



1957

**egg poultry  
production  
&  
management  
study**

COMPILED BY  
 .. Virgil Stratton  
 .. Fred C. Price  
 Farm Advisors

CONDUCTED BY  
 .. The Agricultural  
 Extension Service  
 University of  
 California  
 .. U.S. Department  
 of Agriculture,  
 Cooperating

ISSUED FROM  
 .. Farm Advisors Office  
 912 Santa Rosa Ave.  
 Santa Rosa, Calif.  
 .. March 1958

sonoma county

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

This is the ninth annual summary of the current Sonoma County Poultry Management Study. Twenty records, all from Sonoma County, cover the calendar year of 1957. This study is conducted by the Agricultural Extension Service in cooperation with an interested group of local poultrymen for the purpose of disclosing important management, cost, income, and profit information to aid the entire local poultry industry in obtaining maximum earnings. The number of records is small and the averages in this report are not considered as averages for the county but apply only to the twenty flocks covered. They may or may not be typical of the county, but they do show much useful information on current local production, costs, and profits for all poultrymen and those interested in the business.

This study is being continued under conditions which change from year to year. Cooperators are receiving a monthly summary and comparison of flock performance and mortality. At the end of each year, a detailed analysis of the year's records with comments and suggestions is available. This report represents a part of the information available for public use.

## O U T L O O K

The outlook now on eggs is generally a steady price with some chance of slight improvement. The note of optimism stems from indications of improving consumer demands, weather conditions, (which sometimes influence prices), and more active egg-breaking operations. While production continues to expand, it will remain well under a year ago. According to the U. S. Department of Agriculture, the number of hens laying on January 1 was down about 6 per cent from last year, and there are 7 per cent fewer pullets available as potential layers for 1958.

In spite of a 3.4-cent drop per dozen from 1956 to 1957 in our Management Study, the latest figures indicate that the southern Atlantic and the eleven western states boosted egg output last year in the face of a slight general decline in other areas. As a result, January 1 showed both regions with an increase in potential layers, where in the nation as a whole, numbers were down from last year.

The January hatching of replacement chicks was 10 per cent above 1957 for California; 11 per cent above for the United States. This could mean more layers by fall and result in lower egg prices than in the fall of 1957. Consumer demand could decline through unemployment.

Feed cost should be lower. There may be some good buys in barley and milo at harvest time.

## EXPLANATION OF TERMS USED IN A POULTRY ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS

Total Income is composed of returns from the sale of eggs, poultry manure, and other miscellaneous incomes; the value of eggs eaten in the home; and the net increase in the poultry stock inventory. A decrease is subtracted in obtaining total income.

Total Expense is made up of all costs of feed, chicks or poultry bought, hired labor, other cash expense items, the value of operator and other family labor, depreciation on buildings and equipment, and 5 per cent interest on the average investment shown by the inventory and capital record.

Management Income is the amount by which the total income exceeds the total expense. If the total expense is larger, a Net Loss occurs, which is designated by a minus sign (-) preceding the figure.

Farm Income is the sum of the management income, the value of the operator and family labor, and the interest on investment. It is the net income the poultryman receives above cash expenses and depreciation. It includes interest for the use of his capital, wages for his actual labor, and profit for his management.

Average Number of Hens is the average number of hens in the flock for the year. It is obtained by dividing the number of hen days for the year by the number of days in the year.

Per Cent Mortality is the per cent of the average number of hens that died during the year. It is obtained by dividing the number died by the average number of hens.

Per Cent Culled is the per cent of the average number of hens that were sold and eaten in the home during the year. Dividing the number so disposed by the average number of hens gives this figure.

Per Cent Added is the per cent of the average number of hens which were actually added to the flock during the year. It is obtained by dividing total additions by the average number of hens. Pullets are added at about six months of age.

Per Cent Pullets is the per cent of total hens in the flock which were pullets between six and eighteen months of age. It is obtained by dividing the total number of pullets of this age at the beginning and end of the year by the total number of hens and pullets at these times.

TABLE I: PROFIT equals INCOME ( eggs, stock, misc. ) less EXPENSE ( feed, labor, other ).

Ser. No.	Income Per Hen					Cash & Depreciation Costs Per Hen						Net Farm Inc.	None-Cash Costs per Hen		Mgt. Income Per Hen
	Egg Sales	Poultry Sales	Manure	Chng.in Stock Inven.	Total Income	Feed	Chicks Bght.	Misc. Costs	Depr.	Hired Labor	Total Exp.		Fam. Labor	Int.on Inv.	
8	8.12	.42	.07	.40	9.01	4.39	.50	.33	.20	.50	5.92	3.09	.38	.20	2.51
13	8.15	.37	.02	.56	9.10	4.56	.57	.45	.20	.10	5.88	3.22	1.18	.17	1.87
17	8.18	.49	.12	.10	8.89	5.01	.44	.21	.18	---	5.84	3.05	1.48	.19	1.38
4	7.73	.46	---	-.10	8.09	4.18	.49	.43	.25	.63	5.98	2.11	.52	.25	1.34
21	8.03	.42	---	.36	8.81	4.97	.51	.54	.21	.92	7.15	1.66	.16	.23	1.27
12	8.16	.46	.01	-.05	8.58	4.64	.40	.40	.40	.02	5.86	2.72	1.35	.24	1.13
1	8.42	.44	.02	.08	8.96	4.34	.44	.45	.49	.05	5.77	3.19	1.84	.30	1.05
3	7.37	.41	---	.44	8.22	4.19	.52	.18	.35	---	5.24	2.98	1.67	.27	1.04
29	7.72	.28	.12	-.45	7.67	4.38	.65	.25	.33	.01	5.62	2.05	.84	.25	.96
9	6.71	.26	---	-.01	6.96	4.09	.32	.65	.04	.40	5.50	1.46	.36	.15	.95
16	7.61	.45	.01	.26	8.33	4.50	.49	.43	.27	.22	5.91	2.42	1.54	.27	.61
11	8.67	.44	---	-.01	9.10	5.14	.39	.76	.32	.10	6.71	2.39	1.52	.27	.60
6	7.71	.38	.01	---	8.10	4.54	.31	.33	.33	---	5.51	2.59	2.03	.26	.30
2	7.71	.44	---	.55	8.70	4.63	.47	.79	.52	.12	6.53	2.17	1.55	.34	.28
18	6.77	.39	.02	.04	7.22	4.09	.39	.29	.21	.53	5.51	1.71	1.24	.19	.28
23	7.16	.38	---	.21	7.75	4.86	.48	.35	.18	---	5.87	1.88	1.41	.21	.26
22	7.09	.48	---	-.11	7.46	4.26	.40	.59	.36	---	5.61	1.85	1.44	.22	.19
28	7.83	.35	---	.06	8.24	4.23	.54	.58	.55	.12	6.02	2.22	1.85	.27	.10
19	7.13	.35	---	-.21	7.27	4.57	.32	.32	.25	---	5.46	1.81	1.58	.24	-.01
5	6.32	.54	---	-.51	6.35	4.20	.53	.26	.47	.09	5.55	.80	2.41	.35	-1.96
Hi-10	7.65	.38	.03	.12	8.18	4.43	.46	.45	.21	.35	5.90	2.28	.75	.21	1.32
Lo-10	7.48	.42	.01	.07	7.98	4.51	.44	.49	.34	.14	5.92	2.06	1.63	.26	.17
Ave.	7.58	.40	.02	.10	8.10	4.46	.45	.46	.27	.27	5.91	2.19	1.10	.23	.86

Individual records are listed above in order of management income per hen, which appears in the last column. The first ten records form the Hi 10, or the higher management income group, for which the averages appear at the bottom of the table. Notice that the Hi 10 sold eggs for 17 cents more per hen than the lower group. The Hi 10 had a management income of \$1.32 compared to \$.17 per hen for the Lo 10. This is largely due to the fact that the Hi 10 had a cost of 75 cents per hen for farm labor compared to \$1.63 for the Lo 10. In the farm income, the range was from a total or net earning of \$3.22 per hen to a low of \$.80 per hen on individual records. There is little difference in this year's records between the average net farm income of \$2.28 for the Hi 10 and an average of \$2.05 for the Lo 10. Some of the difference may be due to luck or chance, but most of it can be attributed to management. Decisions pertaining to the source of stock, conditions of pullets raised, number and timing of replacements raised, methods of feeding, plus the selection and purchasing of feeds, marketing and handling of eggs, and disease prevention are important influences on the results and profits.

TABLE II: DISEASES ARE IMPORTANT -- SEE RELATED FACTORS HERE

Serial No.	Eggs Laid Per Hen	Fall Eggs Per Fall Hen	Per Cent Pullets	PerCent Added July--October	Per Cent Mortality	Per Cent Chicks Lost	Culling		Per Cent Feed Mash	Size of Flock ***	Type of Floor	Disease or Troubles, etc.
							Per Cent	No. Mos. %				
8	264	87	92	40	10	3.3	83	12	48	L	Wire	Leu., Mites
13	251	81	100	50	10	0.6	72	10	55	L	Litter	I.C., C.C., Can., CRD., Wrm., Mites
17	251	81	100	28	8	12.6	97	11	49	S	Wire	Lar., Leu., CRD.
4	250	83	100	33	11	3.7	107	12	52	L	Wire	Can., Lice, N.C. Reaction, Leu.
21	251	82	86	31	9	6.8	87	12	48	L	Wire	---
12	246	82	73	26	12	0.9	90	12	82	L	Wire	Mites
1	258	84	82	35	10	1.2	76	12	82	S	Wire	Can., Leu., Gout, Mites
3	241	79	76	44	8	0.8	85	12	49	M	Wire	---
29	242	75	73	48	5	4.9	74	12	100	M	Litter	C.C., Hem., Leu., Worms, Mites
9	205	74	81	22	18	16.4	67	4	46	L	Lit. & Wr.	Lice, CRD.
16	231	76	72	27	5	0.5	105	12	55	L	Wire	CRD., Mites
11	244	80	89	32	6	17.0	108	12	90	L	Wire	Pox., Mites
6	249	76	86	16	6	4.6	65	12	59	M	Wire	Mites, Can.
2	241	79	87	39	10	7.0	81	12	54	M	Wire	Leu., Mites
18	213	69	83	35	19	6.5	77	11	45	L	Lit. & Slat	C.C., I.B., CRD.
23	223	75	85	33	13	3.1	82	8	70	M	Wire	Can., CRD.
22	222	81	96	74	13	1.3	87	6	53	S	Wire	Can., Mites
28	242	80	82	50	6	2.5	83	12	52	M	Wire	CRD., Mites
19	219	68	84	33	15	8.0	86	12	99	S	Wire	---
5	218	76	92	100	10	5.6	112	12	52	S	Wire	Leu.
Hi-10	239	80	87	34	12	6.8	81	---	56	3768		
Lo-10	231	76	86	37	10	6.5	90	---	62	2511		
Ave.	236	78	86	35	11	6.7	84	---	59	3140		

If you compare these records with the 1956 records, you will find that the number of hens is greater by an average of 284 birds per farm. Since the size of flocks is increasing, we raised the size-rating table. In 1957 we had the lowest mortality since the study began for both young stock raised and laying hens, which shows that poultrymen did a better job in this department last year than in any other year since the start of the management study.

Leu. - Leucosis	I.C. - Intestinal
Can. - Cannibalism	Coccidiosis
C.C. - Cecal	N.C. - New Castle
Coccidiosis	Hem. - Hemorrhagic
CRD. - Chronic	disease
Respiratory	I.B. - Infectious
Disease	Bronchitis
Wrm. - Worms	Lar. - Laryngotracheitis

\*\*\* Flock Size: S: Up to 2,000 M: 2,000 to 3,000  
L: 3,000 and Up

TABLE III: EXPENSE PER HEN IS IMPORTANT TO PROFIT

Ser. No.	Per Cent of Average Number of Hens				Ave. Price Cull Hens	Ave. Cost Per Pul. Chick	Per Cent Chicks Lost	Average Cost Per CWT. of Feed			Feed Cost Per Hen	Per Cent Mash	lbs. Mash and Grain	lbs. Feed Per Doz.	lbs. Feed Loss	Grit Shell Lime-stone	Value of Feed Lost
	Died	Culled	Added	Repl.				Mash	Grain	M&G							
8	10	83	126	93	50.1	38.3	3.3	3.85	2.93	3.36	4.39	48	128	5.6	2.2	3.3	.07
13	10	72	117	82	51.3	38.6	0.6	4.07	3.08	3.62	4.56	55	123	5.5	2.5	6.8	.09
17	8	97	113	107	50.2	33.5	12.6	4.08	2.93	3.49	5.01	49	142	6.2	9.7	1.8	.34
4	11	107	134	121	41.6	38.6	3.7	3.91	2.59	3.27	4.18	52	126	6.0	2.2	5.2	.07
21	9	87	120	96	49.4	36.5	6.8	4.17	2.94	3.53	4.97	48	140	6.4	9.1	3.0	.32
12	12	90	111	102	50.9	46.7	0.9	3.66	2.97	3.54	4.64	82*	130	6.1	3.0	5.1	.11
1	10	76	96	88	55.6	43.9	1.2	3.83	2.93	3.67	4.34	82*	118	5.4	1.0	2.6	.04
3	8	85	115	86	45.4	37.7	0.8	3.83	3.05	3.44	4.19	49	121	5.9	0.8	5.9	.03
29	5	74	116	80	34.5	46.8	4.9	4.01	---	4.01	4.38	100	109	5.3	---	0.1	---
9	18	67	89	86	48.1	32.1	16.4	4.04	2.45	3.18	4.09	46	126	6.8	9.0	4.1	.29
16	5	105	112	110	41.8	35.1	0.5	4.17	2.93	3.61	4.50	55	122	5.8	1.7	7.9	.06
11	6	108	137	112	40.2	31.7	17.0	3.87	3.30	3.81	5.14	90	135	6.5	7.6	3.9	.29
6	6	65	77	71	57.9	38.3	4.6	3.93	2.78	3.46	4.54	59	129	6.1	11.4	7.9	.39
2	10	81	119	91	47.1	35.8	7.0	3.85	3.05	3.48	4.63	54	131	6.5	9.0	3.9	.31
18	19	77	97	109	49.0	38.9	6.5	3.75	2.96	3.30	4.09	45	121	6.2	0.6	14.8	.02
23	13	82	112	98	46.7	39.9	3.1	4.32	3.10	3.95	4.86	70	121	6.1	0.2	4.4	.01
22	13	87	99	103	53.6	43.4	1.3	3.80	3.05	3.45	4.26	53	121	6.4	3.6	7.7	.12
28	6	83	78	89	42.6	40.6	2.5	4.31	2.89	3.63	4.23	52	114	5.3	+5.0	8.5	+.18
19	15	86	97	101	40.5	37.1	8.0	3.76	3.06	3.76	4.57	99	121	6.2	3.9	6.3	.15
5	10	112	84	123	47.0	47.2	5.6	3.84	3.10	3.48	4.20	52	118	6.2	2.1	5.1	.07
Hi-10	12	81	111	93	47.5	38.0	6.8	3.95	2.77	3.44	4.43	56	127	6.1	5.1	4.0	.18
Lo-10	10	90	104	102	45.5	37.6	6.5	3.96	2.98	3.59	4.51	62	124	6.1	3.5	7.2	.13
Ave.	11	84	108	96	46.7	37.8	6.7	3.96	2.85	3.50	4.46	59	126	6.1	4.4	5.3	.15

\* Nos. 12 and 1 bought mash mixed with whole grain.

Feed requirements were estimated from the amount used in the Eighth Official Random Sample Egg Laying Test, according to the kind of stock used and considering the young stock added and the young stock in the opening and closing inventories. This year we find the lowest feed waste since we began figuring this item. The high group wasted 18 cents per hen and the low group, 13 cents per hen—neither was very significant. We believe this is the only table where a slight variation might occur in the figure of estimated feed waste. There are so many factors that enter into the feed-waste picture, but no doubt part of this is because some poultrymen still choose to buy minerals in the feed rather than separately. This is shown in the above table.

TABLE IV: PRODUCTION, MORTALITY, REPLACEMENTS, FEED, AND LABOR USE DETERMINE PROFITS

Ser. No.	Eggs Sold Per Hen.	Eggs Laid Per Hen	% AA of Lge.	Per Cent of All Eggs Sold					% Eggs Sept-Dec	Average Price Per Dozen			Cents Per Dozen						
				Lge.	Med.	Sm. & Com.	Whl-sale	Re-tail		Whl-sale	Re-tail	All Eggs	Feed Cost	Cash Cost	Net Cost	Mgt. Inc.	Fam. Labor	Int. or Invest.	Net Farm Inc.
8	275	264	97	59	30	11	99	1	37	35.4	40.2	35.5	19.2	22.0	24.5	11.0	1.6	0.9	13.5
13	266	251	97	66	24	10	95	5	39	36.3	41.8	36.6	20.5	22.1	28.2	8.4	5.3	0.8	14.5
17	271	251	96	74	16	10	96	4	31	35.5	53.4	36.1	22.1	22.6	30.0	6.1	6.6	0.8	13.5
4	252	250	98	71	18	11	100	--	35	36.8	----	36.8	19.9	26.8	30.4	6.4	2.4	1.2	10.0
21	262	251	97	70	19	11	100	--	36	36.9	----	36.9	22.8	29.3	31.1	5.8	0.7	1.1	7.6
12	256	246	95	79	12	9	96	4	36	38.1	44.2	38.3	21.8	25.5	33.0	5.3	6.3	1.2	12.8
1	263	258	95	79	15	6	99	1	35	38.3	47.7	38.4	19.9	23.8	33.6	4.8	8.4	1.4	14.6
3	247	241	90	63	25	12	100	--	36	35.7	----	35.7	20.3	21.3	30.7	5.0	8.1	1.3	14.4
29	248	242	96	65	16	11	92	**	33	35.1	**	37.3	21.2	27.4	32.6	4.7	4.0	1.2	9.9
9	224	205	87	67	23	10	99	1	35	35.9	36.3	35.9	21.9	28.1	30.8	5.1	1.9	0.8	7.8
16	251	231	89	77	13	10	99	1	33	36.4	37.2	36.4	21.5	24.9	33.5	2.9	7.4	1.3	11.6
11	247	244	95	82	13	5	85	15	37	40.7	49.2	42.0	24.9	30.4	39.1	2.9	7.4	1.3	11.6
6	256	249	85	78	14	8	100	--	32	36.3	----	36.3	21.3	24.1	34.9	1.4	9.5	1.3	12.2
2	242	241	99	75	18	7	98	2	39	38.1	43.9	38.2	22.9	27.4	36.8	1.4	7.7	1.7	10.8
18	236	213	90	54	28	18	97	3	33	34.0	46.9	34.4	20.8	25.7	33.0	1.4	6.3	1.0	8.7
23	236	223	97	69	20	11	100	--	36	36.3	----	36.3	24.7	26.8	35.1	1.2	7.2	1.1	9.5
22	226	222	95	76	14	10	97	3	43	37.3	45.4	37.6	22.6	27.7	36.6	1.0	7.7	1.2	9.9
28	258	242	92	77	15	8	100	--	34	36.5	----	36.5	19.7	26.1	36.0	0.5	8.6	1.3	10.4
19	236	219	85	68	19	13	100	--	32	36.2	----	36.2	23.2	27.0	36.3	-0.1	8.0	1.3	9.2
5	227	218	91	74	16	10	98	2	36	33.2	44.5	33.4	22.2	29.2	43.8	-10.4	12.7	1.9	4.2
Hi-10	251	239	95	69	21	10	98	2	36	36.3	42.7	36.6	21.2	25.7	30.3	6.3	3.6	1.0	10.9
Lo-10	242	231	92	73	17	10	97	3	35	36.6	47.5	36.9	22.3	26.8	36.1	0.8	8.0	1.3	10.1
Ave.	247	236	93	71	19	10	98	2	35	36.4	45.4	36.7	21.6	26.1	32.5	4.2	5.3	1.1	10.6

\*\* No. 29 sold 8 per cent hatching eggs for an average price of 63.2 cents per dozen.

A higher production per hen is again shown by the higher management income group compared to the lower group. There are a few exceptions, and their cost per hen was the reason they ranked above some of the lower ones. Egg prices are determined by size, quality, seasonal distribution, and channel of sale. Slightly better egg prices were received by the lower ten flocks, which received an average of 36.9 cents per dozen for all eggs. The Hi 10 recieved an average of 36.6 cents per dozen for all eggs. Grades of eggs were considerably better in 1957 than in 1956, which shows one way in which more profit can be obtained.

TABLE V: RESULTS BY THREE TYPES OF HOUSING

Ser. No.	Size of Flock	Eggs Laid Per Hen	Hens Per Pen or Cage	Per Cent Mortality	Average Price		Hrs. Lab. Per Hen	House & Equipment Per Hen		Dollars Per Average Hen					
					Feed Per CWT	Eggs Per Doz.		Investment	Depreciation	Egg Income	Net Stock & Misc. Inc.	Total Income	Total Expense	Mgt. Income	Net Farm Income
<b>CAGE FLOCKS</b>															
8	L	264	2	10	3.36	35.5	0.8	.20	.20	8.12	.89	9.01	6.50	2.51	3.09
17	S	251	2	8	3.49	36.1	1.0	.19	.18	8.18	.71	8.89	7.51	1.38	3.85
21	L	251	1	9	3.53	36.9	0.6	.23	.21	8.03	.78	8.81	7.54	1.27	1.66
12	L	246	1,2	12	3.54	38.3	0.9	.24	.40	8.16	.42	8.58	7.45	1.13	2.72
1	S	258	1,2	10	3.67	38.4	1.3	.30	.49	8.42	.54	8.96	7.91	1.05	3.19
3	M	241	2	8	3.44	35.7	1.1	.27	.35	7.37	.85	8.22	7.18	1.04	2.98
16	L	231	1,2	5	3.61	36.4	1.2	.27	.27	7.61	.72	8.33	7.72	.61	2.42
11	L	244	2	6	3.81	42.0	1.1	.27	.32	8.67	.43	9.10	8.50	.60	2.39
6	M	249	2	6	3.46	36.3	1.4	.26	.33	7.71	.39	8.10	7.80	.30	2.59
2	M	241	2	10	3.48	38.2	1.1	.34	.52	7.71	.99	8.70	8.42	.28	2.17
28	M	242	2	6	3.63	36.5	1.3	.27	.55	7.83	.41	8.24	8.14	.10	2.22
19	S	219	2	15	3.76	36.2	1.1	.24	.25	7.13	.14	7.27	7.28	-.01	1.81
5	S	218	1	10	3.48	33.4	1.7	.35	.47	6.32	.03	6.35	8.31	-1.96	.80
<b>COLONY</b>															
4	L	250	25	11	3.27	36.8	0.8	.25	.25	7.73	.36	8.09	6.75	1.34	2.11
23	M	223	40	13	3.95	36.3	0.9	.21	.18	7.16	.59	7.75	7.49	.26	1.88
22	S	222	15-25	13	3.45	37.6	0.9	.22	.36	7.09	.37	7.46	7.27	.19	1.85
<b>LITTER</b>															
13	L	251	500	10	3.62	36.6	0.9	.17	.20	8.15	.95	9.10	7.23	1.87	3.22
29	M	242	500	5	4.01	37.3	0.6	.25	.33	7.72	-.05	7.67	6.71	.96	2.05
9*	L	205	30, 500	18	3.18	35.9	0.7	.15	.04	6.71	.25	6.96	6.01	.95	1.46
18*	L	213	225-500	19	3.30	34.4	1.4	.19	.21	6.77	.45	7.22	6.94	.28	1.71
Cage-2810		244	—	9	3.55	37.0	1.1	.26	.33	7.85	.61	8.46	7.66	.80	2.38
Colony-2442		235	—	12	3.51	36.9	0.9	.23	.26	7.41	.43	7.84	7.09	.75	1.98
Litter-4712		220	—	15	3.39	36.0	0.8	.18	.14	7.13	.36	7.49	6.48	1.01	1.90

\* Birds mostly on litter; small percentage on slats or wire (pens).

It still looks as if there are many influences on profit which are more important than the type of housing. You will notice that with multiple- and liter-type hen housing, the poultrymen were able to take care of more birds per hour of labor; however, the cage operators were able to get higher egg production and a higher farm income per hen. Caged birds in the study totaled 36,520; birds in multiple- or colony-type housing, 7,427; and birds on litter floors, 18,846. There is still a question as to which type of housing is best, but it seems to us that the man in business is more important than the housing. However, with almost twice as many birds on the study in cages as on floors, it looks as though many of our poultrymen are choosing cages.



TABLE VI: HOW WE COMPARE WITH OTHER YEARS

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957
Number of records	21	24	23	17	24	27	24	24	20
Ave.No. hens per flock	1619	1734	1716	1784	1920	2293	2759	2856	3140
Eggs laid per hen	197	210	209	228	218	228	231	232	236
Hens: % Mortality	21.8	16	14	11	15	13	10.9	12.3	11
% Culled	92.3	82	104	118	97	96	86.7	101.0	84
% Added	129.6	99	121	138	131	129	124.7	115.1	108
% Increase or decrease	15.5	1	3	9	19	20	27.1	1.8	13
Av.Price mash & grain per CWT.	3.93	3.67	4.04	4.42	4.14	3.79	3.60	3.58	3.50
lbs. mash & grain per hen	141	128	138	146	144	135	135	127	126
Per cent mash	64	62	55	57	53	56	49	55	59
Hours labor per hen	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.1
Av. price per doz. eggs	49.5	41.9	54.9	48.6	55.0	40.7	42.8	40.1	36.7
Net cost per dozen	45.1	37.8	42.3	42.3	42.3	38.3	33.3	33.8	32.5
Management inc. per doz.	4.4	4.1	12.6	6.3	12.7	2.4	9.5	6.3	4.2
<u>Income per hen</u>									
Egg sales	8.19	7.36	9.74	9.47	10.37	8.05	8.59	8.11	7.58
Poultry sales	.67	.73	1.32	1.01	.95	.57	.56	.56	.40
Miscellaneous income	.22	.22	.30	.05	.03	.04	.02	.02	.02
Inventory change	.26	---	-.12	.28	-.57	.43	.60	.07	.10
TOTAL INCOME	9.34	8.31	11.24	10.81	11.92	9.09	9.77	8.76	8.10
<u>Cash &amp; Depreciation Costs</u>									
Feed	5.68	4.78	5.66	6.51	6.03	5.15	4.91	4.60	4.46
Stock bought	---	.53	.74	.78	.66	.60	.53	.48	.45
Miscellaneous costs	.68	.45	.53	.48	.57	.62	.47	.49	.46
Depreciation	.23	.21	.30	.32	.26	.27	.25	.26	.27
Hired labor	.25	.26	.38	.15	.17	.24	.22	.24	.27
TOTAL CASH & DEPR. COSTS	6.84	6.23	7.61	8.24	7.69	6.88	6.38	6.07	5.91
<u>Farm Income</u>									
Family labor	2.50	2.08	3.63	2.57	4.23	2.21	3.38	2.69	2.19
Interest on Investment	1.51	1.12	1.11	1.06	1.55	1.45	1.20	1.16	1.10
MANAGEMENT INCOME	.26	.24	.29	.28	.28	.29	.28	.27	.23
	.73	.72	2.23	1.23	2.40	.47	1.90	1.26	.86

The above study averages for Sonoma County for the last nine years represent a small sample from a large poultry industry and should not be considered as applied to the entire poultry business in this county. The 1957 Study shows an increase in egg production per hen and a reduction in the percentage of mortality as compared to most years. With income per hen down from last year because of lower egg prices, poultrymen were able to make less in 1957 than in 1956. This loss could have been greater but because they were able to reduce costs and improve efficiency, this difference amounted to only fifty cents per hen, while the total income was sixty-six cents less. Therefore, efficiency was increased over 1956.