SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT

TULARE COUNTY

POULTRY MANAGEMENT STUDY

1956

Study conducted by
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Agricultural Extension Service
in cooperation with
Tulare County Poultrymen

Farm Advisors Office
Post Office Building,
Visalia, California

W. F. Rooney
Farm Advisor

INTRODUCTION

This is the sixth annual report of the Tulare County Poultry Management Study, covering the calendar year 1956. This study is conducted by the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with a small group of local poultrymen for the purpose of improving efficiency and profit. Detailed monthly reports are furnished by each cooperator, covering production and mortality as well as costs and income. At the end of the record year an annual record and analysis is prepared for each cooperator. Certain figures from these annual records are presented in this report.

This study demonstrates to cooperators and other poultrymen important profit making factors. High egg production per hen, a good average price per dozen for eggs, and costs per hen no higher than necessary are the most important. To have low costs one must be a good buyer and user of feed and keep enough poultry to properly utilize the available labor and facilities. The sixteen 1956 records show a wide range in costs, returns, and flock statistics. A careful comparison shows opportunities for improving profit. All flocks were White Leghorns.

Another study may be conducted in 1958. Any county poultryman who wishes to participate should contact the Farm Advisors Office.

POULTRY OUTLOOK - MARCH 1957

Fewer replacement chicks now should result in improved egg prices late in 1957. Late reports indicate that poultrymen have purchased fewer chicks for flock replacement in recent months. During January and February of 1957, the U. S. production of egg type chicks was 26 per cent less than the same months in 1956. Eggs of the same type in incubators on March 1 were 26 per cent less than a year ago. In California the hatch for the same months was down about 14 per cent. Settings in California in March are about 10 per cent less than a year ago.

Egg production the first half of 1957 is likely to exceed the same period in 1956. The USDA reports the number of layers on hand January 1, was up 1 1/2 per cent from a year earlier, with the rate of lay up 6 per cent. With the customary reduction in the number of layers the first half of the year, USDA expects that by midyear layer numbers will be about the same as midyear 1956. However, locally there are a number of producers selling out because of poor returns in 1956 and so far in 1957. If this trend occurs nationally the number of layers should be below 1956 by midyear and egg prices could be expected to improve as a result.

Feed cost is not likely to increase. U. S. "feed grain acreage may be slightly larger than in 1956 from increases in sorghum and barley which offset decreases in acreage of corn and oats." In California increase is expected in the acreage planted to barley, corn, oats, and sorghum. Support prices on barley, corn, oats, and sorghum will be slightly lower in 1957. Feed concentrates are expected to be close to peak supply.

TABLE 1 - INCOME, COSTS AND EARNINGS PER HEN FOR INDIVIDUAL FLOCKS - 1956

Ranch number & size 1/	Income Per Hen					Cash and Depreciation Costs per hen						Farm income per Hen	Non cash costs per hen		Management income per hen
	Egg Sales	Poultry Sales	Misc.	Change stock Inv.	Total	Feed	Hired Labor	Chix	Misc.	Depreciation	Total		Family Labor	Interest	
15 L	7.40	.45	.26	.56	8.67	5.25	.71	.45	.16	.16	6.74	1.93	.08	.18	1.67
20 M	7.59	.62	.06	.17	8.43	5.07	.34	.33	.28	.20	6.22	2.21	.55	.22	1.44
9 M	7.67	.47	.10	.10	8.34	5.21	-	.47	.35	.21	6.24	2.10	.81	.18	1.11
12 S	7.87	.52	.04	.56	8.98	5.40	.03	.55	.38	.31	6.66	2.32	1.02	.27	1.03
23 L	6.74	.35	.05	1.26	8.40	5.70	.15	.44	.40	.18	6.87	1.53	.63	.20	.70
17 M	7.11	.68	.14	.65	8.58	5.74	.02	.65	.27	.35	7.03	1.55	.85	.25	.45
22 L	7.15	.53	.09	.18	7.59	5.09	.07	.42	.65	.18	6.41	1.18	.60	.19	.39
1 S	7.81	.48	.03	.11	8.21	5.45	.25	.30	.50	.31	6.81	1.40	.84	.29	.27
11 M	7.53	.48	.02	.37	7.66	4.29	1.45	.37	.36	.38	6.85	.81	.35	.24	.22
13 L	6.07	.28	-	.13	6.48	4.00	-	.30	.28	.23	4.81	1.67	1.32	.21	.14
2 L	7.65	.49	.06	.06	8.14	5.75	.60	.49	.35	.25	7.44	.70	.33	.23	.14
24 S	7.20	.50	.12	2.72	10.54	7.05	1.08	1.12	.55	.34	10.14	.40	.34	.32	-.26
19 M	8.20	.56	-	.25	9.00	5.85	.73	.52	.83	.39	8.32	.67	.75	.26	-.34
21 S	6.63	.24	.06	.45	7.39	5.06	.09	.33	.19	.27	5.98	1.41	1.59	.25	-.42
3 M	6.76	.67	.13	.03	7.53	5.35	1.05	.60	.40	.22	7.62	-.09	.19	.20	-.48
25 M*	7.58	.43	.16	.21	8.38	4.25	-	.41	.73	.23	5.63	2.75	1.68	.20	.87
Av. 3639	7.29	.49	.08	.41	8.27	5.35	.44	.49	.40	.27	6.95	1.32	.68	.23	.41

1/ Flock size based on average number of hens; S = under 2,500; M = 2,500 - 3,500; L = over 3,500.

Individual flocks are arranged in the above table in order of decreasing management income per hen, as shown in the extreme right column. An analysis of the tables in this study will indicate why certain flocks were considerably more profitable than others.

*25 is a Merced County poultryman who is not considered in the averages.

TABLE 2 - FLOCK STATISTICS AND MANAGEMENT - 1956

Ranch number	Laying Flock: Percent died	Laying Flock: Percent culled	Laying Flock: Percent replaced	Price per culled hen	Cost per cwt.: Mash	Cost per cwt.: Grain	Cost per cwt.: Average	Total pounds per hen	Est. pounds hens only	Est. Percent mash	Hours labor per hen	Cost per chick	Percent chick mortality
15	11	84	107	.53	4.53	-	4.53	116	89	100	0.8	37.4	5.4
20	12	90	119	.69	4.69	3.34	4.07	123	93	54	0.9	38.3	4.8
9	5	110	113	.43	3.99	-	3.99	131	103	100	0.8	43.4	-
12	9	93	116	.55	4.20	3.01	4.18	128	99	98	1.0	38.0	6.2
23	13	67	133	.52	4.25	2.88	4.00	142	109	82	0.8	31.5	8.5
17	16	110	153	.62	3.84	-	3.84	149	111	100	0.9	38.7	5.3
22	12	114	132	.46	4.13	2.94	4.08	117	89	96	0.7	41.7	5.6
1	16	78	111	.61	4.45	2.82	4.01	131	103	73	1.1	32.1	7.7
11	10	104	78	.46	3.78	-	3.78	113	93	100	1.5	37.1	4.5
13	30	58	105	.49	3.86	2.52	3.15	126	100	47	1.3	32.4	5.2
2	24	91	112	.54	4.34	2.78	4.18	136	108	90	0.9	39.8	8.9
24	19	73	180	.68	4.50	2.84	4.43	158	113	96	1.4	41.0	7.1
19	9	97	123	.56	4.73	3.35	4.46	130	99	80	1.5	37.4	11.3
21	9	38	88	.64	4.25	-	4.25	119	97	100	1.7	35.9	6.1
3	12	122	102	.55	4.48	3.00	4.06	125	100	71	1.2	50.0	11.6
25	10	80	102	.54	3.88	2.34	3.20	130	104	56	1.7	38.9	2.3
Avg.	14	89	118	.56	4.27	2.95	4.07	130	100	86	1.1	38.3	7.0

Some important management factors are compared in the above table and show considerable variation. Feed cost is one of the most important, averaging 77% of the total cash and depreciation cost in 1956. It is interesting to note that Cooperator 15 with the best management income had the highest feed cost per hundred and the lowest estimated pounds of feed per hen. He was feeding a high calorie ration. When the feed per hen for the year exceeds 100 pounds you can suspect feed waste.

TABLE 3 - EGG PRODUCTION AND SALES FACTORS - 1956

Ranch number	Type housing	Eggs per hen	Per cent of market eggs sold			No. Months Replacements Added	% of Flock 6-18	Dozen eggs sold per hen	Value per dozen			
			Large	Medium	Small				Price	Net cost	Mgt. income	Farm income
15	Wire pen	244	--	--	--	4	75	20.2	36.5	28.3	8.2	9.4
20	Litter	227	62	29	9	5	83	20.5	37.0	30.1	6.9	10.7
9	Wire pen and cage	233	--	--	--	11	97	19.4	39.4	34.8	4.7	9.8
12	Cage	250	75	19	6	10	98	20.7	38.0	33.0	5.0	11.2
23	Litter	207	--	--	--	2	96	18.6	36.3	32.5	3.8	8.2
17	Cage	214	60	32	18	5	91	19.4	36.7	34.4	2.3	8.0
22	Cage	227	--	--	--	10	93	18.7	38.2	36.1	2.1	6.3
1	Litter	250	57	30	13	2	86	22.0	35.5	34.2	1.3	6.5
11	Litter & wire pen	244	--	--	--	5	90	20.1	37.4	36.3	1.1	4.0
13	Litter	195	--	--	--	5	72	15.7	38.6	37.6	1.0	10.6
2	Litter	234	--	--	--	2	100	20.8	36.8	36.1	0.7	3.4
24	Wire pen	224	--	--	--	3	93	19.6	36.8	37.8	-1.0	2.2
19	Litter	246	75	20	5	2	99	20.6	39.6	41.2	-1.6	3.2
21	Litter	206	71	19	10	1	67	17.7	37.5	39.8	-2.4	8.0
3	Wire pen	208	--	--	--	2	70	18.7	36.1	38.7	-2.6	-0.5
25	Litter	234	--	--	--	1	97	20.9	36.3	32.2	4.1	13.2
Avg.		227	--	--	--	5	87	19.5	37.4	35.4	2.0	6.7

Wide differences are apparent in some of the columns above; notice particularly "net cost." Since 1954 egg prices for medium and small eggs on the Fresno market have been considerably below large from June to November. Cooperator No. 1 shows the poorest egg price and egg size. His production during most of these months was less than 50% large. Raising more replacements at other times of the year would have helped his average egg price.

TABLE 4 - MAJOR COST AND INCOME FACTORS ARRANGED IN ORDER AND IDENTIFIED BY COOPERATOR

Change from ranch number to letter	Dozen eggs sold per hen	Price per dozen	Feed cost per cwt.	Estimated pounds feed per hen	Hrs. labor per hen	Per cent mortality laying flock
15 - (A)	22.0 (H)	39.6 (M)	3.15 (K)	89 (A)	0.7 (G)	5 (C)
20 - (B)	20.9 (P)	39.4 (C)	3.20 (P)	89 (G)	0.8 (A)	9 (D)
9 - (C)	20.8 (L)	38.6 (K)	3.78 (J)	93 (B)	0.8 (C)	9 (M)
12 - (D)	20.7 (D)	38.0 (D)	3.84 (F)	93 (J)	0.8 (E)	9 (N)
23 - (E)	20.6 (M)	38.2 (G)	3.99 (C)	97 (N)	0.9 (B)	10 (J)
17 - (F)	20.5 (B)	37.5 (N)	4.00 (E)	99 (D)	0.9 (F)	10 (P)
22 - (G)	20.2 (A)	37.4 (J)	4.01 (H)	99 (M)	0.9 (L)	11 (A)
1 - (H)	20.1 (J)	37.0 (B)	4.06 (O)	100 (K)	1.0 (D)	12 (B)
24 - (I)	19.6 (I)	36.8 (I)	4.07 (B)	100 (O)	1.1 (H)	12 (G)
11 - (J)	19.4 (C)	36.8 (L)	4.08 (G)	103 (C)	1.2 (O)	12 (O)
13 - (K)	19.4 (F)	36.7 (F)	4.18 (D)	103 (H)	1.3 (K)	13 (E)
2 - (L)	18.7 (G)	36.5 (A)	4.18 (L)	104 (P)	1.4 (I)	16 (F)
19 - (M)	18.7 (O)	36.3 (E)	4.25 (N)	108 (L)	1.5 (J)	16 (H)
21 - (N)	18.6 (E)	36.3 (P)	4.43 (I)	109 (E)	1.5 (M)	19 (I)
3 - (O)	17.7 (N)	36.1 (O)	4.46 (M)	111 (F)	1.7 (N)	24 (L)
25 - (P)	15.7 (K)	35.5 (H)	4.53 (A)	113 (I)	1.7 (P)	30 (K)

In Table 4 the ideal position is at the top of the table. Cooperator No. 15, whose letter is (A) has been underlined so he can be followed easily through the table. Both No. 19 (M) and No. 9 (C) sold a considerable number of eggs retail at the ranch. Hours labor per hen indicates that perhaps some cooperators either need labor saving equipment or a more efficient routine.

TABLE 5 - A COMPARISON WITH OTHER CALIFORNIA COUNTIES - 1956

	Tulare	Sonoma	Los Angeles	Sacramento	San Diego	
					Single Cages	Wire Pens & double cages
No. Records	15	24	17	27	19	24
Avg. No. Hens	3639	2856	4467	5683	3464	5496
Eggs per hen	227	232	233	220	242	233
Lbs. feed per hen	130	127	119	123	127	111
Cost mash	4.27	4.07	---	3.38	---	---
Cost grain	2.95	2.96	---	3.12	---	---
Average	4.07	3.58	3.83*	3.25	3.65*	3.63*
Hours labor per hen	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.2	1.0	.9
Avg. price eggs	37.4	40.1	41.3	36.7	38.4	38.4
Net cost per dozen	35.4	33.8	36.6	34.8	34.4	31.0
Income per hen	8.27	8.76	7.76	7.57	8.32	7.87
Cash & depreciation	6.95	6.07	5.97	6.47	6.38	5.68
Farm income per hen	1.32	2.69	1.79	1.10	1.94	2.19
Family-labor	.68	1.16	.61	.46	.83	.55
Interest	.23	.27	.36	.28	.31	.22
Management income per hen	.41	1.26	.82	.36	.80	1.42

* Feed cost per cwt. appears to include shell and grit