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## INTRODUCTION

The Division of Agricultural Economics of the University of Minnesota in cooperation with the United St?tes Departmont of Agriculture made survey of 120 dairy forms in enst central Minnesotn the post summer. ${ }^{(1)}$ In addition to information covering the receipts and expenses of the frm, considerable drto covering erop and livestock orgnnization, labor expended on the dniry hord, crop and livestock practices, building and machinery cquipment, and soil conservetion needs and practices were obtained. These recrrds envered the yenr ending April 30, 1936. This peport is designed primerily for the purpose of presenting somo of the results of this study for the benefit of the formers who so generously grive of their time at a very busy season of the yenr. In the roports sent to these fermers onch individual's figures are written into the column hoodod "your f'rm". For onch itom the ayerages for the entire group and for the most successful and the lenst successful formers rere given. This should enable each individunl cooper ting in this study to gee how he compares with his neighbros in the success with which he operates the verious parts of his form business as well as to indic te some of the factors nocounting for his success or his feilure to chieve it. Addition l reports of other phases of this survey study will appenr it later dates.
(1) A similar survey wis mad on 130 driry ferms in southeastern Minnesota. An nnlysis of the farm businesses for those 130 frrms, in a mancr similar to that used in this report, is presented in Vimeogrephed Report No. 79

This Survey is a part of the general study of interregional competition in dairying, which is under the supervision of Sherman Johnson of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics at Washington, D. C. The collection of the data and analysis of the records are under the direction of G. A. Pond and W. P. Ranney of the Division of Agficultural Economics, University of Minnesota. The data were collected by the following agents representing both the United States Department of Agricultural and the University of Minnesota: Raymond Burkholder, Clarence Herming, Raymond W. Palmby, and Harold Peterson. B. R. Hurt of the United States Department of Agriculture assisted in checking the records.

Hearty support and assistance were rendered by the county agricultural agents Walter Boekke and Max McMillan. The agricultural Extension Division of the University of Minnesota is cooperating in the publication and distribution of this report.

## LOCATION OF AREA

The farms surveycd are loceted in the south central part of Kanabec County, the southehstern part of MilleLacs County and the southwestern corner of Pine County. The logation of the farms by townships is as follows:

| Kanabec County |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Township | No. of |
|  | farms |
| Brunswick | 17 |
| Arthur | 14 |
| Comfort | 5 |
| Grass Lake | 2 |


| Mille Lacs | County |
| :--- | :--- |
| Township | No. of |
| farms |  |
| Bogus Brook | 32 |
| Borgholm | 10 |

Pine County

| No. of |
| :--- |
| Township farms |


| Royalton | 39 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rock Creek | 1 |

## TYPE OF FARMING

The farms included in this survey are livestock farms on which dairy cattle are the principal source of income. The buttorfat is sold as cream for manufacture into butter, principally through farmer owned cooperative creameries specializing in the manufacture of high quality butter. The skimmilk is retained on the farm and fed to the cows, fifes and poultry. On many farms much of the skimmilk is wasted as the supply is greater than can bo used to advantage: in feeding the livestock on hand.

The principal crops grown are corn, onts, berley, and hay. These crops are raised primarily as livestock feed. Potatoes ere grown to a limited extent as a cash crop.

This report shows that the receipts from the seles of dairy products constituted over half of the aversge cash income of the 120 fscmers included in this report. These farms are fairly typical of the systom of dairy forming prevailing in east central Minnesota.

CLIMATE, SOIL, AND TOPOGRAPHY
On eccount of the severe drouth of 1934, the supply of feed on these farms on May 1, 1935 was below normal. Weather conditions and crop yields in 1935, however, were approximately normol.

The soil on these ferms varies from a sandy loam to a clay loam, with the former predomineting. There are small areas of peat and sand on some farms. Applications of lime are in gencral unnecessary in order to grow alfalfa and sweet clover.

The land varies from level to slightly rolling. Most of these farms were originally covered with timber. There is a small amount of timber and stumps remaining to be cleared on a few farms. Likewise, stone removal would increase the tillable acreage on a number of farms.

## ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BUSINESS

The main purpose of the farm business analysis is to present each farmer's data and information in such a way that he can compare it with that secured on other farms. Thereby he is enabled to study his efficiency in various enterprises and to organize his farm on a more profitable basis. For the latter purpose, it was necessary for all of the farmers, tenents as well as owner-operators to include the whole farm business in order that the results would be on a comprative basis. The earnings 88 shown in this report are computed as if each farm was owned by its operator.

On pages 4 to 6 are presented finencial summaries of the years business, showing the average results for the 120 farms, the average results for the highest onefifth of the farms in respect to Operator's Labor Earnings, and likewise fof the lowest one-fifth.

The data on pages 7 to 19 should suggest to each cooparetor some possibilities for improvement in his production, control of expenses, and in his organizetion of the various enterprises and of the business os a whole, Each farm is an individual problem and hes its particuler adventeges and limitations in respect to nathrel resources and markets. However, there are certain general factors related to financial success on these farms.

## CAPITAL INVESTED IN FARV BUSINESS

The average size of the farms in this report is 111 acres. The average farm inventory wos \$6107. This does not include the value of the house in which the op. erator lived, which amounted to $\$ 1793$. In 1935,33 per cent of the average farm inventory consisted of land, 36 per cent of permanent improvements, 1 per cent of feeds and supplies, 12 per cent of mechinery and equipment, and 18 per cent of livestock, of which one-half or an average of $\$ 571$ was the average inventory value of milk cows.

## RETURNS TO OPERATORS FOR THEIR LABOR AND MANAGENENT

The average cesh receipts per farm was $\$ 1310$. In addition, farm produce to the value of $\$ 226$ was consumed by the farm family and there was an average inventory incrense of $\$ 155$ per form. The total averuge receipts per farm is the sum of these three items, $\$ 1691$. The average total expenses per form, ${ }^{\text {p }} 635$, includes $\$ 608$ cash expenses and an estimated allownce of $\$ 27$ for boord of hired labor. The difference between the total income and totel expense figure is $\$ 1056$. This is the return which the farmer roceived for his own labor and managoment, the services of members of his family and the uso of his capital. Aftur deducting a charge of 5 per cent on the average inventory valuation, $\$ 305$, for the services of capital, there remains $\$ 751$ for the services of the farmer and his fanily. The everage velue of family labar used, if computed at hired man's wages, was $\$ 354$. The average operator's lnbor enrnings are the ferally enrnings less their allownce of $\$ 354$, or $\$ 397$. This is the return to the fomer for his labor and management over end above a 5 per cent return for his capital and going wages for other members of the family.

| Items | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { form } \end{aligned}$ | Averege of 120 farms | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { most } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { least } \\ & \text { profitable } \\ & \text { farms } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sizo of form (acres) |  | 111 | 148 | 98 |
| Size of business(days of prod.work) (1) |  | 367 | 561 | 290 |
| Average ferm inventory (without house) |  | \$6107 | \$8713 | \$5433 |
| Land |  | 2008 | 3147 | 1815 |
| Farm improvements |  | 2188 | 2786 | 2115 |
| Machinery \& equipment (total) |  | 713 | 991 | 552 |
| Gen, machinery \& equipment |  | 446 | 616 | 385 |
| Practor |  | 83 | 114 | 57 |
| Truck |  | 13 | 62 | 0 |
| Auto (farm share) |  | 127 | 157 | 101 |
| Electrical equipment (farm share) |  | 44 | 42 | 9 |
| Feeds and seed | - | 58 | 104 | 25 |
| Horses (total) |  | 294 | 421 | 263 |
| Horses |  | 276 | 392 | 250 |
| Colts |  | 18 | 28 | 13 |
| Productive livestock (total) | - | 84 ? | 1264 | 663 |
| Cows |  | 571 | 831 | 453 |
| Other cattle |  | 161 | 240 | 117 |
| Hogs |  | 51 | 99 | 29 |
| Sheep |  | 9 | 20 | 22 |
| Poultry |  | 54 | 74 | 42 |

(1) Explanction of terin, "Days of Productive Work".

The total "Deys of Productive Work" for any one farm are a measure of size of that frm business. The averege number of "ten-hour days" of man labor required per head of productive livestock and per acre of crops is used in combining the crops and the livestock in one single riensure of size or business.

The number of days of productive work for ench antmal and each acre of crops, computed from labor data secured on detoiled accounting routes conducted in polk and Pincepunties, is listed as follows:

|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Items | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { farm } \end{aligned}$ | Average of 120 farms | 24 most profitable <br> farms | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { least } \\ & \text { proftitable } \\ & \text { farmp } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CASH EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Tractor (now \& exp.) |  | \$ 32 | \$ 40 | * ${ }^{3}$ |
| Truck (new \& exp.) |  | 7 | 33 | , |
| Auto (new \& exp, ) (farm share) |  | 73 | 94 | 5 |
| Electricity (new \& exp.) (farm share) |  | 8 | 9 | 3 |
| Mnchinery and equipment (new) |  | 41 | 69 | 19 |
| Machinery end equipment (exp.) |  | 25 | 43 | 18 |
| Buildings, fences, tiling (new) |  | 18 | 46 | 17 |
| Buildings, fences, tiling (exp.) |  | 32 | 45 | 27 |
| Hired labor |  | 47 | 95 | 38 |
| Feed for livestock |  | 90 | 150 | 69 |
| Other expense for livestock |  | 10 | 15 | 12 |
| Horses bought |  | 31 | 42 | 34 |
| Cows bought |  | 11 | 8 | 1 |
| Other cattle bought |  | 6 | 8 | 1 |
| Hogs bought |  | 10 | 13 | 8 |
| Sheep bought |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Poultry bought |  | 9 | 13 | 4 |
| Crop (seed, twine, spray) |  | 66 | 94 | 51. |
| Taxes and insurance |  | 95 | 127 | 84 |
| General ferm |  | 6 | 8 | 5 |
| (1) Total cash expense |  | 608 | 955 | 457 |
| (2) Decrease in farm inventory |  | - | - | - |
| (3) Board for hired labor |  | 27 | 62 | 19 |
| (4) Totol expense (sum of (1)(2) \&(3)) |  | 635 | 1017 | 476 |
| CASH RECEIPTS |  |  |  |  |
| Horses |  | 9 | 25 | 0 |
| Cows |  | 38 | 75 | 20 |
| Dairy products |  | 718 | 1110 | 482 |
| Other cattle |  | 96 | 158 | 66 |
| Hogs |  | 98 | 228 | 48 |
| Sheep |  | 10 | 26 | 19 |
| Poultry |  | 37 | 52 | 27 |
| Eges |  | 162 | 256 | 109 |
| Small grain |  | 28 | 52 | 8 |
| Corn |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Hay |  | 8 | 8 | 1 |
| Root crops |  | 32 | 101 | 9 |
| Other crops |  | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| Miscellancous |  | 15 | 49 | 3 |
| Income from work off the form |  | 54 | 151 | 48 |
| A.A.A. adjustment peyments |  | 5 | 14 | 6 |
| (5) Total cash recoipts |  | 1,310 | 2,313 | 848 |
| (6) Increase in frorm inventory |  | 155 | 401 | 14 |
| (7) Farm product used in house |  | 226 | 273 | 201 |
| (8) Total receipts (sum of (5) \& (6)) |  | 1,691 | 2,987 | 1,063 |
| (9) Ret to Total expenses (4) |  | 635 | 1,017 | 476 |
| (9) Ret, to cap. \& fam, labor (8) minus(4) |  | 1,056 | 1,970 | 587 |
| (11) Family lebor earnings (9) minus (10) |  | 305 751 | 436 1,534 | 272 315 |
| (12) Unpaid family labor |  | 354 | 1,413 | 490 |
| (13) Oper.labor earnings (11)minus (12) |  | 397 | 1,121 | -175 |




## ANALYZING THE REASONS FOR DIFFERENCES IN OPERATOR'S EARNINGS

The financial statements on the preceding pages show that on the average the farm wr included in this study obtained about $\$ 33$ per month for their labor and management, or a total for the yenr of $\$ 397$. The most significant fact in these stataments, however, is the wide range in earnings -- from $\$ 1987$ to a loss of $\$ 498$, or a range of $\$ 2485$. The following di agram 111 ustrates this fact:

Chart 1. Range of Earnings


Some of the ceuses for these differences in earnings mey be beyond the control of the former. It is significant, however, that the data secured from the survey indicate that there are several very definite factors thet enoble some farmers to make qubstantial earnings while others fail to meet expenses. These factors and their rel tionship with earnings are the following :

Thale 1. Relation of Dairy Production to Farm Earnings

| Hps. butterfat per cow | No. of | Average |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aroup | Avercge | fnrms | Eornings |
| \$elow 210 | 180 | 25 | $\$ 220$ |
| $\$ 10$ to 289 | 251 | 68 | 398 |
| $\$ 90$ and above | 320 | 27 | 557 |

隹gh production per cow tends to lowor the cost of producing a pound of butterfat. This is very importont on those farms on which butterfat salas are the major source of income.

Table 2. Relation of Returns From Othor Productive Livestock to Earnings Heturns above feed cost per animal unit

| ct prod. live | her the | No, of | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| group | Avercge | Farms | Enrnings |
| \#610w \$30 | \$17 | 25 | \$265 |
|  | 56 | 67 | 378 |
| 00 and above | 103 | 28 | 559 |

These farmers have, in addition to the dairy herd, quite on investment in other plasses of productive livestock, as young cattle, hogs, sheep, or poultry. Most ot oll of the feed raised is fed, and considerable additional feed is purchased. High returns per dollar invested in these animals usually accompanies greater profits from the livestock. This means another addition to the farm earnings,

Thble 3. Relation of Amount of Productive Livestock to Farm Earnings.

| Ploductive liv | unit | No. of | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gfoup | Averag | farms | Earnings |
| Below 12.0 | 8.9 | 30 | \$244 |
| 12.0 to 17.9 | 14.7 | 62 | 440 |
| L18.0 and above | 21.1 | 28 | 464 |

If the livestock is yielding 2 net return, an increased amount of livestock adds to size of business and the opportunity to increase the farm earnings. Livestock produces manure and aids in keeping up the fertility of the land, and utilizes wasto products on the farm. Livestock also helps to provide productive employment throughout the year. Any method thet aids in utilizing the available resources to full and efficient capecity should add to the farm income.

Table 4. Relation of Crop Yiclds to Form Eernings

| Per cent crop yields were of the average for all the 120 farms |  | No. of | Aversge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ferms | Errnings |
| Below 85 | 70 | 24 | \$187 |
| db to 114 | 100 | 70 | 382 |
| 125 and above | 125 | 26 | 630 |

High production per acre, up to certain limits, tends to lower the cost per bushei of grain or per ton of hay. Any possible method of mangement that will increase crop yields and thercfore lower cost of production more than the extra expense fautred in securing the higher yields should be given consideration.

Thale 5. Relation of Use of Legumes to Farm Earnings

| Fer cent of tillinble land |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In logume hay. | pesture* | No. of | Average |
| Group | Average | farms | Earnings |
| Welow 8.0 | 3.0 | 25 | \$275 |
| 8.0 to 24.9 | 15.9 | 64 | 432 |
| 25.0 and above | 31.9 | 28 | 439 |

* In calculating this percentage, acreage in alfalfa hay and pasture, and sweet clover pasture wore counted in full, but only half of ecreage in other legumes were counted.

It is quite important to have the very best pasture crop so as to reduce grain and roughage feeding as much as possible. Also, as hay is buiky, necessitating high freight charges, if shipped in, it is important to raise all the hay needed and purchase concentrates, if necessary to supplement it.

There are also differencus in the emount of feed produced per acre, in the veluc of that feed, end in the effect on sofl fertility, emong different hay crops. Legumes furnish more protein, which is an expensive feed to buy, and also add nitrogen to the soil. Among the legumes, alfalfa and sweet clover pasture, where they can b/ grown suceessfully, yield more nutrients per acre than other legumos. There is comaiderable variation in the adaptibility of these crops, and it is important for epeh farmer to determine the kind of crops best adepted to his farm, those that
will give the highest net returns, taking into consideration livestock feed requirements, the value of the crop as a feed, yields per acre, the development of a good crop rotation, end expenses of production.

Table 6. Relation of Sixe of Business(days of prod, work) to Farm Eamings. Days of Productive Work Group Avernge_ fa
Below 250
250 to 449

450 and above 60
Average farm earnings tend to increase with an increase in size of business where size of business is mensured by days of productive work. However, for those farmers who are operating their farms at a loss, the lerger the volume of business the lorger will be the loss. On the other hand, a farmer who is making a profit, could make a lerger profit if he increased his size of busincss, providing that in so doing he does not lower materially the efficiency in some one or more important branches of his business. Those farmers who have large businesses usually have more flexibility of their organization than does the men with a small business, and can utilize more efficiently and to better sdvantage available labor, power, machinery and buildings.

Table 7. Relation of amount of Work iccomplished per Worker to Farm Enrnings.

| Days of productive work per worker | No. of | average |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | Avcrage | Farms | Earnings |  |
| Below 150 | 118 | 26 | $\$ 29$ |  |
| 150 t 249 | 192 | 65 | 372 |  |
| 250 and above | 293 | 29 | 782 |  |

More days of productive ark accomplished per worker reduce the labor charge per unit of business. Higher lebnr accomplishment cen bc secured in several ways. In the first place the business must be large enough so that there will be at least sufficient work available for the family labor. The from should be so organized that the labor requirements are well distributed throughout the year. Hendling pastures in an efficient minner, in such a way that as large a proportion as possible of the years' feed for livestock may be obtained from them, helps to reduce labor requirements. Proper planning of the farm work, economical use of labor sating machinery, etc., help to increese the work accomplished per worker.

Table 8. Relation of Power, Machinery and Building Expense of Farm Eernings. *

| Expense per day | ductive | No. of | Average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group | avercge | forms | Earnings |  |
| \$1.50 and above | \$1.85 | 26 | \$267 |  |
| . 90 to \$1.49 | 1.19 | 69 | 376 |  |
| Belom . 90 | 69 | :25 | 590 |  |

*Includes building, fencing, machinery, and horse expenses and vilue of feed fed to horses.

The expense fector shows a higher relation with enrnings when prices are very low then when they are high. Some farms are under-equipped. On a few farme, excessive expenses constitute the main factor cousing earnings to be very low.

Some of the cash expenses can be kept down by careful management, ofteptimes necessary repairs and improvements can be mede by using the available farm 1 bor rather than by hiring extra help. Repairs and overhauling should be done betore spring work begins insofar as possible, or on rainy days or in other spare tme during the summer. Reducing the numbor of horses to the minimum required for efficient operation of the frrm, helps reduce the powor expense. In some ceses farm-
ers con offset some or all of the power and machinery expense by using their equipment for outside work.

## EFFECT OF WELL BALANCED EFFICIENCY ON FARM PROFITS

It is quite evident from this report that few farmers have a monopoly on efficiency. quite of ten farm operators show efficient management in one part of the farm business, which is offset by poor results in other phases. These farmers get medium returns while those who fall down all along the line get the lowest.returns, and on the other hend those few who can manage to attain high efficiency in all parts of their organization receive returns woll above the average. This is well illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9. Relation of Operator's Labor Earnings to the Number of Factorf ; in Which the Farmer is Above the iverage

The length of the shaded
No. of Factors

| in which Farm Excels | No. of Farms | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Your } \\ & \text { Farm } \end{aligned}$ | to the average Operator's labor earning 3 | Operator's <br> Earnings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 5 |  | KXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | \$1087 |
| 6 | 14 |  | mxxxxxxxxxxxxcxxx | 871 |
| 5 | 33 |  |  | 541 |
| 4 | 24 |  | xxaxxax | 322 |
| 3 | 20 |  | xxxx | 203 |
| 2 | 19 |  | xx | 72 |
| 1 | 5 |  | xxxx | -183 |
| 0 | 1 |  | ${ }_{x} \times x \times x x$ | -275 |

The array in Table 9 indicates that it will be worth while for each cooperator to stufy carefully his ranking on pages 11 and 12 , and learn his standing in respect to each of the above factors and the elements of strength and weakness in his farm businees.

Measures of Farm Oxganization and Management Efficiency


Using your figures from page 1l, locate your standing with respect to the variptus measures of farm organization and management efficiency. The averages for 120 farms included in this summary are located between the two dotted lines across the penter of this page.



Yield of Crops


Some methods fermers use to incrense their crop yields:

1. Plow under legumesagrow sweet clover in smnll grains on high lime soil--lime for alfalfa, if necessary.
2. Test out commercial fertilizers on strips of land to see if they pry.
3. Utilize monure effectively.
4. Uee rotatad legume pestures.
5. Grow recommended varieties of crops.
6. Use best tested soed available.
7. Prepare seed-bed thoroly and timely.

Summary of Amount of Livestock


Factors of Cost and Returns in Dalry Production

| Items $\quad \begin{array}{ll}\text { Your } \\ & \\ \text { farm }\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average } \\ & \text { lzo } \\ & \text { farms } \end{aligned}$ | 24 farms highest in B.F. per cow | 24 farms lowest in B. F. per cow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Poundo butterfat per cow | 252 | 324 | 179 |
| Feeds per cow, lbs.: |  |  |  |
| Coma | 29 | 54 | 34 |
| Smath grain | 1040 | 1344 | 868 |
| Tot. feeds - under $25 \%$ protein | 135 | 171 | 93 |
| Com. feeds - over $25 \%$ protein | 28 | 44 | 19 |
| \$k1mmilk | 424 | 593 | 515 |
| Tame hay | 972 | 755 | 1242 |
| Altalfa | 2878 | 3469 | 1737 |
| Willd hay | 445 | 572 | 640 |
| Capn fodder | 2336 | 2194 | 3453 |
| Silloge | 7508 | 8823 | 2986 |
| Tatal concentretes | 1232 | 1613 | 1014 |
| Total dry roughage | 6631 | 6990 | 7072 |
| Tatal digestible nutrients | 5392 | 6068 | 4703 |
| Tatel digest. nutrionts per lb. B.F.* | 22.2 | 19.0 | 27.8 |
| \%protaln in ration | 12.8 | 13.1 | 12.0 |
| \% cows fresh - Sept. to Dec. inclusive | 31 | 35 | 22 |
| Feed cost per cow: |  |  |  |
| Concentrates | \$12 | S15 | \$13 |
| Roughages | 21 | 24 | 15 |
| Pasture | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL FEED COSTS | 335 | \$ 42 | \$28 |
| Value of produce per cow: |  |  |  |
| B. F. sales | \%69 | \$92 | \$49 |
| Dairy produce used in house | 8 | 10 | 7 |
| Milk to other livestock | 13 | 12 | 12 |
| Appreciation or deprecietion | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| TOTAL ViLUE OR PRODUCT | n 93 | \$127 | 370 |
| REIURNG ABOVE FEED COST FBR COT | ¢58 | \% 75 | \$42 |
| Price peceived rer lb. B. F. sold: As minufacturing cream (cents) | 31.9 | 32.0 | 33.2 |
| Feed oost per lb. B. F. | 14.5 | 13.1 | 16.4 |
| Numbert of cows** | 10.1 | 10.9 | 9.4 |
| Hours of man labor per cow | 233 | 251 | 235 |
| Hours of horse work per cow | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Miles of car or truck trevel per cow | 76 | 92 | 89 |

[^0]Feed Costs and Returns for Other Cattle and Sheep

|  | Feed Costs and Returns for Other Cattle and Sheep |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Feed Costs and Returns for Hogs

| Your | Average | 20 farms | 20 farms |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| farm | 102 | highest in | lowest in |
|  | farms | returns | returns |
|  |  | above feed | above feed |

Lbs, fit feed per 100 lbs. hogs produced: Cpmin Stall grain
Cpamercial grain feeds
Tptal grain and commercial feeds

|  | 106 | 14 | 256 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\cdots$ | 222 | 158 | 381 |
| $\longrightarrow$ | 3 | 2 | 0 | Skimmilk


|  | 331 | 174 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2381 | 979 |

Cost of feed per 100 lbs, hogs producod:

Grain and commercial feeds
Tankage and skimmilk Pasture
Total Feed Cost per 100 lbs. Hogs Prod.

$\$ 1.54$
1.47
47.16
8.60
.01
315.77
$\$ 7.03$
$\$ 3.02$
素
9.58
11.18
8.52

RETURNS PER 100 LES. HOGS PROLUCED

2.55
8.16
$-7.25$
RET. ABOVE FEED COST PLR 100, HOGS PROD. Pridelreceived per 100 lbs. hogs sold

Lbs. pf hogs produced 18601796
Feed Costs and Returns for Poultry
Your Average
116

23 farms
23 farms
You highest in lowest in
farm farms returns returns above feed above feed per hen per hen


## Feed Costs per Horse and Other Power Expense Items

| Items Your <br> farm  | Average | Kost <br> profitakle <br> farms | Least profita farms | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of farms: | 120 | 24 | 24 |  |
| Feed per horse,* lbs.: Grain |  |  |  |  |
| Grain ${ }_{\text {Tame }}$ hay and alfalfa | 1,377 |  | 1,315 |  |
| Tame hay and alfalfa | 1,912 | 1,825 | 1,919 |  |
| Wild hay and fodder | 2,545 | 2,076 | 3,206 |  |
| Feed costs per horse: |  |  |  |  |
| Grain \$ | \$ 11 | \$14 | \$11 |  |
| Roughage | 8 | 7 | 8 |  |
| Pasture | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| Total \$ | \$ 22 | \$24 | \$22 |  |
| Number of work horses | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.7 |  |
| Number of colts | , 3 | . 4 | . 2 |  |
| Total acres in ferm | 103 | 106 | 98 |  |
| Crop acres per horse | 20 | 23 | 17 |  |
| Tractor and horse exp. per crop acres | \$1.92 | \$1.62 | \$2. 21 |  |
| Farm power expense per day prod. work | . 71 | . 58 | . 76 |  |

*T'wo colts equal one horse.


[^0]:    *Not Including nutrients secured from pasture.
    **All cows which have at some time in the past freshened are included in the dairy herd, and affect the average number of cows used in computing this table. There is some verintion in the number of months of dry period per cow; however, this vartation is smell for the majority of the farms.

