

# This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search. 

## Help ensure our sustainability. Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from AgEcon Search may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.


# INTENSIVE GRAZING FARMS NEW YORK 2007 



George Conneman
Jason Karszes
Daniel Murray
James Grace Janice Degni
A. Edward Staehr
A. Fay Benson

Peggy Murray
Nancy Glazier
Linda Putnam

Department of Applied Economics and Management College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853-7801

It is the Policy of Cornell University actively to support equality of educational and employment opportunity. No person shall be denied admission to any educational program or activity or be denied employment on the basis of any legally prohibited discrimination involving, but not limited to, such factors as race, color, creed, religion, national or ethnic origin, sex, age or handicap. The University is committed to the maintenance of affirmative action programs which will assure the continuation of such equality of opportunity.

The Dairy Farm Business Summary and Analysis Project is funded in part by:


For additional copies, please contact:

Linda Putnam
Cornell University
Dept of Applied Economics \& Management
305 Warren Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-7801

E-mail: ldp2@cornell.edu
Fax: 607-255-1589
Voice: 607-255-8429
Or visit:
http://aem.cornell.edu/order/pub_order_form.pdf
© Copyright 2008 by Cornell University. All rights reserved.

## 2007 DAIRY FARM BUSINESS SUMMARY Intensive Grazing Farms Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION ..... 1
Program Objectives .....  1
Format Features .....  1
PROGRESS OF THE FARM BUSINESS .....  2
Profitability Measures .....  2
INTENSIVE GRAZING SURVEY SUMMARY .....  5
Breeds. .....  6
Supplemental Feeding .....  6
Grazing Season Ration Details .....  6
Frequency of Rotation .....  7
Water Source .....  .7
Milking System .....  7
Commercial Fertilizer. .....  7
Intensive Grazing Satisfaction Comments .....  8
Grazing Trends. .....  8
Percent Forage from Pasture .....  8
Intensive Grazing Farms vs. Non-grazing Farms. ..... 10
CASE STUDIES ..... 11
Sheffer's Grassland Dairy ..... 11
Cloverpatch Dairy ..... 12
Willow Creek Farm ..... 14
SUMMARY OF GRAZING FARMS BY HERD SIZE ..... 16
SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BUSINESS ..... 18
Business Characteristics ..... 18
Income Statement ..... 18
Profitability Analysis ..... 20
Farm and Family Financial Status ..... 24
Cash Flow Statement ..... 28
Repayment Analysis ..... 29
Cropping Analysis. ..... 31
Dairy Analysis ..... 34
Capital and Labor Efficiency Analysis ..... 36
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BUSINESS. ..... 38
Progress of the Farm Business ..... 38
Grazing Farm Business Chart ..... 41
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ..... 42
IDENTIFY AND SET GOALS ..... 44
GLOSSARY AND LOCATION OF COMMON TERMS ..... 46
INDEX ..... 49

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report was written by the Intensive Grazing Committee consisting of George Conneman, Professor Emeritus, Farm Management; Jason Karszes, Senior Extension Associate, PRO-DAIRY; Daniel Murray, Extension Support Specialist, Applied Economics and Management; James Grace, Extension Educator, Steuben, Chemung and Schuyler Counties; Janice Degni, Area Field Crops Specialist, South Central New York Dairy Team; Ed Staehr, Extension Associate, Applied Economics and Management; Fay Benson, Small Farms Educator, South Central New York Dairy Team; Peggy Murray, Extension Educator, Lewis County; Nancy Glazier, Extension Support Specialist, Northwest New York Team; and Linda Putnam, Extension Support Specialist, Applied Eonomcis and Management. The committee appreciates the assistance from all the Cornell Cooperative Extension Educators that collected the Dairy Farm Business Summary data, as well as the following Extension Educators that collected the grazing practices survey data: Mariane Kiraly and David Munsee (former Educator).

The authors appreciate the assistance of Loree McOwen and Rella Moag in preparing this publication.

# 2007 DAIRY FARM BUSINESS SUMMARY INTENSIVE GRAZING FARMS 

## INTRODUCTION

Dairy farm managers throughout New York State have been participating in Cornell Cooperative Extension's farm business summary and analysis program since the early 1950's. Managers of each participating farm business receive a comprehensive summary and analysis of the farm business.

The farms included in the study are a subset of New York State farms participating in the Dairy Farm Business Summary and Analysis Program (DFBS). Fifty New York farms indicated that they grazed dairy cows at least three months, moving to a fresh paddock at least every three days and more than $30 \%$ of the forage consumed during the growing season was from grazing. Operators of these 50 farms were asked to complete a grazing practices survey. Thirty of the farms did complete it. The investigators had special interest in practices used on farms with above average profitability. Therefore the study centered on 36 New York farms which were not organic farms, were not first year grazers and on which at least $\mathbf{3 0}$ percent of forage consumed during the grazing season was grazed. The "Average Top $50 \%$ Farms" are 18 farms with the highest labor and management incomes per operator per cow and are compared to the average of the $\mathbf{3 6}$ farms.

## Program Objective

The primary objective of the dairy farm business summary, DFBS, is to help farm managers improve the business and financial management of their business through appropriate use of historical farm data and the application of modern farm business analysis techniques. This information can also be used to establish goals that will enable the business to better meet its objectives. In short, DFBS provides business and financial information needed in identifying and evaluating strengths and weaknesses of the farm business.

## Format Features

The first section compares intensive grazing farms that participated in the Dairy Farm Business Summary project in 2006 and 2007. A ten-year comparison is also included this year. The second section of this publication reports data from the grazing practices survey. A comparison of intensive grazing farms with non-grazing farms is included on page 10. The third section, Case Studies, describes three grazing farms. The fourth section summarizes grazing farms by herd size.

The summary and analysis portion of this report follows the same general format as in the 2007 DFBS individual farm report received by all participating dairy farmers. It may be used by any dairy farm manager who wants to compare his or her business with the average data of intensive grazing farms. Non-DFBS participants can download a DFBS Data Check-In Form at http://dfbs.cornell.edu . After collecting data on the form, it can be entered in the U.S. Top Dairies business summary program at the same website to obtain a summary of their business.

The summary and analysis portion of the report features:
(1) an income statement including accrual adjustments for farm business expenses and receipts, as well as measures of profitability with and without appreciation,
(2) a complete balance sheet with analytical ratios;
(3) a statement of owner equity which shows the sources of the change in owner equity during the year;
(4) a cash flow statement and debt repayment ability analysis;
(5) an analysis of crop acreage, yields, and expenses;
(6) an analysis of dairy livestock numbers, production, and expenses; and
(7) a capital and labor efficiency analysis.

## PROGRESS OF THE FARM BUSINESS

Comparing your business with average financial data from Dairy Farm Business Summary (DFBS) grazing farms that participated for the last two years can be helpful in analyzing performance ${ }^{1}$ and establishing goals for your business. It is equally important for you to determine the progress your business has made over the past two or three years, to compare this progress to your goals, and to set goals for the future. Please refer to the table on page 3 for selected factors from 34 farms that were grazing in both 2006 and 2007 and participated in the DFBS project for both years.

These 34 farms increased in herd size from 105 cows in 2006 to 110 cows in 2007. Along with the increase in cow numbers, the average number of heifers increased from 87 to 89 head. The average number of cows increased and so did the total milk sold, however, the milk sold per cow remained steady, decreasing only 16 pounds per cow.

There was a 1.5 percent decrease in worker equivalents, to 2.71 , which resulted in an increase of 7.9 percent in cows per worker equivalent. Milk sold per worker equivalent increased 5.9 percent, with the increase in cows per worker restrained by the steady milk production per cow. The increase in milk sold per worker equivalent coupled with a decrease of 3.1 percent in average cost per worker (from $\$ 29,670$ in 2006 to $\$ 28,737$ in 2007), resulted in a 9.4 percent decrease in the hired labor cost per hundredweight of milk produced.

The 2007 growing season was variable across New York State with near record yields in some areas, while other areas experienced dry conditions and loss of yield and quality in both corn and hay. For these grazing farms, corn yields increased 17.3 percent, while hay yields held constant and grazing pastures grew throughout the year. This minimized the amount of forage supplementation needed during the grazing season.

The major factor impacting farm profitability in 2007 was the milk price, which rose 50.3 percent, from $\$ 14.16$ per hundredweight in 2006 to $\$ 21.28$ per hundredweight in 2007. With this large increase in milk price, coupled with the steady milk sold per cow, gross milk sales per cow increased 50.1 percent to $\$ 3,557$. While milk sales rose, the beef market experienced a downturn, and dairy cattle sales per cow decreased 29.8 percent to $\$ 236$ per cow.

With farm revenue increasing from the prior year, costs to operate also mirrored this trend. Total farm operating costs per hundredweight increased 21.6 percent to $\$ 13.47$ per hundredweight. Purchased grain and concentrates increased 18.6 percent to $\$ 4.85$ per hundredweight. This increase was coupled with the 14.5 percent increase in interest costs per hundredweight.

The amount of investment per cow continued its upward trend, increasing from $\$ 7,691$ to $\$ 8,240$ or 7.1 percent. This increase continued even though the average farm size had also increased. This resulted from the value of machinery and equipment increasing and cattle and land being worth more than in 2006. Debt per cow increased 15.9 percent to $\$ 2,385$ for 2007.

Despite the large increase in the cost of operations, the average farm remained profitable due to the sharp increase in milk price. Even with a bearish dairy cattle market the price of milk rose so greatly that farms were able to handle the rise in costs.

## Profitability Measures

- Net farm income without appreciation increased 265.7 percent to $\$ 116,785$.
- Net farm income per cow without appreciation increased from \$304 to \$1061.
- Net farm income with appreciation increased 233.9 percent to $\$ 160,062$.
- Labor and management income per operator increased from \$-5,378 to \$58,594.
- Rate of return on equity capital without appreciation increased from -3.1 percent to 9.9 percent.
- Rate of return on all capital without appreciation increased from -0.8 percent to 8.8 percent.

The year 2007 was lucrative for many grazing dairy farms. The increase in costs were not enough to limit the earnings of farms that were able to increase herd size and therefore sell more milk. The sharp contrast to 2006 allowed farms to repay debt or to expand. Farm net worth increased as well as farm debt per cow, a sign that grazing dairies were either expanding farm size or improving the land and buildings on their farms.

[^0]PROGRESS OF THE FARM BUSINESS
Same 34 Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& 2007

| Selected Factors | Average of 34 Farms |  | Percent <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 2007 |  |
| Size of Business |  |  |  |
| Average number of cows | 105 | 110 | 4.8 |
| Average number of heifers | 87 | 89 | 2.3 |
| Milk sold, lbs. | 1,764,730 | 1,842,156 | 4.4 |
| Worker equivalent | 2.75 | 2.71 | -1.5 |
| Total nontillable and tillable pasture \& hay acres | 247 | 273 | 10.5 |
| Total nontillable pasture \& tillable acres | 313 | 325 | 3.8 |
| Rates of Production |  |  |  |
| Milk sold per cow, lbs. | 16,732 | 16,716 | -0.1 |
| Hay DM per acre, tons | 2.1 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| Corn silage per acre, tons | 15.0 | 17.6 | 17.3 |
| Labor Efficiency \& Costs |  |  |  |
| Cows per worker | 38 | 41 | 7.9 |
| Milk sold per worker, lbs. | 641,720 | 679,762 | 5.9 |
| Hired labor cost per cwt. | \$1.70 | \$1.54 | -9.4 |
| Hired labor cost per worker | \$29,670 | \$28,737 | -3.1 |
| Hired labor cost as \% of milk sales | 12.0\% | 7.2\% | -40.0 |
| Cost Control |  |  |  |
| Grain \& concentrate purchased as \% of milk sales | 29\% | 23\% | -20.7 |
| Grain \& concentrate per cwt. milk | \$4.09 | \$4.85 | 18.6 |
| Dairy feed \& crop expense per cwt. milk | \$5.35 | \$6.57 | 22.8 |
| Labor \& machinery costs per cow | \$1,341 | \$1,385 | 3.3 |
| Total farm operating costs per cwt. Sold | \$14.79 | \$16.50 | 11.6 |
| Interest costs per cwt. milk | \$0.69 | \$0.79 | 14.5 |
| Milk marketing costs per cwt. milk sold | \$1.01 | \$0.95 | -5.9 |
| Operating cost of producing cwt. of milk | \$11.08 | \$13.47 | 21.6 |
| Total costs of producing cwt. of milk | \$16.90 | \$19.52 | 15.5 |
| Capital Efficiency (average for the year) |  |  |  |
| Farm capital per cow | \$7,691 | \$8,240 | 7.1 |
| Mach. \& equipment per cow | \$1,334 | \$1,421 | 6.5 |
| Asset turnover ratio | 0.41 | 0.54 | 31.7 |
| Income Generation |  |  |  |
| Gross milk sales per cow | \$2,370 | \$3,557 | 50.1 |
| Gross milk sales per cwt. | \$14.16 | \$21.28 | 50.3 |
| Net milk sales per cwt. | \$13.15 | \$20.33 | 54.6 |
| Dairy cattle sales per cow | \$336 | \$236 | -29.8 |
| Dairy calf sales per cow | \$49 | \$61 | 24.5 |
| Government receipts per cwt. | \$0.91 | \$0.47 | -48.4 |
| Profitability |  |  |  |
| Net farm income without appreciation | \$31,932 | \$116,785 | 265.7 |
| Net farm income with appreciation | \$47,933 | \$160,062 | 233.9 |
| Labor \& mgt. income per operator/manager | \$-5,378 | \$58,594 | 1,189.5 |
| Labor \& mgt. income per oper./manager per cow | \$-51 | \$533 | 1,145.1 |
| Rate of return on equity capital without apprec. | -3.1\% | 9.9\% | 419.4 |
| Rate of return on all capital without appreciation | -0.8\% | 8.8\% | 1,200.0 |
| Financial Summary |  |  |  |
| Farm net worth, end year | \$612,436 | \$723,290 | 18.1 |
| Debt to asset ratio | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.0 |
| Farm debt per cow | \$2,058 | \$2,385 | 15.9 |

TEN YEAR COMPARISON: SELECTED BUSINESS FACTORS New York Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 1998 to 2007

| Item | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of farms | 59 | 65 | 65 | 54 | 30 | 27 | 30 | 42 | 42 | 36 |
| Cropping Program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total tillable acres | 247 | 227 | 271 | 288 | 243 | 270 | 267 | 264 | 254 | 273 |
| Tillable acres rented | 90 | 105 | 133 | 142 | 125 | 126 | 96 | 110 | 145 | 132 |
| Hay crop acres | 126 | 120 | 139 | 152 | 119 | 149 | 133 | 143 | 145 | 162 |
| Corn silage acres | 45 | 42 | 44 | 37 | 22 | 28 | 38 | 34 | 41 | 39 |
| Hay crop, tons DM/acre | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Corn silage, tons/acre | 14.8 | 13.9 | 12.0 | 15.5 | 12.4 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 14.9 | 15.5 | 17.6 |
| Fertilizer \& lime exp./tillable acre | \$25 | \$25 | \$20 | \$22 | \$30 | \$21 | \$31 | \$31 | \$29 | \$45 |
| Machinery cost/cow | \$448 | \$545 | \$501 | \$528 | \$439 | \$447 | \$598 | \$586 | \$590 | \$688 |
| Dairy Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of cows | 83 | 79 | 93 | 94 | 94 | 100 | 104 | 95 | 101 | 110 |
| Number of heifers | 62 | 60 | 67 | 70 | 68 | 72 | 74 | 76 | 83 | 87 |
| Milk sold, cwt. | 14,652 | 14,477 | 15,860 | 15,396 | 15,687 | 15,637 | 17,744 | 15,868 | 17,168 | 18,243 |
| Milk sold/cow, lbs. | 17,653 | 18,346 | 17,107 | 16,295 | 16,618 | 15,684 | 17,144 | 16,783 | 17,054 | 16,627 |
| Purchased dairy feed/cwt. milk | \$3.98 | \$3.65 | \$3.88 | \$4.19 | \$4.21 | \$4.45 | \$4.76 | \$4.48 | \$4.41 | \$5.46 |
| Purchased grain \& concentrate as |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of milk receipts | 24\% | 23\% | 27\% | 23\% | 28\% | 29\% | 25\% | 26\% | 30\% | 23\% |
| Purchased feed \& crop exp/cwt.milk | \$4.81 | \$4.39 | \$4.56 | \$4.94 | \$4.99 | \$5.06 | \$5.55 | \$5.34 | \$5.30 | \$6.59 |
| Operating cost producing milk/cwt. | \$10.53 | \$10.53 | \$10.17 | \$11.71 | \$9.76 | \$9.53 | \$11.83 | \$11.35 | \$10.58 | \$13.56 |
| Veterinary \& medicine exp./cow | \$55 | \$68 | \$66 | \$67 | \$57 | \$59 | \$74 | \$67 | \$83 | \$85 |
| Capital Efficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farm capital/cow | \$6,438 | \$6,236 | \$6,445 | \$6,841 | \$5,870 | \$6,286 | \$7,300 | \$7,526 | \$7,667 | \$8,158 |
| Real estate/cow | \$3,025 | \$2,508 | \$2,791 | \$2,951 | \$2,389 | \$2,738 | \$3,475 | \$3,369 | \$3,249 | \$3,445 |
| Machinery investment/cow | \$1,137 | \$1,291 | \$1,316 | \$1,319 | \$1,109 | \$1,191 | \$1,287 | \$1,337 | \$1,289 | \$1,474 |
| Asset turnover ratio | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.50 | 0.48 | 0.42 | 0.54 |
| Labor Efficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worker equivalent | 2.75 | 2.63 | 2.76 | 2.78 | 2.59 | 2.71 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.70 |
| Operator/manager equivalent | 1.30 | 1.41 | 1.35 | 1.40 | 1.24 | 1.36 | 1.50 | 1.32 | 1.39 | 1.28 |
| Milk sold/worker, lbs. | 532,809 | 550,437 | 574,630 | 553,819 | 605,677 | 577,020 | 611,862 | 587,165 | 614,066 | 675,657 |
| Cows/worker | 30 | 30 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 36 | 41 |
| Labor cost/cow | \$642 | \$715 | \$644 | \$717 | \$683 | \$681 | \$732 | \$746 | \$744 | \$705 |
| Hired labor exp./hired worker equiv. | \$19,706 | \$21,189 | \$20,024 | \$24,430 | \$24,009 | \$22,912 | \$25,966 | \$25,645 | \$26,504 | \$28,417 |
| Profitability \& Financial Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labor \& mgmt. income/operator | \$26,364 | \$13,203 | \$1,693 | \$15,205 | \$2,482 | \$9,638 | \$22,397 | \$17,801 | \$1,606 | \$54,684 |
| Labor \&mgmt income/operator/cow | \$318 | \$167 | \$18 | \$162 | \$26 | \$96 | \$215 | \$187 | \$16 | \$498 |
| Net farm income/cow w/o apprec. | \$703 | \$543 | \$310 | \$555 | \$322 | \$449 | \$652 | \$572 | \$383 | \$1,019 |
| Farm net worth, end year | \$376,720 | \$364,069 | \$410,672 | \$477,037 | \$369,123 | \$454,465 | \$578,704 | \$535,182 | \$584,266 | \$706,999 |
| Percent equity | 68\% | 73\% | 67\% | 71\% | 66\% | 69\% | 73\% | 72\% | 74\% | 73\% |

## INTENSIVE GRAZING SURVEY SUMMARY

From the survey data of the 26 selected grazing farms that completed the grazing practices survey, analysis of average production levels and profitability measures are shown below. Labor and management income per operator per cow without appreciation was used to evaluate whether certain practices contributed favorably to improved profitability. Labor and management income per operator per cow is a measure of the net annual return after the operators' unpaid family labor and an equity charge for capital used in the business has been applied. This is the best way to compare diverse businesses that have high debt to those with no debt and those that may rely heavily on unpaid labor with those that have all paid labor. The farms were divided into two groups comprised of the top 50 percent and the lower 50 percent scaled from the highest to lowest labor and management income per operator per cow.

## SELECTED PRODUCTION AND PROFITABILITY MEASURES

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

|  | Average <br> $(26$ farms $)$ | Average of the <br> Top 50\% <br> $(13$ farms $)$ | Average of the <br> Lower $50 \%$ <br> $(13$ farms) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor and management income per cow | $\$ 544$ | $\$ 727$ | $\$ 360$ |
| Average number of cows | 127 | 157 | 96 |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds | 16,739 | 17,367 | 16,112 |
| Operating cost of producing milk per cwt. | $\$ 12.45$ | $\$ 11.97$ | $\$ 12.93$ |
| Total cost of producing milk per cwt. | $\$ 20.15$ | $\$ 17.83$ | $\$ 22.47$ |

Comparison of survey data on the various grazing practices, such as water availability, supplemental feeding, pasture species, pasture management, milking system type and frequency of rotation are shown as follows:

## GRAZING PRACTICES

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

|  | Number of Farms Responding | Average of All Farms Answering Question | Average of the Top 50\% | Average of the <br> Lower 50\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experience |  |  |  |  |
| Average years of farming experience | 24 | 28 | 26 | 30 |
| Average years of grazing experience | 24 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| Farm Characteristics |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of farms with seasonal or semi-seasonal calving | 25 | 40\% | 60\% | 40\% |
| Percent of farms with a parlor milking system | 23 | 57\% | 54\% | 46\% |
| Pasture in the Ration |  |  |  |  |
| Average percent forage from pasture | 24 | 59\% | 60\% | 58\% |
| Average length (days) of grazing season | 26 | 182 | 164 | 199 |
| Average pounds of grain fed while grazing | 22 | 13.7 | 15.7 | 11.6 |
| Average pounds of grain fed in winter | 22 | 17.4 | 19.4 | 15.4 |
| Average pounds of forage dry matter fed while grazing | 22 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 10.0 |
| Average pounds of forage dry matter from grazing | 22 | 14.8 | 13.7 | 15.8 |
| Average pounds of forage dry matter fed in winter | 22 | 24.9 | 24.1 | 25.8 |
| Pasture Management |  |  |  |  |
| Percent rotated after each milking | 26 | 50\% | 38\% | 62\% |
| Percent rotated daily | 26 | 35\% | 38\% | 31\% |
| Percent rotated every other day | 26 | 4\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Percent other rotation | 26 | 12\% | 13\% | 8\% |
| Percent applied commercial fertilizer to pasture | 26 | 50\% | 93\% | 15\% |
| Percent applied manure to pasture | 26 | 33\% | 57\% | 46\% |
| Percent applied lime to pasture | 26 | 31\% | 46\% | 15\% |
| Percent that clipped pasture | 25 | 88\% | 83\% | 92\% |
| Percent with a weed problem | 24 | 67\% | 64\% | 69\% |
| Percent with water in every paddock | 25 | 44\% | 46\% | 42\% |
| Percent with pasture re-seeded in past 10 years | 24 | 71\% | 67\% | 75\% |
| Percent that mechanically harvested pastures | 24 | 75\% | 75\% | 75\% |
| Most common pasture species |  |  |  |  |
| First |  | Orchardgrass | Orchardgrass | Orchardgrass |
|  |  | Native White | Native White | Native White |
| Second |  | Clover | Clover | Clover |
| Third |  | Bluegrass | Bluegrass | Timothy |

Practices to increase pasture quality tended to indicate higher profitability. Those practices included having more grazing experience, rotating pastures more often, use of fertilizer, clipping weeds, re-seeding pasture, and mechanically harvesting pasture before it becomes overgrown.

## Breeds

Holstein was the most common breed with 11 of the farms having 95 percent or greater Holstein animals. The second most common were crossbreeds which were on seven farms. Farms with Holstein animals tended to have higher milk production and higher profitability both per cow and per hundredweight.

## FARMS SCALED BY BREED OF HERD

|  | Number | Milk <br> Production | Labor \& Mgmt. Income per Operator Per Cow | Labor \& Mgmt. Income per Operator Per Cwt. | Cull Rate (Sold for Beef or Died) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farms that are 95+\% Holstein | 11 | 20,392 | \$743 | \$3.43 | 27.6\% |
| Farms that are less than 95\% Holstein | 15 | 14,061 | \$397 | \$2.95 | 21.9\% |

## Supplemental Feeding

Twenty-two farms gave detailed ration data and the table below compares the 11 farms that fed corn silage to the 11 that did not. Farms that incorporated corn silage into their grazing forages tend to have higher milk production. These farms did not always have higher profitability. In past years, the feeding of corn silage has shown to be profitable some years and unprofitable others, while supplementation of pasture in general has always shown to be a profitable practice. For a more specific look at what was being fed to these grazing herds, see the following section "Grazing Season Ration Details".

SUPPLEMENTAL FEEDING
Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007

|  | Top 50\% (11 farms) |  | Lower 50\% (11 farms) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Corn Silage <br> (6) | No Corn Silage <br> (5) | Corn Silage <br> (7) | No Corn Silage <br> (4) |
| Labor \& management income per oper. per cow | \$995 | \$790 | \$129 | \$ 42 |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds | 19,534 | 17,034 | 16,793 | 13,995 |
| Grain fed in summer, pounds dry matter | 14.9 | 16.6 | 11.5 | 4.5 |
| Corn silage fed in summer, pounds dry matter | 8.1 | - | 8.0 | - |
| Other forage fed in summer, pounds dry matter | 5.2 | 6.8 | 4.4 | 5.9 |
| Percent forage from pasture | 49\% | 70\% | 56\% | 76\% |

## Grazing Season Ration Details

The 11 farms in the top 50 percent of profitability fed an average of 16 pounds dry matter of grain during the grazing season. Six farms fed corn silage at an average of 14.9 pounds dry matter.

The 11 farms in the lower 50 percent of profitability fed an average of 9 pounds dry matter of grain during the grazing season. Seven of the farms fed corn silage at an average of 11.5 pounds dry matter. Three fed haylage at an average of 6.3 pounds dry matter. Nine farms fed dry hay at an average of 3.7 pounds dry matter.

## Frequency of Rotation

Thirteen of the farms rotated their pastures for milk cows after each milking, 9 of the farms rotated pasture every day, 1 farm rotated pasture every other day, and 3 farms rotated based on field conditions. The table below compares the rotation frequency to milk production and labor and management income per operator per cow.

## ROTATION FREQUENCY

Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007

|  | Top 50\% (13 farms) |  | Lower 50\% (13 farms) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rotate After Each <br> Milking (7) | Other Rotation <br> Schedule (6) | Rotate After Each <br> Milking (6) | Other Rotation <br> Schedule (7) |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds <br> Labor and management income per <br> operator per cow | 19,826 | 15,861 | 14,870 | 16,008 |

## Water Source

Thirteen farms provided the majority of water from a well while the remaining ten provided water from a natural source (pond-4, spring-5, and stream-1).

## WATER SOURCE

Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007

|  | Upper 50\% (12 farms) |  | Lower 50\% (11 farms) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Well (6) | Other (6) | Well (7) | Other (4) |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds | 17,162 | 18,711 | 13,274 | 18,060 |
| Labor and management income per operator per cow | $\$ 908$ | $\$ 1,018$ | $\$ 218$ | $\$ 6$ |

## Milking System

Farms utilizing some sort of a parlor (herringbone, parallel, rotary, flat barn or other) were separated from those utilizing a pipeline. The type of milking system may impact the degree of control the manager has over the supplemental feeding system and the capital investment level of the farm. In total there were 13 parlor systems ( 11 pit parlors, 2 flat parlors) and the remaining 10 farms used pipeline systems.

## MILKING SYSTEM

Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007

|  | Top 50\% (11 farms) |  | Lower 50\% (12 farms) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pipeline (4) | Parlor (7) | Pipeline (6) | Parlor (6) |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds | 19,120 | 17,092 | 14,741 | 16,911 |
| Labor and management income per operator per cow | $\$ 1,135$ | $\$ 784$ | $\$ 52$ | $\$ 201$ |
| Average number of cows | 59 | 205 | 82 | 160 |

## Commercial Fertilizer

Fifteen farms applied fertilizer to the paddocks during the growing season. The majority of farms applied urea and others applied a blended fertilizer. It is not possible to compare pasture yields in the different systems because quantities were not measured from farms that mechanically harvested hay from pasture.

COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER
Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007

|  | Top 50\% (13 farms) |  | Lower 50\% (13 farms) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Applied <br> Fertilizer (8) | Did Not Apply <br> Fertilizer (5) | Applied <br> Fertilizer (7) | Did Not Apply <br> Fertilizer (6) |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds | 17,548 | 18,713 | 16,793 | 13,954 |
| Labor and management income per operator per cow | $\$ 1,025$ | $\$ 875$ | $\$ 129$ | $\$ 110$ |
| Stocking rate, cows per acre | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| Percent forage from pasture | $61 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Most common product applied | Urea |  | Urea |  |

## Intensive Grazing Satisfaction Comments

On a scale of 1 to 5 , with 5 being the highest, 26 farms responded with the average rating of grazing satisfaction as 4.6 with 16 farms responding 5 (very satisfied), 7 responding 4 (satisfied), and 3 responding 3 (equally satisfied). When asked whether their lifestyle has improved with the adoption of rotational grazing, 22 farms responded with 21 saying "yes" and 1 saying "no".

## Grazing Trends

The table below compares key figures from 1996 (the first year of the intensive grazing summary), 2007, and a 12-year average (not the same farms all 12 years). Cow numbers have increased but milk sold per cow has remained basically the same. ${ }^{3}$ Operating cost of producing milk in 2007 averaged $\$ 2.57$ above the 12 -year average and $\$ 2.27$ above 1996 . Net farm income per cow without appreciation was $\$ 506$ higher in 2007 than the 12 -year average. Due to the higher milk price in 2007, the grain cost was lower as a percent of milk receipts.

2007 GRAZING INFORMATION COMPARED TO 1996 AND 1996 - 2007 AVERAGE
Intensive Grazing Farms, 1996-2007

|  | 59 Grazing Dairy Farms, <br> 1996 Average | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms, <br> 2007 <br> Average | 46 Grazing Dairy Farms, <br> $1996-2007$ Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of cows | 78 | 110 | 93 |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds |  | 16,627 | 16,988 |
| Operating cost of producing milk per cwt. | 17,270 | $\$ 13.56$ | $\$ 10.99$ |
| Net farm income per cow without apprec. | $\$ 11.29$ | $\$ 1,019$ | $\$ 513$ |
| Grain and concentrate as $\%$ of milk receipts | $\$ 409$ | $23 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Grain and concentrate expense per cwt. milk | $30 \%$ | $\$ 4.82$ | $\$ 3.96$ |
| Price of milk per cwt. | $\$ 4.41$ | $\$ 21.21$ | $\$ 15.37$ |

[^1]
## Percent Forage from Pasture

The following graphs compare the percent forage from pasture to labor and management incomes per operator per cow and pasture acres per cow.



## INTENSIVE GRAZING FARMS VS. NON-GRAZING FARMS

## New York State Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | All Intensive Grazing Farms ${ }^{65}$ | Non-Grazing Farms ${ }^{66}$ | Profitable Grazing Farms ${ }^{67}$ | Profitable NonGrazing Farms ${ }^{68}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of farms | 36 | 131 | 18 | 47 |
| Business Size \& Production |  |  |  |  |
| Number of cows | 110 | 114 | 107 | 103 |
| Number of heifers | 87 | 92 | 87 | 86 |
| Milk sold, lbs. | 1,824,273 | 2,261,969 | 1,784,418 | 2,188,578 |
| Milk sold/cow, lbs. | 16,627 | 19,811 | 16,625 | 21,195 |
| Milk plant test, \% butterfat | 3.4\% | 3.5\% | 4.0\% | 3.6\% |
| Cull rate | 24.0\% | 29.0\% | 25.0\% | 28.0\% |
| Tillable acres, total | 273 | 322 | 223 | 275 |
| Hay crop, tons DM/acre | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Corn silage, tons/acre | 17.6 | 17.8 | 19.4 | 17.3 |
| Forage DM/cow, tons | 5.1 | 8.8 | 4.3 | 9.2 |
| Labor \& Capital Efficiency |  |  |  |  |
| Worker equivalent | 2.70 | 3.35 | 2.59 | 3.00 |
| Milk sold/worker, lbs. | 675,657 | 675,551 | 688,300 | 729,323 |
| Cows/worker | 41 | 34 | 41 | 34 |
| Farm capital/worker | \$331,528 | \$327,292 | \$320,473 | \$300,325 |
| Farm capital/cow | \$8,158 | \$9,603 | \$7,733 | \$8,725 |
| Farm capital/cwt. milk | \$49 | \$48 | \$47 | \$41 |
| Machinery \& equipment per cow | \$1,474 | \$1,897 | \$1,355 | \$1,668 |
| Milk Production Costs \& Returns |  |  |  |  |
| Selected costs/cwt.: |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$1.54 | \$1.80 | \$1.54 | \$1.51 |
| Grain \& concentrate | \$4.82 | \$4.94 | \$4.67 | \$4.73 |
| Purchased roughage | \$0.64 | \$0.26 | \$0.57 | \$0.34 |
| Replacements purchased | \$0.09 | \$0.09 | \$0.07 | \$0.08 |
| Vet \& medicine | \$0.51 | \$0.56 | \$0.42 | \$0.60 |
| Milk marketing | \$0.95 | \$0.97 | \$0.93 | \$0.97 |
| Other dairy expenses | \$1.15 | \$1.51 | \$0.99 | \$1.42 |
| Operating cost of producing milk/cwt. | \$13.56 | \$14.01 | \$12.04 | \$12.85 |
| Total labor cost/cwt. | \$4.24 | \$4.26 | \$4.03 | \$3.81 |
| Owner/operator resources/cwt. | \$4.07 | \$3.97 | \$3.89 | \$3.54 |
| Total cost of producing milk/cwt. | \$19.64 | \$19.62 | \$17.71 | \$17.86 |
| Average farm price/cwt. | \$21.21 | \$20.43 | \$21.28 | \$20.53 |
| Related Cost Factors |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor/cow | \$256 | \$357 | \$256 | \$321 |
| Total labor/cow | \$705 | \$844 | \$671 | \$808 |
| Purchased dairy feed/cow | \$907 | \$1,030 | \$872 | \$1,073 |
| Purchased grain \& concentrate as \% of milk receipts | 23\% | 25\% | 23\% | 23\% |
| Vet \& medicine/cow | \$85 | \$111 | \$71 | \$127 |
| Machinery costs/cow | \$688 | \$793 | \$599 | \$799 |
| Feed \& crop exp./cwt. | \$6.59 | \$6.24 | \$6.49 | \$6.07 |
| Profitability Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| Net farm income (with appreciation) | \$154,327 | \$149,932 | \$172,820 | \$178,621 |
| Net farm income (without apprec.) | \$111,783 | \$114,705 | \$140,063 | \$142,082 |
| Net farm income per cow (w/o apprec.) | \$1,019 | \$1,005 | \$1,305 | \$1,376 |
| Net farm income per cwt. (w/o apprec.) | \$6.13 | \$5.07 | \$7.85 | \$6.49 |
| Labor \& management income/operator | \$54,684 | \$46,592 | \$86,364 | \$80,635 |
| Labor \& mgmt. income/operator/cow | \$497 | \$409 | \$807 | \$781 |
| Rates of return on: |  |  |  |  |
| Equity capital with appreciation | 15.9\% | 11.7\% | 20.1\% | 19.9\% |
| All capital with appreciation | 13.3\% | 10.2\% | 16.9\% | 15.8\% |

[^2]
## CASE STUDIES

## Sheffer's Grassland Dairy

For the Sheffer family of Hoosick Falls, New York, farming has been a way of life for over two centuries. The current farm dates back to 1774. The newest generation (Eric Sheffer and family) is shaking up tradition and milking cows under a managed grazing system. Wally and Kathy (Eric's parents), bought the current farm from Wally's parents in 1983. The farm came with 160 acres and older facilities that were taken down or converted to crop storage. Wally decided to custom raise heifers for eleven years (1987-1998) peaking at 225 heifers. In the late 1990’s Wally went back to cropping and turned the farm into a haymaking operation from 1998 to 2007. During these years, Wally became interested in grazing and employed self-education as a way to satisfy his intrigue. Beginning about 2000, Wally attended various conferences and took part in many farm tours taking Eric along with him.

Eric attended Cornell University in the fall of 2004 and over the course of his undergraduate career made several key decisions that positioned him to begin farming immediately following his graduation in December of 2007. He had made the concrete decision that he was going to return to the farm in the winter of 2005. This decision may have been the most crucial because this would lay the foundation for some of Eric's collegiate experiences. He spent a semester abroad in Canterbury, New Zealand. In this grazing intensive area of the world Eric took advantage of both the academic and practical education that was offered. In 2007, he set the stage for the grazing dairy by purchasing 100 open yearlings with financial backing from his parents. The heifers were bought open intentionally so that a seasonal herd could be developed from the start. The facility construction and renovation was mostly done in-house, being planned and engineered mainly by Wally and took place over the course of three years. A costshared fence was installed in the winter of 2005, the double 20-swing parlor was built over the fall of 2007 and into the beginning part of March 2008, and the housing facilities were renovated in the summer of 2007.

Today the dairy is fully operational. The herd consists of 102 two-year-olds, grazing 115 acres of fenced pasture, and peaking at 52 pounds of milk per day. There are currently 40 replacements. However, due to the seasonal nature of the dairy the replacements are all calves. The total acreage owned is still 160 acres with another 150 acres that are rented to make baleage for the winter months. Eric's parents own the land, facilities, and machinery while Eric owns all of the animals. The herd is rotated every twelve hours to a new pasture. This year the herd started grazing around the middle of April. Eric and Wally are the chief sources of labor with a helping hand from a part-time relief employee. Water is provided in all pastures via a water wagon but there are plans to implement a hose and trough system for next spring. Financing for this was received through a NRCS grant from the federal government.

Sheffer's Grassland Dairy has bought into genetics through the use of New Zealand bulls. They feel that this gives them an advantage in this tight margined dairy industry. The herd currently consists mostly of Crossbred Jerseys and Holsteins with a few Jerseys and Ayrshires. The genetics being used are all out of New Zealand and the calves on the ground today are the first generation of New Zealand Friesian (New Zealand Jersey, Kiwi Cross, and New Zealand Ayrshire). The service semen used depends on the breed of the cow. The Sheffers feel that because they are using genetics from a country that has been successfully grazing for decades, they are positioning themselves well for the future. High components, fertility and the genetic predisposition to graze allows for an effective grazing dairy. The herd is 100 percent seasonal and currently no sexed semen is being used. The seasonal herd has its challenges but through an extremely high heat detection rate and a young and well-managed herd, the pregnancy rate on this dairy is also extremely high. Heats are recorded through visual detection and tail painting and all cows are given a lutylase shot by 20 days in milk to ensure the cycling pattern has started.

Looking back over the course of the last year Eric and Wally faced many challenges that tested their tempers and built their confidence and skill. When asked to reflect on getting started in dairying, Eric felt that the key was to make decisions and investments that allow one to widen that margin. They kept their investment low by only purchasing assets that were productive and would give them a return that is constant. The cost-shared fence was another decision that made the starting process more bearable and cost effective. Eric also feels that through the challenging month of March, when the majority of the herd freshened, he persevered and learned from mistakes. He is confident that he and the family can make smart decisions and weather through future challenging times.

The future plan for the dairy is to grow and grow quickly. Sheffer's Grassland Dairy would like to double the herd size in less than four years. This will require the farm to improve soil fertility and utilize more adjacent land to incorporate into the grazing system. The purchase of extra replacements is also on the list of investments to make. This was Eric and Wally’s mindset even before they started milking in March. The double 20-swing parlor's efficiency currently makes the size of the dairy unrestricted. It is clear that Eric, with the help of his parents, has positioned Sheffer’s Grassland Dairy well for future growth.

## Cloverpatch Dairy

Located in eastern central Ohio, Cloverpatch Dairy is a grazing operation centered around Jersey cows. Located at the present facility since 1997 the farm is operated by Alan and Sharon Kozak, with help from their two young children, Courtney and Brandon.

## History

After graduating from Penn State University in 1984, Alan returned to the home farm in Southwestern PA. After six months, he realized that it was not going to work out, and that he needed to do something else. After working in extension for 2 years and for breed associations for 4 years, it was time to try dairy farming again. While working on budgets and planning on where to go to get back into dairy farming, grazing was the only way that he figured that he would be successful. In 1991, a farm was rented and 156 cows with youngstock were purchased, and the grazing dairy was started. The rented facility was quite rough and after a year, he determined that another facility was needed if he was going to stay in business. A second facility in eastern Ohio was located and rented for 5 years. Over the next five years, the herd grew to 150 cows, but there was not sufficient land for grazing. The facilities were also quite rough and labor inefficient.

However, the facility was going to be sold at the end of the lease period, (a blessing in disguise) and it was time to again look for a place to farm. Despite the difficulty in the first six years, Alan was still quite interested in being in the dairy business. At the time of the next move, if he sold out, the business was technically insolvent. Time was spent looking in 5 or 6 different states at facilities and land bases, as well as what was available to rent. Buying an existing farm was not an option due to his highly leveraged position. An operation was located, found through the milk hauler, and the herd was moved in 1997 to the current facility. The dairy at that time was a conventional farm, so wire was strung around hay fields and new pastures were established. When deciding on where to move, the landlord's goals, location, milk market, land base, and facilities were all evaluated.

## Current Operation

By controlling Johnes' disease, involuntary culling, and achieving low death losses in the replacement program, the herd has grown to 400 cows, 300 heifers, and 500 workable acres. Pasture consists of 405 acres, with 95 utilized to grow corn silage and cereal grain.

The main barn has 220 sand bedded stalls with the milking parlor in one corner. The new bedded pack barn, built in 2007, is a drive-through measuring $120 \times 156$ feet. It is used to house 150 cows during the winter months and for feeding TMR during the grazing season. Over the years, they have used three different management rails and now have 390 headlocks and would hate to be without them.

The milking parlor was originally a swing 12 , which was used up until the spring of 2008. In 2008, the parlor was retro fitted and expanded into a swing 20 , with all new equipment to improve labor efficiency and the ability to milk more cows.

## Key Operating Characteristics

The first key ingredient for the success of the operation is the herd, focusing on registered Jerseys. Jerseys are better adapted to grazing and fit well in stalls that would be too short for anything but a Jersey. This focus, they feel, has increased the productive life of their cows within their herd, allowed them to produce higher pounds of components shipped off the farm, take advantage of the local milk market that rewards higher protein, and have the ability to merchandise excess animals for a premium. The combination of reproduction efficiency and productive life advantages of the Jersey has allowed tremendous internal herd growth, with both the farm expanding in size and having the ability to sell excess animals.

The second key area has been a focus on making high levels of milk production while utilizing grazing methods. In 2007, over 19,900 pounds were shipped per cow, with grazing being a key component of the ration. For the 2007 grazing season, the ration consisted of 42 pounds of dry matter intake, with the average from pasture equaling 15 pounds of dry matter, or 36 percent. The remainder of the ration, on an as-fed basis, was comprised of 20 pounds of grain, 15 pounds of corn silage, 3.5 pounds of hay, 2 pounds of liquid molasses, and a mineral pack. Currently in 2008, the grain supplementation is at 18 pounds of grain, due to higher quality forages. The grazing pastures are comprised of both new seedings and old hay fields. The old hay fields are a mixture of orchardgrass, bluegrass, quackgrass, clover and other miscellaneous things. The new seedings are a orchard/clover mix. Orchardgrass is utilized for palatability, durability, dry tolerance, space for diversity, ease of mechanical harvest, and use a year-round ration. The pastures are maintained with a ph greater than 6.5 , and 100 pounds of urea per acre is spread four times a year, for a total of 400 for the year. Chicken manure and compost are also utilized when available.

With the spring flush of grass, Alan mechanically harvests paddocks not needed for grazing to encourage tillering, expression of volunteer crabgrass and to maintain quality of pasture for latter cycles and winter feed production. Pastures are clipped 2-4 times a year. Dry cows follow milk cows in rotation in August and September. With the semi-seasonal herd, these are the fall calving cows that will calve in October and November. During the rest of the grazing season, there are no dry cows. A key management approach for the pasture and the dry matter intake of the cows is the following: if the pasture gets ahead of the cows; mechanically harvest as baleage. If the cows get ahead of the pasture, increase amounts of baleage or dry hay are fed in the TMR.

The third key area is the location of the farm. The environment allows for a good grass growing season without too long or cold of a winter. Also the farm is located in a milk market that rewards higher percent components, due to the fact that the milk goes for cheese.

The fourth key ingredient, or business approach, is renting the complete dairy and focusing ownership efforts on cattle. By renting the facility, total investment levels have been lower, and when extra capital has been available, it could be focused on cattle. This was also the only way they could be in the dairy business initially. While the facility is rented, significant capital has been used to improve the operations, with the investment in the new milking center and compost bedded pack barn coming from Alan and the family, and not the landlords. The dairy farm business summary is utilized heavily in this approach to budget the impact changes may have, track performance, and to work with the lender to finance facility improvements and new construction on land not owned.

The agreement is for 12 more years at this point, with the landlords very excited to have a grazing operation utilizing their resources. Part of their focus for doing certain things, such as replacing the roof on the main barn, is to help Alan be successful as a renter.

## Breeding Program

With the focus on purebred animals, and generating the ability to grow the herd internally and/or sell excess animals, special focus is placed on the breeding program. Sexed semen is used on 100 percent of the heifers for up to 3 breedings, at which point bulls are utilized. Heat detection is through observation only, with no aids utilized. Bulls utilized for clean-up are raised on the farm, with the farm being a closed herd over the last 5 years. Over the last year, over 90 percent of the animals have been bred and confirmed pregnant from an artificial insemination service.

Sexed semen is also used on one-half of the cows for the first service. The milking herd is 100 percent AI, with no bulls being utilized. Breedings are done utilizing head locks and tail chalking. AI bulls are selected based on udder depth and production level. Ultra sound is also utilized every week, primarily to detect open cows and get them back into the breeding cycle.

## Replacements

Newborn calves are fed colostrum from their dam or a first-calve heifer within the first 2 hours of their life. No colostrum is pooled in order to control Johne's. They are kept in individual pens for one week, at which point they are moved into group pens of 10-14 animals on a barrel mob feeder. They are weaned at eight weeks old. Sanitation is a key focus for the wet calves, with ammonia utilized for cleaning to control cyrpto. An aggressive vaccination program is also utilized with the dry cows to improve the passive immunity of the newborn calves.

Heifers receive 2 to 5 pounds of grain daily, balanced to supplement the forages being fed. Pasture is the forage of choice with baleage and hay utilized when pasture is not available. Except for fall calves, which have a bedded shelter for their first winter, replacements are housed outdoors until 21 days prior to calving, when they move back into the barn.

## Looking to the Future

Alan and family are excited about the future in the grazing dairy business. They are looking forward to capturing the value associated with the additional barn space and milking parlor capacity. With 12 years left on the rental agreement, they are not currently looking to buy a farm. As the children get older, and if they express an interest in dairy farming, purchasing a farm is something that would be considered if they are in a financial position to do so. Alan uses the Dairy Farm Business Summary (DFBS) to track the progress of the business as different decisions are made. With DFBS, they have better information for making decisions and preparing budgets. DFBS is a tool used with the lender for tracking the overall performance of the business and comparing it to other farms, grazing and non-grazing, in the summary.

Willow Creek Farm: Thinking Outside The Fence
Grazing Dairy Looks to Robotic Milker to Increase Family Time

Willow Creek Farm of Belmont New York, looks similar to other grazing dairies in the Northeast: cows grazing or resting in sloping pastures waiting for milking time. The big difference is that these cows don't wait for milking time. They can walk back to the barn to be milked at any time they choose. At present the herd is choosing to being milked 2.8 times daily by two Lely robotic milkers. Chuck Diechman, owner operator of Willow Creek, programs the number of milkings for each of the 75 cows into the robotic milker. The number of milkings is based on the stage of lactation and the cow's production, any where from 2 to 4 milkings per day. He has been very happy with his decision to go to robotic milkers, he estimates that they have increased his cow's production 6-7 lbs per cow and they have cut his daily chore time in half. These two benefits alone will pay back his $\$ 210,000$ investment in less than 7 years. Even though he is happy now, making the decision to purchase the robots was not an easy one, due in part to the amount of capital required for the purchase but also the unknowns such as: how would the cows react to being milked by the robots; since Willow Creek is certified organic, how would his certifier and milk purchaser react; and one of the biggest unknowns, was that robotic milkers have traditionally been used in confinement operations, would the cows come back from his pastures to be milked? His system is one of the first in the United States to be on a grazing dairy.

## History of Willow Creek Farm

Chuck and his wife Julia, a teacher, purchased the farm from Chuck's father in 1995. The barn was modified to hold 36 cows in tie stalls. In 2001 he added a coverall building with 80 stalls. He milked the cows in shifts in the tie stalls for 5 years. By 2006 cow numbers were up to 60 and Chuck felt his knees were giving out and chores were taking 6-7 hours per day for him and a full time employee. His strongest motivation for a change was family time -- -- there wasn't enough of it. At that time he had four children aged $3,6,8$, and 10 . Something needed to change so that he could increase his family time.

When he looked at cost of a parlor it was around $\$ 90,000$. The parlor would shorten his chore time by 1-2 hours and relieve the stress on his knees. Chuck had read about dairies using robots and decided to price one for his dairy. The amount of time saving was much better with the robot. The cost was $\$ 165,000$. When he went to his banker with his comparisons the banker remarked, that for the extra money that a robot cost, it was still "cheap labor". Typically one unit handles up to 55 cows milking. Chuck had the first unit installed in June of 2007. His cow numbers were at the maximum for the single unit so he ordered another unit that was installed in July of this year. Horizon Organic purchases Chuck's milk and he was concerned there might be negative response to robotics in organic. The company encouraged him to proceed and has been interested in his progress.

## Robots vs. Hands On

Chuck was asked by an organic farmer at a recent field day at Willow Creek, "doesn't he find that the elimination of the constant touching of the animals at milking time eliminate his abilities to identify a cow who may have a health issue beginning?" Chuck replied that with the daily reports the robot prepares, he has even better tools for diagnosing herd and individual cow health. Some of the measurements that Chuck can check at the monitor in the barn office next to the robots or at another screen in his house:

- Conductivity of each quarter to measure SCC.
- Body Temperature.
- Whether milk contains blood, if it does it is automatically diverted to a container.
- All teats have the first ounce of milk discarded.
- Milk production.
- Number of times and when each cow enters the machine.
- Body weight, (useful when tracking ration changes).
- The gates where the cows go after milking can also be changed from either of the monitors.

Each cow wears a transponder on her collar. The units tracks and stores all information on a computer. With this information Chuck can tell if a cow is beginning a stressful time if her production drops, or her temperature changes, or her times visiting the unit varies.

The robots are set to call Chuck's cell phone and alert him if there are any major deviances from set parameters. He will get a call if the wash system is out of soap, the vacuum is incorrect, or a cow hasn't gone through the units in 14 hours. At present he has 4 cows that refuse to use the units, all are older cows. He makes it part of his chores to go out to the pastures to bring them in. Heifers have no problem learning the robotic system. At present he has one new heifer that enters the units up to 20 times a day hoping for some more grain. The units will only dispense grain depending on whether the animal is due to be milked again. When the cows come back to the barn they are prevented from going back to the pastures by one-way gates. The only way out is
through the robots. When leaving the units, depending on how Chuck has set the automatic gates, the cows will either be directed to the feed alley or out to the pastures where there is another set of one-way gates. From here Chuck uses manual gates to direct them to one of five different grazing systems on his farm. The furthest pasture is about a half mile away.

## Forage Management

Willow Creek is located in a high valley of western New York. They have tried to grow corn 7 years in the past 30. Five times the corn was frosted before it ripened. For that reason Chuck doesn't grow any grain crops, he instead has put a lot of management into his grass production, harvesting, and feeding. They do most of their first cutting as baleage. This is sampled and stacked in specific areas where it can be retrieved as Chuck feels that it would fit his feeding plan best. He feeds some baleage all the time in the barn. His mixer can process two bales at once. He will decide what level of quality he needs to compliment his pastures. In early spring he will place two of his lower quality bales in the mixer. As the quality of the pasture goes down he will use one of higher quality bales to go along with the lower quality bale. When pasture is gone he uses two of his higher quality bales. This year Chuck tried a pea and oat mix as a nurse crop. He has enough of this mix to use one a day during the winter months. His grain that is dispensed by the robots is an 18 percent pellet. He programs the units to feed 1 pound of grain to 6 pounds of milk during the pasture months and then he reprograms them to give 1 pound to 4 pounds in the winter months.

## Quality of Life

Chuck can now attend his children's soccer games, attend events and meetings further from home. Chuck tells the story that last year he attended a high school reunion. He had a call on his cell phone. When he told his friends that his robot was calling, no one believed him. The message said that the unit was out of soap. Chuck was able to reset the unit from his phone, it continued milking and he refilled the soap when he got home. He figures chores take only half the time they used to and he can do them quicker but enjoys the opportunity to do a better job with the calves. Not being confined to a parlor during milking time also allows Chuck to work with his children around the farm. They are now ages 12, 10, 8, and 5 . He appreciates this time which allows the children to feel more a part to the family operation. Chuck's decision seems an easy one now. When there were the unknowns -- the weeks of holding the cows in the robot unit, and then having to milk in the tie stalls too, he wasn't so sure he had made the right one.

## SUMMARY OF GRAZING FARMS BY HERD SIZE

There were 12 New York grazing farms with more than 90 cows. Herd size does not guarantee profitability, however, as small farms that are able to produce higher levels of milk per cow also show higher levels of profitability. The chart below shows the variation in labor and management income per operator by pounds of milk sold per cow. The table on the following page compares grazing farms by herd size group.

## LABOR AND MANAGEMENT INCOMES PER OPERATOR PER COW AND MILK PER COW

36 Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007


Pounds Milk Sold Per Cow

## INTENSIVE GRAZING FARMS BY HERD SIZE GROUP

36 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | Less Than 48 Cows | $\begin{gathered} 48 \text { to } 90 \\ \text { Cows } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 90 \text { Cows } \\ & \text { Or More } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of farms | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Business Size \& Production |  |  |  |
| Number of cows | 39 | 59 | 231 |
| Number of heifers | 30 | 44 | 186 |
| Milk sold, lbs. | 656,215 | 985,914 | 3,830,691 |
| Milk sold/cow, lbs. | 16,900 | 16,592 | 16,589 |
| Milk plant test, \% butterfat | 3.7\% | 4.3\% | 3.3\% |
| Cull rate | 25\% | 28\% | 23\% |
| Tillable acres, total | 157 | 151 | 512 |
| Hay crop, tons DM/acre | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| Corn silage, tons/acre | 17.4 | 16.0 | 17.9 |
| Forage DM/cow, tons | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.0 |
| Labor \& Capital Efficiency |  |  |  |
| Worker equivalent | 1.75 | 1.95 | 4.40 |
| Milk sold/worker, lbs. | 376,055 | 504,734 | 870,612 |
| Cows/worker | 22 | 30 | 52 |
| Farm capital/worker | \$239,252 | \$270,244 | \$395,389 |
| Farm capital/cow | \$10,783 | \$8,869 | \$7,534 |
| Farm capital/cwt. milk | \$64 | \$53 | \$45 |
| Milk Production Costs \& Returns |  |  |  |
| Selected costs/cwt.: |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$0.73 | \$0.90 | \$1.84 |
| Grain \& concentrate | 5.28 | 4.61 | 4.79 |
| Purchased roughage | 0.89 | 0.61 | 0.60 |
| Replacements purchased | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.07 |
| Veterinary \& medicine | 0.49 | 0.40 | 0.54 |
| Milk marketing | 1.01 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Other dairy expenses | 1.68 | 1.62 | 0.95 |
| Operating cost of producing milk/cwt. | 13.45 | 12.90 | 13.75 |
| Owner/operator resources/cwt. | 7.06 | 5.63 | 3.15 |
| Total labor cost/cwt. | 7.44 | 5.28 | 3.43 |
| Total cost of producing milk/cwt. | 24.05 | 20.23 | 18.74 |
| Average farm price/cwt. | 20.94 | 20.59 | 21.41 |
| Related Cost Factors |  |  |  |
| Hired labor/cow | \$124 | \$149 | \$305 |
| Total labor/cow | 1,257 | 876 | 568 |
| Purchased dairy feed/cow | 1,043 | 866 | 895 |
| Purchased grain \& concentrate as \% of milk receipts | 25\% | 22\% | 22\% |
| Veterinary \& medicine/cow | \$83 | \$67 | \$89 |
| Machinery costs/cow | \$805 | \$607 | \$690 |
| Feed \& crop expense/cwt. | \$7.03 | \$6.19 | \$6.62 |
| Profitability Analysis |  |  |  |
| Net farm income (without appreciation) | \$34,774 | \$64,306 | \$236,308 |
| Net farm income/cow (without appreciation) | \$895 | \$1,082 | \$1,023 |
| Net farm income/cwt. (without appreciation) | \$5.29 | \$6.52 | \$6.17 |
| Labor \& management income/operator | \$7,842 | \$31,096 | \$107,568 |
| Labor \& management income/operator/cow | \$201 | \$527 | \$466 |
| Rates of return on: |  |  |  |
| Equity capital with appreciation | 1.9\% | 8.0\% | 22.8\% |
| All capital with appreciation | 2.7\% | 7.7\% | 17.5\% |

## SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BUSINESS

## Business Characteristics

Planning the optimal management strategies is a crucial component of operating a successful farm. Various combinations of farm resources, enterprises, business arrangements, and management techniques are used by the grazing dairy farmers in New York. The following table shows important farm business characteristics and the number of farms with each characteristic.

## BUSINESS CHARACTERISTICS
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| Type of Farm | Number | Milking System | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dairy | 36 | Bucket \& carry | 0 |
| Part-time dairy | 0 | Dumping station | 0 |
| Dairy cash-crop | 0 | Pipeline | 18 |
|  |  | Herringbone-conventional exit | 7 |
|  |  | Herringbone-rapid exit | 2 |
| Type of Ownership | Number | Parallel | 1 |
| Owner | 32 | Parabone | 3 |
| Renter | 4 | Rotary | 0 |
|  |  | Other | 5 |
| Type of Business | Number |  |  |
| Sole Proprietorship | 24 | Production Records | Number |
| Partnership | 6 | Testing Service | 26 |
| Limited Liability Corporation | 5 | On-Farm System | 3 |
| Subchapter S Corporation | 1 | Other | 0 |
| Subchapter C Corporation | 0 | None | 7 |
| Type of Barn | Number | bST Usage | Number |
| Stanchion or Tie-Stall | 18 | Used consistently | 4 |
| Freestall | 13 | Used inconsistently | 0 |
| Combination | 5 | Started using in 2007 | 0 |
|  |  | Stopped using in 2007 | 0 |
| Milking Frequency | Number | Not used in 2007 | 32 |
| 2 times per day | 35 | Average percent usage, if used | 90\% |
| 3 times per day | 0 |  |  |
| Other | 1 | Business Record System | Number |
|  |  | Account Book | 11 |
| Breed | Percent | Accounting Service | 3 |
| Holstein | 69 | On-farm computer software | 22 |
| Jersey | 17 | Other | 0 |
| Other | 14 |  |  |

The averages used in this report were compiled using data from all the participating grazing dairy farms in New York unless noted otherwise. There are full-time dairy farms, farm renters, partnerships, and corporations included in the average. Average data for these specific types of farms are presented in the State Business Summary.

## Income Statement

In order for an income statement to accurately measure farm income, it must include cash transactions and accrual adjustments (changes in accounts payable, accounts receivable, inventories, and prepaid expenses).

Cash paid is the actual cash outlay during the year and does not necessarily represent the cost of goods and services actually used in 2007.

Change in inventory: Increases in inventories of supplies and other purchased inputs are subtracted in computing accrual expenses because they represent purchased inputs not actually used during the year. Decreases in purchased inventories are added to expenses because they represent inputs purchased in a prior year and used this year.

CASH AND ACCRUAL FARM EXPENSES
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| Expense Item | Cash Paid | - |  | Change in Inventory Prepaid Expense | + | Change in Accounts Payable | = |  | Accrual <br> xpenses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired Labor | \$ 27,981 |  | \$ | -52 | << | \$ 5 |  | \$ | 28,038 |
| Feed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy grain \& concentrate | 99,703 |  |  | 9,232 |  | -2,624 |  |  | 87,847 |
| Dairy roughage | 11,724 |  |  | 75 |  | 26 |  |  | 11,675 |
| Nondairy | 26 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 26 |
| Professional nutritional services | 171 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 171 |
| Machinery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Machinery hire, rent \& lease | 17,693 |  |  | 833 | << | 1,276 |  |  | 18,135 |
| Machinery repairs \& farm vehicle exp. | 17,984 |  |  | 31 |  | -731 |  |  | 17,222 |
| Fuel, oil \& grease | 12,902 |  |  | 421 |  | -222 |  |  | 12,259 |
| Livestock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement livestock | 1,607 |  |  | 0 | << | 0 |  |  | 1,607 |
| Breeding | 4,451 |  |  | 73 |  | 44 |  |  | 4,422 |
| Veterinary \& medicine | 9,231 |  |  | -139 |  | -98 |  |  | 9,272 |
| Milk marketing | 17,241 |  |  | 0 | << | 71 |  |  | 17,313 |
| Bedding | 3,988 |  |  | 280 |  | -643 |  |  | 3,066 |
| Milking supplies | 8,261 |  |  | 20 |  | -401 |  |  | 7,840 |
| Cattle lease \& rent | 0 |  |  | 0 | << | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Custom boarding | 517 |  |  | 0 | << | 4 |  |  | 522 |
| bST expense | 552 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 552 |
| Livestock professional fees | 1,474 |  |  | 167 |  | 0 |  |  | 1,307 |
| Other livestock expense | 3,342 |  |  | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 3,330 |
| Crops |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fertilizer \& lime | 18,943 |  |  | 5,054 |  | 561 |  |  | 14,449 |
| Seeds \& plants | 4,687 |  |  | 636 |  | 0 |  |  | 4,051 |
| Spray, other crop expense | 1,974 |  |  | 4 |  | -39 |  |  | 1,930 |
| Crop professional fees | 165 |  |  | 0 |  | 123 |  |  | 288 |
| Real Estate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land, building \& fence repair | 7,208 |  |  | 47 |  | 2 |  |  | 7,163 |
| Taxes | 8,081 |  |  | 0 | << | 76 |  |  | 8,158 |
| Rent \& lease | 6,025 |  |  | 0 | << | 0 |  |  | 6,025 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Insurance | 5,669 |  |  | 94 | << | -51 |  |  | 5,524 |
| Utilities (farm share) | 9,439 |  |  | 17 | << | -198 |  |  | 9,224 |
| Interest paid | 15,007 |  |  | 0 | << | -43 |  |  | 14,964 |
| Other professional fees | 2,041 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 2,041 |
| Miscellaneous | 3,514 |  |  | 14 |  | 61 |  |  | 3,560 |
| Total Operating | \$ 321,599 |  | \$ | 16,820 |  | \$-2,801 |  | \$ | 301,978 |
| Expansion livestock | 60 |  |  | 0 | << | 0 |  |  | 60 |
| Extraordinary expense | 456 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 456 |
| Machinery depreciation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,830 |
| Building depreciation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,333 |
| TOTAL ACCRUAL EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 329,657 |

Change in prepaid expenses (noted above by $\ll$ ) is a net change in non-inventory expenses that have been paid in advance of their use. For example, prepaid lease expense on the beginning of year balance sheet represents last year's payment for use of the asset during this year. End of year prepaid expense represents payments made this year for next year's use of the asset. Adding payments made last year for this year's use of the asset, and subtracting payments made this year for next year's use of the asset is accomplished by subtracting the difference.
Change in accounts payable: An increase in accounts payable from beginning to end of year is added when calculating accrual expenses because these expenses were incurred (resources used) in 2007 but not paid for. A decrease is subtracted because it represents payment for resources used before 2007.
Accrual expenses are an estimate of the costs of inputs actually used in this year's production. They are the cash paid, less changes in inventory and prepaid expenses, plus accounts payable.

## CASH AND ACCRUAL FARM RECEIPTS
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| Receipt Item |  | Cash <br> Receipts | + |  | Change in Inventory | + |  | Change in Accounts Receivable | = |  | Accrual Receipts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Milk sales | \$ | 374,148 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 12,692 |  | \$ | 386,840 |
| Dairy cattle |  | 22,952 |  | \$ | 1,736 |  |  | -17 |  |  | 24,671 |
| Dairy calves |  | 4,509 |  |  | 2,211 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 6,720 |
| Other livestock |  | 1,411 |  |  | 687 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 2,102 |
| Crops |  | 1,254 |  |  | 5,231 |  |  | -75 |  |  | 6,411 |
| Government receipts |  | 8,993 |  |  | 0 |  |  | -183 |  |  | 8,810 |
| Custom machine work |  | 757 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 757 |
| Gas tax refund |  | 511 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 511 |
| Other |  | 4,612 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4,618 |
| Less nonfarm noncash capital ${ }^{8}$ |  |  | (-) |  | 0 |  |  |  | (-) |  | 0 |
| Total Receipts | \$ | 419,146 |  | \$ | 9,865 |  | \$ | 12,428 |  | \$ | 441,439 |

${ }^{7}$ Change in advanced government receipts.
${ }^{8}$ Gifts or inheritances of cattle or crops included in inventory.
Cash receipts include the gross value of milk checks received during the year plus all other payments received from the sale of farm products, services, and government programs. Nonfarm income is not included in calculating farm profitability.

Changes in inventory of assets produced by the business are calculated by subtracting beginning of year values from end of year values excluding appreciation. Increases in livestock inventory caused by herd growth and/or quality are added, and decreases caused by herd reduction and/or quality are subtracted. Changes in inventories of crops grown are also included. An increase in advanced government receipts is subtracted from cash income because it represents income received in 2007 for the 2008 crop year in excess of funds earned for 2007. Likewise, a decrease is added to cash government receipts because it represents funds earned for 2007 but received in 2006.

Changes in accounts receivable are calculated by subtracting beginning year balances from end year balances. Payments in January for milk produced in December 2007 compared to January 2007 payments for milk produced in 2006 are included as a change in accounts receivable.

Accrual receipts represent the value of all farm commodities produced and services actually generated by the farm business during the year.

## Profitability Analysis

Farm operators ${ }^{9}$ contribute labor, management, and equity capital to their businesses and the combination of these resources, and the other resources used in the business, determines profitability. Farm profitability can be measured as the return to all family resources or as the return to one or more individual resources such as labor and management.

These measures should be considered estimates as they include inventory values that are only estimates and they include an unknown degree of error stemming from cash flow imbalances.

[^3]Net farm income is the return to the farm operators and other unpaid family members for their labor, management, and equity capital. It is the farm family's net annual return from working, managing, and financing the farm business. This is not a measure of cash available from the year's business operation. Cash flow is evaluated later in this report.

Net farm income is computed both with and without appreciation. Appreciation represents the change in values caused by annual changes in prices of livestock, machinery, real estate inventory, and stocks and certificates (other than Farm Credit). Appreciation is a major factor contributing to changes in farm net worth and must be included for a complete profitability analysis.

## NET FARM INCOME

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | $\begin{gathered} 36 \text { Grazing } \\ \text { Dairy Farms }^{10} \end{gathered}$ |  | Average <br> Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{10}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total accrual receipts | \$ | 441,439 | \$ | 442,471 |
| Appreciation: Livestock |  | 23,357 |  | 27,211 |
| Machinery |  | 3,696 |  | -3,116 |
| Real Estate |  | 14,919 |  | 7,783 |
| Other Stock \& Certificates |  | 573 |  | 879 |
| Total Including Appreciation | \$ | 483,984 | \$ | 475,228 |
| Total accrual expenses | - | 329,657 | - | 302,408 |
| Net Farm Income (with appreciation) | \$ | 154,327 | \$ | 172,820 |
| Net Farm Income Per Cow (with appreciation) | \$ | 1,407 | \$ | 1,610 |
| Net Farm Income (without appreciation) | \$ | 111,783 | \$ | 140,063 |
| Net Farm Income Per Cow (without appreciation) | \$ | 1,019 | \$ | 1,305 |

${ }^{10}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
The chart below shows the relationship between net farm income per cow (without appreciation) and pounds of milk sold per cow. Higher new farm incomes can be achieved across a range of production levels as a result of different management systems, such as grazing, being utilized by the participating dairies.

NET FARM INCOME PER COW AND MILK PER COW
36 Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007


Net farm income without appreciation averaged $\$ 111,783$ on these 36 farms in 2007. The range in net farm income without appreciation was from less than $\$-32,000$ to more than $\$ 660,000$. Net farm income was less than $\$ 40,000$ on 33 percent of the farms, between $\$ 40,000$ and $\$ 100,000$ on 31 percent of the farms, while 36 percent showed net farm incomes of $\$ 100,000$ or more.

DISTRIBUTION OF NET FARM INCOME WITHOUT APPRECIATION
36 Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007


The importance of cost control and its impact on farm profitability are illustrated in the chart below. As the operating cost of producing milk per hundredweight increased, net farm income per cow fell.

NET FARM INCOME/COW \& OPERATING COST OF PRODUCING MILK /CWT.
36 Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007


Labor and management income is the return which farm operators receive for their labor and management used in the farm business. Appreciation is not included as part of the return to labor and management because it results from ownership of assets rather than management of the farm business. Labor and management income is calculated by deducting a charge for family labor unpaid and the opportunity cost of using equity capital, at a real interest rate of five percent, from net farm income excluding appreciation. The interest charge of five percent reflects the long-term average rate of return above inflation that a farmer might expect to earn in comparable risk investments.

## LABOR AND MANAGEMENT INCOME
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| Item | $\begin{gathered} \hline 36 \text { Grazing } \\ \text { Dairy Farms }^{11} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{11}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net farm income without appreciation | \$ | 111,783 | \$ | 140,063 |
| Family labor unpaid @ \$2,400 per month | - | 9,107 | - | 6,947 |
| Interest on average equity capital @ 5\% real rate | - | 32,680 | - | 30,343 |
| Labor \& Management Income per Farm | \$ | 69,996 | \$ | 102,774 |
| Labor \& Management Income per Operator/Manager | \$ | 54,684 | \$ | 86,364 |
| Labor \& Management Income per Operator per Cow | \$ | 498 | \$ | 805 |

${ }^{11}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
Labor and management income per operator averaged $\$ 54,684$ on these 36 farms in 2007. The range in labor and management income per operator was from less than $\$-44,000$ to more than $\$ 497,000$. Returns to labor and management were less than $\$ 0$ on 22 percent of the farms. Labor and management incomes per operator were between $\$ 0$ and $\$ 40,000$ on 31 percent of the farms while 47 percent showed labor and management incomes of $\$ 40,000$ or more per operator.

DISTRIBUTION OF LABOR \& MANAGEMENT INCOMES PER OPERATOR
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The distribution of labor and management incomes per operator on grazing farms is somewhat similar to the distribution for all farms across the state that participate in the DFBS project. A considerable percentage of farms have labor and management incomes per operator less than zero. One comparison to make to the state distribution is the percentage of farms that were above zero labor and management income per operator. For the intensive grazing farms, 78 percent of the farms had returns that were over zero, while for 250 farms across the state, 86 percent had returns greater than zero in 2007.

Return on equity capital measures the net return remaining for the farmer's equity or owned capital after a charge has been made for the owner-operator's labor and management. The earnings or amount of net farm income allocated to labor and management is the opportunity cost of operators' labor and management estimated by the cooperators. Return on equity capital is calculated with and without appreciation. The rate of return on equity capital is determined by dividing the amount returned by the average farm net worth or equity capital. Return on total capital is calculated by adding interest paid to the return on equity capital and then dividing by average farm assets to calculate the rate of return on total capital. Net farm income from operations ratio is net farm income (without appreciation) divided by total accrual receipts.

## RETURN ON EQUITY CAPITAL AND RETURN ON TOTAL CAPITAL
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| Item | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{12}$ |  | Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{12}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net farm income with appreciation | \$ | 154,327 | \$ | 172,820 |
| Family labor unpaid @\$2,400 per month | - | 9,107 | - | 6,947 |
| Value of operators' labor \& management | - | 41,499 | - | 39,074 |
| Return on equity capital with appreciation | \$ | 103,721 | \$ | 126,800 |
| Interest paid | $+$ | 14,964 | $+$ | 13,069 |
| Return on total capital with appreciation | \$ | 118,685 | \$ | 139,869 |
| Return on equity capital without appreciation | \$ | 61,177 | \$ | 94,042 |
| Return on total capital without appreciation | \$ | 76,141 | \$ | 107,112 |
| Rate of return on average equity capital: |  |  |  |  |
| with appreciation |  | 15.9\% |  | 20.9\% |
| without appreciation |  | 9.4\% |  | 15.5\% |
| Rate of return on average total capital: |  |  |  |  |
| with appreciation |  | 13.3\% |  | 16.9\% |
| without appreciation |  | 8.5\% |  | 12.9\% |
| Net farm income from operations ratio |  | 0.25 |  | 0.32 |

${ }^{12}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.

## Farm and Family Financial Status

The first step in evaluating the financial position of the farm is to construct a balance sheet which identifies and values all the assets and liabilities of the business. The second step is to evaluate the relationship between assets, liabilities, and net worth and changes that occurred during the year.

Financial lease obligations are included in the balance sheet. The present value of all future payments is listed as a liability since the farmer is committed to make the payments by signing the lease. The present value is also listed as an asset, representing the future value the item has to the business. For 2007, lease payments were discounted by 9.05 percent to obtain their present value.

Advanced government receipts are included as current liabilities. Government payments received in 2007 that are for participation in the 2008 program are the end year balance and payments received in 2006 for participation in the 2007 program are the beginning year balance.

Current Portion or principal due in the next year for intermediate and long term debt is included as a current liability.

## 2007 FARM BUSINESS \& NONFARM BALANCE SHEET

36 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Farm Assets |  | Jan. 1 |  | Dec. 31 | Farm Liabilities \& Net Worth |  | Jan. 1 | Dec. 31 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current |  |  |  |  | Current |  |  |  |  |
| Farm cash, checking | \$ | 5,307 | \$ | 10,592 | Accounts payable | \$ | 15,442 | \$ | 12,641 |
| \& savings |  |  |  |  | Operating debt |  | 14,786 |  | 21,046 |
| Accounts receivable |  | 19,468 |  | 31,896 | Short Term |  | 57 |  | 314 |
| Prepaid expenses |  | 141 |  | 1,202 | Advanced govt. receipts |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Feed \& supplies |  | 47,889 |  | 68,880 | Current Portion: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Intermediate |  | 15,559 |  | 16,745 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Long Term |  | 6,843 |  | 7,520 |
| Total Current | \$ | 72,806 | \$ | 112,570 | Total Current | \$ | 52,687 | \$ | 58,265 |
| Intermediate |  |  |  |  | Intermediate |  |  |  |  |
| Dairy cows: |  |  |  |  | Structured debt |  |  |  |  |
| owned | \$ | 141,828 | \$ | 159,839 | 1-10 years | \$ | 77,924 | \$ | 75,000 |
| leased |  | 0 |  | 0 | Financial lease |  |  |  |  |
| Heifers |  | 86,190 |  | 95,396 | (cattle/machinery) |  | 455 |  | 196 |
| Bulls \& other livestock |  | 3,305 |  | 4,080 | Farm Credit stock |  | 825 |  | 741 |
| Mach. \& equip. owned |  | 149,984 |  | 172,753 | Total Intermediate | \$ | 79,204 | \$ | 75,937 |
| Mach. \& equip. leased |  | 455 |  | 196 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farm Credit stock |  | 825 |  | 741 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other stock/certificate |  | 15,567 |  | 17,664 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Intermediate | \$ | 398,155 | \$ | 450,668 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Long Term |  |  |  |  |
| Long Term |  |  |  |  | Structured debt |  |  |  |  |
| Land \& buildings: |  |  |  |  | >10 years | \$ | 92,877 | \$ | 124,089 |
| owned | \$ | 354,003 | \$ | 402,053 | Financial lease |  |  |  |  |
| leased |  | 0 |  | 0 | (structures) |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Total Long Term | \$ | 354,003 | \$ | 402,053 | Total Long Term | \$ | 92,877 | \$ | 124,089 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total Farm Liab. |  | 24,769 | \$ | 258,292 |
| Total Farm Assets |  | 824,964 | \$ | 965,290 | FARM NET WORTH |  | 600,195 | \$ | 706,999 |

Nonfarm Assets, Liabilities \& Net Worth (Average of 18 farms reporting)

| Assets |  | Jan. 1 |  | Dec. 31 | Liabilities \& Net Worth | Jan. 1 |  | Dec. 31 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Personal cash, checking \& savings | \$ | 12,819 | \$ | 19,653 | Nonfarm Liabilities | \$ | 1,160 | \$ | 684 |
| Cash value life insurance |  | 11,542 |  | 11,989 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonfarm real estate |  | 10,833 |  | 10,833 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Auto (personal share) |  | 9,421 |  | 10,498 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stocks \& bonds |  | 54,208 |  | 59,610 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household furnishings |  | 12,556 |  | 12,389 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All other nonfarm assets |  | 11,025 |  | 10,088 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Nonfarm Assets | \$ | 122,405 | \$ | 135,060 | NONFARM NET WORTH |  | 21,245 | \$ | ,376 |


| Farm \& Nonfarm Assets, Liabilities, and Net Worth ${ }^{13}$ | Jan. 1 | Dec. 31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Assets | \$ 947,369 | \$1,100,350 |
| Total Liabilities | 225,929 | 258,976 |
| TOTAL FARM \& NONFARM NET WORTH | \$ 721,440 | \$ 841,374 |

[^4]Balance sheet analysis involves examination of relative asset and debt levels for the business. Percent equity is calculated by dividing end of year net worth by end of year assets and multiplying by 100. The debt to asset ratio is compiled by dividing liabilities by assets. Low debt to asset ratios reflect business solvency and the potential capacity to borrow. The leverage ratio is the dollars of debt per dollar of equity, computed by dividing total farm liabilities by farm net worth. Debt levels per productive unit represent old standards that are still useful if used with measures of cash flow and repayment ability. A current ratio that has been falling or is less than 1.5 warrants additional evaluation. An adequate amount of working capital will be related to the size of the farm business.

BALANCE SHEET ANALYSIS
Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

${ }^{14}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
Farm inventory balance is an accounting of the value of assets used on the balance sheet and the changes that occur from the beginning to end of year. Changes in the livestock inventory are included in the dairy analysis. Net investment indicates whether the capital stock is being expanded (positive) or depleted (negative).

FARM INVENTORY BALANCE
36 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | Real Estate |  |  |  | Machinery \& Equipment |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Value beginning of year |  |  | \$ | 354,003 |  |  | \$ | 149,984 |
| Purchases | \$ | 57,479 ${ }^{15}$ |  |  | \$ | 39,627 |  |  |
| Gift \& inheritance | + | 5,694 |  |  | + | 53 |  |  |
| Lost capital | - | 21,736 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sales | - | 972 |  |  | - | 777 |  |  |
| Depreciation | - | 7,333 |  |  | - | 19,830 |  |  |
| Net investment |  |  | $=$ | 33,131 |  |  | = | 19,073 |
| Appreciation |  |  | $+$ | 14,919 |  |  | $+$ | 3,696 |
| Value end of year |  |  | \$ | 402,053 |  |  | \$ | 172,753 |

[^5]The Statement of Owner Equity has two purposes. It allows (1) verification that the accrual income statement and market value balance sheet are consistent (in accountants terms, they reconcile) and (2) identification of the causes of change in equity that occurred on the farm during the year. The Statement of Owner Equity allows you to determine to what degree the change in equity was caused by (1) earnings from the business, and nonfarm income, in excess of withdrawals being retained in the business (called retained earnings), (2) outside capital being invested in the business or farm capital being removed from the business (called contributed/withdrawn capital) , (3) increases or decreases in the value (price) of assets owned by the business (called change in valuation equity), and (4) the error in the business cash flow accounting.

Retained earnings is an excellent indicator of farm generated financial progress.

## STATEMENT OF OWNER EQUITY (RECONCILIATION)

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007


[^6]
## Cash Flow Statement

Completing an annual cash flow statement is an important step in understanding the sources and uses of funds for the business. Understanding last year's cash flow is the first step toward planning and managing cash flow for the current and future years.

The annual cash flow statement is structured to show net cash provided by operating activities, investing activities, financing activities and from reserves. All cash inflows and outflows, including beginning and end balances, are included. Therefore, the sum of net cash provided from all four activities should be zero. Any imbalance is the error from incorrect accounting of cash inflows/outflows. You should be aware that all profitability measures may be affected by this error.

## ANNUAL CASH FLOW STATEMENT <br> 36 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | Average |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow from Operating Activities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash farm receipts | \$ | 419,146 |  |  |  |  |
| - Cash farm expenses |  | 321,599 |  |  |  |  |
| - Extraordinary expense |  | 456 |  |  |  |  |
| $=$ Net cash farm income |  |  | \$ | 97,092 |  |  |
| Personal withdrawals \& family expenses including nonfarm debt payments | \$ | 43,195 |  |  |  |  |
| Nonfarm income |  | 7,254 |  |  |  |  |
| - Net cash withdrawals from the farm |  |  | \$ | 35,941 |  |  |
| $=$ Net Provided by Operating Activities |  |  |  |  | \$ | 61,151 |
| Cash Flow From Investing Activities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sale of assets: machinery | \$ | 777 |  |  |  |  |
| + real estate |  | 972 |  |  |  |  |
| + other stock \& cert. |  | 131 |  |  |  |  |
| $=$ Total asset sales |  |  | \$ | 1,880 |  |  |
| Capital purchases: expansion livestock | \$ | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| + machinery |  | 39,627 |  |  |  |  |
| + real estate |  | 57,479 |  |  |  |  |
| + other stock\& cert. |  | 1,654 |  |  |  |  |
| - Total invested in farm assets |  |  | \$ | 98,820 |  |  |
| $=$ Net Provided by Investment Activities |  |  |  |  | \$ | -96,941 |
| Cash Flow From Financing Activities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Money borrowed (intermediate \& long term) | \$ | 57,051 |  |  |  |  |
| + Money borrowed (short term) |  | 436 |  |  |  |  |
| + Increase in operating debt |  | 6,259 |  |  |  |  |
| + Cash from nonfarm capital used in business |  | 5,215 |  |  |  |  |
| + Money borrowed - nonfarm |  | 305 |  |  |  |  |
| $=$ Cash inflow from financing |  |  | \$ | 69,267 |  |  |
| Principal payments (intermediate \& long term) | \$ | 26,900 |  |  |  |  |
| + Principal payments (short term) |  | 179 |  |  |  |  |
| + Decrease in operating debt |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| - Cash outflow for financing |  |  | \$ | 27,080 |  |  |
| $=$ Net Provided by Financing Activities |  |  |  |  | \$ | 42,187 |
| Cash Flow From Reserves |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning farm cash, checking \& savings |  |  | \$ | 5,307 |  |  |
| - Ending farm cash, checking \& savings |  |  |  | 10,592 |  |  |
| $=$ Net Provided from Reserves |  |  |  |  | \$ | -5,285 |
| Imbalance (error) |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,112 |

## Repayment Analysis

A valuable use of cash flow analysis is to compare the debt payments planned for the last year with the amount actually paid. The measures listed below provide a number of different perspectives on the repayment performance of the business. However, the critical question to many farmers and lenders is whether planned payments can be made in 2008. The cash flow projection worksheet on the next page can be used to estimate repayment ability, which can then be compared to planned 2008 debt payments shown below.

FARM DEBT PAYMENTS PLANNED
Same Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& 2007

| Debt Payments | Same 34 Grazing Dairy Farms |  |  |  |  |  | Same 18 Farms in Top 50\% Farms |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 Payments |  |  |  | Planned 2008 |  | 2007 Payments |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Planned } \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  | Planned |  | Made |  |  |  | Planned |  | Made |  |  |
| Long term | \$ | 12,243 | \$ | 13,309 | \$ | 16,696 | \$ | 10,638 | \$ | 14,402 | \$ | 17,984 |
| Intermediate term |  | 20,266 |  | 25,082 |  | 22,224 |  | 15,761 |  | 19,188 |  | 16,199 |
| Short term |  | 61 |  | 191 |  | 332 |  | 0 |  | 268 |  | 0 |
| Operating (net reduction) |  | 775 |  | 3,641 |  | 5,103 |  | 872 |  | 945 |  | 9,444 |
| Accounts payable (net reduction) |  | 294 |  | ,218.44 |  | 126 |  | 556 |  | 4,125 |  | 0 |
| Total | \$ | 33,638 | \$ | 46,441 | \$ | 44,481 | \$ | 27,826 | \$ | 38,927 | \$ | 43,538 |
| Per cow | \$ | 305 | \$ | 421 |  |  | \$ | 259 | \$ | 363 |  |  |
| Per cwt. 2006 milk | \$ | 1.83 | \$ | 2.52 |  |  | \$ | 1.56 | \$ | 2.18 |  |  |
| Percent of total 2006 farm receipts |  | 8\% |  | 10\% |  |  |  | 7\% |  | 9\% |  |  |
| Percent of 2006 milk receipts |  | 9\% |  | 12\% |  |  |  | 8\% |  | 10\% |  |  |

The coverage ratios measure the ability of the farm business to meet its planned debt payment schedule. The ratios show the percentage of payments planned for 2007 (as of December 31, 2006) that could have been made with the amount available for debt service in 2007. Farmers who did not participate in DFBS in 2006 have their 2007 coverage ratios based on planned debt payments for 2008.

COVERAGE RATIOS
Same Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& 2007

| Item | Average |  | Item | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Same 34 Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& 2007 |  |  |  |  |
| (A)=Amount Available for Debt Service | $\$$ | 76,706 | (A')=Repayment Capacity | $\$ 122,493$ |
| (B)=Debt Payments Planned for 2007 | $\$$ | 33,638 | (B)=Debt Payments Planned for 2007 | $\$ 33,638$ |
| (A/B)=Cash Flow Coverage Ratio for 2007 |  | 2.28 | (A'/B)=Debt Coverage Ratio for 2007 | 3.64 |

Same 18 Farms in Top 50\% Farms, 2006 \& 2007

| (A)=Amount Available for Debt Service | $\$$ | 82,794 | (A')=Repayment Capacity | $\$ 141,436$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (B)=Debt Payments Planned for 2007 | $\$$ | 27,826 | (B)=Debt Payments Planned for 2007 | $\$$ | 27,826 |
| (A/B)=Cash Flow Coverage Ratio for 2007 |  | 2.98 | (A'/B)=Debt Coverage Ratio for 2007 | 5.08 |  |

ANNUAL CASH FLOW WORKSHEET
Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms |  | Average Top 50\% Farms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per Cow | Per Cwt. | Per Cow | Per Cwt. |
| Average no. of cows | 110 |  | 107 |  |
| Total cwt. of milk sold |  | 18,243 |  | 17,844 |
| Accrual Operating Receipts |  |  |  |  |
| Milk | \$3,526 | \$21.21 | \$3,539 | \$21.28 |
| Dairy cattle | 225 | 1.35 | 324 | 1.95 |
| Dairy calves | 61 | 0.37 | 70 | 0.42 |
| Other livestock | 19 | 0.12 | 15 | 0.09 |
| Crops | 58 | 0.35 | 53 | 0.32 |
| Misc. Receipts | 134 | $\underline{0.81}$ | 122 | . 74 |
| Total | \$4,023 | \$24.20 | \$4,123 | \$24.80 |
| Accrual Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$ 256 | \$ 1.54 | \$ 256 | \$ 1.54 |
| Dairy grain \& concentrate | 801 | 4.82 | 777 | 4.67 |
| Dairy roughage | 106 | 0.64 | 95 | 0.57 |
| Nondairy feed | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Professional nutritional services | 2 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mach. hire, rent \& lease | 165 | 0.99 | 141 | 0.85 |
| Mach. repair \& vehicle expense | 157 | 0.94 | 153 | 0.92 |
| Fuel, oil \& grease | 112 | 0.67 | 79 | 0.47 |
| Replacement livestock | 15 | 0.09 | 11 | 0.07 |
| Breeding | 40 | 0.24 | 38 | 0.23 |
| Vet \& medicine | 85 | 0.51 | 71 | 0.42 |
| Milk marketing | 158 | 0.95 | 155 | 0.93 |
| Bedding | 28 | 0.17 | 14 | 0.08 |
| Milking supplies | 71 | 0.43 | 65 | 0.39 |
| Cattle lease | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Custom boarding | 5 | $0 . .03$ | 5 | 0.03 |
| bST expense | 5 | 0.03 | 5 | 0.03 |
| Livestock professional fees | 12 | 0.07 | 7 | 0.04 |
| Other livestock expense | 30 | 0.18 | 31 | 0.19 |
| Fertilizer \& lime | 132 | 0.79 | 164 | 0.98 |
| Seeds \& plants | 37 | 0.22 | 27 | 0.16 |
| Spray \& other crop expense | 18 | 0.11 | 12 | 0.07 |
| Crop professional fees | 3 | 0.02 | 5 | 0.03 |
| Land, bldg., fence repair | 65 | 0.39 | 38 | 0.23 |
| Taxes | 74 | 0.45 | 83 | 0.50 |
| Real estate rent \& lease | 55 | 0.33 | 62 | 0.37 |
| Insurance | 50 | 0.30 | 49 | 0.30 |
| Utilities | 84 | 0.51 | 79 | 0.48 |
| Miscellaneous | 51 | 0.31 | 43 | 0.26 |
| Total Less Interest Paid | \$2,616 | \$15.73 | \$2,464 | \$14.82 |
| Net Accrual Operating Income |  |  |  |  |
| (without interest paid) |  |  |  |  |
| - Change in livestock \& crop invent. ${ }^{18}$ |  |  |  |  |
| - Change in accounts receivable |  |  |  |  |
| - Change in feed \& supply inventory ${ }^{19}$ |  |  |  |  |
| + Change in accounts payable ${ }^{20}$ |  |  |  |  |
| NET CASH FLOW |  |  |  |  |
| - Net family withdrawals |  |  |  |  |
| Available for Farm |  |  |  |  |
| - Farm debt payments |  |  |  |  |
| Available for Farm Investment |  |  |  |  |
| - Capital purchases |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Capital Needed |  |  | \$ 10 |  |

[^7]
## Cropping Analysis

The cropping program is an important part of the dairy farm business and often represents opportunities for improved productivity and profitability. A complete evaluation of what the available land resources are, how they are being used, how well crops are producing, and what it costs to produce them is important to evaluating alternative cropping and feed purchasing alternatives.

## LAND RESOURCES AND CROP PRODUCTION

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{22}$ |  |  | Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{22}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land | Owned | Rented | Total | Owned | Rented | Total |
| Tillable | 141 | 132 | 273 | 144 | 79 | 223 |
| Nontillable | 37 | 23 | 60 | 43 | 17 | 60 |
| Other nontill. | 104 | 9 | 113 | 101 | 14 | 115 |
| Total | 282 | 164 | 446 | 288 | 110 | 398 |
| Crop Yields | Farms | Acres ${ }^{21}$ | Prod/Acre | Farms | $\underline{\text { Acres }}{ }^{21}$ | Prod/Acre |
| Hay crop | 36 | 162 | 2.0 tn DM | 18 | 117 | 2.3 tn DM |
| Corn silage | 19 | 73 | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \mathrm{tn} \\ & 5.9 \mathrm{tn} \mathrm{DM} \end{aligned}$ | 12 | 45 | $\begin{aligned} & 19.4 \mathrm{tn} \\ & 6.3 \mathrm{tn} \mathrm{DM} \end{aligned}$ |
| Other forage | 5 | 18 | 1.6 tn DM | 0 | 0 | 0 tn DM |
| Total forage | 36 | 203 | 2.8 tn DM | 18 | 147 | 3.1 tn DM |
| Corn grain | 3 | 26 | 105 bu | 2 | 20 | 98 bu |
| Oats | 2 | 11 | 26 bu | 0 | 0 | 0 bu |
| Wheat | 0 | 0 | 0 bu | 0 | 0 | 0 bu |
| Other crops | 3 | 72 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Tillable pasture | 17 | 130 |  | 6 | 207 |  |
| Idle | 5 | 29 |  | 2 | 9 |  |
| Total Tillable Acres | 36 | 273 |  | 18 | 223 |  |

${ }^{21}$ This column represents the average acreage for the farms producing that crop. For the 36 New York dairy farms, average acreages including those farms not producing were hay crop 162, corn silage 39 , corn grain 2 , oats 1 , wheat 0 , tillable pasture 62 , and idle 5.

Average crop acres and yields compiled for the grazing farms are for the farms reporting each crop. Yields of forage crops have been converted to tons of dry matter using dry matter coefficients reported by the farmers. Grain production has been converted to bushels of dry grain equivalent based on dry matter information provided.

The following crop/dairy ratios indicate the relationship between forage production, forage production resources, and the dairy herd.

CROP/DAIRY RATIOS
Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | 36 Grazing <br> Dairy Farms $^{22}$ | Average Top 50\% <br> Farms $^{22}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total tillable acres per cow |  |  |
| Total forage acres per cow | 2.49 | 2.08 |
| Harvested forage dry matter, tons per cow | 1.85 | 1.37 |

[^8]
## Cropping Analysis (continued)

A number of cooperators have allocated crop expenses among the hay crop, corn, and other crops produced. Fertilizer and lime, seeds and plants, and spray and other crop expenses have been computed per acre and per production unit for hay and corn. Additional expense items such as fuels, labor, and machinery repairs are not included. Intensive grazing was used by all farms reported in the below tables.

## CROP RELATED ACCRUAL EXPENSES

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms Reporting, 2007

| Item | Total Per Till. Acre |  | All Corn Per Acre |  | Corn <br> Silage <br> Per <br> Ton DM |  | Corn <br> Grain <br> Per Dry <br> Sh. Bu. |  | Hay Crop |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Per Acre |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { Ton DM } \end{gathered}$ |
| All Grazing Farms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of farms reporting |  | $36^{23}$ |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ave. number of acres |  | 273 |  | 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fert. \& lime | \$ | 44.90 | \$ | 16.81 | \$ | 23.16 | \$ | 0.22 |  | \$ 42.89 | \$ | 17.27 |
| Seeds \& plants |  | 13.86 |  | 1.83 |  | 12.24 |  | 0.13 |  | 4.71 |  | 1.80 |
| Spray \& other |  | 7.35 |  | 0.19 |  | 7.23 |  | 0.13 |  | 0.87 |  | 0.53 |
| TOTAL | \$ | 66.11 | \$ | 18.83 | \$ | 42.63 | \$ | 0.48 |  | \$ 48.47 | \$ | 19.60 |
| Average Top 50\% Farms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of farms reporting |  | $18^{23}$ |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ave. number of acres |  | 223 |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fert. \& lime | \$ | 61.40 | \$ | 23.16 | \$ | 19.48 | \$ | 0.33 |  | \$ 63.48 |  | 23.16 |
| Seeds \& plants |  | 12.10 |  | 1.28 |  | 11.46 |  | 0.19 |  | 4.50 |  | 1.29 |
| Spray \& other |  | 7.42 |  | . 28 |  | 5.03 |  | 0.20 |  | 0.48 |  | 0.28 |
| TOTAL | \$ | 80.92 | \$ | 24.72 | \$ | 35.97 | \$ | 0.72 |  | \$ 68.46 |  | 24.73 |

${ }^{23}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
Most machinery costs are associated with crop production and should be analyzed with the crop enterprise. Total machinery expenses include the major fixed costs (interest and depreciation), as well as the accrual operating costs. Although machinery costs have not been allocated to individual crops, they are shown below per total tillable acre.

## ACCRUAL MACHINERY EXPENSES

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Machinery Expense | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{24}$ |  |  |  | Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{24}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Expenses } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Per Tillable <br> Acre |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Expenses } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Per Tillable Acre |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel, oil \& grease | \$ | 12,259 | \$ | 44.86 | \$ | 8,442 | \$ | 37.87 |
| Mach. repair \& vehicle exp. |  | 17,222 |  | 63.02 |  | 16,472 |  | 73.88 |
| Machine hire, rent \& lease |  | 18,135 |  | 66.36 |  | 15,095 |  | 67.71 |
| Interest (5\%) |  | 8,085 |  | 29.58 |  | 7,274 |  | 32.63 |
| Depreciation |  | 19,830 |  | 72.56 |  | 17,039 |  | 76.43 |
| Total | \$ | 75,530 | \$ | 276.38 | \$ | 64,321 | \$ | 288.52 |

[^9]
## Cropping Analysis (continued)

The charts below show the relationship between the stocking rate (forage and grazing acres per cow) and labor and management income per operator per cow and real estate investment per cow. Stocking rate is total tillable acres plus nontillable pasture acres less corn grain acres, all divided by the average number of cows.

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT/COW \& FORAGE AND GRAZING ACRES/COW
36 Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007


LABOR AND MANAGEMENT INCOMES/OPERATOR/COW \& FORAGE AND GRAZING ACRES/COW
36 Intensive Grazing Farms, 2007


## Dairy Analysis

Analysis of the dairy enterprise can reveal strengths and weaknesses of the dairy farm business. Information on this page should be used in conjunction with DHI and other dairy production information. Changes in dairy herd size and market values that occur during the year are identified in the table below. The change in inventory value without appreciation is attributed to physical changes in herd size and quality. Any change in inventory is included as an accrual farm receipt when calculating all of the profitability measures on pages 21 through 24.

DAIRY HERD INVENTORY
Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | Dairy Cows |  | Bred Heifers |  |  | Open Heifers |  |  | Calves |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | Value | No. |  | Value | No. |  | Value | No. |  | Value |
| 36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{25}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beg. year (owned) | 105 | \$ 141,828 | 33 | \$ | 43,936 | 33 | \$ | 27,797 | 22 | \$ | 14,457 |
| + Change w/o apprec. |  | 3,158 |  |  | 860 |  |  | -2,282 |  |  | 2,211 |
| + Appreciation |  | 14,853 |  |  | 4,747 |  |  | 1,839 |  |  | 1,831 |
| End year (owned) | 108 | \$ 159,839 | 34 | \$ | 49,543 | 30 | \$ | 27,354 | 25 | \$ | 18,499 |
| End including leased | 108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average number | 110 |  | 87 |  | age gro |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{25}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beg. year (owned) | 101 | \$ 140,681 | 33 | \$ | 45,839 | 22 | \$ | 18,303 | 30 | \$ | 21,883 |
| + Change w/o apprec. |  | 7,344 |  |  | 3,683 |  |  | -1,178 |  |  | 3,025 |
| + Appreciation |  | 17,819 |  |  | 5,289 |  |  | 1,272 |  |  | 2,322 |
| End year (owned) | 107 | \$ 165,844 | 35 | \$ | 54,811 | 20 | \$ | 18,397 | 34 | \$ | 27,230 |
| End including leased | 107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average number | 107 |  | 87 | (al) | age gro |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{25}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
Total milk sold and milk sold per cow are extremely valuable measures of size and productivity, respectively, on the dairy farm. These measures of milk output are based on pounds of milk marketed during the year.

## MILK PRODUCTION

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | 36 Grazing <br> Dairy Farms $^{26}$ | Average Top 50\% <br> Farms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total milk sold, pounds | $1,824,273$ | $1,784,418$ |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds | 16,627 | 16,626 |
| Average milk plant test, percent butterfat | $3.4 \%$ | $3.95 \%$ |
| ${ }^{26}$ S |  |  |

${ }^{26}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
Monitoring and evaluating culling practices and experiences on an annual basis are important herd management tools. Culling rate can have an effect on both milk per cow and profitability.

## ANIMALS LEAVING THE HERD

| Item | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms |  | Average Top 50\% Farms |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent ${ }^{27}$ | Number | Percent ${ }^{27}$ |
| Cows sold for beef | 22 | 19.7 | 22 | 20.9 |
| Cows sold for dairy | 6 | 5.1 | 5 | 5.0 |
| Cows died | 5 | 4.3 | 4 | 3.9 |
| Culling rate ${ }^{28}$ |  | 24.0 |  | 24.8 |

[^10]The cost of producing milk has been compiled using the whole farm method and is featured in the following table. Accrual receipts from milk sales can be compared with the accrual costs of producing milk per cow and per hundredweight of milk. Using the whole farm method, operating costs of producing milk are estimated by deducting nonmilk accrual receipts from total accrual operating expenses including expansion livestock purchased. Purchased inputs cost of producing milk are the operating costs plus depreciation. Total costs of producing milk include the operating costs of producing milk plus depreciation on machinery and buildings, the value of unpaid family labor, the value of operators' labor and management, and the interest charge for using equity capital.

## ACCRUAL RECEIPTS FROM DAIRY, COSTS OF PRODUCING MILK, AND PROFITABILITY

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{29}$ |  |  | Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{29}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per Cow |  | Per Cwt. | Per Cow |  | Per Cwt. |  |
| Accrual Cost of Producing Milk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating costs | \$ | 2,255 | \$ 13.56 | \$ | 2,002 | \$ | 12.04 |
| Purchased inputs costs | \$ | 2,507 | \$ 15.08 | \$ | 2,234 | \$ | 13.44 |
| Total Costs | \$ | 3,266 | \$ 19.64 | \$ | 2,945 |  | 17.71 |
| Accrual Receipts From Milk | \$ | 3,526 | \$ 21.21 | \$ | 3,539 | \$ | 21.28 |
| Net milk receipts | \$ | 3,414 | \$ 20.26 | \$ | 3,713 | \$ | 20.35 |
| Net Farm Income without Appreciation | \$ | 1,019 | \$ 6.13 | \$ | 1,305 | \$ | 7.85 |
| Net Farm Income with Appreciation | \$ | 1,407 | \$ 8.46 |  | 1,610 |  | 9.68 |

${ }^{29}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
The accrual operating expenses most commonly associated with the dairy enterprise are listed in the table below. Evaluating these costs per unit of production enables an evaluation of the dairy enterprise.

## DAIRY RELATED ACCRUAL EXPENSES

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Item | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{29}$ |  |  |  | Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{29}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per Cow |  | Per Cwt. |  | Per Cow |  | Per Cwt. |  |
| Purchased dairy grain \& concentrate | \$ |  | \$ | 4.82 | \$ | 777 | \$ | 4.67 |
| Purchased dairy roughage |  | 106 |  | 0.64 |  | 95 |  | 0.57 |
| Total Purchased Dairy Feed | \$ |  | \$ | 5.46 | \$ | 872 | \$ | 5.24 |
| Purchased grain \& concentrate as \% of milk receipts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchased feed \& crop expense |  | 1,096 | \$ | 6.59 | \$ | 1,079 | \$ | 6.49 |
| Purchased feed \& crop expense as $\%$ of milk receipts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breeding | \$ |  | \$ | 0.24 | \$ | 38 | \$ | 0.23 |
| Veterinary \& medicine |  | 85 |  | 0.51 |  | 71 |  | 0.42 |
| Milk marketing |  | 158 |  | 0.95 |  | 155 |  | 0.93 |
| Bedding |  | 28 |  | 0.17 |  | 14 |  | 0.08 |
| Milking supplies |  | 71 |  | 0.43 |  | 65 |  | 0.39 |
| Cattle lease |  | 0 |  | 0.00 |  | 0 |  | 0.00 |
| Custom boarding |  | 5 |  | 0.03 |  | 5 |  | 0.03 |
| bST expense |  | 5 |  | 0.03 |  | 5 |  | 0.03 |
| Livestock professional fees |  | 12 |  | 0.07 |  | 7 |  | 0.04 |
| Other livestock expense |  | 30 |  | 0.18 |  | 31 |  | 0.19 |

## Capital and Labor Efficiency Analysis

Capital efficiency factors measure how intensively the capital is being used in the farm business. Measures of labor efficiency are key indicators of management's success in generating products per unit of labor input.

CAPITAL EFFICIENCY
Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

|  | Per | Per | Per Tillable | Per Tillable |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Worker | Cow | Acre | Acre Owned |

36 Grazing Dairy Farms ${ }^{30}$

| Farm capital | $\$ 331,528$ | $\$ 8,158$ | $\$ 3,275$ | $\$ 6,340$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Real estate |  | 3,445 |  |  |
| Machinery \& equipment | 59,887 | 1,474 | 592 |  |

Ratios:

| Asset Turnover Ratio | Operating Expense | Interest Expense | Depreciation Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.54 | 0.65 | 0.03 | 0.06 |

Average Top 50\% Farms ${ }^{30}$

| Farm capital | $\$ 320,473$ | $\$ 7,733$ | $\$ 3,723$ | $\$, 762$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Real estate |  | 3,066 |  |  | 2,284 |
| Machinery \& equipment | 56,167 | 1,355 |  | 653 |  |

Ratios:

| Asset Turnover Ratio | Operating Expense | Interest Expense | Depreciation Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.06 |
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## Capital and Labor Efficiency Analysis (continued)

## LABOR FORCE INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Labor Force | Months | Age | Years of Education | Value of Labor \& Management |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42 Grazing Dairy Farms |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operator number 1 | 13.2 | 44 | 14 | \$ | 31,846 |
| Operator number 2 | 3.6 | 42 | 12 |  | 9,653 |
| Family paid | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Family unpaid | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Hired | 9.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 32.4 | $\begin{array}{r} / 12=2.70 \\ 1.28 \end{array}$ | alent <br> ager Equivalent |  |  |
| Average Top 30\% Farms |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Labor Force | 31.1 | / 12 = 2.59 | alent |  |  |
| Operator's Labor |  | 1.19 | ger Equivalent |  |  |


| Labor | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms |  |  | Average Top 50\% Farms |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Efficiency | Total |  | Per Worker |  | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  | Per Worker |
| Cows, average number | 110 | 41 |  | 107 | 41 |
| Milk sold, pounds | $1,824,273$ |  | 675,657 |  | $1,784,418$ |
| Tillable acres | 273 | 101 |  | 223 | 688,300 |


|  | 36 Grazing Dairy Farms |  |  | Average Top 50\% Farms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor Costs | Per Cow |  | Per Cwt. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { Cow } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Per Cwt. |
| Value of operator(s) labor (\$2,400/month) | \$ 367 | \$ | 2.21 | \$ | 350 | \$ | 2.11 |
| Family unpaid (\$2,400/month) | 83 |  | 0.50 |  | 65 |  | 0.39 |
| Hired | 256 |  | 1.54 |  | 256 |  | 1.54 |
| Total Labor | \$ 706 | \$ |  | \$ | 671 | \$ | 4.04 |
| Machinery Cost | \$ 688 | \$ | 4.14 | \$ | 599 | \$ | 3.60 |
| Total Labor \& Machinery | \$ 1,394 | \$ | 8.38 |  | 1,270 | \$ | 7.64 |
| Hired labor expense per hired worker equivalent | \$28,417 |  |  | \$26,224 |  |  |  |
| Hired labor expense as \% |  |  |  | 7.2\% |  |  |  |

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BUSINESS

## Progress of the Farm Business

Comparing your business with average data from regional DFBS cooperators that participated in both of the last two years can be helpful to establishing your goals for these parameters. It is equally important for you to determine the progress your business has made over the past two or three years, to compare this progress to your goals, and to set goals for the future.

PROGRESS OF THE FARM BUSINESS
Same Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& $2007^{31}$

| Selected Factors | Same 34 Grazing Dairy Farms |  |  |  | Same 18 Farms in Top 50\% Farms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  | 2006 |  | 2007 |
| Size of Business |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average number of cows |  | 105 |  | 110 |  | 103 |  | 107 |
| Average number of heifers |  | 87 |  | 89 |  | 84 |  | 87 |
| Milk sold, pounds |  | 1,764,730 |  | 1,842,156 |  | 1,717,698 |  | 1,784,418 |
| Worker equivalent |  | 2.75 |  | 2.71 |  | 2.6 |  | 2.59 |
| Total tillable acres |  | 249 |  | 261 |  | 206 |  | 223 |
| Rates of Production |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk sold per cow, pounds |  | 16,732 |  | 16,716 |  | 16,758 |  | 16,625 |
| Hay DM per acre, tons |  | 2.1 |  | 2.10 |  | 2.1 |  | 2.30 |
| Corn silage per acre, tons |  | 15 |  | 17.60 |  | 17.8 |  | 19.40 |
| Labor Efficiency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cows per worker |  | 38 |  | 41 |  | 39 |  | 41 |
| Milk sold/worker, pounds |  | 641,720 |  | 679,762 |  | 660,653 |  | 688,964 |
| Cost Control and Milk Price |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grain \& concentrate purchased as \% of milk sales |  | 29\% |  | 23.00\% |  | 27\% |  | 22.00\% |
| Dairy feed \& crop expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labor \& machinery costs/cow | \$ | 1,341 | \$ | 1,385 | \$ | 1,180 | \$ | 1,270 |
| Operating cost of producing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milk receipts per cwt. Capital Efficiency ${ }^{32}$ | Capital Efficiency ${ }^{32}$ |  |  | 21.28 | \$ | 14.11 |  | 21.28 |
| Farm capital per cow | \$ | 7,691 | \$ | 8,240 | \$ | 6,895 | \$ | 7,733 |
| Machinery \& equipment per cow | \$ | 1,334 | \$ | 1,421 | \$ | 1,224 | \$ | 1,355 |
| Asset turnover ratio |  | 0.41 |  | 0.54 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.57 |
| Profitability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net farm income without appreciation | \$ | 31,932 | \$ | 116,785 | \$ | 57,960 | \$ | 140,063 |
| Net farm income with appreciation | \$ | 47,933 | \$ | 160,062 | \$ | 64,777 | \$ | 172,820 |
| Labor \& management income per operator/manager | \$ | -5,378 | \$ | 58,594 | \$ | 19,935 | \$ | 86,364 |
| Rate of return on equity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate of return on all capital with appreciation |  | 1.2\% |  | 13.60\% |  | 4\% |  | 16.90\% |
| Financial Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farm net worth, end year | \$ | 612,436 | \$ | 723,290 | \$ | 556,627 | \$ | 662,998 |
| Debt to asset ratio |  | 0.26 |  | 0.26 |  | 0.24 |  | 0.28 |
| Farm debt per cow | \$ | 2,058 | \$ | 2,385 | \$ | 1,734 | \$ | 2,473 |

[^12]RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES PER COW AND PER CWT.
Same 34 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& 2007

|  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Per Cow | Per Cwt. | Per Cow | Per Cwt. |
| Average Number of Cows | 105 |  | 110 |  |
| Cwt. Of Milk Sold |  | 17,647 |  | 18,422 |
| ACCRUAL OPERATING RECEIPTS |  |  |  |  |
| Milk | \$2,370 | \$14.16 | \$3,557 | \$21.28 |
| Dairy cattle | 336 | 2.01 | 236 | 1.41 |
| Dairy calves | 49 | 0.29 | 61 | 0.36 |
| Other livestock | 13 | 0.07 | 20 | 0.12 |
| Crops | 17 | 0.10 | 59 | 0.35 |
| Miscellaneous receipts | 223 | 1.33 | 131 | 0.79 |
| Total Receipts | \$3,007 | \$17.97 | \$4,064 | \$24.32 |
| ACCRUAL OPERATING EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$ 284 | \$ 1.70 | \$ 257 | \$ 1.54 |
| Dairy grain \& concentrate | 685 | 4.09 | 811 | 4.85 |
| Dairy roughage | 72 | 0.43 | 96 | 0.57 |
| Nondairy feed | 1 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Professional nutritional services | 5 | 0.03 | 2 | 0.01 |
| Machine hire/rent/lease | 124 | 0.74 | 169 | 1.01 |
| Machinery repair \& vehicle expense | 158 | 0.95 | 155 | 0.93 |
| Fuel, oil \& grease | 102 | 0.61 | 109 | 0.65 |
| Replacement livestock | 20 | 0.12 | 15 | 0.09 |
| Breeding | 31 | 0.18 | 42 | 0.25 |
| Veterinary \& medicine | 82 | 0.49 | 85 | 0.51 |
| Milk marketing | 169 | 1.01 | 159 | 0.95 |
| Bedding | 35 | 0.21 | 28 | 0.17 |
| Milking supplies | 56 | 0.34 | 71 | 0.42 |
| Cattle lease | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Custom boarding | 7 | 0.04 | 4 | 0.03 |
| bST expense | 5 | 0.03 | 5 | 0.03 |
| Livestock professional fees | 15 | 0.09 | 13 | 0.08 |
| Other livestock expense | 29 | 0.18 | 30 | 0.18 |
| Fertilizer \& lime | 85 | 0.51 | 132 | 0.79 |
| Seeds \& plants | 31 | 0.19 | 38 | 0.23 |
| Spray/other crop expense | 20 | 0.12 | 18 | 0.11 |
| Crop professional fees | 3 | 0.02 | 3 | 0.02 |
| Land, building, fence repair | 49 | 0.30 | 66 | 0.40 |
| Taxes | 61 | 0.37 | 77 | 0.46 |
| Real estate rent/lease | 62 | 0.37 | 54 | 0.32 |
| Insurance | 50 | 0.30 | 50 | 0.30 |
| Utilities | 80 | 0.48 | 84 | 0.50 |
| Interest paid | 115 | 0.69 | 132 | 0.79 |
| Other professional fees | 6 | 0.04 | 18 | 0.11 |
| Miscellaneous | 33 | 0.20 | 34 | 0.20 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$2,475 | \$14.79 | \$2,757 | \$16.50 |
| Expansion Livestock | 16 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.00 |
| Extraordinary Expense | 5 | 0.03 | 4 | 0.03 |
| Machinery Depreciation | 150 | 0.90 | 173 | 1.04 |
| Real Estate Depreciation | 58 | 0.35 | 69 | 0.41 |
| Total Expenses | \$2,704 | \$16.17 | \$3,004 | \$17.98 |
| Net Farm Income Without Appreciation | \$ 303 | \$ 1.81 | \$1,060 | \$ 6.34 |

## RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES PER COW AND PER CWT.

Same 18 Farms in Top 50\% Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2006 \& 2007

|  | 2006 |  | 2007 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Per Cow | Per Cwt. | Per Cow | Per Cwt. |
| Average Number of Cows | 103 |  | 107 |  |
| Cwt. Of Milk Sold |  | 17177 |  | 17844 |
| ACCRUAL OPERATING RECEIPTS |  |  |  |  |
| Milk | \$2,364 | \$14.11 | \$3,539 | \$21.28 |
| Dairy cattle | 306 | 1.83 | 324 | 1.95 |
| Dairy calves | 74 | 0.44 | 70 | 0.42 |
| Other livestock | 13 | 0.08 | 15 | 0.09 |
| Crops | 49 | 0.29 | 53 | 0.32 |
| Miscellaneous receipts | 198 | 1.18 | 122 | 0.74 |
| Total Receipts | \$3,005 | \$17.93 | \$4,123 | \$24.80 |
| ACCRUAL OPERATING EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Hired labor | \$ 247 | \$ 1.47 | \$ 256 | \$ 1.54 |
| Dairy grain \& concentrate | 638 | 3.81 | 777 | 4.67 |
| Dairy roughage | 101 | 0.60 | 95 | 0.57 |
| Nondairy feed | 1 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Professional nutritional services | 1 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Machine hire/rent/lease | 96 | 0.58 | 141 | 0.85 |
| Machinery repair \& vehicle expense | 153 | 0.91 | 153 | 0.92 |
| Fuel, oil \& grease | 76 | 0.46 | 79 | 0.47 |
| Replacement livestock | 12 | 0.07 | 11 | 0.07 |
| Breeding | 31 | 0.18 | 38 | 0.23 |
| Veterinary \& medicine | 62 | 0.37 | 71 | 0.42 |
| Milk marketing | 168 | 1.00 | 155 | 0.93 |
| Bedding | 22 | 0.13 | 14 | 0.08 |
| Milking supplies | 44 | 0.26 | 65 | 0.39 |
| Cattle lease | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Custom boarding | 5 | 0.03 | 5 | 0.03 |
| bST expense | 6 | 0.03 | 5 | 0.03 |
| Livestock professional fees | 14 | 0.09 | 7 | 0.04 |
| Other livestock expense | 23 | 0.13 | 31 | 0.19 |
| Fertilizer \& lime | 108 | 0.65 | 164 | 0.98 |
| Seeds \& plants | 26 | 0.15 | 27 | 0.16 |
| Spray/other crop expense | 14 | 0.09 | 12 | 0.07 |
| Crop professional fees | 5 | 0.03 | 5 | 0.03 |
| Land, building, fence repair | 35 | 0.21 | 38 | 0.23 |
| Taxes | 58 | 0.35 | 83 | 0.50 |
| Real estate rent/lease | 67 | 0.40 | 62 | 0.37 |
| Insurance | 45 | 0.27 | 49 | 0.30 |
| Utilities | 75 | 0.45 | 79 | 0.48 |
| Interest paid | 85 | 0.51 | 122 | 0.73 |
| Other professional fees | 5 | 0.03 | 11 | 0.07 |
| Miscellaneous | 26 | 0.15 | 32 | 0.19 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$2,250 | \$13.43 | \$2,586 | \$15.55 |
| Expansion Livestock | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Extraordinary Expense | 1 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Machinery Depreciation | 124 | 0.74 | 159 | 0.95 |
| Real Estate Depreciation | 65 | 0.39 | 73 | 0.44 |
| Total Expenses | \$2,440 | \$14.56 | \$2,818 | \$16.94 |
| Net Farm Income Without Appreciation | \$ 565 | \$ 3.37 | \$1,305 | \$ 7.85 |

## Grazing Farm Business Chart

The Farm Business Chart is a tool, which can be used in analyzing your business. Compare your business by drawing a line through or near the figure in each column, which represents your current level of performance. The five figures in each column represent the average of each 20 percent or quintile of farms included in the regional summary. Use this information to identify business areas where more challenging goals are needed.

## FARM BUSINESS CHART FOR FARM MANAGEMENT COOPERATORS

36 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Size of Business |  |  | Rate of Production |  |  | Labor Efficiency |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Worker Equiv- <br> alent | No. of Cows | Pounds Milk Sold | Pounds Milk Sold Per Cow | Tons Hay Crop DM/Acre | Tons Corn Silage Per Acre |  | Pounds Milk Sold Per Worker |
| $(14)^{33}$ | (12) | (12) | (12) | (11) | (11) | (14) | (14) |
| 5.49 | 311 | 5,013,134 | 22,510 | 3.3 | 24 | 61 | 960,014 |
| 2.91 | 106 | 1,969,684 | 20,077 | 2.4 | 20 | 41 | 741,523 |
| 2.22 | 59 | 1,015,827 | 17,533 | 2.0 | 18 | 32 | 619,051 |
| 1.74 | 47 | 796,608 | 15,082 | 1.7 | 16 | 26 | 411,890 |
| 1.34 | 36 | 513,383 | 11,546 | 1.0 | 12 | 19 | 282,950 |


| Grain <br> Bought <br> Per Cow | \% Grain is <br> of Milk <br> Receipts | Machinery <br> Costs <br> Per Cow |  <br> Machinery <br> Costs per Cow | Feed \& Crop <br> Expenses <br> Per Cow | Feed \& Crop <br> Expenses Per <br> Cwt. Milk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(12)$ | $(12)$ | $(14)$ | $(14)$ | $(12)$ | $(12)$ |
| $\$ 526$ |  |  |  |  | $\$ 737$ |
| 723 | $18 \%$ | $\$ 442$ | 1,084 | 925 | $\$ 4.90$ |
| 844 | 21 | 655 | 1,389 | 1,122 | 5.76 |
| 978 | 23 | 894 | 1,677 | 1,320 | 6.29 |
| 1,182 | 25 | 1,204 |  |  |  |
|  | 30 |  |  |  | 7.13 |


| Value and Cost of Milk Production |  |  | Profitability |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Milk | Operating Cost | Total Cost | Net Farm | Net Farm | Labor \& |  |
| Receipts | Milk Prod. | Production | Income with | Income w/o | Mgmt. Income | Net Worth with |
| Per Cow | Per Cwt. | Per Cwt. | Appreciation | Appreciation | Per Operator | Appreciation |


| $(12)$ | $(12)$ | $(12)$ | $(4)$ | $(4)$ | $(4)$ | (8) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 4,590$ | $\$ 9.84$ | $\$ 16.41$ | $\$ 482,797$ | $\$ 325,878$ | $\$ 172,366$ | $\$ 350,392$ |
| 4,138 | 11.98 | 18.76 | 152,035 | 117,100 | 67,881 | 116,603 |
| 3,635 | 13.18 | 20.38 | 90,112 | 79,895 | 40,742 | 49,067 |
| 3,160 | 14.58 | 22.97 | 50,778 | 43,277 | 13,732 | 26,071 |
| 2,545 | 19.56 | 31.13 | 15,715 | 7,640 | $-22,876$ | 6,251 |
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## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Each year DFBS cooperators volunteer to complete supplementary data collection forms looking at selected management aspects of the business or specific research areas being studied. This is in addition to the normal DFBS data collection form. Two areas that were examined this year were the source of dairy replacements and the breakdown of the milk income and marketing expenses. Following is a summary of this information.

## SOURCE OF DAIRY REPLACEMENTS

39 New York Dairy Farms, 2007

| Animals Entering Herd | Average |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number calving in 2007 for first time | 127.4 |
| Animals purchased, percent ${ }^{34}$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Animals raised by farm, percent ${ }^{35}$ | $94.1 \%$ |
| Current Heifer Inventory |  |
| Raised on dairy, percent | $89.7 \%$ |
| Raised by a custom grower, percent | $10.3 \%$ |

${ }^{34}$ Animals purchased are animals purchased from a different farm and were not the farm's genetics.
${ }^{35}$ Animals raised by farm are animals that were born on the farm and entered the herd, which includes animals raised by the farm or custom grower.

On the average farm, 127.4 animals calved for the first time in 2007. The breakdown of these animals for source was 5.9 percent purchased and 94.1 percent raised by the farm. Of the current heifer inventory, 89.7 percent were raised on the dairy and 10.3 percent were being raised by a custom grower. There is increased interest in evaluating the dairy replacement enterprise.

## Milk Income and Marketing Expense Breakdown

Starting January $1^{\text {st }}, 2000$, the Northeast switched to multiple components pricing, which changed the format of the milk check and how farmers received payment for their milk. To examine the breakdown of the gross milk income and the marketing expenses, 12 intensive grazing farms filled out a detailed form for all the different sources of income for milk sales and the milk marketing expenses on an accrual basis. This information is reported in the following table. The table is divided into five different areas, each representing a different area of income or expenses.

The first section looks at the value of the milk components on a per cwt. basis. The second area looks at the Producer Price Differential. The third area looks at the premiums a farm receives. Any premiums not specifically noted as quality or volume related are included in market premiums. The fourth area looks at the expenses associated with marketing milk. The line item in this section is the expenses associated with utilizing forward contracting or hedging programs to market milk, such as commission or broker fees. The fifth area is the patronage dividends or refunds from the milk cooperatives. Equity purchased in the milk cooperative utilizing a monthly deduction from the milk check or a percent of the patronage dividend is treated as a capital purchase and is not a milk marketing expense. The cumulative total for these five areas is the net price received on farms. Your net farm price can be found on page 12 of your farm's DFBS report.

The table on page 43 reports the averages for these different areas.
For your individual farm, compare your accrual numbers following this same format to look at how you compare to other farms in your region and to identify possible areas to generate additional revenue.

## AVERAGE ${ }^{36}$ MILK INCOME AND MARKETING REPORT <br> 12 Intensive Grazing Dairy Farms, 2007

| Pounds | Percent | Price/Pound | Total | \$/Cwt of Milk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASE FARM PRICE |  |  |  |  |
| Butterfat 82,378.08 | 3.37 | \$ 1.75 | \$144,017.50 | \$ 5.88 |
| Protein 67,261.42 | 2.75 | \$ 4.37 | \$293,850.00 | \$ 12.01 |
| Solids 118,857.75 | 4.86 | \$ 0.48 | \$ 57,370.25 | \$ 2.34 |
| Total Component Contribution |  |  |  | \$20.23 |
| PPD 2,447,535.58 |  |  | \$ 27,051.33 | \$ 1.11 |
| Base Farm Price |  |  |  | \$21.34 |
| Premiums |  |  |  |  |
| Quality |  |  | \$ 2,134.42 | \$ 0.09 |
| Volume |  |  | \$ 8,725.33 | \$ 0.36 |
| Market Premiums |  |  | \$ 2,492.42 | \$ 0.10 |
| Total Premiums |  |  |  | \$ 0.55 |
| BASE FARM PRICE + PREMIUM |  |  |  | \$21.88 |
| Deductions |  |  |  |  |
| Promo |  |  | \$ 3,725.25 | \$ 0.15 |
| Hauling + Stop Charges |  |  | \$16,352.00 | \$ 0.67 |
| Market Fees \& Coop Dues |  |  | \$ 3,650.42 | \$ 0.15 |
| Total Deductions |  |  |  | \$ 0.97 |
| BASE FARM PRICE + PREMIUMS - DEDUCTIONS |  |  |  | \$20.92 |
| Marketing Programs |  |  |  |  |
| Futures Contracts, Forward Contracting, Etc. |  |  | \$ 0.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| Total Marketing Income |  |  |  | \$ 0.00 |
| Patronage Dividends |  |  | \$ 2,798.00 | \$ 0.11 |
| NET PRICE RECEIVED ON FARM, ALL SOURCES |  |  |  | \$21.03 |
| PPD - Hauling, \$ per cwt. |  |  |  | \$ 0.44 |
| PPD - Hauling + Market Premiums, \$ per cwt. |  |  |  | \$ 0.54 |
| Net Marketing Value (PPD + Total Premiums - Total Deductions), \$ per cwt. |  |  |  | \$ 0.68 |
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## IDENTIFY AND SET GOALS

If businesses are to be successful, they must have direction. Written goals help provide businesses with an identifiable direction over both the long and short term. Goal setting is as important on a dairy farm as it is in other businesses. Written goals are a tool which farm operators can use to ensure that the business continues to move in the desired direction. Goals should be SMART:

1. Goals should be Specific.
2. Goals should be Measurable.
3. Goals should be Achievable but challenging.
4. Goals should be Rewarding.
5. Goals should be Timed with a designated date by which the goal will be achieved.

Goal setting on a dairy farm should be a process for writing down and agreeing on goals that you have already given some thought to. It is also important to remember that once you write out your goals they are not cast in concrete. If a change takes place which has a major impact on the farm business, the goals should be reworked to accommodate that change. Refer to your goals as often as necessary to keep the farm business progressing.

It is important to identify both objectives (long-range) and goals (short-range) when looking at the future of your farm business.

A suggested format for writing out your goals is as follows:
a. Begin with a mission statement which describes why the business exists based on the preferences and values of the owners.
b. Identify 4-6 objectives.
c. Identify SMART goals.

## Worksheet for Setting Goals

I. Mission and Objectives

## Worksheet for Setting Goals (Continued)

II. Goals

What
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| How | When | Who is Responsible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Summarize Your Business Performance

The Farm Business Chart on page 41 can be used to help identify strengths and weaknesses of your farm business. Identify three major strengths and three areas of your farm business that need improvement.

Strengths: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Needs improvement: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## GLOSSARY AND LOCATION OF COMMON TERMS

Accounts Payable - Open accounts or bills owed to feed and supply firms, cattle dealers, veterinarians and other providers of farm services and supplies.

Accounts Receivable - Outstanding receipts from items sold or sales proceeds not yet received, such as the payment for December milk sales received in January.

Accrual Expenses - (defined on page 19)
Accrual Receipts - (defined on page 20)
Annual Cash Flow Statement - (defined on page 28
Appreciation - (defined on page 21)
Asset Turnover Ratio - The ratio of total farm income to total farm assets, calculated by dividing total accrual operating receipts plus appreciation by average total farm assets.

Balance Sheet - A "snapshot" of the business financial position at a given point in time, usually December 31. The balance sheet equates the value of assets to liabilities plus net worth.
bST Usage - An estimate of the percentage of herd, on average, that was injected with bovine somatotropin during the year.
Capital Efficiency - The amount of capital invested per production unit. Relatively high investments per worker with low to moderate investments per cow imply efficient use of capital.

Cash From Nonfarm Capital Used in the Business - Transfers of money from nonfarm savings or investments to the farm business where it is used to pay operating expenses, make debt payments and/or capital purchases.

Cash Flow Coverage Ratio - (defined on page 29)
Cash Paid - (defined on page 18)
Cash Receipts - (defined on page 20)
Change in Accounts Payable - (defined on page 19)
Change in Accounts Receivable - (defined on page 20)
Change in Inventory - (defined on page 20)
Cost of Term Debt - A weighted average of the cost of borrowed capital to the farm. Calculate by multiplying end of year principal of each loan that is borrowed by the interest rate for each loan at that time. Add up each amount that is calculated for each loan and then divide by total amount of borrowed funds. Do not include accounts payable, operating debt or advanced government receipts. This information is found on pages $8 \& 9$ of the data entry form.

Culling Rate - (defined on page 34)
Current Portion - (defined on page 24)
Current Ratio - Measures the extent to which current farm assets, if liquidated, would cover current farm liabilities. Calculated as current farm assets at end year divided by current farm liabilities at end year.

Dairy (farm) - A farm business where dairy farming is the primary enterprise, operating and managing this farm is a fulltime occupation for one or more people and cropland is owned.

Dairy Cash-Crop (farm) - Operating and managing this farm is the full-time occupation of one or more people, cropland is owned but crop sales exceed 10 percent of accrual milk receipts.

Debt Coverage Ratio - (defined on page 29)
Debt Per Cow - Total end-of-year debt divided by end-of-year number of cows.
Debt to Asset Ratios - (defined on page 26)
Depreciation Expense Ratio - Machinery and building depreciation divided by total accrual receipts.
Dry Matter - The amount or proportion of dry material that remains after all water is removed. Commonly used to measure dry matter percent and tons of dry matter in feed.

Equity Capital - The farm operator/manager's owned capital or farm net worth.
Expansion Livestock - Purchased dairy cattle and other livestock that cause an increase in herd size from the beginning to the end of the year.

Farm Debt Payments as Percent of Milk Sales - Amount of milk income committed to debt repayment, calculated by dividing planned debt payments by total milk receipts. A reliable measure of repayment ability, see page 29.

Farm Debt Payments Per Cow - Planned or scheduled debt payments per cow represent the repayment plan scheduled at the beginning of the year divided by the average number of cows for the year.

Financial Lease - A long-term non-cancelable contract giving the lessee use of an asset in exchange for a series of lease payments. The term of a financial lease usually covers a major portion of the economic life of the asset. The lease is a substitute for purchase. The lessor retains ownership of the asset.

Hired Labor Expense per Hired Worker Equivalent - The total cost to the farm per hired worker equivalent. Divide accrual hired labor expense by number of hired plus family paid worker equivalents.

Hired Labor Expense as \% of Milk Sales - The percentage of the gross milk receipts that is used for labor expense. Divide accrual hired labor expense by accrual milk sales.

Income Statement - A complete and accurate account of farm business receipts and expenses used to measure profitability over a period of time such as one year or one month.

Interest Expense Ratio - Accrual interest expense divided by total accrual receipts.
Labor and Management Income - (defined on page 23)
Labor and Management Income Per Operator - The return to the owner/manager's labor and management per full-time operator.

Labor Efficiency - Production capacity and output per worker.
Leverage Ratio - (defined on page 26)
Liquidity - Ability of business to generate cash to make debt payments or to convert assets to cash.
Net Farm Income - (defined on page 21)
Net Farm Income from Operations Ratio - (defined on page 24)

Net Milk Receipts - Accrual milk receipts less milk marking expense.
Net Worth - The value of assets less liabilities equal net worth. It is the equity the owner has in owned assets.

Operating Costs of Producing Milk - (defined on page 35)
Operating Expense Ratio - Total accrual expenses less interest and machinery and building depreciation, divided by total accrual receipts.

Opportunity Costs - The cost or charge made for using a resource based on its value in its most likely alternative use. The opportunity cost of a farmer's labor and management is the value he/she would receive if employed in his/her most qualified alternative position.

Other Livestock Expenses - All other dairy herd and livestock expenses not included in more specific categories. Other livestock expenses include DHIC, registration fees and transfers.

Owner/Operator Resources/cwt. - The total value of equity, management, and labor contributed to the farm from all owner/operators. This measure is calculated by adding the interest on equity capital to the value of labor and management for all owner/operators and dividing by the hundredweight produced during the year.

Part-Time Dairy (farm) - Dairy farming is the primary enterprise, cropland is owned but operating and managing this farm is not a full-time occupation for one or more people.

Personal Withdrawals and Family Expenditures Including Nonfarm Debt Payments - All the money removed from the farm business for personal or nonfarm use including family living expenses, health and life insurance, income taxes, nonfarm debt payments, and investments.

Profitability - The return or net income the owner/manager receives for using one or more of his or her resources in the farm business. True "economic profit" is what remains after deducting all the costs including the opportunity costs of the owner/manager's labor, management, and equity capital.

Purchased Inputs Cost of Producing Milk - (defined on page 35)
Renter - Farm business owner/operator owns no tillable land and commonly rents all other farm real estate.
Repayment Analysis - An evaluation of the business' ability to make planned debt payments.
Replacement Livestock - Dairy cattle and other livestock purchased to replace those that were culled or sold from the herd during the year.

Return on Equity Capital - (defined on page 24)
Return on Total Capital - (defined on page 24)
Solvency - The extent or ability of assets to cover or pay liabilities. Debt/asset and leverage ratios are common measures of solvency.

Stocking Rate - (defined on page 33)
Total Costs of Producing Milk - (defined on page 35)
Total Labor Cost/cwt. - The total cost of all labor used on the farm on a per cwt. basis. The value of unpaid labor at $\$ 2,400$ per month plus the value of operator(s) labor at $\$ 2,400$ per month plus total hired labor expense divided by the number of cwt. produced.

Whole Farm Method - A procedure used to calculate costs of producing milk on dairy farms without using enterprise cost accounts. All non-milk receipts are assigned a cost equal to their sale value and deducted from total farm expenses to determine the costs of producing milk.

Working Capital - A theoretical measure of the amount of funds available to purchase inputs and inventory items after the sale of current farm assets and payment of all current farm liabilities. Calculated as current farm assets at end year less current farm liabilities at end year.Page(s)
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| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\right]$| Title |
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| EB No |

[^15]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The importance of trend analysis is to identify what areas changed, ask why they changed, and look at what you can do differently in the future to influence that change. If you would like help in developing and looking at the trends in your business, contact your local Cornell Cooperative Extension office and become involved in a financial management education program.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In 1996, similar size non-grazers sold 17,547 pounds of milk per cow and in 2007 similar size non-grazers sold 19,811 pounds per cow.

[^2]:    ${ }^{65}$ Farms grazing at least three months of year, changing paddock at least every three days, forage from pasture at least 30 percent, and no organic farms.
    ${ }^{66}$ Farms with similar herd size as the 36 rotational grazing farms.
    ${ }^{67}$ Top 50 percent of grazing farms by labor and management incomes per operator per cow.
    ${ }^{68}$ Farms with similar herd size as the "Top $50 \%$ " grazing farms and labor and management incomes per operator per cow greater than $\$ 500$.

[^3]:    ${ }^{9}$ Operators are the individuals who are integrally involved in the operation and management of the farm business. They are not limited to those who are the owner of a sole proprietorship or are formally a member of the partnership or corporation.

[^4]:    ${ }^{13}$ Assumes that average nonfarm assets and liabilities for the nonreporting farms were the same as for those reporting.

[^5]:    ${ }^{15}$ \$14,133 land and \$43,346 building and/or depreciable improvements.

[^6]:    ${ }^{16}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.
    ${ }^{17}$ May not add due to rounding.

[^7]:    ${ }^{18}$ Includes change in advance government receipts. ${ }^{19}$ Includes change in prepaid expenses. ${ }^{20}$ Excludes change in interest account payable.

[^8]:    ${ }^{22}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.

[^9]:    ${ }^{24}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.

[^10]:    ${ }^{27}$ Percent of average number of cows in the herd. ${ }^{28}$ Cows sold for beef plus cows died.

[^11]:    ${ }^{30}$ See page 1 for a description of these groups of farms.

[^12]:    ${ }^{31}$ Farms participating both years.
    ${ }^{32}$ Average for the year.

[^13]:    ${ }^{33}$ Page number of the participant's DFBS where the factor is located.

[^14]:    ${ }^{\overline{36}}$ Each calculation of an average is independent of all others. Therefore, math operations on the detail will not result in the totals. However, detail in the "\$/Cwt of Milk" column will result in the totals.

[^15]:    Paper copies are being replaced by electronic Portable Document Files (PDFs). To request PDFs of AEM publications, write to (be sure to include your e-mail address): Publications, Department of Applied Economics and Management, Warren Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-7801. If a fee is indicated, please include a check or money order made payable to Cornell University for the amount of your purchase. Visit our Web site (http://aem.cornell.edu/outreach/materials.htm) for a more complete list of recent bulletins.

