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The need for a detailed and systematic method for estimating poultry numbers has been documented both by Egyptian and domestic economists. In order to address this need, a team of Egyptian economists have conducted a detailed survey of Egyptian poultry producing firms by size, number, and location. This information should yield valuable insight as to the structure, conduct, and performance of the industry but leaves wanting the question of an appropriate method or methods of incorporating their efforts into an ongoing program of statistical livestock and poultry numbers estimating over time.

A trip to Egypt last year by the investigator suggested some methods of evaluating numbers over time. 2 This paper addresses some of the techniques discussed in that particular paper and narrows the approach to the question of methodology involved in evaluating poultry numbers in California. The methodology involved is consistent throughout the United States. Therefore, one would suspect the approach to be consistent with other reporting agencies' so that data collected in California may be incorporated into other states' data to ultimately produce an aggregate U.S. industry report, useful for both planning and marketing effort.

Discussion in the paper is subdivided into eight distinct areas consistent with categorical reports produced by California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service in their periodic survey of domestic producers. These areas are as follows:

[^0]Production and Marketings of Eggs, Chickens, and Turkeys (Calendar Year)

Chickens: Layers on Hand, Rate rf Lay, and Eggs Produced by Months (Calendar Year)

Chickens: Number of Layers on Fams, Egg Production, Disposition, Prices Received, and Gross Income (Calendar Year)

Broilers and Fryers: Number Produced, Prices Received, and Gross Income, California (Calendar Year)

Chickens: Number Hatched, Egg Type, Broiler Type, By Months, California (U.S. Total) (By Calendaz Year)

Chick and Turkey Hatcheries: Nurber, Incubator Capacity, Number Hatched, California (By Calendar Year)

Slaughter: Poultry Slaughter Under Federal Inspection, California (By Calendar Year)

Chicks and Poults: Number Produced by Commercial Hatcheries, by Weeks (By Week--Annually)

It is recognized all of the areas may not be physically or economically capable of duplication within the Egyptian institutional framework. However, at least some of the methodology has been employed by the Egyptian team and, with some intensification of effort, much of the remaining information could be incorporated into their efforts.

California Poultry Data

This paper explains how the U.S. poultry data is derived. This is the first part of an eight-part series. Each part will describe a table in the Production and Marketing: Eggs, Chickens, and Turkeys annual for California, 1981.

The first table is Table 1, Number on Farms, December 1, California, 1972-1981. (See Table 1.) The information for this entire annual is from primary data, more specifically, survey data (survey included in the Appendix
as an exhibit). The survey is the Chicken and Egg Report for December 1 which is conducted in every siate once a year on December lst (see Appendix 1).

This survey is done statewide and then compiled for national figures.
The headings on Table 1 are somewhat misleading. Therefore, some definitions are included. The hens category contains all female chickens one year old and older. The first pullets category includes female chickens twenty weeks to one year of age. Pullets younger than twenty weeks are the second pullets category; pullets not of laying age. The other chickens category includes cockerels, roosters, male chickens, etc., but excludes broilezs.

The hens and also the pullets category comes from question number 2 under the Inventory heading. Hatchery data is used to separate the two categories. The pullets not of laying age are an addition of the survey's questions 3 and 4 under the heading Inventory. The other chickens category is derived from survey question number 5, "Inventory." Addition of questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 or categories hens, pullets $2 /$, pullets $3 /$, and other chickens equals the total category on Table 1 .

The December 1 survey is a stratified probability area frame survey. The stratifications are in number of chickens as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1-\quad 2,999 \\
3,000-\quad 9,999 \\
10,000-19,999 \\
20,000-49,999 \\
50,000-99,999 \\
100,000-199,999 \\
200,000-399,999 \\
400,000-\text { over }
\end{array}
$$

The California Crop and Livestock Reportiny Service (CCLRS) mails out surveys to all existing poultry producers in each stratification.

The surveys are mailed out according to a master list. This list contains all the known poultry producers. Advertisements in trade journals and magazines and information from county agricultural commissioners are used to keep the list current.

For the December 1 survey, the California Crop and Livestock Reporing Service works to obtain an effective 100 percent response rate. They have trained interviewers to first phone and then do personal interviews on the nonresponsive producers. Then bias arising from nonresponse is eliminated.

The process of transferring the data from the surveys to the data published is a two-step process. First, the survey data is processed directly onto a computer. There are checks in the system to curtail any false data on the surveys. Examples of these checks are data that is not feasibly possible or data not fitting last month's data from the same producer.

Once all the data has been verified and is on the computer, ratios, estimators, and alterations to the data are completed. The estimation procedures statisticians use are regression analysis, time series analysis, and, most importantly, the balance sheet approach. The balance sheet approach is illustrated here as an example: the number of hens last year is first determined; then this year's death loss is subtracted, as is the current year's slaughtered hens. To these totals are added this year's placement of hens. The resulting derived number should be close to the number reported for the current year. If the numbers do not reconcile, then revisions on the actual data are completed. The result best fitting the actual data and estimator analysis is the published final estimate.

After the numbers are finalized, two ratios are derived. Included in the Appendix is a copy of one month's computer printout within which the ratios are derived. Note the control data expansion ratio. This is equal to $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{n}$
where $N$ equals the universe size and $n$ equals the sample size. To assure greater accuracy, the December 1 survey control data expansion ratios are accomplished for each stratification. The sample is then multiplied by the ratio to obtain a state direct expansion. The ratio is used for the U.S. direct expansion by summing up the individual states. An example follows: a universe of 10 , a sample of 5 , resulting in a ratio equalling 2 . The value of the sample is then multiplied by the 2 to get the expansion. This expansion ratio is derived from the December 1 data but is not used on the December 1 data. The ratio is used on the monthly poultry data which is similar to the December 1 data but does not use such an extensive surveying procedure.

The other ratio calculated is the identical ratio. This ratio is a comparison of current data with data reported a year earlier for matched sampling units. Questionnaires from producers are matched with the same producer's questionnaire from the previous year. Thus a current to current (C/C) percentage of the preceding year's number is computed. This ratio is then applied to total chickens on December lst of last year to obtain a current indication of the number of chickens on hand. Both of the ratios illustrated are only indicators. They are not used for estimating procedures. Therefore, the figures are not published.

Revisions on this data do occur but are not common. If they are revised, it happens every five years after the Agricultural Census.

This data is disseminated nationally by mail. It is mailed to anyone who wants the poultry data. There are weekly, monthly, and annual publications. The people who wish to be sent the information must pay a fee for it. The data is also sent out on various commodity news services, and producers are the main users of the information, although marketing firms and policy
analysts are also users. It takes almost a full month for the estimator to be published. For example, September's monthly data is mailed out on October 22nd. Weekly data is mailed out on the Wednesday of the next week.

This is the second section of eight segments, and the subject of this section is Table 2, Chickens: Layers on Hand, Rate of Lay, and Eggs Produced, By Months, California, 1980-81. (See Table 2.) The information for this table is from primary survey data, Chicken and Egg Report (see Appendix). This survey is conducted quarterly in California as well as in 11 other states. 3

The first category, "Layers," information comes from question 2 on the Chicken and Egg Report. The second category, "Eggs per 100 Layers," is derived from question 1 on the report. "Eggs Produced" category is a multiplication of the categories "Layers" and "Eggs per 100 Layers."

This chicken and egg report survey is conducted in the identical manner of the Chicken and Egg Report for December 1. The stratifications are the same, the methodology is the same, and the surveying is the same. The tabulation is the same (see Appendices 4 and 5), and the dissemination of data is also identical.

The third portion of this paper deals with Table 3, Chickens: Number of Layers on Farms, Egg Production, Disposition, Prices Received, and Gross Income, California, 1972-81. (See Table 3.) The information in this table is derived from egg producers.

The headings on this table come from a variety of sources. "Hens and Pullets of Laying Age, On Hand December l" comes straight from the

[^1]December 1 survey as described in Table 1. "Hens and Pullets of Laying Age, Annual Average" comes from the monthly Chicken and Egg Report. One takes the summation of the 12 months divided by 12. "Eggs per Layer" is derived by dividing "Eggs Produced" by "Hens and Pullets of Laying Age, Annual Average." "Eggs Produced" is transferred directly from Table 2 , the total summation of the monthly data for a year. "Eggs Used on Farm" is from a survey done in Washington, D.C. "Eggs Sold" equals "Eggs Produced" less "Eggs Used on Farms.:" "Prices Received Per Dozen" comes from the Poultry and Egg Price Inquiry (see Appendix 6). "Gross Income" is a multiplication between "Eggs Sold" and "Prices Received Per Dozen."

All data, except the Poultry and Egg Price Inquiry, has been previously discussed. The Poultry and Egg Price Inquiry is distributed to buyers of eggs and/or poultry from a master list. Sixty buyers are sampled by mail every month. It is a simple random survey; no stratifications are used. The responses are then averaged to finalize the published figures.

The fourth section of this paper deals with Table 4, Broilers and Fryers: Number Produced, Prices Received, and Gross Income, California, 1972-81. (See Table 4.) All data here comes from primary sources.

Each column comes from different sources. "Number Produced" (12/1-11/30) is estimated primarily from weekly placements ( $10 / 1-9 / 30$ ). This is weekly hatchery placements minus death loss from the six largest producers. "Average Live Weight" is based on data from federal and state inspection and from trade sources. "Pounds Produced" is a multiplication of columns "Number Produced" and "Average Live Weight." "Prices received per pound" is estimated from the Poultry and Egg Price Inquiry previously described under Table 3. "Gross Income" is merely a multiplication of "Pounds Produced" and "Prices Received per Pound."

The fifth part of this series discusses Table 5, Chickens: Number Hatched, Egg Type, Broiler Typa, By Montns, California (U.S. Total), 1977-81. (See Table 5.) This table, again as all the others; is based on primary data--rather, survey data. The survey is called Weekly Hatchery and Chick Placement Report (see Appendix 7). This survey is done weekly in California. The headings are self descriptive and come from question 2 on the above mentioned survey.

This weekly hatchery survey is mailed out to all known hatcheries that hatch egg type or broiler type chicks on a commercial basis. The universe is divided into two groups: hatcheries reporting monthly and hatcheries reporting weekly. There is a high response rate. At the end of the yaar, an intensive effort is made to obtain reports from those not reporting during the year. Followup is done by personal interview and telephone call backs.

After tabulations are made on the data collected, two indications are computed, matched report indication (c/c ratio), and an indication based on the relation between the number of chicks hatched during the montio and the totial. capacity of hatcheries reporting.

The first indication compares current hatching reported by hatcheries with the hatch reported by the same hatcheries in the corresponding month a year earlier (a c/c ratio). This c/c ratio is applied to the estimate a year earlier to obtain an indication of the monthly hatch for the current month.

The second indication is a four-step process. a) Total operating capacity is established for size groups within each state since the number of chicks hatched per unit of capacity varies with the size of the hatchery. b) Taking each size group as a unit, the ratio of the number of chicks hatched to total capacity is calculated for hatcheries reporting. c) These ratios are then applied to the total capacity of all hatcheries in the respective size
groups to derive the total number hatched for the group. d) The sum of the size groups is the indicated total production for the state. The main assumption in this process is that within a certain size group, hatcheries that did not return the questionnaire operated on approximately the same scale as those hatcheries which did reply.

The two primary uses of this data are to provide a continuous record of the potential supply of replacements for the laying flock, and broiler typa hatched data provides a measure of future broiler slaughter.

The sixth part of this series deals with Table 6, Chick and Turkey Hatcheries: Number, Incubator Capacity, Number Hatched, California, 1972-82 (U.S. 1982). (See Table 6.) The table is based on primary data from the surveys, weekly Hatchery and Chick Placement Report (discussed in the last section), weekly Turkey Hatchery Report, and the monthly Turkey Hatchery Report (see Appendices 8 and 9). These surveys are done weekly and monthly, respectively.

The "Hatcheries" column contains the number of hatchery operations and comes from the master list used for the mail surveys. The "Incubator Capacity" is the capacity for the hatcheries. This is estimated from survey data, "Chicks Hatched" comes straight from Table 12's annual data. "Poults Hatched" is estimated from the weekly and monthly Turkey Hatchery Report. The weekly and monthly Turkey Hatchery Report is handled the same way the weekly Hatchery and Chick Placement Report is.

The seventh table discussed is collection analysis and presentation of Table 7, Slaughter: Poultry Slaughter Under Federal Inspection, California, 1980-81. (See Table 7.) The data in this table is obtained from federal government survey efforts. In 1981, 96 percent of all poultry slaughtered in California was done in federally inspected plants (all poultry slaughtered in
plants engaged in interstate shipments of dressed poultry are required to be inspected by a federal inspector).

The "Young Chickens" column contains broilers and fryers. "Mature Chickens" are old hens and old roosters. "Fryer-Roasters" column is empty because there are none in California. "Young Turkeys" are turkeys less than 34 weeks old.

The last part of this series deals with Table 8, Chicks and Poults: Number Produced by Commercial Hatcheries, By Weeks. (See Table 8.) The data in this table comes from the surveys discussed previously for Table 11 and Table 17.

The columns defined "Eggs Set" means how many eggs are put into the incubator each week, "Chicks Hatched" equals the number of chicks taken out of the incubator, and "Chicks Placed in California" identifies the number of chicks leaving the hatchery that week.

Summary and Conclusions

From a review of the previous discussion, it is relatively easy to see that a systematic and comprehensive effort is maintained to assimilate, evaluate, and disseminate high quality statistical poultry information. This information pertains to number, rate of replacement, death loss, and other pertinent information concerning layers, broilers, and turkeys in California.

Change has come about over time in the frequency and intensity of poultry information. However, relatively high quality information is still nade available and, as noted in the preceding, is used by producers, marketing firms, and others. Their participation is also mandatory in the collection and auditing of these data.

TASLE 1. CHICKENS: Number on farms December 1, California, 1972-81 1/ (U.S.-1981)

| Year | Chickens on farms December 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hens | Pullets $2 /$ | Pullets 3/ | Other Chickens | Total |
|  | ------ Thousand birds $-\ldots-\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1972 | 18,742 | 16,504 | 12,783 | 195 | 48,224 |
| 1973 | 19,844 | 17,164 | 13,177 | 199 | 50,384 |
| 1974 | 22,184 | 16,374 | 10,727 | 293 | 49,878 |
| 1975 | 22,978 | 14,714 | 10,139 | 240 | 48,071 |
| 1976 | 21,969 | 14,953 | 9,019 | 250 | 46,191 |
| 1977 | 20,664 | 15,736 | 9,026 | 190 | 45,616 |
| 1978 | 20,985 | 15,591 | 9,251 | 193 | 46,020 |
| 1979 | 17,794 | 19,206 | 8,282 | 228 | 45,510 |
| 1980 | 17,221 | 18,779 | 7,096 | 174 | 43,270 |
| 1981 | 15,470 | 20,230 | 6,238 | 212 | 42,150 |
| U.S. 1981 | 128,229 | 164,280 | 83,965 | 6,746 | 283,222 |

// Excluding commercial broilers and fryers.
$\frac{2}{3} /$ Pullets of laying age.
3/ Pullets not of laying age.
SOURCE: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

TABLE 2. CHICKENS: Layers on hand, rate of lay, and eggs produced, by months, California 1980-81

| Month | Layers 1/ |  | Eggs per 100 Layers |  | Eggs Produced |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1980 | 1981 | 1980 | 1981 | 1980 | 1961 |
|  | Thousands |  | Nurber |  | Millions |  |
| Dec. 2/ | 37,051 | 36,000 | 2,008 | 2,025 | 744 | 729 |
| January | 37,225 | 36,000 | 2,007 | 2,011 | 747 | 724 |
| February | 37,050 | 35,700 | 1,881 | 1,821 | 697 | 650 |
| March | 36,525 | 35,000 | 2,064 | 2,034 | 754 | 712 |
| April | 36,300 | 34,450 | 1,972 | 1,956 | 716 | 674 |
| May | 36,150 | 34,400 | 1,986 | 1,985 | 718 | 683 |
| June | 36,150 | 34,500 | 1,994 | 1,913 | 721 | 660 |
| July | 36,450 | 34,900 | 2,071 | 2,052 | 755 | 716 |
| August | 36,700 | 35,000 | 2,033 | 2,094 | 746 | 733 |
| September | 35,750 | 34,600 | 1,984 | 2,020 | 729 | 699 |
| October | 37,100 | 34,750 | 2,029 | 2,052 | 753 | 713 |
| November | 36,750 | 35,350 | 1,948 | 2,000 | 716 | 707 |

1/ Average number on hand during month.
2/ December preceding year.
SOURCE: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

TASLE 3.CHICKENS: Number of layers on farms, egg production, disposition, prices received, and gross income, California, 1972-81 (U.S.-1981)

| Year | Hens and Pullets of Laying Age |  | Eggs Per <br> Layer 1/ | Eggs Produced | Eggs Usedon Farms | Eggs <br> Sold | Prices Received Per Doz. | Gross Income |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | On Hand Dec. 1 | Annual Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Thousand Birds Number $\quad$ - - Millions |  |  |  |  |  | Cents | Thousand S |
| 1972 | 42,465 | 39,201 | 221 | 8,652 | 6 | 8,646 | 28.1 | 202,602 |
| 1973 | - 37,193 | 35,147 | 219 | 7,680 | 5 | 7,675 | 50.6 | 323,840 |
| 1974 | 38,858 | 38,276 | 222 | 8,485 | 4 | 8,481 | 47.9 | 338,693 |
| 1975 | 37,692 | 37,940 | 223 | 8,467 | 4 | 8,463 | 49.8 | 351,381 |
| 1976 | 36,922 | 37,557 | 230 | 8,635 | 4 | 8,631 | 53.5 | 384,977 |
| 1977 | 36,400 | 36,469 | 229 | 8,345 | 5 | 8,340 | 50.8 | 353,272 |
| 1978 | 36,576 | 35,767 | 235 | 8,412 | 5 | 8,407 | 46.0 | 322,460 |
| 1979 | 37,000 | 37,005 | 235 | 8,713 | 10 | 8,703 | 50.8 | 368,850 |
| 1980 | 36,000 | 36,684 | 240 | 8,796 | 10 | 8,786 | 50.5 | 370,165 |
| 19812 | 36,000 | 35,054 | 240 | 8,400 | 10 | 8,390 | 56.9 | 398,300 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { U.S. } \\ & 1981 \end{aligned}$ | 294,136 | 286,884 | 243 | 69,603 | 444 | 69,159 | 63.1 | 3,662,733 |

I/ Based on annual average number of layers.
2/ Preliminary.
SOURCE: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.


Source: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service

TABLE 5. CHICKENS: Number hatched, egg type, broiler type, by months, California (U.S. total), 1977-81

| Sonth | Egs Type |  |  |  |  | Broiler Type |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 |
|  | - - - - Ihousand - - - - - |  |  |  |  | - - - - Thousand - - - - |  |  |  |  |
| Jan. | 4,344 | 4,944 | 4,809 | 4,043 | 4,558 | 9,346 | 10,624 | 11,038 | 13,014 | 12,990 |
| Feb. | 4,385 | 4,009 | 4,245 | 4,992 | 4,174 | 9,031 | 10,507 | 11,410 | 12,963 | 12,785 |
| Mar. | 4,435 | 4,139 | 4,796 | 5,218 | 3,584 | 11,234 | 11,578 | 12,866 | 11,382 | 15,041 |
| Apr. | 4,322 | 4,241 | 4,905 | 4,936 | 4,740 | 10,779 | 11,346 | 12,784 | 13,409 | 14,054 |
| May | 4,996 | 5,537 | 4,886 | 4,710 | 4,029 | 11,094 | 11,681 | 13,222 | 13,986 | 14,407 |
| Jun. | 4,389 | 4,898 | 4,274 | 3,861 | 3,521 | 10,494 | 11,734 | 12,912 | 13,299 | 14,423 |
| Jui. | 4,101 | 3,644 | 4,619 | 3,400 | 3,359 | 10,427 | 11,836 | 12,784 | 13,852 | 14, 843 |
| Aug. | 3,757 | 4,102 | 4,494 | 3,816 | 3,375 | 10,040 | 10,418 | 13,092 | 13,496 | 14,91.9 |
| Sep. | 3,275 | 3,910 | 3,963 | 3,982 | 3,294 | 9,072 | $\begin{array}{r}9,549 \\ \hline 10349\end{array}$ | 12,663 | 12,809 | 13,895 |
| Oct. | 4,206 | 4,232 | 4,204 | 3,417 | 3,918 | 9,490 | 10,349 | 12,597 | 13,176 | 13,510 |
| Nov. | 3,741 | 3,374 | 3,267 | 3,244 | 3,665 | 9,236 | 10,407 | 12,445 | 12,918 | 14,140 |
| Dec. | 4,079 | 4,352 | 3,648 | 3,335 | 3,041 | 10,109 | 10,707 | 13,623 | 12,983 | 14,477 |
| Total | 50,031 | 51,382 | 52,110 | 48,955 | 45,258 | 120,352 | 130,736 | 151,436 | 157,317 | 169,474 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { U.S. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | 501,913 | 491,578 | 518,953 | 4S4,622 | 454,175 | 3,636,672 | , 879,339 | 4,197,758 | 4,280,33S | 416,641 |

Scurce: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service

TABLE 6. CHICK AND TURKEY HATCHERIES: Number, incubator capacity, number hatched, California, 1972-82 (U.S. 1982)

| Year | Hatcheries 1/ |  | Incubator Capacity 1/ |  | Chicks Hatched |  | Poults Hatched |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chick | Turkey | Chick | Turkey | Broiler Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Egg } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | - - Nuriber - - |  | - - - Thousand Birds - - - |  |  |  |  |
| 1972 | 39 - 26 |  | 18,571 | 6,688 | 90,850 | 57,807 | 20,516 |
| 1973 | 31 | 26 | 17,505 | 6,638 | 90,203 | 59,594 | 20,048 |
| 1974 | 322 | 20 | 16,445 | 5,379 | 96, 293 | 47,027 | 19,623 |
| 1975 |  | 16 | 19,218 | 5,517 | 104,355 | 43,802 | 18,640 |
| 1976 |  | 16 | 19,561 | 5,516 | 113,266 | 45,831 | 20,318 |
| 1977 | - 22.14 |  | 18,551 | 5,032 | 120,352 | 50,031 | 20.003 |
| 1978 |  | 14 | 17,672 | 5,042 | 130,736 | 51,382 | 20,190 |
| 1979 |  |  | 21,104 | 5,112 | 151,436 | 52,110 | 22.432 |
| 1980 | 2216 |  | 22,899 | 5,068 | 157,317 | 48,955 | 23,779 |
| 1981 |  |  | 18,852 | 4,935 | 169,474 | 45,258 | 24,127 |
| 1982 | 1 | 12 | 22,144 | 4,935 | 169,474 | 45,25 | 24,127 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { U.S. } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 538 | 106 | 466,096 | 39,022 | 4,416,641 | 454,175 | 187,334 |

1/ Includes hatcheries actually operating and some hatcheries held on a stand-by basis.
SOURCE: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

TABLE 7. SLAUGHTER: Poultry slaughter under federal inspection, California, 1980-81
(U.S. 198()-81)


SOURCE: California Crop and Livestock Peporting Service.


| Week <br> Enín: | Broiler Tice |  |  | Eig Typt |  |  | Turteys 1/ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Egiss Set | Chicks Hatched | Clicks Placed in Calfornia | Eggs Set | Chicks Hatched | Sexed Pullets Placed in California | Eges Set | Poults Hatched | Poulis Plasin 1n California |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jain 3 | 3,651 | 3,016 | 3,004 | 1,171 | 1,025 | 521 | 743 | 475 | 8.75 |
| Jan. 10 | 3,724 | 2,861 | 2,842 | 1,328 | 1,026 | 509 | 541 | 549 | 543 |
| Jan. 17 | 3,795 | 2,836 | 2,836 | 1,204 | 1,039 | 455 | 776 | 539 | 537 |
| Jan. 2ir | 4,090 | 2,966 | 2,906 | 1,151 | 950 | 446 | 695 | 439 | 4.09 |
| Jan. 31 | 4,052 | 3,033 | 3,012 | 1,339 | 1,103 | 593 | 813 | 512 | 466 |
| Feb. 7 | 4,04? | 3,040 | 3,020 | 1,390 | 1,032 | 603 | 930 | 383 | 383 |
| Feb. 14 | 4,294 | 3,243 | 3,192 | 1,009 | 862 | 521 | 525 | 496 | 429 |
| Eeb. 21 | 4,150 | 3,248 | 3,228 | 868 | 1,134 | 652 | 846 | 441 | 418 |
| Feb. 28 | 4,307 | 3,254 | 3,234 | 1,011 | 1,146 | 651 | 935 | 566 | 521 |
| Mar. 7 | 4,269 | 3,437 | 3,416 | 865 | 849 | 478 | 1,007 | 667 | 601 |
| Mar. 14 | 4,217 | 3,310 | 3,258 | 1,297 | 660 | 353 | 847 | 647 | 611 |
| :1ar. 21 | 4,272 | 3,445 | 3,425 | 1,111 | 854 | 503 | 965 | 647 | 613 |
| Sar. 28 | 4,181 | 3,404 | 3,353 | 1,544 | 759 | 439 | 954 | 622 | 478 |
| Apre 4 | 4,055 | 3,367 | 3,346 | 1,400 | 1,064 | 597 | 821 | 714 | 670 |
| A? = 11 | 3,895 | 3,396 | 3,375 | 1,447 | 920 | 470 | 924 | 572 | 53' |
| Apr. 18 | 4,051 | 3,287 | 3,266 | 784 | 1,254 | 684 | 938 | 640 | 5 29 |
| APE. 25 | 4,101 | 3,263 | 3,242 | 1,122 | 1,187 | 655 | 968 | 654 | 605 |
| Hzy 2 | 4,015 | 3,074 | 3,054 | 1,377 | 1,030 | 590 | 957 | 561 | 533 |
| ㅊay 9 | 4,211 | 3,244 | 3,224 | 1,071 | . 657 | 361 | 1,016 | 638 | 581 |
| :29 16 | 4,276 | 3,282 | 3,262 | 1,436 | 912 | 477 | 959 | 620 | 585 |
| May 23 | 4,023 | 3,242 | 3,222 | 832 | 1,116 | 594 | 905 | 639 | 620 |
| May 30 | 4,210 | 3,280 | 3,259 | 1,010 | 864 | 495 | 1,000 | 572 | 547 |
| Jun. 6 | 4,409 | 3,357 | 3,336 | 802 | 1,196 | 589 | 894 | 670 | 640 |
| Jun. 13 | 4,116 | 3,248 | 3,228 | 1,188 | - 665 | 361 | 1,101 | 642 | 615 |
| Jun. 20 | 4,502 | 3,371 | 3,351 | 331 | 795 | 455 | 913 | 590 | 576 |
| Jur. 27 | 3,976 | 3,525 | 3,504 | 1,266 | 639 | 389 | 976 | 700 | 608 |
| Jul. ${ }_{\text {; }}$ | 4,013 | 3,20́7 | 3,246 | 934 | 926 | 469 | 826 | 592 | 557 |
| Jul. 21 | 4,130 | 3,617 | 3,587 | 1,051 | 272 | 158 | 802 | 723 | 722 |
| Ju!. 18 | 4,145 | 3,205 | 3,105 | 583 | 1,067 | 539 | 583 | 641 | 637 |
| Ju1. 25 | 4,360 | 3,232 | 3,211 | 1,218 | 741 | 372 | 659 | 639 | 619 |
| Aug. 1 | 4,042 | 3,423 | 3,402 | 856 | 875 | 429 | 645 | 554 | 537 |
| At: 6.8 | 4,323 | 3,335 | 3,315 | 1,120 | 463 | 307 | 379 | 557 | 549 |
| Aug. 15 | 4,168 | 3,355 | 3,335 | 1,265 | 958 | 540 | 363 | 393 | 385 |
| AUS. 22 | 4,045 | 3,243 | 3,222 | +665 | 666 | 418 | 371 | 458 | 447 |
| A.LE. 29 | 3,859 | 3,521 | 3,500 | 1,203 | 869 | 504 | 241 | 456 | 443 |
| Sep. 5 | 3,901 | 3,413 | 3,393 | 799 | 1,029 | 569 | 322 | 271 | 189 |
| Stp. 12 | 3,570 | 3,335 | 3,315 | + 962 | 526 | 333 | 211 | 242 | 232 |
| Sep. 19 | 4,027 | 3,170 | 3,149 | 1,198 | 935 | 513 | 174 363 | 252 | 229 |
| Scp. 26 | 3,692 | 3,239 | 3,218 | 1,079 | 659 | 409 | 363 | 168 | 163 |
| Oct. 3 | 3,771 | 2,956 | 2,946 | 1,052 | 765 | 431 | 227 | 233 | 213 |
| Oct. 10 | 3,224 | 3,342 | 3,322 | 964 | 1,040 | 553 | 261 | 137 | 133 |
| cict. 17 | 3,368 | 3,069 | 3,049 | 890 | 908 | 503 | 191 | 123 | 121 |
| 0=t. 24 | 4,072 | 3,143 | 3,122 | 1,037 | 847 | 426 | 299 | 205 | 252 |
| Dct. 31 | 4,206 | 2,648 | 2,663 | 1,013 | 794 | 422 | 262 | 171 | 171 |
| Sov. 7 | 4,152 | 2,819 | 2,798 | 1,099 | 718 | 422 | --- | - | -- |
| licv. 14 | 4,24,5 | 3,393 | 3,372 | 1,419 | 855 | 451 | --- | - | -- |
| Nov. 21 | 4,056 | 3,504 | 3,484 | 1,028 | 823 | 461 | -- | - | - |
| İov. 28 | 3,750 | 3,418 | 3,398 | 690 | 933 | 496 | -- | -- | -- |
| Dec. 5 | 3,725 | 3,516 | 3,493 | - 450 | 1,124 | 586 | --- | --- | -- |
| Dec. 12 | 4,156 | 3,364 | 3,343 | 986 | 800 | 420 | --- | --- | --- |
| Déc. 19 | 3,953 | 3,090 | 3,069 | 1,103 | 545 | 296 | - | --- | - |
| Dec. 25 | 3,599 | 3,067 | 3,046 | 1,247 | 325 | 177 | --- | --- | -- |
| Jan. 2 | 3,701 | 3,426 | 3,40ú | 1,584 | 794 | 412 | --- | -- | - |

1/ heekly Turkey discontinued after October 31, 1951.
Source: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service

Appendices
R. R. M: OLظid.

Agricultural Statictician in Charge
C. B. TJ:ryip. J:

Agracultural Stac:r:iciat:


 MASE: $\qquad$ aporess: $\qquad$
11. Aic any of these h.․ x and pullets in item 6 out on contract?
12. if irg then winy contractucs arc nou caring for flocks ownod by you?
13. No you save any heas and pullecs in any other

$\square$
No-- That completes the murvey. thank you for your hely.
$\square$
res-Please reprort the number of hens and fulleti: by state so that wic can rusum dufilication in cootects ilch other xtates.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$ tate: $\qquad$


R. A. MCGREGOR

Agricultural Statistician in Charge
****************
PLEASE RETURN BY
5TH OF MONTH . IF POSSIBLE

## Dear Egg Producer:

The following data on chickens and eggs are needed to prepare State and National monthly egg proauction statistics. These data are coliected and published as a service to the poultry industry. Individual reports are held confidential. Response to this survey is voluntary and not required by law. However, cooperation is very important in order to provide accurate estimates. Please.complete and return this report promptly in the enclosed envelope, which requires no stamp.

Very truly yours,
GECRGE N. TUCKER, JR.
Agricultural. Statistician


REPORTED BY: DATE: $\qquad$
COMMENTS: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

EGG PRODUCTION SUMMARY AND EXPANSION SHEET
＊＊＂COMPARABLE FOR THESE ITEMS MJLTI FRAME STATES HPLA DIMECT EXPÁVSION
RATE OF LAY－COMPARABLE FOR THESE ITEMS
COMPLETED ：PERCENT＊R！PQRYED：EXPAN．：［i］゙̈［こT
STRATUM RERORTED：PROOUCED：RATEX ：PERCENT： NUMBER ：NUMBER ：25／24．NUMBER ：NUMBER： $28 / 27$ ： NUMBER：30／27．NJY9EZ：FAこTOR：EXPGNSIO：

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\text { MBER : NUMBER }: 25 / 24 \cdot N U M B E R: ~ N U M B E R: ~ & 28 / 27: \\
(24):(25):(26):(27): ~
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{gather*}
\text { IUMBER : 30127. NJM9E2 } \\
(30):(31):(33):(34)
\end{gather*}
$$

TABLE E゙GG FLOCKS
TABLE
$1-2$
$3-9$
$10-19$
$20-49$
$50-99$
$100-199$
$200-399$
4001
$L$ TABLE
$\therefore$ FLOCKS $\because T$
$730,000 \quad 474,000$
.649
.563
.632
.620
.670
.646
.696
.649
.657
.655

| ． 649 | 730000 |  |  |  | 40.50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ． 563 | 44475 |  |  | 18．014 | $40 \cdot 50$ |
| ． 632 | 294474 | 2.723 | .92 5.28 | ＋1．192 |  |
| ． 620 | 563197 | 29.771 | 5．28 | 219,214 384,861 | 38.92 38.17 |
| .670 | 1008099 | 41.607 | 4.12 | 384．861 | 38.17 34.25 |
| ． 646 | 1053537 | 126.270 | 11.98 3.02 | 360.848 1303.884 | 37.25 27.72 |
| ． 696 | 4702160 | 142．130 | 3.02 | 1303.884 6124.784 | 27.72 35.13 |
| ． 649 | 27434448 | 1305.075 | 7.48 | 6124．784 | 35.13 32.72 |
| .657 .655 | 25830390 | 1647，576 | 6.37 6.30 | 8452．797 | $\begin{aligned} & 32.72 \\ & 32.91 \end{aligned}$ |
| ． 667 | 877019 |  |  | 5，994 | －68 |
| ． 734 | 232233 | 26．169 | 11．26 |  |  |
| ．681 | 1109252 | 26．169 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.35 \\ & 2.59 \end{aligned}$ | 5．994 | $\begin{array}{r} .54 \\ .52 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & .658 \\ & .656 \end{aligned}$ | 26939642 | 1673，745 | $\begin{aligned} & 6.21 \\ & 6.20 \end{aligned}$ | 8458.791 | $\begin{aligned} & 31.39 \\ & 32.02 \end{aligned}$ |

$294,474 \quad 186,384$
$\begin{array}{rr}563,197 & 349.627 \\ 1008,099 & 675.861\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}1008,099 & 675,861 \\ 1053,537 & 680.672\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{rr}4702,160 & 3275,229 \\ 17434,448 & 11323,465\end{array}$
17434,448 11323，465
$\because T$

|  | 877,019 | 585,654 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 232,233 | 170,581 |
| HATCHING ST | 1109,252 | 756,235 |

[Appendix 6]
Form Approved O:IB No. 535-0003
POULTRY AMD EGG PRICE INQUIRY
Month: $\qquad$

| REPORT AVERAGE PRICES PAID TO CALIFORMIA PRODUCERS AT RA:ICH ON OR ABOUT THE 15TH. OF THIS MONTH \& MAIL BY THE $16 T H$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| CHICKENS |  |
| YCUNG CHICKENS: | Petersende |
| Under 4 pounds (Sroizere, fivera)....... 60414 | - |
| Over 4 pounds (Roasters). 6 6;15 |  |
| HE!S: <br> Light Breeds \& Crossbreeds 60146 |  |
|  |  |
| Heavy Breeds ............60136 |  |
| OLD ROOSTERS: . . . . . . . . . . 50.35 |  |

TURKEYS
HENS: 10 pounds and over. 51171 $\qquad$
TOMS: 10 pounds and over. 51174 $\qquad$
HENS \& TOMS: under 10 pounds
(Eroilers, fryens, \&
roasters).................. 51162 $\qquad$
EGGS

| - . |  | Tolure Purchasse: (3) Dosen Cosesi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LARGE .........55111 |  |  |
| MEDIU 4 . . . . . . . . 65112 |  |  |
| SHALL . . . . . . . . 65113 |  |  |
| UNDERGRADE/ <br> BREAKER ......... 65117 |  |  |

Reported by: $\qquad$

81286 Date: $\qquad$
[Appendix 7]
nding Saturday

Dear Reporter:
Your cooperation on this survey is importert to insure reliable chick estinates. Knowin:' the availeble number of broiler and egg-type chiche should help you with production and mariesting decisions.
Your response to this survey will be apprecieter but is not required by law. Individual reports are kept confidential. Please return your completed form in the postage paid envelope provide: Definitions and instructions are on the back.

Very truly yours, GEORGE M. TUCKER, JR. R. A. MC.GREGOR

Agricultural Statisticians
Instruetions: Please report " 0 " if answer is none. Include custom settings and hatchings. Include Breeder Flock replacement settings and hatch.

1. Chicken eggs set during week ending (Include custom set for others)
2. Chicks haiched during week ending (Include custon hatch for others)
3. Of the chicks hatched in Item 2, how many were:
a. Placed for comercial broiler production
b. Placed as (1) straight run chicks
(2) pullet chicks
(3) cockerel chicks (including any given away)..
c. Other disposition (Specify) $\qquad$

| Broiler-Type Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Esg-Type } \\ & \text { Number } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| - |  |
| - | XXXXXY.XXXXYX:XX |
| XXXXXXXYXXXXXXX |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

4. Of the chicks placed (Item 3a and 3b (1) and (2), how many were placed in:

5. How many CHICKS were RECEIVED last week from other hatcheries:

| Name of Hatchery | Location | Broilers | Sexed Pullets | Straight Run |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

6. Average cash price received per 100 for straight run broiler type chicks sold (based on actual sales) $\qquad$
7. Averaye cash price received per 100 (based on actual sales) for:
a. Straight run chicks
b. Pullets:
(i) Pure breeds and cross breeds
(2) Other (including incrosses, incrossbreds, strain crosses, and franchised breeds).
c. Cockerels $\qquad$
8. Average price paid per dozen to producers for broiler and egg type hatching eggs (include any premium paid for hatchability)

$\qquad$
(Sunday through Saturday)

## [Appendix 8]

## Dear Reporter:

Tre infomation which you are being asked to provide will be used in compiling a report of weekly production of turkey poults in California. The turkey industry has requested the Department of Agriculture to prepare such reports for the use and benefit of the ircustry. In return we request your cooperation to enable us to perform this service. Your individuai reports are kept confidential. Response to this survey is voluntary and not reouired by la\%. However, cooperation is very important in order to provide accurate estimates. Use accomparying envelope to return this questionnaire. No stamp is required.

Very truly yours,
R. A. MCGREGOR

Agricultural Statistician in Charge
G. N. TUCKER, JP.

Agricultural Statistician
i. Number of turkey eggs set during the week (include custorn settings and eggs set for breeder production as well as comercial)
2. Poults hatched during week (Include custom hatchings)
3. Of the poults hatched, how many were: (Sum of Items 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d should equal Item 2)
a. Placed in Califormia
b. Placed in other states or countries (Specify)

1. $\qquad$ -...............................
2. $\qquad$ ................................
3. $\qquad$ .................................
c. Breeder Flock Replacement
d. Destroyed

| Heavy breeds | Light breeds |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mature Liveweight |  |
| 12 Pounds <br> or More | Under I2 <br> Pounds |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Appendix 9




[^0]:    $1_{\text {Prepared }}$ for the UC-Egypt Project, June 10, 1983.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Trip Report, James Cothern, June 10, 1982.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ This survey has historically been conducted monthly but currently is being conducted quarterly, due solely to budget considerations.

