

2004 NATIONAL DISTILLERS GRAINS SUMMARY SURVEY OF ETHANOL PRODUCERS

Released by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), Iowa State Statistical Office, U.S. Department of Agriculture. For more information call (515) 284-4340, office hours 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. CT.

Of the ethanol-producing plants that responded:

- The average ethanol production capacity was more than 31 million gallons per year.
- The average year ethanol production began was 1989.
- Fifty-two percent of the plants were farmer owned, with an average of 627 farmers involved in the ownership.
- Seventy-eight percent of the ethanol was produced from corn, with an average usage of nearly 11.0 million bushels per year.
- Nearly 23% of the ethanol was produced from something other than corn.
- Nearly 5% of the plants de-germ the corn as a part of their processing.
- Thirty percent of the plants had a minimum order requirement for their distillers grains. The average minimum order requirement was 9.8 tons.
- Eighty-two percent of the plants had distillers grains standards for their products.

Distillers Grains Produced

Type	Number of Plants Reporting		Percent Moisture		Average Tons Produced Per Year Per Plant		Total Tons Produced by Those Reporting		Average Price Charged Per Ton	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
	(Number)		(Percent)		(Tons)		(Tons)		(Dollars)	
Condensed Distillers Solubles	7	11	58	70	28,115	18,691	196,804	205,596	19	17
Distillers Dried Grains ¹										
Distillers Dried Grains with Solubles	22	15	11	11	73,854	74,519	1,624,809	1,043,269	85	97
Distillers Wet Grains	13	10	66	64	86,928	137,511	1,130,066	1,237,600	27	26
Distillers Dried Solubles ¹										
Wet Distillers Grains with Solubles	4	7	50	56	126,159	132,046	504,635	924,321	38	32

¹ Insufficient data.

Percent of Distillers Grains Distributed By Marketing Channels (Initial Point of Sale)

Livestock Feeders		Feed Companies		Local Elevators		Broker		Exported	
2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)	
44	56	19	18	8	10	29	14	0	2

Percent of Distillers Grains Sold, By Contract Type

Spot		Yearly		Monthly		Quarterly		6-Month		Clock		No Contract	
2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)	
38	18	NA	20	10	15	10	13	9	12	11	10	19	13

NA = Not available.

Relative Importance of Distillers Grains Product Qualities to Their Customers¹

	2002		2003	
Consistent Product	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7
Quality Product	4.7	4.0	4.2	3.4
Protein Content	4.0	3.0	3.4	3.7
Shelf Life	3.0	3.4	3.6	4.0
Freshness	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.0
Color	3.6	3.7	4.0	4.0
Moisture	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.3
Handling Ease	3.7	NA	4.3	4.0
Price	NA	NA	4.3	4.0
Mold	NA	NA	4.0	4.0

¹ Operators were asked to rate the relative importance of each product quality to their customers from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Most Important).

NA = Not available.

Relative Importance of Plant Services to Their Customers¹

Reliability of Deliveries		Availability of Supply		Contracting		Comparative Value		Inventory Control		Technical Service	
2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
4.3	4.3	4.5	4.6	3.0	3.4	3.9	4.1	3.4	3.4	NA	3.0

¹ Operators were asked to rate the relative importance of each plant service to their customers from 1 (Least Important) to 5 (Most Important).

NA = Not available.

2004 NATIONAL DISTILLERS GRAINS SUMMARY SURVEY OF ETHANOL PRODUCERS

Marketing of Distillers Grains

Company (In-House)		Marketing Company		Feed Mill	
2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)	
31	50	76	59	7	0

Percent With Consumer Services Offered To Distillers Grains Customers

Nutritionist Service		Delivery Services		Variety of Products		Consumer Education		On-Site Consultation		None	
2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)		(Percent)	
31	38	48	33	14	29	38	33	31	24	17	38

Transportation of DRY Distillers Grains, 2003

	Percent of Plants Using Transportation Mode	Percent of Product Hauled By This Mode	Average Miles to Delivery	Average Transportation Costs Per Ton
	(Percent)	(Percent)	(Miles)	(Dollars)
Paid by Plant				
Rail	100	16	1,550	30
Truck	67	10	82	4
Barge ¹				
Paid by Buyer				
Rail	50	16	1,813	40
Truck	100	58	133	7

¹Insufficient data.

Transportation of WET Distillers Grains, 2003

	Percent of Plants Using Transportation Mode	Percent of Product Hauled By This Mode	Average Miles to Delivery	Average Transportation Costs Per Ton
	(Percent)	(Percent)	(Miles)	(Dollars)
Paid by Plant				
Rail	0			
Truck	100	23	61	4
Barge	0			
Paid by Buyer				
Rail	0			
Truck	100	77	60	4

Feed Ingredient Definitions – Source: Association of American Feed Control Officials

- ◆ **CDS – Condensed Distillers Solubles** is obtained after the removal of ethyl alcohol by distillation from the yeast fermentation of corn by condensing the thin stillage fraction to a semi-solid.
- ◆ **DDG – Distillers Dried Grains** is obtained after the removal of ethyl alcohol by distillation from the yeast fermentation of corn by separating the resultant coarse grain fraction of the whole stillage and drying it.
- ◆ **DDGS – Distillers Dried Grains with Solubles** is the product obtained after removal of ethyl alcohol by distillation from the yeast fermentation of corn by condensing and drying at least ¾ of the solids of the resultant whole stillage.
- ◆ **DDS – Distillers Dried Solubles** is obtained after the removal of ethyl alcohol by distillation from the yeast fermentation of corn by condensing the thin stillage fraction and drying it.
- ◆ **DWG – Distillers Wet Grains** is the product obtained after the removal of ethyl alcohol by distillation from the yeast fermentation of corn.
- ◆ **WDGS – At the time of publication, a definition for this feed ingredient was not available.**

Survey Methodology: The office of Renewable Fuels and Co-Products, IDALS provided the Iowa Agricultural Statistics Service a list of ethanol producers. The list of 86 businesses were each mailed a questionnaire followed by a second request nearly two weeks later. A telephone follow-up of non-respondents was then conducted. Some companies that were ethanol producers were contacted, but did not feel their co-products fit the survey definition. There were 25 completed reports. Each returned questionnaire was hand edited for reasonableness, in addition to a computer edit. Data inconsistencies were clarified by re-contacting the firm by telephone. The data was then summarized using a PC statistical analysis software program.