.66
1976	341.5	9.5	11.3	34.2	396.5	3.6	2.0	4.2	375.8	1.72	1.53
1977	316.1	9.3	14.2	20.8	360.4	4.3	1.3	9.6	345.2	1.57	1.39
1978	282.6	8.5	9.6	38.0	338.6	3.1	1.2	11.4	323.0	1.45	1.29
1979	266.3	8.5	11.4	42.6	328.8	1.3	1.5	10.2	315.7	1.40	1.25
1980	290.2	7.5	10.2	55.0	541.0	1.4	2.9	8.7	528.1	1.44	1.28
1981	200.2	9.4	8./	51.7 10 7	32/.4	2.3	2.2	10.5	342.4 750 7	1.49	1.52
1902	332.7	0.4 7 F	10.5	10./	370.1	1.0	2.3	0.0	370.2	1.24	1.20
1905	343.Y 3/2 0	7.5	0.U 10 7	1/.¥ 19.7	311.4 379.0	1.5	2.1	10.3 A A	363.1	1.55	1.30
1904	J42.9 ZZ1 7	(.) (.)	2.01	71 0	376.9	1.0	2.7	12 7	JOI.1 741 7	1.55	1 7/
1986	315.9	6.7	12.3	20.3	364.2	1.9	1.9	11.7	348 A	1 44	1.28
1987	296.7	6.7	11.7	28.7	343.9	1.4	2.2	7.5	332.8	1.37	1.22
1988	308.5	6.7	7.5	29.5	352.2	1.4	2.1	7.0	341.7	1.39	1.24

 $\underline{1}/$  Prior to 1976 exports and shipments were combined.  $\underline{2}/$  Shipments to U.S. territories.

## Figure 15 Per capita meat consumption

Pounds



ì

ł

•

## Figure 16 Lamb and mutton's share of meat consumption

Percent



Group and food	Mean	intake	Share of per capita consumption		
	1977	1985	1977	1985	
	- Grams	s per dav -	Perc	ent	
Children, 1-5 years old:					
Beef	21	14	29.1	17.5	
Pork	7	7	20.5	16.2	
Lamb, veal, and game	2/	1	.3	1.4	
Organ meats	$\frac{1}{2}$	2/	.7	.3	
Frankfurter, sausages,		_			
and luncheon meats	15	12	33.1	28.2	
Chicken	17	16	17.0	19.6	
Fish and shellfish	5	5	7.0	8.1	
Mixtures <u>3</u> /	45	45	34.7	32.0	
Females, 19-50:					
Beef	49	27	34.9	23.1	
Pork	18	14	24.0	20.5	
Lamb, veal, and game	1	1	1.3	1.0	
Organ meats	1	1	.9	1.0	
Frankfurter, sausages,					
and luncheon meats	16	13	25.1	24.6	
Chicken	22	19	16.1	16.8	
Fish and shellfish	11	13	9.8	11.5	
Mixtures <u>3</u> /	65	88	33.2	37.1	
Males, 19-50:					
Beef	80	52	42.0	28.3	
Pork	28	26	28.2	25.3	
Lamb, veal, and game	3	1	1.9	.5	
Organ meats	2	1	1.4	.4	
Frankfurter, sausages,					
and luncheon meats	32	27	35.7	31.4	
Chicken	28	23	14.0	13.3	
Fish and shellfish	14	21	8.5	11.4	
Mixtures <u>3</u> /	105	110	39.0	39.7	
		Survey	participants		
		1977		1985	
			Number		
Children, 1-5 vears old		690		548	
Female, 19-50 years old		2,228		1,503	
Male, 19-50 years old		1,778		1,134	

Table 8--Trends in meat, poultry, and fish consumption by age and sex  $\underline{1}/$ 

١ł

9

for 1 day. <u>2</u>/ Values are less than 0.5 grams per day, but more than zero. <u>3</u>/ Mixtures are mainly meat, poultry, or fish.

Source: (19).

Some promotion funds are available from a checkoff in the wool support program. The American Sheep Industry Association receives these funds to promote wool and lamb products. In 1987, \$4 million were set aside to promote these products. Beef, pork, and poultry are increasing both checkoff and private promotion funds. The lamb industry will likely need to consider increasing the promotion of its product just to hold its market share. Promotion of imported lamb by Australia and New Zealand in the United States may increase demand for domestic lamb because of the current lack of U.S. consumer awareness.

#### Lamb Imports

The United States imports both sheep meat and live animals. Live animal imports have never been large, and the United States has been a net exporter of live animals. However, the United States has been a net importer of lamb meat and mutton. Mutton is covered under Public Law 96-177, the Meat Import Act of 1979, which restricts by a single quota the importation of certain fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, mutton, and goat meat products. Lamb imports are not included under the Meat Import Act. Lamb and mutton imports have been declining since 1960, along with domestic production and consumption.

#### Trends in Imports

Data separating lamb and mutton imports show that mutton was the prominent meat imported in the late sixties and early seventies, (fig. 17). Lamb imports have varied from as little as 12 million pounds in 1967 to 44 million pounds in 1969 (fig. 18). Lamb imports reached another peak in 1979 and then trended downward during the early eighties as domestic production expanded cyclically. The variation in lamb imports appears to depend on domestic prices; imports rise when cyclical declines in domestic production raise prices. Conversely, U.S. imports decline when domestic production is high and prices are low.

à

Lamb imports during the current production cycle have varied from a high of 16 percent of domestic consumption in 1979 to a low of 5 percent in 1983 (fig. 19). Lamb imports since 1984 have been in the 9- to 10-percent range of domestic consumption and are expected to remain in this range over the next several years.

New Zealand was the largest exporter of lamb to the United States until 1987, when Australia became the largest supplier (fig 20). The switch was due in part to the imposition of a countervailing duty on New Zealand lamb by the U.S. International Trade Commission because of New Zealand's agricultural policies.

#### Fresh Lamb Imports

Imports of fresh products as opposed to frozen products from both New Zealand and Australia have become a large proportion of lamb

## Figure 17 U.S. lamb and mutton imports

Million pounds



## Figure 18 U.S. lamb imports



## Figure 19 Lamb imports as a share of domestic production





## Figure 20 U.S. lamb imports by country of origin

Million pounds



imports during the past several years (fig. 21). During January-September 1988, 60 percent of the Australian lamb exports to the United States were fresh. Of this fresh lamb, approximately 98 percent was cuts and 2 percent was carcasses (table 9). Nearly 15 percent of New Zealand exports to the United States was fresh, while 85 percent was frozen during January-September 1988 (table 10).

The largest part of Australian lamb exports to the United States, both fresh and frozen during July 1981-June 1988, were legs. Legs accounted for 32 percent of the total lamb exports (including carcasses) and 43 percent of the cuts (table 11). During this period, loins, shoulders, and racks were 14, 8, and 10 percent of the total.

Legs from Australia accounted for 58 percent of the fresh lamb cuts imported by the United States during July 1981-June 1988, but declined to 43 percent in the June 1987-July 1988 period. As fresh imports to the United States have increased from about 322 metric tons in the 1981/82 period to over 5,661 in the 1987/88 period, the mixture of cuts has moved closer to the composition of the carcass.

### Live Lamb Trade

The U.S. Department of Commerce does not identify imports of live animals as sheep or lambs, or for slaughter or breeding. The United States has generally been a net exporter of live animals, trading mostly with Canada and Mexico (table 12). Most U.S. sheep exports, generally cull ewes, have gone to Mexico. Most of the live trade between the United States and Canada is in breeding animals or movements across the border to slaughter facilities.

## Seasonality of Imports

U.S. imports of lamb are heaviest in March through May, usually peaking in April much like domestic production (fig. 22). Foreign suppliers, as well as domestic producers, respond to peak prices in the United States and the peak production period in the Southern Hemisphere. New Zealand exports to the United States tend to peak in May, with high levels in March and April. Australian exports have been the largest in March and April but are also large in January. The proportion of Australian imports in March and April has been increasing.

#### Conclusions

The decline in the U.S. sheep industry since World War II is not the result of one factor but rather many factors that have compounded each other over time. The sheep industry has become a specialty industry and makes up only 0.6 percent of total U.S. meat consumption. Unless there is a major change in the demand for lamb that would raise returns and attract new producers, the

Figure 21 U.S. fresh lamb imports as a percentage of total





Figure 22 Seasonal patterns of U.S. lamb imports, 1967-88



		East C	Coast		West Coast				
Item	Bone	in	Bonel	ess	Bone	e in	Bonel	ess	U.S.
	Carcass	Cuts	Carcass	Cuts	Carcass	Cuts	Carcass	Cuts	total
		<u>n.</u> ***		Metr	ic_tons				·
Chilled.									
1985									
January	n	n	0	n	n	47 9	n	n	47 9
February	ñ	ñ	ñ	ñ	2.8	47.7	ñ	õ	50.1
March	ů	ñ	ñ	ñ	1 4	85.0	ñ	ñ	86.4
April	ů 0	õ	ñ	Õ	7.7	37.5	ů	0 0	44.7
May	0.6	0.3	ñ	ñ	3.3	22.5	ñ	Õ	26.7
June	2.0	0	ñ	ñ	10.7	55.0	ů Ú	0.8	68.5
July	25.4	2.3	Õ	õ	10.2	33.2	ů	0	71.1
August	22.6	2.4	Õ	õ	18.2	51.9	ů	.2	95.3
September	23.4	10.2	ñ	ñ	24.9	18-2	õ	0	77.1
October	28.0	30.9	õ	õ	41.2	77.0	õ	.1	177.2
November	42.9	41.7	0	0	35.8	67.0	Õ	.1	187.5
December	29.5	11.5	0 0	Ō	46.1	94.7	0	.9	182.7
Year	174.4	99.3	0	0	202.5	636.7	0	2.5	1,115.2
1986									
January	51.6	41 1	n	6.2	67.7	135 1	n	2	301.9
February	57 1	78.9	ů 0	27	64 1	108 7	ñ	6 7	318 2
March	52 1	90.1	ů	5	74.0	210 0	ñ	1 1	437 7
April	44 7	83 1	0		94.8	116 1	0 0	1 3	340.6
May	15 7	13 6	ñ	0.0	92.2	137 3	ő	6	250 4
June	3 0	2.4	ň	ñ	110.0	114 6	ñ	17	232 6
July	0	0	ñ	ñ	137.6	130 4	ů n	1 2	260 2
August	ů N	ñ	ñ	ñ	130.3	138.9	ñ	1.8	271 0
September	ñ	2.7	õ	õ	122.0	176.6	ñ	2.4	303 7
October	ů	6.8	õ	õ	169.5	197.5	ů D	3.5	377 3
November	6.9	1.4	ů	õ	137.8	215.0	õ	0	379.6
December	0	0	Õ	Õ	156.7	249.9	0	18.7	425.3
Year	231.1	338.1	0	0	1,357.6	1,940.0	0	57.7	3,934.5
1987									
January	n	n	Ω	n	138 2	200 2	n	78	355 6
February	ů N	õ	ñ	ň	192 1	177.5	ñ	7.4	377 0
March	ů 0	õ	ñ	õ	419.9	405.7	ñ	33 5	850 1
April	5.3	ñ	0 0	ň	411 1	381 1	ñ	37 7	835 2
May	0	Ő	ñ	ñ	374 6	321.8	ñ	11 4	707.8
June	Ő	õ	Õ	Ō	327.6	278.4	õ	13.5	619.6
July	0	0	0	0	209.0	272.8	0	11.3	494.0
August	0	0	0	0	167.7	222.6	0	8.6	398.9
September	0	0	0	0	151.5	238.0	0	13.0	402.5
October	0	0	0	0	127.4	315.5	0	14.9	457.8
November	0	0	0	0	118.6	271.6	0	23.9	414.1
December	0	0	0	0	45.3	292.3	0	15.3	352.9
Year	5.3	6.0	0	.7	2,683.9	3,386.9	0	198.3	6,275.7
1988 Ionus	0	0	0	0	270 /	200 0	<u>^</u>		F/A A
January	U	U	υ	U	230.4	298.0	U	11.5	540.2
repruary	U A	0	U	0	121.9	422.5	U	21.2	565.6
March	U	0	U	0	15/.9	574.5	U	54.2	786.4
Аргті Мам	U A	U	U	U	204.2	265.2	U	14.6	484.4
мау	0	U	U	U O	112.0	275.0	U	17.6	408.2
June	70	0	U	0	121.0	217.4	U	10.4	555.4
JULY	1.7	U A	0	U n	22.4	129.0	U	6.8	197.6
Sontombon	1 7	0	0	0	23.0	101.7	U C	25.5	228.0
Year 1/	0.2	ñ	0	0	J2.0 1 N44 9	2 / 70 2	0	12.2	102.5
	7.2	U	U	U	1,000.0	2,470.3	U	Cor	o,/וא.1 htinued

## Table 9--Australian lamb exports to the United States

•

See footnotes at end of table

		East (	Coast		West Coast				
Item	Bone	e in	Bonel	ess	Bone	in	Bonel	ess	U.S.
	Carcass	Cuts	Carcass	Cuts	Carcass	Cuts	Carcass	Cuts	total
				Metri	c tons				
Frozen:									
1985									
January	0	6.0	Ω	49.6	n	23.8	n	35.0	115 3
February	7.6	7.3	ň	66.7	ů	31 2	ñ	0 1	17.5
March	21.4	23.3	Ő	49.8	74	47.6	ñ	16 7	166 2
April	0	15.3	9.2	64.4	0	50.9	ñ	52 4	100.2
Mav	1.3	4.4	0	26.8	õ	36.2	õ	4.4	73 1
June	0	10.4	ō	59.2	õ	12.1	õ	27.5	109.2
July	1.3	21.0	Ō	93.9	-1.3 2/	49.2	õ	0	164 1
August	0	27.3	0	64.7	0	39.1	ñ	13 5	144 6
September	1.4	16.6	0	115.9	0	25.1	0	0	159 0
October 5	<b>6 1</b> 0	6.0	Ō	54.7	Õ	47.0	õ	47	112 4
November	0	12.9	0	60.1	Õ	0	Ő	0	73.0
December	3.3	30.7	0	55.1	0	66.7	Ō	ő	155 8
Year	36.3	181.1	9.2	760.9	6.1	428.9	õ	164.2	1,586.7
1986									
January	1.0	21.8	0	66.2	0	12.8	0	21.5	124.3
February	7.6	49.6	0	49.7	0	91.0	0	4.6	202.5
March	14.3	59.3	0	37.4	0	12.4	0	0	123.4
April	7.3	75.1	0	33.6	0	104.5	0	0	220.5
May	7.3	51.3	0	16.7	0	105.7	0	4.6	185.6
June	11.0	10.7	2.8	87.0	0	27.6	0	0	139.1
July	0	32.5	0.3	12.6	0	21.8	0	0	67.2
August	7.7	36.8	0	19.7	0	46.2	0	0	110.4
September	7.2	0.7	16.9	0	0	74.0	0	0	98.8
October	20.3	82.5	0	4.1	2.4	70.1	0	0	179.4
November	13.9	75.8	13.2	21.6	0	44.0	0	0	168.5
December	21.2	74.0	0	0	10.4	190.4	0	0	296.0
Year	118.8	570.1	33.2	348.6	12.8	801.8	0	30.7	1,916.0
1987	15 0	•	<u>^</u>	<u>,</u>	•			_	
January	15.0	0	0	0	0	17.0	0	0	32.0
February	21.4	78.6	0	23.0	7.4	120.9	0	.4	251.7
April	7.0	104.4	0	0	0	155.2	0	0	266.6
Mov	0.0	1/1.2	0	11.1	0	165.1	0	0	367.7
May	0.4	148.5	0	26.7	U	86.3	0	20.0	289.9
July	0.4 75 0	144.0	0	22.8	U	155.3	0	19.1	349.6
August	0	58.0	777	12.0	U 11 7	112.7	0	13.3	325.1
Sentember	/3 7	32.5	33.7	20.0	11.3	121.0	U	47.7	292.3
October	15 1	172 /	0	15 1	20.2	110.9	0	17.6	284.5
November	23.0	90 /	0	12.1	19.8	94.2	U	16.6	333.2
December	2J.9 10 /	77.4	0	8.9 (7.2	U	85.9	U	7.1	225.2
Year	178.2	1,327.2	33.7	33.7	214.0	58.7	0	0 155.6	323.7 3,324.7
1988									-
January	0	155.0	0	17 8	n	00 T	n	n	242 1
February	8.0	158.0	õ	19 3	5 2	94 1	n n	10.2	203.1
March	11.5	267.9	Ő	0	30 5	1167 1	n	21 5	202.0
April	7.4	118.9	ō	0.6	8 6	112 1	n	5 1	470.7
May	14.3	177.6	Ō	0.6	0	131.0	n	11 4	275 0
June	0	105.5	Ō	12.5	õ	159.8	ñ	10 1	7/0 K
July	0	0	Ō	0	ñ	67 3	ñ	10.7	ט. <del>קוי</del> נ 78 ח
August	0	106.0	Ō	17.2	õ	51 9	ñ	12 0	188 0
September	4.3	121.1	Û	12.9	0 0	107.4	õ	35.2	280.0
Year <u>1</u> /	45.5	1,210.0	0	111_4	13.8	981.9	ñ	136 1	2 408 7
-		• • • • •	-				~	150.1	-,470.1

۴

.

## Table 9--Australian lamb exports to the United States--Continued

<u>1</u>/ Year to date <u>2</u>/ Statistical correction. Source: (<u>5</u>).

	198	6	198	37	1988	
Month	Chilled	Frozen	Chilled	Frozen	Chilled	Frozen
			Metric	<u>tons</u>		
January	20	1,091	37	57	53	6
February	66	1,899	25	53	55	96
March	5	539	58	127	88	476
April	22	2,224	55	177	94	469
May	9	356	26	212	59	664
June	35	1,237	49	244	106	732
July	0	350	36	349	67	652
August	25	706	51	325	81	431
September	15	626	40	410	NA	NA
October	7	455	78	239	NA	NA
November	28	334	110	157	NA	NA
December	11	80	43	14	NA	NA
Total	243	10,077	608	2,364	603	3,526

Table 10--New Zealand lamb exports to the United States

NA = Not available.

Source: (20).

Table 11--Australian lamb exports to the United States, year ending June

					С	uts				Total
Period <u>1</u> /	<pre>'eriod <u>1</u>/ Carcass Boneless, manufac- turing</pre>	Boneless, manufac- turing	Legs	Loins	Racks	Should ers	- Breast	Fore- shank	Assorted cuts	carcass and cuts
			-		<u>Metric t</u>	ons				
Total:										
1981/82	223.39	181.35	1.086.71	25.14	64.20	16.37	0	41.61	0	1.638.76
1982/83	192.01	147.93	672.97	146.1	99.59	23.22	0	31.54	0	1,313.39
1983/84	581.72	245.87	594.46	224.49	77.49	39.75	4.18	35.23	0.37	1,740.33
1984/85	166.77	397.21	498.80	242.80	138.09	111.65	0	46.48	.02	1,601.19
1985/86	1,132.06	568.51	1,230.35	470.77	415.39	298.10	2.35	194.22	192.29	4,504.04
1986/87	2,892.41	75.95	2,066.03	882.89	772.62	881.12	41.45	367.82	261.58	8,241.87
1987 <b>/88</b>	2,055.29	120.15	2,946.91	1,050.68	1,043.61	1,246.04	12.80	639.00	283.04	9,397.51
Fresh:										
1981/82	151.09	0	144.43	9.85	.10	16.37	0	0	0	321.84
1982/83	143.55	0	175.60	137.25	.03	4.92	0	0	0	462.35
1983/84	35.81	0	326.08	177.98	1.14	4.57	0	0	0	545.61
1984/85	28.45	1.42	362.03	170.10	.44	1.89	0	.69	0	569.01
1985/86	1,076.02	22.39	829.34	323.11	126.32	129.92	.03	.06	192.12	2,699.30
1986/87	2,729.83	1.18	1,291.39	630.59	451.45	410.83	1.38	3.47	260.71	5,780.82
1987/88	1,777.90	27.13	1,686.08	731.44	622.01	512.86	2.52	18.55	282.92	5,661.40
Frozen:										
1981/82	72.30	181.35	942.28	15.29	64.10	0	0	41.60	0	1.316.92
1982/83	48.46	147.93	497.37	8.87	99.56	18.31	0	31.54	Ō	852.04
1983/84	482.91	245.87	268.18	46.48	76.35	35.18	4.18	35.19	.37	1,194.72
1984/85	138.33	395.79	136.13	72.17	137.66	109.75	0	45.79	.02	1,036.17
1985/86	56.04	546.12	401.01	147.67	289.07	168.18	2.32	194.16	.17	1,804.74
1986/87	162.58	74.76	774.65	252.30	321.17	470.30	40.08	364.35	.87	2,461.04
1987/88	277.39	93.03	1,260.83	319.24	421.60	733.18	10.28	620.45	.11	3,736.11

1/ Period begins July 1 and end June 30 of the next year. Source: (<u>6</u>).

level of production will likely cycle around present levels in the foreseeable future.

The main challenge to the U.S. lamb industry is to expand consumption of a relatively expensive red meat in a market where poultry is capturing more of the red meat market because of lower relative prices. Furthermore, only a small segment of the population consumes lamb, which means that the industry also needs to attract new consumers to expand consumption.

U.S. imports and domestic production of lamb have both declined at about the same rate, indicating that the decline in the lamb industry is not the result of import penetration, but due mainly to a decline in consumer demand. Imports have been countercyclical, attracted into the United States when production declines lead to higher prices.

An increasing proportion of U.S. lamb imports have been fresh product, particularly from Australia. Australia has been an innovator in the delivery of fresh lamb to the United States. The Australians have also been promoting their lamb to U.S. consumers in a much more visible way than the U.S. industry. The Australians appear to be trying to establish a broader consumer base, which in the long run could benefit the U.S. industry.

Most sheep production is located in the Western United States because sheep are one of the few animals that can effectively use the forage in many mountain and arid areas. If sheep are not used to harvest the forage in these areas, these resources will remain idle. In fact, many of the sheep permits on U.S. Government grazing land are idle because sheep producers are leaving the industry.

ERS costs and returns information indicates that stock sheep

Year	Exports	Imports	Year	Exports	Imports
	1,000	) head		1,00	0 head
1970	133	12	1980	124	21
1971	214	5	1981	221	7
1972	159	14	1982	281	9
1973	204	10	1983	221	16
1974	291	1	1984	317	24
1975	339	3	1985	363	22
1976	244	5	1986	122	28
1977	205	9	1987	42	33
1978	142	11	1988	175	37
1979	125	9			

Table 12--U.S. live sheep and lamb imports and exports

production has been profitable more often than domestic cattle production, on an equivalent resource base. This indicates that sheep require higher returns than cattle to attract the intensity of management necessary in sheep production. Management and labor problems persist in the industry because sheep are susceptible to disease and predators. Because sheep are excellent foragers in arid areas, sheep tending is a lonely existence that does not appeal to many people.

Sheep producers have confronted the problem of labor intensity by reducing the amount of labor required to produce a pound of lamb and by increasing the weights of lambs slaughtered. This has been done through genetics and feedlot finishing.

The sheep industry has benefited from U.S. Government programs. In 1987, 17 percent of stock sheep receipts were Government payments from the wool program. In many years, the wool program has been the difference between profits and losses for the U.S. sheep industry.

Lamb has become a specialty product in the United States. Per capita consumption of lamb was 1.2 pounds in 1988, less than 0.6 percent of meat and poultry consumption. As the infrastructure of the industry shrinks, small-scale production and distribution tend to increase the costs of processing live animals into meat. Such costs are generally borne by both consumers and producers. It is important to know that U.S. imports have declined along with U.S. production in the domestic market, indicating that the industry's problem is a lack of a consumer base. The lamb industry will likely need to consider the costs and benefits of increasing the promotion of its product to attract a broader consumer base.

The industry has adjusted to a long-term decline unmatched by any other livestock sector. Producers' returns have consistently been positive in recent years, and marketing facilities and slaughtering plants have been adjusted to gain scale economies for a declining industry.

#### References

- (1) American Sheep Producers Council. <u>U.S. Sheep Industry</u> <u>Market Situation Report</u>. Various issues, 1987-88.
- (2) American Sheep Producers Council. "Outlook of the Sheep and Lamb Industry." 1988.
- (3) Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics. <u>Quarterly Review of the Rural Economy</u>. Various issues, 1985-88.
- (4) Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics. "Financial Performance of Australian Farms," <u>Farm Survey Report</u>. Apr. 1988.
- (5) Australian Meat and Live-stock Corporation. <u>Annual</u> <u>Report</u>. Various issues, 1983-88.
- (6) Australian Meat and Live-stock Corporation. <u>Statistical</u> <u>Review of Livestock and Meat Industries</u>. Various issues, 1984-86.
- Collins, Keith, and John Lawler. <u>Wool and Mohair:</u> <u>Background for 1985 Farm Legislation</u>. AIB-466. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., Sept. 1984.
- (8) Commonwealth Secretariat, International Wool Textile Organization and International Wool Study Group. <u>Wool</u> <u>Statistics, 1987-88</u>. ISSN 0260-216. June 1988.
- (9) Ensminger, M.E. <u>Animal Science</u>, 5th ed. The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Danville, IL, 1978.
- (10) Gee, C. Kerry. <u>Enterprise Budgets for Sheep Management</u> <u>Systems Western United States, 1982</u>. ANRE Information Report IR:85-8. Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, CO, Dec. 1985.
- (11) Gee, C. Kerry, and David L. Briskey. <u>Effects of</u> <u>Reductions in Federal Grazing Permits on Sheep Ranch</u> <u>Value and Borrowing Capacity</u>. Experiment Station Bulletin 583S, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, CO, May 1982.
- (12) Gee, C. Kerry, and others. <u>Sheep and Lamb Losses to</u> <u>Predators and Other Causes in the Western United</u> <u>States</u>. AER-369. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., Apr. 1977.
- (13) Gee, C. Kerry, and Albert G. Madsen. <u>Sheep Production</u> <u>in the 17 Western States</u>. ERS Special Series 24. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., Apr. 1983.

- (14) Gee, C. Kerry, Albert G. Madsen, and Leland Southard. "Lamb Feeding in the Western States," <u>Livestock and</u> <u>Poultry Situation and Outlook Report</u>. LPS-20. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., May 1986.
- (15) Hamilton, Diana R. "Competitiveness Analysis of the United States Sheep Industry in Comparison to Australia and New Zealand." Report to U.S. International Trade Commission, fall 1987.
- (16) Huang, Kuo S. <u>U.S. Demand for Food: A Complete System</u> of Price and Income Effects. TB-1714. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., Dec. 1985.
- (17) Kruse, Jamie L., C. Kerry Gee, and Albert G. Madsen. <u>Farm Flock Sheep Management Systems</u>. Experiment Station Bulletin 589S, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, CO, 1982.
- (18) Luskin, David. "Estimation of Supply Response in the Australian Sheep Industry." Report to the Wool Research Trust Fund and The Australian Meat and Livestock Research and Development Council, Project No. 21372, Oct. 1988.
- (19) National Research Council. <u>Designing Foods: Animal</u> <u>Product Options in the Marketplace</u>. National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1988.
- (20) New Zealand Meat and Wool Boards Economic Service. <u>Annual Review of the New Zealand Sheep and Beef</u> <u>Industry</u>. Multiple issues.
- (21) Sheep Industry Development Program, Inc., <u>Sheepman's</u> <u>Production Handbook</u>. Abegg Printing Co., Denver, CO, 1986.
- (22) Smith, G.C. "Designing Sheep--Improving the Leanness of Lamb," <u>Agriculture Update Program for Legislative</u> <u>Aides</u>. National Wool Growers Association, Inc., San Angelo, TX, Oct. 1988.
- (23) Stillman, Richard, Mark Weimar, and Larry Duewer. "Changes in the Supply and Utilization Series for Red Meat and Poultry," <u>Livestock and Poultry Situation and</u> <u>Outlook Report</u>. LPS-28. U.S. Dept. Agr., Econ. Res. Serv., Feb. 1988.
- (24) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. <u>Cotton and Wool Situation and Outlook Report</u>. Various issues, 1985-88.
- (25) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. <u>Livestock and Meat Statistics</u>. Various issues, 1957-83.

- (26) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. <u>Pacific Rim: Agriculture and Trade Report</u>. RS-88-3. Aug. 1988.
- (27) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. <u>World Livestock Situation</u>. FL&P 2-88. Oct. 1988.
- (28) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. <u>Grazing</u> <u>Statistical Summary FY 1987</u>. 1987.
- (29) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. <u>Grazing Fee Review and Evaluation: A Report From The</u> <u>Secretary of Agriculture and The Secretary of the</u> <u>Interior</u>. Report of the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, Feb. 1986.
- (30) U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. <u>Agricultural Prices</u>. Various issues, 1980-88.
- (31) U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. <u>Cold Storage</u>. Various issues, 1980-89.
- (32) U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. <u>Livestock Slaughter</u>. Various issues, 1980-89.
- (33) U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. <u>Production, Disposition, and</u> <u>Income</u>. Various issues, 1980-88.
- (34) U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. <u>Sheep and Goats</u>. Various issues, 1980-89.
- (35) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Packers and Stockyards Administration. <u>Packers and Stockyards' Statistical</u> <u>Report</u>. Various issues, 1984-87.
- (36) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Packers and Stockyards Administration. <u>Slaughter Lamb Marketing: A Study of</u> <u>the Lamb Industry</u>. P&SA Research Report. Jan. 1987.
- (37) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Packers and Stockyards Administration, and Economic Research Service. <u>The</u> <u>Lamb Industry: An Economic Study of Marketing</u> <u>Structure, Practices, and Problems</u>. P&SA Research Report No. 2. May 1973.
- (38) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. <u>1982</u> <u>Census of Agriculture</u>. Oct. 1985.

- (39) Usman, Mohammad, and C. Kerry Gee. <u>Prices and Demand</u> <u>for Lamb in the United States</u>. Experiment Station Technical Bulletin 132. Colorado State Univ. Fort Collins, CO, Jan. 1977.
- (40) Whipple, Glen D., and Dale J. Menkhaus. "An Econometric Investigation of the Demand for Lamb," <u>Sheep Industry</u> <u>Development Program Research Journal</u>. Vol. 5, No. 1, winter 1988.

Wool is a joint product of the sheep industry, along with lamb and mutton. Wool receipts annually accounted for 25-35 percent of stock sheep receipts. The largest proportion of these wool receipts are payments from a U.S. Government support program that has been in effect since 1954. Government payments for wool have helped to improve the profitability of the sheep industry, likely slowing, but not stopping, the industry's decline.

## Trends in Domestic Wool Production

U.S. wool production has declined proportionally to the decline in the U.S. sheep inventories. Unlike lamb production, wool production has shown no significant gain in output per animal. The domestic wool production record was 338 million pounds in 1942. In 1988, the amount was 90.4 million pounds, less than a fourth of the peak production.

Domestic wool production has also declined as a percentage of domestic use. U.S. imports of raw wool were approximately twice that of domestic production in 1988. The biggest effect has been on imports of wool fabric. Wool fabric imports were more than double raw wool products on an equivalent basis in 1988 (24).

Domestic wool prices during the past few years have been increasing, as demand increased in the international market. Factors affecting wool prices are fashion, relative fiber prices, price variability, and overall economic activity (7).

Domestic wool prices have been supported by various U.S. Government programs since 1938 (7). The Agricultural Act of 1954 (Title VII) provided for the present wool and mohair support program, as renewed under each farm law. A base rate of 0.62per pound was established by the law. The Food and Agricultural Act of 1965 introduced a formula that adjusts the base rate. This rate is adjusted by the ratio of the average parity index (as calculated by USDA and published in <u>Agricultural Prices</u>) for the preceding 3 years divided by the average parity index for the period 1958 (29). The ratio for the 1988 support price uses the 1985-87 parity indexes.

Actual payments to producers depend on the price that they have received for their wool. A payment rate is established by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service by a formula. This formula bases the payment rate for wool on the percentage that the support price exceeds the market price. For example, the support price for 1987 was \$1.81 per pound and the average farm price received by farmers was \$0.917. This resulted in a payment rate of 97.4 percent ((\$1.81/\$0.917)-1). A producer receiving \$3.00 a pound for wool would receive \$2.92 per pound in payments, less the promotion fee. Payments to producers under the program in 1987 were \$65 million, less \$4 million for promotion.

#### Appendix B--World Sheep Production

The United States has a very small sheep industry, compared with many other countries (app. table 1). In 1987, the United States ranked 13th among the major sheep-producing countries, with an inventory of 10 million head. Australia was the largest with 159 million head, followed by the USSR. China had the third largest sheep population with approximately 108 million head, and New Zealand was the fourth largest with 69 million head.

Many of the leading sheep-producing countries are also major wool-producing countries (app. table 2). Australia is by far the largest wool-producing country. In the marketing year October 1987 to September 1988, Australia produced 917,000 metric tons of wool, which was almost twice the level of the next highest producer, the USSR, with 477,000 metric tons. New Zealand was the third largest producer with 355,000 metric tons during this period. China was the fourth largest producer, 208,000 metric tons. The United States is the 14th largest wool producer in the world.

Countries with large per capita sheep populations have become large exporters of lamb and mutton (app. table 3). New Zealand was the largest exporter of lamb, mutton, and goat (481,000 metric tons) in the world in 1988. Australia was the second largest exporter with 237,000 metric tons. The European Community (EC) was the third largest exporter of lamb, mutton, and goat; however, a great deal of this trade was intra-EC.

Country	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
	······································		<u>1,000</u>	head		
United States	11,487	10,443	9,983	10,334	10,774	11,000
Argentina	33,938	29,441	29,243	28,998	29,202	29,502
Uruguay	23,337	22,777	24,808	25,707	27,365	28,420
European						
Community Belgium-	57,275	52,218	54,051	54,705	56,567	57,922
Luxembourg	120	134	147	149	151	153
Denmark	38	40	52	70	73	90
France	11,882	11,580	11,241	10,580	10,360	9,986
West Germany	1,218	1,300	1,296	1,383	1,414	1,449
Greece	9,962	10,029	10,122	10,000	10,512	10,694
Ireland	2,537	2,690	2,774	2,917	3,252	3,38/
Italy	10,745	11,098	11,300	11,451	11,48/	11,500
Netherlands	766	814	868	985	2 100	2 210
Portugal	2,493	2,743	3,000	3,118	3,100	18 000
Spain United Vingdom	17,554	17,520	24 540	25 976	27 820	29 000
United Kingdom	1 23,317	23,940	24,540	23,970	27,020	27,000
Eastern Europe:						
Bulgaria	10,978	10,500	9,724	9,563	8,886	8,975
Czechoslovakia	a 1,041	1,068	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087
East Germany	2,359	2,528	2,587	2,647	2,710	2,700
Hungary	2,977	2,832	2,465	2,337	2,336	2,310
Poland	2,493	3,920	4,112	4,300	4,075	4,0/5
Romania	18,451	18,637	18,609	18,762	18,900	19,400
Yugoslavia	7,459	7,679	7,693	7,819	/,824	7,899
USSR	145,265	142,876	140,850	142,210	140,783	142,000
Turkey	47,650	47,772	47,000	43,500	40,000	36,500
Egypt	1,157	1,450	1,500	1,550	1,650	1,685
South Africa	31,265	30,256	29,481	29,728	29,640	30,155
India	51,130	52 <b>,</b> 770	54,460	55,482	51,684	50,986
Australia	139,242	149,747	155,561	158,800	164,590	171,310
New Zealand	70,263	69,739	67,854	69,204	64,244	64,800
China <u>2</u> /	95,200	94,200	100,500	107,800		

Appendix table 1--World sheep and lamb inventories 1/

--- = Not available.

1/ Data for 1988 are preliminary; data for 1989 are forecast. 2/ Commonwealth Secretariat ( $\underline{8}$ ). Source: (27).

i

•

Country	1977-82 average	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
			1,000 gr	easy met	ric tons		
Australia	702	702	728	814	830	887	917
New Zealand	347	371	364	373	358	350	355
United Kingdo	m 49	50	54	56	58	59	62
India	35	35	35	35	35	30	33
Lesotho	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Canada	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Falkland Isla	nds 2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Other		-	-	-	2		5
Commonwealth	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Argentina	170	162	162	150	152	150	152
South Africa	105	113	108	105	98	90	92
United States	49	49	47	44	41	39	40
Uruguay	69	82	82	71	87	90	90
Turkey	59	62	62	60	61	61	61
Spain	28	30	31	32	31	32	32
Brazil	30	28	25	30	28	28	30
Pakistan	37	41	45	48	49	50	51
France	24	25	25	24	24	24	24
Chile	20	22	21	21	21	20	22
Iran	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Morocco	18	13	16	15	15	15	15
Iraq	18	18	17	17	17	17	18
Yuqoslavia	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Italy	12	13	13	13	13	13	14
Portugal	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Peru	11	12	12	12	12	12	12
Ireland	8	7	7	7	7	8	
Greece	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
West Germanv	5	5	5			6	6
Other Asia	60	63	64	66	61	69	69
Other Africa	71	71	74	86	94	93	93
Other America	20	21	21	21	22	21	21
Other Western	20			21	22	21	21
Europe	10	11	11	11	12	10	.12
USSR	470	474	485	488	468	102	12
Romania	36	39	39	400	400	492	42// ///
Bulgaria	35	35	36	36	31	33	44
Hungary	11	13	13	12	11	11	10
Poland	13	12	13	15	17	10	10
East Germany	11	13	12	15	15	16	19
Czechoslovaki	 -	10	12	10	10	TO	τo
and Albania	- 7	Q	Q	0	0	0	0
China	160	202	19/	0 102	0	0 100	8 200
Mongolia	200	202	194 20	20 TO2	1/0 1/0	10	208
	20	<b>21</b>	20	20	ТЭ	19	19

Source:  $(\underline{8})$ .

Year	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
		<u>1,0</u>	00 metric tons	carcass weight		
Production:			-		~~	<b>0</b> /
Argentina	95	92	86	82	83	80
Australia	450	552	584	591	589	619
Bulgaria	103	112	113	110	110	110
China	586	593	620	690	800	880
EC-12	908	914	881	997	1,045	1,074
India	48	499	517	486	531	222
New Zealand	667	727	611	585	572	200
Other countries	357	371	407	381	382	392
South Africa	231	219	198	201	203	205
Turkey	375	380	385	382	380	373
United States	172	162	153	145	151	100
USSR	866	880	894	905	810	915
Imports:						202
EC-12	278	301	296	620	317	327
Intra-EC	200	221	197	203	199	199
Japan	149	159	159	153	155	160
Korea	11	15	14	16	18	19
Other countries	8	21	14	12	10	11
United States	9	16	19	20	25	27
USSR	30	21	26	35	35	35
Exports:						05.0
Australia	129	168	221	207	257	250
Bulgaria	_7	7	4	4		12
EC-12	77	90	101	119	136	155
India	52	35	35	22	20	10
Korea	23	21	15	13	14	15
Other countries	44	39	58	39	40	55
New Zealand	528	544	522	490	481	431
Romania	23	21	50 (F	50	50	30
Turkey United States	47 1	40	45 1	45 1	45 1	45 1
0						
Lonsumption:	70	90	74	75	75	77
Argentina	79	700	70	797	75	740
Australia	307	302	204	202	330	J07 91
Bulgaria	81	89 507	87	01 400	800	880
	200	272	020	090	1 227	1 2/2
	1,119	1,110	1,094 E00	1,197	1,22J E17	520
	428	4/0	JUZ	4/3	217	140
Japan Navi Zanland	122	100	102	100	νοι ¢ο	100
New Zealand	100	1/0	001	57 200	76	7C 207
SOUTH ATFICA	231	217	200	203	200	207
Turkey	323	330	340 171	333	202 175	101
UNITED STATES	102	1/4	171	104	175	0/0
022K	070	901	AIA	ACA	744	749

## Appendix table 3--Lamb, mutton, and goat meat supply and use

Source: (27).

#### Appendix C--Australian and New Zealand Sheep Production

As in the United States, Australian and New Zealand sheep producers use sheep to harvest forage that might otherwise go unused. Australian sheep production is located in semi-arid areas where sheep excel at foraging. Sheep producers in Australia, like those in the United States, tend also to be in the cattle and crop business. New Zealand, on the other hand, is not as arid as Australia but has a large supply of grass that producers use for both sheep and cattle.

## Australia

Australia has the largest sheep population in the world. They forage on a large area of semi-arid land ideally suited to sheep production, much like parts of the Western United States. The major difference between the U.S. and Australian sheep industries is the dependence on wool production by the Australian sheep producers. Wool is by far the major product and source of revenue for the Australian sheep industry.

## Australian Sheep Production

Australian sheep producers tend to have multienterprise farms. Wool is by far the largest receipt category of the Australian sheep producer, accounting for 66 percent of their receipts in 1986-87 (app. table 4). During 1953-84 on average, wool sales accounted for 41 percent of the receipts of a sheep farm; sheep, 14 percent; wheat, 26 percent; cattle, 8.5 percent; and other crops, 7.5 percent (<u>18</u>).

Lamb and mutton exports are a major use of domestic sheep production in Australia. Australia exported approximately 40 percent of its lamb and mutton production in 1988 (27). Because of the dependence of the Australian sheep industry on wool production, mutton exports are larger than lamb exports. The largest market for mutton is the Middle East and Japan. Lamb exports in 1988 were only 32 percent of the total Australian lamb and mutton exports (app. table 5). Lamb exports go mainly to the Middle East and the United States. The U.S. share of the Australian lamb export market has increased during the past 4 years. The U.S. share of Australian lamb exports in 1988 was about 19 percent.

Australians, on average, ate 49 pounds of lamb and mutton (carcass weight basis) in 1988 (27). This is approximately 30 times the per capita consumption of lamb in the United States. This indicates that there is a domestic market for lamb and mutton in Australia that does not exist in the United States.

## New Zealand

The New Zealand sheep industry differs from the Australian sheep industry to a great extent because of climatic differences. New Zealand has a much more lush vegetation than does Australia, and the New Zealanders use sheep to harvest this vegetation. The

Item	Unit	1985-86	1986-87	
Total farm area as of June 30	Hectares	6,095	6,737	
Wheat sown	do.	10	8	
Sheep carried as of June 30	Number	3,941	3,954	
Beef cattle carried as of June	e 30 do.	54	60	
Area harvested:				
Wheat	Hectares	4	7	
Other grains	do.	13	11	
Wheat harvested	Metric tons	7	10	
Sheep sold	Number	1,381	1,235	
Beef cattle sold	do.	27	21	
Sheep and lambs shorn	do.	4,404	4,249	
Wool produced	Kilograms	18,223	18,302	
Labor used	Weeks	106	NA	
Cash receipts:				
Sales				
Sheep	Aus\$	21,322	24,860	
Beef cattle	do.	8,345	6,930	
Other livestock	do.	363	710	
Wool	do.	63,059	73 <b>,</b> 550	
Wheat	do.	890	1,140	
Other crops	do.	2,503	1,500	
Off-farm sharefarming	do.	490	200	
Off-farm contracts	do.	1,717	1,510	
Other income	do.	1,733	1,500	
Total cash receipts	do.	100,422	111,900	
Cash costs:				
Purchases				
Sheep	do.	6,703	8,740	
Beef cattle	do.	1,462	2,000	
Hired labor	do.	5,178	3,120	
Sharing and crutching	do.	8,353	8,010	
Materials	do.	23,388	23,890	
Services	do.	21,623	22,170	
Interest	do.	11,806	10,260	
Rent	do.	1,186	1,170	
Payment to sharefarmers	do.	89	290	
Other cash costs	do.	725	530	
Total cash costs	do.	80,512	80,180	
Farm cash operation surplus	do.	19,910	31,720	
NA = Net available	<u></u>			

Appendix table 4--Australian sheep farm survey results, per farm

NA = Not available. Source:  $(\underline{4})$ . .

Exports/ destination	1984/85	1985/86	1986/87	1987/88
		<u>1,000 me</u>	tric tons	
Lamb:				
Middle East	16.4	20.6	21.5	17.1
United States	1.6	4.5	8.2	9.4
Japan	5.9	8.1	6.3	4.9
EC	.3	.6	5.2	3.9
Canada	.5	1.3	2.1	1.9
Other	.5	8.8	9.5	11.7
Total	32.4	49.3	52.9	48.9
Mutton:				
Middle East	21.3	34.9	40.3	27.5
Japan	.2	29.1	26.1	27.4
Malaysia/Singapore	6.4	6.1	8.7	8.3
EC	10.1	7.0	7.5	6.2
United States	.6	2.4	4.4	6.0
Other	8.2	14.8	23.1	28.8
Total	66.6	94.3	110.1	104.2

#### Appendix table 5--Australian lamb export, year ending June 30

Source: (5).

climatic differences have resulted in the New Zealand producers using different breeds of sheep. New Zealand breeds are meattype sheep that produce a coarser wool. Hence, New Zealanders rely more on meat products for their livelihood.

New Zealand sheep production is usually a joint enterprise with a cattle operation. Sheep meat and wool returns were roughly equivalent until 1985-86 (app. table 6). After this period, wool receipts increased, while sheep receipts dropped off. Part of the reason for the shipment of live sheep from New Zealand to the United States in 1988 is the low prices New Zealand producers have been receiving for their lambs.

New Zealand is the largest exporter of lamb and mutton in the world. Exports of lamb were 89 percent of domestic production from October 1986 to September 1987. USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service estimates that New Zealand exports of lamb, mutton, and goat for 1988 were about 858 million pounds (carcass weight) or 93 percent of domestic production. New Zealand, unlike Australia, produces more lamb for export than mutton, reconfirming the reliance on meat production as opposed to wool production for their domestic industry. The United States made up less than 1 percent of New Zealand lamb exports in 1987 (app. table 7). As in Australia, domestic consumption of lamb and mutton is fairly high on a per capita basis in New Zealand. New Zealand domestic per capita consumption of lamb was 13.8 kilograms (30.4 pounds) and mutton was 26.2 kilograms (57.8 pounds) in 1987.

Year	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
		1	New Zealand dollar	<u>s</u>	
Income:					
Wool	38,448	46,954	42,400	48,800	54,900
Sheep	36,154	44,411	24,957	31,500	28,700
Cattle	14,023	21,745	18,824	19,900	18,900
Deer	-403	121	899	1,000	1,400
Goat	26	300	181	300	200
Crop	14,205	16,444	15,589	13,200	11,700
Other	2,322	2,648	3,469	2,700	2,800
Total gross income	104,775	132,623	106,319	117,400	118,600
Expenditures:					
Fertilizer, lime, and seeds	10,801	14,146	8,201	8,900	8,700
Repairs and maintenance	8,539	9,387	7,142	6,300	6,600
Interest	16,305	17,736	21,509	24,600	25,700
Other	50,639	57,146	54,128	54,900	56,900
Total farm expenditures	86,284	98,415	90,980	94,700	97,900
Net farm income	18,491	34,208	15,339	22,700	20,700

Appendix table 6--New Zealand sheep and beef farm income and expenditures per farm

Source: (20).

Appendix table 7--New Zealand meat production and consumption, year ending September 1/

		1987						
Meat Quantity	Produ	ction	Consumpti	on	1988			
	Quantity	Share of total	Quantity	Per capita	production estimates			
	1,000	Boncont	1,000	Kilogromo	1,000			
<b>-</b> <i>i</i>		reitent	metric tons					
Beet	540.0	44.7	134.9	37.8	537.2			
Veal	15.1	1.2	1.8	.5	15.2			
Mutton	203.3	16.8	86.7	26.2	188.6			
Lamb	406.6	33.6	45.5	13.8	418.0			
Pigmeat	44.4	3.7	46.9	14.2	44.6			
Total	1,209.4	100.0	315.8	92.5	1,203.6			

 $\frac{1}{20}$  Meat quantity is bone-in carcass weight. Source: ( $\frac{20}{20}$ ).

## *Livestock and Poultry Update* gives you up-to-the-minute information.

Each month the *Livestock and Poultry Update* brings you ERS' most up-to-the-minute data on the livestock and poultry sector. This useful 6-page update brings you the most current figures, *delivered by first-class mail to ensure timely delivery.* 

The *Livestock and Poultry Update* looks at commercial production and slaughter, livestock and meat prices, costs and returns, and livestock and poultry imports and exports, all on a monthly basis.

A 1-year subscription to the *Livestock and Poultry Update* costs just \$15. Or save by ordering a 2-year subscription (that's 24 issues) for \$29, or a 3-year subscription for \$42.

## Situation and Outlook Commodity Reports give you the facts . . . and the forecasts!

These reports provide both current intelligence and historical data on national food and agricultural developments. They also forecast the effects of changing conditions and policies on domestic and international agriculture.

Who uses *Situation and Outlook Commodity Reports*? Farmers and trade associations, agriindustries and financial institutions, Federal, State, local, and foreign governments, news media, food service industries, and research and academic facilities all look to these reports as the most reliable source of up-to-date information.

These reports tell you what's affecting land values, production costs, farm finances, world trade, and energy for Aquaculture, Cotton and Wool, Dairy, Feed, Fruit and Tree Nuts, Livestock and Poultry, Oil Crops, Rice, Sugar and Sweetener, Tobacco, Vegetables and Specialties, and Wheat.

The cost is just \$12 for a 1-year subscription per title. Or save by ordering a 2-year subscription for \$23, or a 3-year subscription for \$33. (A subscription to *Livestock and Poultry Situation and Outlook* report runs \$17 for a 1-year subscription; \$33 for a 2-year subscription; and \$48 for a 3-year subscription.)

## Call toll free, 1-800-999-6799 in the U.S. and Canada; other areas, please call 301-725-7937. Or write, ERS-NASS, P.O. Box 1608, Rockville, MD 20849-1608

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE 1301 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4788

.